

does NOT mean a safer cigarette.” (The order requires a similar disclosure in advertising for other tobacco products Alternative Cigarettes advertises as having no additives.) The disclosure must be included in all tobacco advertising that represents (through such phrases as “no additives” or “100% tobacco”) that the product has no additives. Part I exempts Alternative Cigarettes from the disclosure requirement: (1) For cigarette advertisements not required to bear the Surgeon General’s health warning; and (2) if Alternative Cigarettes possesses scientific evidence demonstrating that its “no additives” cigarette poses materially lower health risks than other cigarettes of the same type. In general, the disclosure required by Part I must be in the same type size and style as the Surgeon General’s warning and must appear within a rectangular box that is no less than 40% of the size of the box containing the Surgeon General’s warning.

Part II of the order requires Alternative Cigarettes to include the following disclosure, clearly and prominently, in advertising and on packaging for herbal cigarettes: “Herbal cigarettes are dangerous to your health. They produce tar and carbon monoxide.” (The order requires a similar disclosure for other herbal smoking products.) The disclosure must be included in all advertising and on packaging for herbal smoking products that represent (through such phrases as “no tobacco,” “tobacco-free,” or “herbal”) that the product has no tobacco. Part II also contains an exemption from the disclosure requirement if Alternative Cigarettes possesses scientific evidence demonstrating that such herbal smoking products do not pose any material health risks. In general, the disclosure required by Part II must be in the same type size and style as the Surgeon General’s warning and for advertisements must appear within a rectangular box that is the same size as the box containing the Surgeon General’s warning.

Part III of the order requires Alternative Cigarettes to possess competent and reliable scientific evidence prior to: (1) Claiming that any herbal smoking product does not present the health risks associated with smoking tobacco cigarettes; of (2) making any claim about the health risks associated with the use of any herbal smoking product.

Part IV requires Alternative Cigarettes to send a letter to its purchasers for resale notifying them that they should discontinue the use of certain existing

Alternative Cigarettes advertisements and promotional materials and that Alternative Cigarettes is required to stop doing business with purchasers for resale that do not comply with this request.

Parts V–VIII of the order contain requirements that Alternative Cigarettes keep copies of relevant advertisements and materials substantiating claims made in the advertisements; provide copies of the order to certain of its current and future personnel; notify the Commission of changes in the composition or formula of its tobacco products or herbal smoking products that may affect compliance with the order; and notify the Commission of any changes in the corporate structure that might affect compliance with the order. Part IX requires that the individual respondent notify the Commission of changes in his employment status for a period of ten years. Part X requires Alternative Cigarettes to file one or more reports detailing compliance with the order. Part XI provides that the order will terminate after twenty (20) years under certain circumstances.

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

By Direction of the Commission.

Donald S. Clark,

Secretary.

[FR Doc. 00–11312 Filed 5–4–00; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6750–01–M

FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION

[File Nos. 992 3246 and 992 3247]

R.N. Motors, Inc., et al. and Simmons Rockwell Ford Mercury, Inc., et al.; Analysis To Aid Public Comment

AGENCY: Federal Trade Commission.

ACTION: Proposed Consent Agreements.

SUMMARY: The consent agreements in these two matters settle alleged violations of federal law prohibiting unfair or deceptive acts or practices or unfair methods of competition. The attached Analysis to Aid Public Comment describes both the allegations in the draft complaints that accompany the consent agreements and the terms of the consent orders—embodied in the consent agreements—that would settle these allegations.

DATES: Comments must be received on or before May 30, 2000.

ADDRESSES: Comments should be directed to: FTC/Office of the Secretary,

Room 159, 600 Pennsylvania Ave., NW, Washington, DC 20580.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Carole Reynolds or Michelle Chua, FTC/S–4429, 600 Pennsylvania Ave., NW, Washington, DC 20580. (202) 326–3230 or 326–3248.

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 above-captioned consent agreements containing consent orders to cease and desist, having been filed with and accepted, subject to final approval, by the Commission, have been placed on the public record for a period of thirty (30) days. The following Analysis to Aid Public Comment describes the terms of the consent agreements, and the allegations in the complaints. An electronic copy of the full text of the consent agreements package can be obtained from the FTC Home Page (for April 27, 2000), on the World Wide Web, at “<http://www.ftc.gov/ftc/formal.htm>.” A paper copy can be obtained from the FTC Public Reference Room, Room H–130, 600 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW, Washington, DC 20580, either in person or by calling (202) 326–3627.

Public comment is invited. Comments should be directed to: FTC/Office of the Secretary, Room 159, 600 Pennsylvania Ave., NW, Washington, DC 20580. Two paper copies of each comment should be filed, and should be accompanied, if possible, by a 3½ inch diskette containing an electronic copy of the comment. 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)).

Analysis of Proposed Consent Orders To Aid Public Comment

Summary

The Federal Trade Commission has accepted separate agreements, subject to final approval, to proposed consent orders from respondents: (1) R.N. Motors, Inc., Red Noland Cadillac, Inc., and Nelson B. Noland (“Red Noland”); and (2) Simmons Rockwell Ford Mercury, Inc., Simmons Rockwell Autoplaza, Inc., Don Simmons, Inc., and Donald M. Simmons, II and Richard L. Rockwell (“Simmons Rockwell”). The persons named in these actions are named individually and as officers of their respective corporations.

The proposed consent orders have been placed on the public record for

thirty (30) days for receipt of comments by interested persons. Comments received during this period will become part of the public record. After thirty (30) days, the Commission will again review the agreements and the comments received and will decide whether it should withdraw from the agreements or make final the agreements' proposed orders.

The Red Noland and Simmons Rockwell complaints allege that these respondents disseminated automobile lease advertisements that violate the Federal Trade Commission Act ("FTC Act"), the Consumer Leasing Act ("CLA"), and Regulation M. The Simmons Rockwell complaint also alleges that it disseminated automobile credit advertisements that violate the Truth in Lending Act ("TILA") and Regulation Z.

Section 5 of the FTC Act prohibits false, misleading, or deceptive representations or omissions of material information in advertisements. In addition, Congress established statutory disclosure requirements for lease and credit advertisements under the CLA and the TILA, respectively, and directed the Federal Reserve Board to promulgate regulations implementing such statutes—Regulations M and Z respectively. See 15 U.S.C. 1667 *et seq.*; 15 U.S.C. 1601 *et seq.*; 12 CFR 213; 12 CFR 226.

I. The Complaints

A. FTC Act Violations

The Red Noland complaint alleges that, based on the terms prominently stated in their lease advertisements, including but not necessarily limited to the monthly payment amount, the downpayment, and the security deposit, respondent failed to disclose, and failed to disclose adequately, additional terms pertaining to the lease offer, such as the total amount due at lease inception, including but not limited to whether third-party fees such as taxes, licenses, and registration fees are required as part of the total amount due at lease inception. The Simmons Rockwell complaint alleges that, based on the terms prominently stated in their lease advertisements, including but not necessarily limited to the monthly payment amount, respondent failed to disclose, and/or failed to disclose adequately, additional terms pertaining to the lease offer, such as the total amount due at lease inception, including but not limited to whether third-party fees, such as taxes, licenses, and registration fees, are required as part of the total amount due at lease inception. The Red Noland and

Simmons Rockwell complaints allege that the required information does not appear at all or appears in fine print and/or is illegible in the advertisements and that this information would be material to consumers in deciding whether to visit respondents' dealerships and/or whether to lease an automobile from respondents. These practices, according to both complaints, constitute deceptive acts or practices in violation of section 5(a) of the FTC Act.

B. CLA and Regulation M Violations

The Red Noland and Simmons Rockwell complaints also allege that respondents' lease advertisements have violated the CLA and Regulation M. The Red Noland complaint alleges that respondent's ads state the monthly payment amount, the downpayment, and the security deposit; the Simmons Rockwell complaint alleges that respondent's ads state the monthly payment amount—all "triggering" terms under these laws. The Red Noland and Simmons Rockwell complaints allege that respondents failed to disclose, and/or fail to disclose clearly and conspicuously, certain additional "triggered" terms, as applicable and as follows: The total amount due prior to or at consummation, or by delivery, if delivery occurs after consummation, and that such amount: (1) Excludes third-party fees, such as taxes, licenses and registration fees; and discloses that fact; or (2) includes third-party fees based on a particular state or locality and discloses that fact and the fact that such fees may vary by state or locality; whether or not a security deposit is required; and the number, amounts, and timing of scheduled payments.

According to the complaints, Red Noland's lease disclosures are omitted altogether and are not clear and conspicuous. Simmons Rockwell's lease disclosures, if provided, are not clear and conspicuous because they appear in fine print and/or are illegible.

The Red Noland and Simmons Rockwell complaints, therefore, allege that these practices violate section 184 of the CLA, 15 U.S.C. 1667c, as amended, and section 213.7 of Regulation M, 12 CFR 213.7, as amended.

In addition, the Red Noland complaint alleges that respondent's lease advertisements state specific lease rates for each of certain advertised vehicles, but fail to disclose, and fail to disclose clearly and conspicuously, the following notice concerning lease rates required by Regulation M: "This percentage may not measure the overall cost of financing this lease."

The Red Noland complaint, therefore, alleges that this practice violates section 213.4(s) of Regulation M, 12 CFR 213.4(s).

C. TILA and Regulation Z Violations

The Simmons Rockwell complaint alleges that respondent's credit advertisements have violated the TILA and Regulation Z. It alleges that respondent's credit ads state the number of payments required to finance the transaction and an annual percentage rate (expressed as an "APR"), but failed to disclose, and/or failed to disclose clearly and conspicuously, certain additional terms required by Regulation Z, including the amount of the downpayment and the full terms of repayment, such as the amount of the monthly payment.

According to the complaint, Simmons Rockwell's credit disclosures, if provided, are not clear and conspicuous because they appear in blurred print.

The Simmons Rockwell complaint, therefore, alleges that these practices violate section 144 of the TILA, 15 U.S.C. 1664, as amended, and section 226.24(c) of Regulation Z, 12 CFR 226.24(c), as amended.

II. Proposed Consent Orders

The Red Noland and Simmons Rockwell proposed consent orders contain provisions designed to remedy the violations charged and to prevent the respondents from engaging in similar acts and practices in the future. Specifically, Paragraph I.A. of the Red Noland and Simmons Rockwell proposed orders prohibit respondents, in any lease advertisement, from misrepresenting, in any manner, directly or by implication, the costs or terms of leasing a vehicle, including but not limited to the total amount due at lease signing or delivery.

Paragraph I.B. of the Red Noland and Simmons Rockwell proposed orders prohibit respondents, in any lease advertisement, from making any reference to any charge that is part of the total amount due at lease signing or delivery or that no such charge is required, not including a statement of the periodic payment, unless the advertisement also states with "equal prominence" the total amount due at lease signing or delivery. The "prominence" requirement prohibits respondents from running deceptive advertisements that highlight low amounts due at lease inception with inadequate disclosure of the actual total lease inception fees. This "prominence" requirement for lease inception fees is also found in Regulation M.

Paragraph I.C. of the Red Noland and Simmons Rockwell proposed orders prohibit respondents, in any lease, from stating the amount of any payment or that any or no initial payment is required at lease signing or delivery, unless the advertisement also states, clearly and conspicuously, all of the terms required by Regulation M, as amended and as follows: (1) That the transaction advertised is a lease; (2) the total amount due at lease signing or delivery; (3) whether or not a security deposit is required; (4) the number, amounts, and timing of scheduled payments; and (5) that an extra charge may be imposed at the end of the lease term in a lease in which the liability of the consumer at the end of the lease term is based on the anticipated residual value of the vehicle.

Furthermore, Paragraph I.D. of the Red Noland proposed order prohibits this respondent from stating a percentage rate in an advertisement or in documents evidencing the lease transaction, unless respondent also states the notice required by Regulation M that "this percentage may not measure the overall cost of financing this lease."

Paragraph I.D. of the Simmons Rockwell proposed order, and paragraph I.E. of the Red Noland proposed order, prohibit respondents from engaging in any other violation of Regulation M, as amended.

In addition, Paragraph II. A. of the Simmons Rockwell proposed order enjoins respondent, in any credit advertisement, from stating the amount or percentage of any downpayment, the number of payments or period of repayment, the amount of any payment, or the amount of any finance charge, without disclosing, clearly and conspicuously, all of the terms required by Regulation Z, as follows: (1) The amount or percentage of the downpayment; (2) the terms of repayment; and (3) annual percentage rate, using that term or the abbreviation "APR." If the annual percentage rate may be increased after consummation of the credit transaction, that fact must also be disclosed. Paragraph II.B. of this proposed order also prohibits Simmons Rockwell from stating a rate of finance charge unless respondents state the rate as an "annual percentage rate" or the abbreviation "APR," using that term. Paragraph III.C. of this proposed order also enjoins Simmons Rockwell from engaging in any other violation of Regulation Z, as amended.

The information required by Paragraph I of the Red Noland proposed order (lease advertisements), and Paragraphs I and II of the Simmons

Rockwell proposed order (lease and credit advertisements), must be disclosed "clearly and conspicuously." Both proposed orders define the term "clearly and conspicuously" for Red Noland's and Simmons Rockwell's advertisements in all media. In a television, video, radio or Internet or other electronic advertisement, the required disclosures made in the audio portion of the advertisement must be delivered in a volume, cadence, and location sufficient for an ordinary consumer to hear and comprehend. The required disclosures in the video portion of the advertisement must be of a size and shade, and must appear on the screen for a duration and in a location, sufficient for an ordinary consumer to read and comprehend. In a print advertisement, the required disclosures must be in a type size and location sufficient for an ordinary consumer to read and comprehend, in print that contrasts with the background against which it appears. Additionally, the required disclosures must be in understandable language and syntax. Further, nothing contrary to, inconsistent with, or in mitigation of the required disclosures shall be used in any advertisement.

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

By direction of the Commission.

Donald S. Clark,
Secretary.

[FR Doc. 00-11311 Filed 5-4-00; 8:45 am]
BILLING CODE 6750-01-M

FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION

[File No. 992 3026]

Santa Fe Natural Tobacco Company, Inc.; Analysis to Aid Public Comment

AGENCY: Federal Trade Commission.

ACTION: Proposed consent agreement.

SUMMARY: The consent agreement in this matter settles alleged violations of federal law prohibiting unfair or deceptive acts or practices or unfair methods of competition. The attached Analysis to Aid Public Comment describes both the allegations in the draft complaint that accompanies the consent agreement and the terms of the consent order—embodied in the consent agreement—that would settle these allegations.

DATES: Comments must be received on or before May 30, 2000.

ADDRESSES: Comments should be directed to: FTC/Office of the Secretary, Room 159, 600 Pennsylvania Ave., NW, Washington, DC 20580.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Michael Ostheimer, FTC/S-4002, 600 Pennsylvania Ave., NW, Washington, DC 20580. (202) 326-2699.

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 above-captioned 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 thirty (30) days. The following Analysis to Aid Public Comment describes the terms of the consent agreement, and the allegations in the complaint. An electronic copy of the full text of the consent agreement package can be obtained from the FTC Home Page (for April 27, 2000), on the World Wide Web, at "http://www.ftc.gov/ftc/formal.htm." A paper copy can be obtained from the FTC Public Reference Room, Room H-130, 600 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW, Washington, DC 20580, either in person or by calling (202) 326-3627.

Public comment is invited. Comments should be directed to: FTC/Office of the Secretary, Room 159, 600 Pennsylvania Ave., NW, Washington, D.C. 20580. Two paper copies of each comment should be filed, and should be accompanied, if possible, by a 3½ inch diskette containing an electronic copy of the comment. 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 Rule of Practice (16 CFR 4.9(b)(6)(ii)).

Analysis of Proposed Consent Order to Aid Public Comment

The Federal Trade Commission has accepted, subject to final approval, an agreement containing a consent order from Santa Fe Natural Tobacco Company, Inc. ("Santa Fe").

The proposed consent order has been placed on the public record for thirty (30) days for receipt for comments by interested persons. Comments received during this period will become part of the public record. After thirty (30) days, the Commission will again review the agreement and the comments received, and will decide whether it should withdraw from the agreement or make final the agreement's proposed order.