

COMPLAINT NUMBER	17/065
COMPLAINANT	M Zukowski & L Brown
ADVERTISER	Reckitt Benckiser (NZ) Limited
ADVERTISEMENT	V.I. Poo Television
DATE OF MEETING	27 February 2017
OUTCOME	No Grounds to Proceed

Advertisement: The television advertisement for V.I. Poo toilet spray features a Hollywood-style star attending a film premiere for her latest film “Magic Wanda”. She is very glamorous, with long blonde hair and a pink evening gown. She says to camera “Even Hollywood’s latest sweetheart needs to punish the porcelain occasionally. But to avoid embarrassment I give every toilet the V. I. Poo treatment. Spray generously before taking your seat. V.I. Poo forms a protective layer trapping the icky smell of your devil’s doughnuts. So, no red faces in front of your boss – Hollywood’s latest director. Even a VIP needs to V.I. Poo!”

The Chair ruled there were no grounds for the complaint to proceed.

Complainant, M Zukowski, said: The Air Wick advert for ‘V.I.Poo’ is wholly inappropriate and offensive - the reference to ‘Devils Doughnuts’ is just downright common and not what should be expected from NZ advertisers.

Complainant, L Brown, said: This advert is disgusting, it clearly shows lumps of poo (human shit) (sorry) going into the toilet, then an actor spraying VI Poo solution after she has had the poo, ready for the next visitor to the toilet. Really, I was eating cheese and cracker and had to stop. This is urgent please get it stopped!!

The relevant provisions were Code of Ethics - Basic Principle 4, Rule 4, Rule 5.

The Chair noted the Complainants’ concerns the advertisement is inappropriate, offensive and disgusting.

The Chair said the advertisement uses humour to deal with a socially uncomfortable subject, toilet odour. The Chair said the content of the advertisement is relevant to the product being advertised. She also noted that the visual of the toilet was animated and no actual faeces were shown in the advertisement.

The Chair said while some viewers may find this advertisement unpleasant and distasteful, the level of offensiveness does not reach the threshold required to breach the Code of Ethics.

Therefore, the Chair ruled the advertisement had been prepared with a due sense of social responsibility to consumers and there was no apparent breach of Basic Principle 4 or Rules 4 & 5 of the Code of Ethics. Accordingly, the Chair ruled there were no grounds for the complaint to proceed.

Chair’s Ruling: Complaint **No Grounds to Proceed**