

Activity	Number of respondents	Number of minutes/acti- vity	Total hours
Total	383

Estimated Cost Burden

The cost per respondent should be negligible. Participation is voluntary, and will not require any labor expenditures by respondents. There are no capital, start-up, operation, maintenance, or other similar costs to the respondents.

Debra A. Valentine,

General Counsel.

[FR Doc. 00-8246 Filed 4-3-00; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6750-01-M

FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION

[Docket No. 9292]

Dura Lube Corporation, et al.; 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 complaint that the Commission issued in April 1999 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 April 28, 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: Elaine Kolish or Heather Hipsley, FTC/S-4302, 600 Pennsylvania Ave., NW, Washington, DC 20580. (202) 326-3042 or 326-3285.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Pursuant to Section 6(f) of the Federal Trade Commission Act, 38 Stat. 721, 15 U.S.C. 46 and Section 3.25(f) of the Commission's Rules of Practice, 16 CFR 3.25(f), 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 March 29, 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 Order to Aid Public Comment

The Federal Trade Commission has accepted, subject to final approval, an agreement for entry of a consent order from Dura Lube Corporation, Inc., American Direct Marketing, Inc., Howe Laboratories, Inc., Crescent Marketing, Inc. (d/b/a Crescent Manufacturing, Inc.), National Communications Corporation, The Media Group, Inc., and Herman S. Howard and Scott Howard, the principals who control these corporations (referred to collectively as "Respondents"). The agreement would settle a complaint by the Federal Trade Commission that Respondents engaged in unfair or deceptive acts or practices in violation of section 5(a) of the Federal Trade Commission Act.

The proposed consent order has 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 agreement and the comments received and will decide whether it should withdraw from the agreement or make final the agreement's proposed order.

This matter concerns advertising representations made about Super Dura Lube Engine Treatment and Advanced Dura Lube Engine Treatment (referred to collectively as "Dura Lube"), engine oil additives. The administrative complaint alleged that Respondents violated the FTC Act by disseminating ads that made unsubstantiated performance claims about Dura Lube. The Complaint alleged that Respondents represented that, compared to motor oil alone or oil treated with any other product, Dura Lube: (1) Reduces engine wear; (2) reduces engine wear by more than 50%; (3) prolongs engine life; (4) reduces emissions; (5) reduces the risk of serious engine damage when oil pressure is lost; (6) improves gas mileage; and (7) improves gas mileage by up to 35%. The Complaint alleged that one treatment continues to protect engines for up to 50,000 miles. The Complaint alleged that Respondents represented that they had a reasonable basis for making these claims, but in fact did not possess competent evidence supporting them.

The Complaint also challenged, as false, claims that tests prove that, compared to motor oil alone, Dura Lube: (1) Reduces engine wear; (2) prolongs engine life; (3) reduces emissions; (4) reduces the risk of serious engine damage when oil pressure is lost; (5) improves gas mileage; and (6) improves gas mileage by up to 35%. The Complaint also challenged as false claims that tests prove that one treatment continues to protect engines for up to 50,000 miles. Additionally, the Complaint challenged, as false, claims that Dura Lube: (a) Has been tested by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency; and (b) contains no chlorinated compound.

The Complaint alleged that Respondents represented that product demonstrations in their advertising proved, demonstrated, or confirmed that, (1) compared to motor oil alone, Dura Lube reduces the risk of serious engine damage when oil pressures is lost, and (b) without Dura Lube, motor oil fails to protect automobile engines under hot running conditions, when in fact the demonstrations do not prove, demonstrate, or confirm these product attributes. Finally, the Complaint alleged that Respondents represented that former astronaut Charles "Pete" Conrad had endorsed the product based on a valid exercise of his expertise in

the evaluation of automobile engine lubricants, when in fact Mr. Conrad did not have expertise in the evaluation and testing of automobile engine lubrication.

The Complaint gave notice that the Commission had reason to believe that a proceeding under section 19 of the FTC Act for consumer redress ultimately might be appropriate, depending upon the adjudicative record and other relevant factors.

The proposed consent order contains provisions designed to prevent Respondents from engaging in acts and practices similar to those alleged in the complaint in the future. Part I of the proposed consent order prohibits Respondents from falsely claiming that Dura Lube contains no chlorinated compound or that it has been tested by the Environmental Protection Agency. It also prohibits them from claiming that Dura Lube meets the requirements or standards of any governmental or standard setting organization unless they possess competent and reliable evidence, which when appropriate must be competent and reliable scientific evidence, substantiating the claim.

Part II of the proposed consent order prohibits Respondents from making unsubstantiated representations regarding the performance, benefits, efficacy, attributes or use of any product for use in an automobile, or from misrepresenting the results of any study. It specifically prohibits unsubstantiated claims that, compared to motor oil alone or oil treated with any other product, the product reduces engine wear or reduces it by any percentage, dollar or other figure; prolongs engine life; reduces emissions; reduces the risk of serious engine damage when oil pressure is lost; or improves gas mileage or improves it by any percentage, miles per gallon, dollar or other figure. It also prohibits unsubstantiated claims that one treatment reduces engine wear for 50,000 or any other number of miles. The evidence required to substantiate such claims includes competent and reliable evidence, which when appropriate must be competent and reliable scientific evidence.

Part III of the proposed consent order prohibits Respondents from using misleading demonstrations in the sale of any product.

Part IV of the proposed consent order prohibits Respondents from representing that any endorser of any product for use in a motor vehicle is an expert unless the endorser possesses the expertise he or she is represented to have and the endorsement is adequately supported by evidence that would be accepted by experts in the area.

Part X of the proposed consent order requires Respondents to pay \$2 million in consumer redress. The Federal Trade Commission would administer and distribute the redress as the Commission, in its sole discretion, deemed appropriate. Respondents would be required to provide the Commission with the identities of consumers known to have purchased Dura Lube between January 1, 1994, and December 31, 1999. Consumers electing to accept the redress would release any claims against Respondents.

The remainder of the proposed consent order also contains provisions regarding distribution of the order, replacement of product packaging and labeling with compliant packaging and labeling, record-keeping, notification of changes in corporate status, termination of the order, and the filing of a compliance report.

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 the proposed order or to modify their terms in any way.

By direction of the Commission.

Donald S. Clark,

Secretary.

[FR Doc. 00-8244 Filed 4-3-00; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6750-01-M

FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION

[Docket No. 9291]

Motor Up Corporation, Inc., et al.; 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 complaint that the Commission issued in April 1999 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 April 28, 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: Elaine Kolish or Heather Hipsley, FTC/S-4302, 600 Pennsylvania Ave., NW, Washington, DC 20580. (202) 326-3042 or 326-3285.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Pursuant to Section 6(f) of the Federal Trade Commission Act, 38 Stat. 721, 15 U.S.C. 46 and Section 3.25(f) of the Commission's Rules of Practice, 16 CFR 3.25(f), 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 March 29, 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 Order to Aid Public Comment

The Federal Trade Commission has accepted, subject to final approval, an agreement to a proposed consent order from Motor Up Corporation, Inc., Motor Up America, Inc., and Kyle Burns, the principal who controls these corporations (referred to collectively as "Motor Up"). The agreement would settle a complaint by the Federal Trade Commission that Motor Up engaged in unfair or deceptive acts or practices in violation of Section 5(a) of the Federal Trade Commission Act.

The proposed consent order has been placed on the public record for thirty (30) days for reception 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 agreement and the comments received and will decide whether it should withdraw from the agreement or make final the agreement's proposed order.