

COMPLAINT NUMBER	17/296
COMPLAINANT	J Adams
ADVERTISER	Subway New Zealand Limited
ADVERTISEMENT	Television
DATE OF MEETING	4 September 2017
OUTCOME	No Grounds to Proceed

Advertisement: The television advertisement for the Subway Lamb Roast sub showed a man talking about how he was supposed to go to his mother's for dinner but he got "a better offer" in the form of Subway's Roast Lamb sub. The man said, in part: "it's lamb without a side dish of Mum's 'so when are you getting married?' It's my kind of lambelicious."

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

Complainant, J Adams, said: a current ad for subway where a "man" is going to mums for a roast. Then ditches hers for the subway roast. This is disrespectful to all mothers who take pride in cooking for their family. This also depicts that who gives a dam if Mum has already cooked the meal, I can just leave her in the lurch and go to subway. Lets gets some adds that show family togetherness. How about he rings mum to check if roast is on and if No he grabs a subway for both of them.

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

The Chair noted the concerns of the Complainant the advertisement was disrespectful to mothers and should have depicted better family values.

The Chair noted the light-hearted tone and intended humour of the advertisement. She said the advertisement focused on a young man saying he would rather have a Subway sandwich then go to his mother's house for dinner in order to avoid discussing potential marriage plans. The Chair said while this could be seen as thoughtless behavior on the part of the young man, she did not agree with the Complainant's interpretation that the advertisement was disrespectful and offensive to mothers. The Chair said the advertisement had used a stereotype of a mother very interested in her son's future with a level of humour to help offset possible offence.

The Chair said the advertisement was unlikely to cause offence to most people and there was no apparent breach of Rules 4 or 5 of the Code of Ethics. She said the advertisement had been prepared with a due sense of social responsibility to consumers and society and was not in breach of Basic Principle 4 of the Code of Ethics.

Accordingly, the Chair ruled the complaint had no grounds to proceed.

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