



CASE REPORT

- | | |
|-------------------------------|---|
| 1. Complaint reference number | 352/04 |
| 2. Advertiser | Eli Lilly Australia Pty Ltd |
| 3. Product | Health Products |
| 4. Type of advertisement | TV |
| 5. Nature of complaint | Portrayal of sex/sexuality/nudity – section 2.3 |
| 6. Date of determination | Tuesday, 8 February 2005 |
| 7. DETERMINATION | Dismissed |

DESCRIPTION OF THE ADVERTISEMENT

The advertisement features a man and woman dancing on a city rooftop and a neon street sign in the background that states 95% of erection problems can be treated. The voiceover asks: “Would you like to forget your erection problems for the weekend?”

THE COMPLAINT

Comments which the complainant/s made regarding this advertisement included the following:

“It is offensive that parents are put into a position where their young children (predominantly boys) are confronted with this sort of advertising while watching what should be a show that is suitable for General Exhibition – during the day, even.”

“This was offensive as I have three girls (15, 13, 11 years) who watch the cricket occasionally and I don’t want to have to explain the advert content to them.”

THE ADVERTISER’S RESPONSE

Comments which the advertiser made in response to the complaint/s regarding this advertisement included the following:

“The advertising campaign is designed to reduce some of the stigma about erectile dysfunction, which is experienced by nearly 40 percent of Australian men at some time of their lives.”

“... the inclusion of the billboard message “95% of erection problems can be treated” within the advertisement is intended to enhance its educational content.”

“Further, we have been given a PG rating for our advertisement, and have strictly followed the guidelines regarding media placement of commercials with this classification. The general theme and feel of the advertisement is of a romantic, whimsical nature, designed to deal with the subject matter in a tasteful manner.”

THE DETERMINATION

The Advertising Standards Board (“Board”) considered whether this advertisement breaches section 2 of the Advertiser Code of Ethics (the “Code”).

The Board was of the view that in the context of prevailing community standards, the majority of people would not find this advertisement offensive.

The Board found that the depiction did not contravene the provisions of the Code relating to the portrayal of sex, sexuality & nudity.

Further finding that the advertisement did not breach the Code on any other grounds, the Board dismissed the complaint.