



CASE REPORT

- | | |
|-------------------------------|--|
| 1. Complaint reference number | 94/03 |
| 2. Advertiser | Carter Holt Harvey Tissue Pty Ltd (Handee Ultra) |
| 3. Product | Housegoods/services |
| 4. Type of advertisement | TV |
| 5. Nature of complaint | Other - Miscellaneous |
| 6. Date of determination | Tuesday, 8 April 2003 |
| 7. DETERMINATION | Dismissed |

DESCRIPTION OF THE ADVERTISEMENT

This television advertisement opens on a lounge scene where a young man is watching a sporting event on television while it can be seen to be raining outside. His attention is called to a whimpering dog, outside in the rain. Making his way to the door without taking his eyes from the television action, the man picks up a roll of paper towels. In a following scene, the man is shown to be seated watching television again, with the view switching to show the soaked dog sitting alongside him, completely wrapped in paper towels. A final graphic of a representation of the product is accompanied by a caption-supported voiceover stating: "Handee Ultra, Australia's most absorbent paper towel."

THE COMPLAINT

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

"I was appalled...Is it no wonder why animals are treated badly, even pets, when this is what is being imparted...I felt completely embarrassed that this how Australians are portrayed..."

"I see this as animal cruelty for a stupid football head that couldn't get up off his couch to get the dog out of the pouring rain."

THE DETERMINATION

The Advertising Standards Board ('the Board') considered whether this advertisement breaches Section 2 of the Advertiser Code of Ethics ('the Code').

In its response to the complaint, the advertiser's agency stated its view that "The reasonable viewer will see that as soon as the man is aware of the dog being caught in a downpour outside, he moves to allow it inside out of the rain".

The Board accepted an assurance on behalf of the advertiser that: "The dog 'Sootie' was never put under any distress or discomfort during the making of the commercial".

The Board determined that, within the context of prevailing community standards, the portrayal did not contravene the Code on any grounds and, accordingly, the complaint was dismissed.