

1. *Norwest Corporation*, Minneapolis, Minnesota, to acquire through its subsidiaries, *Norwest Financial Special Services, Inc.*, Des Moines, Iowa, and *Norwest Financial, Inc.*, Des Moines, Iowa, *Orlandi Valuta*, Los Angeles, California, and *Orlandi Valuta Nacional*, Boulder City, Nevada, and thereby engage in money transmission activities to foreign countries, pursuant to *Philippine Commercial International Bank*, 77 Federal Reserve Bulletin 271 (1991).

Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, July 27, 1995.

Jennifer J. Johnson,

Deputy Secretary of the Board.

[FR Doc. 95-18936 Filed 8-1-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6210-01-F

FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION

[Dkt. C-3586]

Glaxo plc; Prohibited Trade Practices, and Affirmative Corrective Actions

AGENCY: Federal Trade Commission.

ACTION: Consent order.

SUMMARY: In settlement of alleged violations of federal law prohibiting unfair acts and practices and unfair methods of competition, this consent order requires, among other things, a British drug company to divest, within nine months, Wellcome's worldwide research and development assets for non-injectable drugs, or else agree to have a Commission-appointed trustee to complete the transaction. In addition, the consent order requires Glaxo, for a period of ten years, to obtain Commission approval before acquiring more than one percent interest in any entity involved in the clinical development, manufacture or sale of migraine drugs.

DATES: Complaint and Order issued June 14, 1995.¹

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Claudia Higgins or Ann Malester, FTC/S-2224, Washington, DC 20580. (202) 326-2682.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: On Wednesday, March 29, 1995, there was published in the **Federal Register**, 60 FR 16139, a proposed consent agreement with analysis in the Matter of Glaxo plc, for the purpose of soliciting public comment. Interested parties were given sixty (60) days in which to submit comments, suggestions or objections

regarding the proposed form of the order.

No comment have been received, the Commission has ordered the issuance of the complaint in the form contemplated by the agreement, made its jurisdictional findings and entered an order to divest, as set forth in the proposed consent agreement, in disposition of this proceeding.

(Sec. 6, Stat. 721; 15 U.S.C. 46. Interpret or apply sec. 5, 38 Stat. 719, as amended; sec. 7, 38 Stat. 731, as amended; 15 U.S.C. 45, 18)

Benjamin I. Berman,

Acting Secretary.

[FR Doc. 95-18953 Filed 8-1-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6750-01-M

[File No. 942 3294]

J. Walter Thompson USA, Inc.; Proposed Consent Agreement With Analysis To Aid Public Comment

AGENCY: Federal Trade Commission.

ACTION: Proposed consent agreement.

SUMMARY: In settlement of alleged violations of federal law prohibiting unfair acts and practices and unfair methods of competition, this consent agreement, accepted subject to final Commission approval, would prohibit, among other things, a New York-based advertising agency, which prepared advertisements for Jenny Craig, Inc., from claiming that any weight-loss program is recommended, approved, or endorsed by any person, group, or other entity, unless it possesses and relies upon competent and reliable scientific evidence to substantiate the representation. In addition, the consent agreement prohibits the respondent from misrepresenting the existence, results, or interpretations of any test, study, or survey.

DATES: Comments must be received on or before October 2, 1995.

ADDRESSES: Comments should be directed to: FTC/Office of the Secretary, Room 159, 6th Street and Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20580.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Jeffrey Klurfeld or Matthew Gold, Federal Trade Commission, San Francisco Regional Office, 901 Market Street, Suite 570, San Francisco, CA 94103. (415) 744-7920.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Pursuant to Section 6(f) of the Federal Trade Commission Act, 38 Stat. 721, 15 U.S.C. 46 and Section 2.34 of the Commission's Rules of Practice (16 CFR 2.34), notice is hereby given that the following consent agreement containing a consent order to cease and desist, having been

filed with and accepted, subject to final approval, by the Commission, has been placed on the public record for a period of sixty (60) days. Public comment is invited. Such comments or views will be considered by the Commission and will be available for inspection and copying at its principal office in accordance with Section 4.9(b)(6)(ii) of the Commission's Rules of Practice (16 CFR 4.9(b)(6)(ii)).

Agreement Containing Consent Order to Cease and Desist

The Federal Trade Commission having initiated an investigation of certain acts and practices of J. Walter Thompson USA, Inc., a corporation, and it now appearing that the proposed respondent is willing to enter into an agreement containing an order to cease and desist from the use of the acts and practices being investigated,

It is hereby agreed by and between J. Walter Thompson USA, Inc., a corporation, by its duly authorized officer, and its attorney, and counsel for the Federal Trade Commission that:

1. Proposed respondent J. Walter Thompson USA, Inc. is a corporation organized, existing and doing business under and by virtue of the laws of the State of Delaware, with its office and principal place of business located at 466 Lexington Avenue, New York, New York 10017.

2. Proposed respondent admits all the jurisdictional facts set forth in the draft of complaint.

3. Proposed respondent waives:

- Any further procedural steps;
- The requirement that the

Commission's decision contain a statement of findings of fact and conclusions of law;

c. All rights to seek judicial review or otherwise to challenge or contest the validity of the order entered pursuant to this agreement; and

d. Any claim under the Equal Access to Justice Act.

4. This agreement shall not become part of the public record of the proceeding unless and until it is accepted by the Commission. If this agreement is accepted by the Commission, it, together with the draft of complaint contemplated thereby, will be placed on the public record for a period of sixty (60) days and information in respect thereto publicly released. The Commission thereafter may either withdraw its acceptance of this agreement and so notify the proposed respondent, in which event it will take such action as it may consider appropriate, or issue and serve its complaint (in such form as the circumstances may require) and

¹ Copies of the Complaint and the Decision and Order are available from the Commission's Public Reference Branch, H-130, 6th Street & Pennsylvania Avenue, NW., Washington, DC 20580.

decision, in disposition of the proceeding.

5. This agreement is for settlement purposes only and does not constitute an admission by proposed respondent of facts, other than jurisdictional facts, or of violations of law as alleged in the draft of complaint.

6. This agreement contemplates that, if it is accepted by the Commission, and if such acceptance is not subsequently withdrawn by the Commission pursuant to the provisions of Section 2.34 of the Commission's Rules, the Commission may, without further notice to proposed respondent, (a) issue its complaint corresponding in form and substance with the draft of complaint and its decision containing the following order to cease and desist in disposition of the proceeding and (b) make information public in respect thereto. When so entered, the order to cease and desist shall have the same force and effect and may be altered, modified or set aside in the same manner and within the same time provided by statute for other orders. The order shall become final upon service. Delivery by the U.S. Postal Service of the complaint and decision containing the agreed-to order to proposed respondent's address as stated in this agreement shall constitute service. The proposed respondent waives any right it may have to any other manner of service. The complaint may be used in construing the terms of the order, and no agreement, understanding, representation, or interpretation not contained in the order or the agreement may be used to vary or contradict the terms of the order.

7. The proposed respondent has read the proposed complaint and order contemplated hereby. The proposed respondent understands that once the order has been issued, it will be required to file one or more compliance reports showing that it has fully complied with the order. The proposed respondent further understands that it may be liable for civil penalties in the amount provided by law for each violation of the order after it becomes final.

Order

For purposes of this order, the term "diet-related food" shall mean any food (as that term is defined in 15 U.S.C. § 55(b)) whose labeling or advertising makes any claim regarding its weight loss or weight maintenance benefits.

I

It is ordered that respondent, J. Walter Thompson USA, Inc., a corporation, its successors and assigns, and its officers, and respondent's agents, representatives

and employees, directly or through any corporation, subsidiary, division or other device, in connection with the advertising, promotion, offering for sale, or sale of any weight loss program, in or affecting commerce, as "commerce" is defined in the Federal Trade Commission Act, do forthwith cease and desist from representing, directly or by implication, that such program is recommended, approved or endorsed by any person, group or other entity, unless, at the time of making any such representation, respondent possesses and relies upon competent and reliable evidence, which when appropriate must be competent and reliable scientific evidence, that substantiates such representation. For the purposes of this order, "competent and reliable scientific evidence" shall mean those tests, analyses, research, studies or other evidence based on the expertise of professionals in the relevant area, that have been conducted and evaluated in an objective manner by persons qualified to do so, using procedures generally accepted in the profession to yield accurate and reliable results.

Provided, however, that it shall be a defense hereunder that the respondent neither knew nor had reason to know of an inadequacy of substantiation for the representation.

II

It is further ordered that respondent, J. Walter Thompson USA, Inc., a corporation, its successors and assigns, and its officers, and respondent's agents, representatives and employees, directly or through any corporation, subsidiary, division or other device, in connection with the advertising, promotion, offering for sale, or sale of any weight loss or weight control program, weight loss product, health or fitness program, exercise equipment, or diet-related food, in or affecting commerce, as "commerce" is defined in the Federal Trade Commission Act, do forthwith cease and desist from misrepresenting, in any manner, directly or by implication, the existence, contents, validity, results, conclusions, or interpretations of any test, study, or survey.

Provided, however, that it shall be a defense hereunder that the respondent neither knew nor had reason to know that the test, study or survey did not prove, demonstrate or confirm the representation.

III

It is further ordered that for five (5) years after the date of the last dissemination of the representation to which they pertain, respondent, or its

successors and assigns, shall maintain and upon request make available to the Federal Trade Commission or its staff for inspection and copying:

A. All materials relied upon to substantiate any claim or representation covered by this Order; and

B. All tests, reports, studies, surveys, demonstrations or other evidence in its possession or control that contradict, qualify, or call into question such representation, or the basis relied upon for such representation, including complaints from consumers.

IV

It is further ordered that respondent shall notify the Commission at least thirty (30) days prior to the effective date of any proposed change in the corporation that may affect compliance obligations under this Order, including but not limited to any change in corporate name or address, dissolution, assignment or sale resulting in the emergence of a successor corporation, or the creation or dissolution of subsidiaries.

V

It is further ordered that respondent shall, within ten (10) days from the date of service of this Order upon it, distribute a copy of this Order to each of its operating divisions, to each of its managerial employees, and to each of its officers, agents, representative or employees engaged in the preparation, review or placement of advertising or other materials covered by this Order, and shall secure from each such person a signed statement acknowledging receipt of this Order.

It is further ordered that respondent shall, within sixty (60) days from the date of service of this Order upon it, and at such other times as the Commission may require, file with the Commission a report, in writing, setting forth in detail the manner and form in which it has complied with this Order.

Analysis of Proposed Consent Order To Aid Public Comment

The Federal Trade Commission has accepted an agreement, subject to final approval, to a proposed consent order from respondent J. Walter Thompson USA, Inc., a Delaware corporation.

The proposed consent order has been placed on the public record for sixty (60) days for reception of comments by interested persons. Comments received during this period will become part of the public record. After sixty (60) days, the Commission will again review that agreement and the comments received and will decide whether it should withdraw from the agreement and take

other appropriate action or make final the agreement's proposed order.

The Commission's complaint in this matter charges J. Walter Thompson with engaging in deceptive practices in connection with the advertising of the Jenny Craig Weight Loss Program. The advertisements at issue contain variations of the claim that nine out of ten Jenny Craig clients would recommend the Jenny Craig Weight Loss Program to a friend.

According to the complaint, print and television advertisement for the Jenny Craig Weight Loss Program represented that ninety percent or more of Jenny Craig customers would recommend the Jenny Craig Weight Loss Program. The complaint also alleges that those advertisements represented that competent and reliable studies or surveys establish that claim.

The complaint further alleges that J. Walter Thompson lacked substantiation for its "nine out of ten" claims, and falsely claimed that competent and reliable studies or surveys support those claims. Finally, the complaint alleges that J. Walter Thompson knew or should have known that these claims were false and misleading.

The consent order contains provisions designed to remedy the violations charged and to prevent J. Walter Thompson from engaging in similar deceptive and unfair acts and practices in the future.

Part I of the order prohibits J. Walter Thompson from misrepresenting that any weight loss program is recommended, approved or endorsed by any person, group or other entity unless it possesses and relies upon competent and reliable evidence, which, when appropriate, must be competent and reliable scientific evidence, that substantiates the representation. Part I provides J. Walter Thompson with a defense to liability if it neither knew nor had reason to know of an inadequacy of substantiation for the representation.

Part II prevents J. Walter Thompson from misrepresenting, with regard to any diet-related food, or any weight loss or weight control program, weight loss product, health or fitness program or exercise equipment, the existence, contents, validity, results, conclusions, or interpretations of any test, study, or survey. "Diet-related food" is defined as "any food (as that term is defined in 15 U.S.C. § 55(b)) whose labeling or advertising makes any claim regarding its weight loss or weight maintenance benefits." Part II provides J. Walter Thompson with a defense to liability if it neither knew nor had reason to know that the test, study or survey did not

prove, demonstrate or confirm the representation.

Part III requires J. Walter Thompson to maintain certain materials relating to advertisements covered by this order and to make such documents available for FTC inspection.

Part IV requires J. Walter Thompson to notify the Commission of any changes in the corporate structure that might affect compliance with the order.

Part V requires J. Walter Thompson to distribute copies of the order to certain company officials and employees and certain other representatives and agents of the company, and to secure from each such person a signed statement acknowledging receipt of the order.

Part VI requires J. Walter Thompson to file with the Commission one or more reports detailing compliance with the order.

The purpose of this analysis is to facilitate public comment on the proposed order. It is not intended to constitute an official interpretation of the agreement and proposed order or to modify in any way their terms.

Benjamin I. Berman,
Acting Secretary.

**Concurring Statement of Commissioners
Roscoe B. Starek, III and Christine A.
Varney**

In the Matter of J. Walter Thompson USA, Inc., File No. 942-3294

Although we have voted to accept the consent order negotiated with J. Walter Thompson USA, Inc. ("JWT") in this matter, we write to comment on the scope of the product coverage in Part II of the order. Part II addresses the false "establishment" claim challenged in paragraphs five and six of the complaint, *i.e.*, the claim that a valid study or survey showed that ninety percent or more of Jenny Craig Weight Loss Program customers would recommend the program to their friends. Part II of the order prohibits misrepresentations regarding the existence, contents, validity, results, conclusions, or interpretations of any test, study, or survey, in connection with the promotion of any weight loss or weight control program, weight loss product, health or fitness program, exercise equipment, or diet-related food.

On three previous occasions JWT has signed consent orders settling allegations that it misrepresented the results of surveys or tests.¹ Because of the narrow scope of the

¹ *J. Walter Thompson Co.*, 97 F.T.C. 333 (1981) (complaint alleged that JWT misrepresented that "4 out of 5 dentists recommend" the Water Pik; consent order prohibits claims regarding surveys of professional groups unless the surveys were designed, executed, and analyzed in a competent and reliable manner); *J. Walter Thompson Co.*, 94 F.T.C. 331 (1979) (complaint alleged that JWT misrepresented the results of tests of the cleaning effectiveness of Sears dishwashers; consent order prohibits, in advertising for major home appliances, misrepresenting the results of tests, studies, surveys, etc.); *J. Walter Thompson Co.*, 84 F.T.C.

product coverage applicable to the relevant order provisions, the Commission, on each occasion, had to pursue a new Section 5 case against the company, rather than being able to seek civil penalties for an order violation. Thus, the Commission's history with JWT raises the question of whether broader product coverage is warranted in this case.²

Extension of an order's product coverage beyond the product or service at issue in a complaint may be justified so long as the order bears a reasonable relationship to the unlawful practices alleged. *See Stouffer Foods Corp.*, D. 9250, slip op. at 17 (Sept. 26, 1994) (citing *Jacob Siegel Co. v. FTC*, 327 U.S. 608, 612-13 (1946)). The Commission generally considers three criteria to determine whether an order bears a reasonable relationship to a particular Section 5 violation: (1) the seriousness and deliberateness of the violation; (2) the ease with which the violative claim may be transferred to other products; and (3) whether the respondent has a history of prior violations. *Stouffer*, slip op. at 17 (citing cases). All three elements need not be present to warrant fencing-in. *Sears, Roebuck & Co. v. FTC*, 676 F.2d 385, 392 (9th Cir. 1982) ("In the final analysis, we look to the circumstances as a whole and not to the presence or absence of any single factor.").

Although we do not have the benefit of a litigated record, from the evidence presented so far, it appears that in this case, the first two, and arguably the third, elements weigh in favor of broad fencing-in. First, the alleged violations are both deliberate and serious. The survey from which the "nine out of ten" claim was derived was obviously and severely flawed. JWT, the largest ad agency in the country, surely must be deemed to have expertise in conducting consumer surveys. Any ignorance in this regard must have been cured by the Commission's earlier decision to hold it liable for the dissemination of misrepresentations about the results of surveys.

The evidence also suggests the violations were serious, as measured by the extent of dissemination. The ad campaign in question was a national one that ran for over a year, and the ads were given to franchisees to run in their areas. Furthermore, the great length of the campaign's dissemination schedule indicates the campaign must have been quite costly.

The second element, the ease with which the violative claims may be transferred to other products, also supports fencing-in. The results of surveys or studies are easily misrepresented, regardless of the type of product or service. The fairly obvious transferability of this type of claim is borne out by the prior consent orders, as those cases involved a diverse range of product

736 (1974) (complaint alleged that JWT misrepresented the results of studies on the safety of Ford automobiles; consent order prohibits, in advertising for automobiles, presenting the results of tests, experiments, or demonstrations unless competent and reliable to prove the claimed feature).

² It is true that this consent order has broader product coverage than the prior JWT orders and appears to cover the range of diet- and fitness-related products.

categories (surveys of professionals, major home appliances, and automobiles).

The final element is the respondent's history of past violations. The question of whether consent orders may be used as evidence of past violations is at best unsettled. *Compare ITT Continental Baking Co. v. FTC*, 521 F.2d 207, 222 n.23 (2d Cir. 1976) (because consent orders do not constitute an admission that the respondent has violated the law, the Commission may not rely on consent orders as evidence of additional illegal conduct when formulating cease and desist orders in other proceedings) with *Thompson Medical Co.*, 104 F.T.C. 648, 833 n.78 (1984), *aff'd*, 791 F.2d 189 (D.C. Cir. 1986), *cert. denied*, 479 U.S. 1086 (1987) (while stating that a single consent order would not be used as a basis for concluding that the respondent has a history of past violations, the Commission expressly took no position on whether a pattern of consent orders would be a sufficient history of past violations to warrant fencing-in). Regardless of whether the prior consent orders may be considered evidence of past violations, they show that JWT was aware of the Commission's concern about this type of claim and of the requirements of the law with respect to claims involving surveys and tests.

Despite these concerns, for several reasons we believe that accepting the order as negotiated appears to be appropriate. For example, we understand that JWT has made clear it would litigate if the Commission attempted to obtain broader coverage; litigation inevitably presents resource allocation questions.³ In addition, broad product coverage obviously weighs more heavily on an ad agency such as JWT that handles accounts for a divers assortment of products and services, than on a manufacturer or advertiser offering a limited range of products.⁴ We write only to point out that in light of all the circumstances of this case, broad product coverage in Part II could have been justified as reasonably related to the violations alleged.

³ Even so, a litigated order could be beneficial for several reasons. First, in case of future similar violations by JWT, a litigated order clearly could be used as evidence of prior law violations. Second, while there is no guarantee that the Commission would obtain broader product coverage in litigation than is contained in this consent order, it seems unlikely that the Commission would do any worse, and the potential gain is great, both in terms of having JWT under a broader order and in terms of precedential value for other cases. Third, a litigated opinion might resolve some of the uncertainties concerning the precedential value of prior consent orders.

⁴ On the other hand, the potential burden of a broad order is partially mitigated by the fact that, as an ad agency, JWT's order contains a safe harbor insulating it from liability unless it knows or should know that the survey or test did not prove, demonstrate, or confirm the representation. In addition, it is not unusual for orders covering establishment claims to have broad product coverage because the type of claim covered—the results or validity of tests or surveys—is fairly discrete.

Statement of Commissioner Mary L. Azcuenaga Concurring in Part and Dissenting in Part

J. Walter Thompson USA, Inc., File No. 942-3294

I dissent from Part II of the proposed consent order because the product coverage is too narrow. Part II would prohibit J. Walter Thompson from making deceptive establishment claims for any weight loss or weight control program, weight loss product, health or fitness program, exercise equipment, or diet-related food. Although the product coverage in this provision does go beyond the product with respect to which a violation has been alleged, given the particular facts of this case, I would impose even broader product coverage. In my view, J. Walter Thompson relied on a clearly flawed study in making its deceptive claims, and it continued to make claims based on this flawed study even after it had received contradictory results from a more reliable study that it had commissioned. J. Walter Thompson also could readily transfer deceptive test result claims to other products, as demonstrated by the fact that J. Walter Thompson has entered into three other consent agreements to settle allegations that it made deceptive claims concerning survey or test results for three disparate products.¹ Given that J. Walter Thompson's deception appears to have been deliberate and that its deception readily could be transferred to other products, see *Stouffer Foods Corp.*, D. 9250, slip op. at 17 (Sept. 26, 1994), broader product coverage is appropriate.

[FR Doc. 95-18954 Filed 8-1-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6750-01-M

[Dkt. C-3588]

Korean Video Stores Association of Maryland, et al.; Prohibited Trade Practices, and Affirmative Correction Actions

AGENCY: Federal Trade Commission.

ACTION: Consent order.

SUMMARY: In settlement of alleged violations of federal law prohibiting unfair acts and practices and unfair methods of competition, this consent order prohibits, among other things, a Maryland based video store association and its members from entering into any agreement to raise, fix, or maintain prices in the retail video tape rental business; and requires, within 30 days, its members to display a poster announcing the settlement, in both English and Korean, in their respective

¹ *J. Walter Thompson Co.*, 97 F.T.C. 323 (1981); (dental cleaning device); *J. Walter Thompson Co.*, 94 F.T.C. 331 (1979) (dishwashers); *J. Walter Thompson Co.*, 84 F.T.C. 736 (1974) (automobiles). Assuming the allegations in this and the previous cases to be true, we would have to conclude that J. Walter Thompson has had difficulty comprehending that the conduct alleged is conduct about which the Commission is concerned.

stores and to publish the entire text of the poster in three Korean-language newspapers in the Washington, DC area.

DATES: Complaint and Order issued June 20, 1995.¹

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Joseph G. Krauss, FTC/S-3627, Washington, DC 20580. (202) 326-2713.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: On Tuesday, April 11, 1995, there was published in the **Federal Register**, 60 FR 18411, a proposed consent agreement with analysis in the Matter of Korean Video Stores, et al., for the purpose of soliciting public comment.

Interested parties were given sixty (60) days in which to submit comments, suggestions or objections regarding the proposed form of the order.

No comments having been received, the Commission has ordered the issuance of the complaint in the form contemplated by the agreement, made its jurisdictional findings and entered an order to cease and desist, as set forth in the proposed consent agreement, in disposition of this proceeding.

(Sec. 6, 38 Stat. 721; 15 U.S.C. 46. Interprets or applies sec. 5, 38 Stat. 719, as amended; 15 U.S.C. 45)

Benjamin I. Berman,

Acting Secretary.

[FR Doc. 95-18955 Filed 8-1-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6750-01-M

[File No. 951-0024]

Summit Communications Group, Inc., et al.; Proposed Consent Agreement With Analysis to Aid Public Comment

AGENCY: Federal Trade Commission.

ACTION: Proposed consent agreement.

SUMMARY: In settlement of alleged violations of federal law prohibiting unfair acts and practices and unfair methods of competition, this consent agreement, accepted subject to final Commission approval, would prohibit, among other things, Summit and seven Wometco Cable TV companies from agreeing, attempting to agree or carrying out an agreement with any cable television provider to allocate or divide markets, customers, contracts or territories for cable television service in the incorporated and unincorporated areas of the Georgia counties of Cobb, Bartow, Dekalb, Walton, Gwinnett, Fulton, Douglas, Fayette, Coweta, Clayton, Henry, Rockdale, Newton and Cherokee.

¹ Copies of the Complaint and the Decision and Order are available from the Commission's Public Reference Branch, H-130, 6th Street & Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, DC 20580.