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I. INTRODUCTION

Chairman Schakowsky, Ranking Member Bilirakis, and members of the Subcommittee, on behalf of Truth in Advertising (TINA.org), I am pleased to appear before you to highlight fraudulent and deceptive marketing schemes that have arisen during this unprecedented crisis, and to sound the alarm that the worst may be yet to come if the Federal Trade Commission is not equipped with the legislative tools it needs to effectively eradicate deceptive and unfair acts and practices, including, but not limited to, clawing back ill-gotten gains from wrongdoers under Section 13(b) of the FTC Act.¹

My organization, TINA.org, is a nonpartisan, nonprofit consumer advocacy organization whose mission is to combat deceptive advertising and consumer fraud; we work with businesses and government agencies on behalf of consumers to effectively prevent and stop deception in our economy.

The central premise of modern consumer protection laws is that marketplace dishonesty causes harm to consumers and businesses alike; and, if left unchecked, such behavior impairs the efficient allocation of resources in our economy.² There can be no doubt that the ongoing pandemic has exacerbated the ever-present dangers of deceptive and unfair acts and practices in the marketplace. TINA.org has heard from countless consumers – senior citizens, military veterans and struggling parents – whose experiences illustrate the fact that deceptive marketing is putting the health, financial well-being and safety of our most susceptible populations at risk.

¹ It is important to note that even the most rigorous of laws are of little value if the agency responsible for enforcing them does not have the means or resources to properly police the marketplace. Given the FTC’s limited resources, its current ability to oversee a multitrillion-dollar marketplace and protect more than 320 million consumers is clearly hampered. Unless more funding is allocated, it is impractical to think that the FTC can do more.
The list of deceptively marketed products and services exploiting this pandemic is extensive. CBD products marketed to military veterans as a coronavirus treatment;\(^3\) bleach advertised as a liquid cure-all;\(^4\) wellness centers targeting first responders with IV vitamin drips to protect against COVID-19;\(^5\) Amazon and eBay sellers falsely claiming that their personal protective equipment (PPE) is FDA approved;\(^6\) scammers simply failing to deliver paid-for PPE;\(^7\) hand sanitizers marketed as providing 24-hour protection against COVID-19;\(^8\) alleged immunity-boosting supplements targeted at children;\(^9\) risky colloidal silver solutions advertised as having the ability to kill the virus from within;\(^10\) toothpastes and teeth-whitening products claiming to prevent COVID-19;\(^11\) and sham wellness kits targeting seniors.\(^12\)

---


\(^6\) Face Mask Sellers on eBay Falsely Claim Products Are ‘FDA Approved’, Truth In Advertising, Inc., May 13, 2020, https://www.truthinadvertising.org/face-mask-sellers-on-ebay-falsely-claim-products-are-fda-approved/. It is often the case that products listed for sale in online marketplaces are deceptively advertised. When presented with such findings, companies typically point the finger at third-party vendors, deny liability, and use Section 230 of the Communications Decency Act as a shield. Removing the 230 shield from online commercial speech would allow the FTC to hold third-party vendor sites accountable.


Unfortunately, the deception does not stop with outrageous health claims; many are also exploiting the economic desperation wrought by this pandemic: multilevel marketing companies claiming people can earn full-time pay working part-time;\(^{13}\) lending companies deceptively using the CARES Act to exploit college students;\(^{14}\) investment scams claiming to have patented COVID cures;\(^{15}\) and financial entities pretending to be SBA-authorized lenders to lure in small businesses struggling to keep their workers employed.\(^{16}\)

And, to make matters worse, the agency primarily charged with policing these deceptive acts, the FTC, is now at risk of losing a mainstay of its enforcement authority – the ability to make victims whole under Section 13(b) of the FTC Act.\(^{17}\) Because Section 13(b) does not specifically say anything about equitable relief when a permanent injunction is issued, the Supreme Court is now deciding the remedial scope (if any) of 13(b) in the case *AMG v. FTC*.\(^{18}\)

*AMG* was a payday lending scheme that extracted money from people in desperate circumstances.\(^{19}\) In its appeal, the company does not dispute that it violated the law. Instead, it

---


argues that the $1.3 billion it stole should be its to keep. AMG asserts that it was never Congress’s intention for the FTC to return money to the victims of fraud under Section 13(b).

Quite to the contrary, AMG argues that this legislative body fully endorsed the notion that wrongdoers should pocket the money they’ve illegally taken when it drafted 13(b).

If the Supreme Court rules in AMG’s favor and this Congress does not act to empower the FTC to seek restitution under Section 13(b), then the deceptive marketing practices I have enumerated will only multiply. Allowing wrongdoers an absolute right to retain funds under Section 13(b) will make consumers and our economy more vulnerable to harm, especially during these unprecedented times.

Moreover, if Congress truly wants to eradicate the deception that is plaguing our economy, it must add to the FTC’s toolkit penalty authority over first-time offenders; a civil penalty fund for victims; as well as enhancement of some tools that the FTC already has at its disposal, including mandating that funeral homes disclose their pricing lists on their websites, requiring companies that use negative-option offers to simplify cancelations and provide clearer renewal information, and exclude the protection of commercial speech from Section 230 of the Communications Decency Act of 1996. At present, businesses find it economically advantageous to ignore first-round FTC orders and settlements. Only when the calculus changes such that it becomes

15 years, [AMG’s] Scott Tucker … made billions of dollars exploiting struggling, everyday Americans through payday loans carrying interest rates as high as 1,000 percent.”)

20 Brief for Petitioners at 44, AMG Capital Mgmt, LLC v. Fed. Trade Comm’n, No. 19-508 (U.S. Sept. 2020), available at https://www.supremecourt.gov/DocketPDF/19/19-508/154981/20200925174040692_19-508%20ts%20AMG%20Capital%20Mgmt.%20LLC%20merits%20brief%20PDF-A.pdf (“As an ‘agency’ charged with administering a congressional statute[,]’ both the Commission’s ‘power to act and how [it is] to act are authoritatively prescribed by Congress.’ … The Commission ‘possess[es] only such powers as are granted by’ the FTC Act. … The Commission thus has been acting ‘ultra vires’ by ‘improperly’ extracting billions of dollars from defendants under §13(b), a provision that authorizes only ‘injunction[s].’ … That overreach should end now.”)(internal citations omitted)

economically disadvantageous to engage in deceptive marketing and fraud from the outset will there be an impetus for all to champion truth in advertising.

II. Truth in Advertising, Inc.

Truth in Advertising (TINA.org) is a nonpartisan, nonprofit consumer advocacy organization whose mission is to combat deceptive advertising and consumer fraud; promote understanding of the serious harms commercial dishonesty inflicts; and work with consumers, businesses, independent experts, synergy organizations and government agencies to advance countermeasures that effectively prevent and stop deception in our economy.

At the center of TINA.org’s efforts is its website, www.tina.org, which aims to re-boot the consumer movement for the 21st century. The site provides information about common deceptive advertising techniques, consumer protection laws and alerts about specific marketing campaigns—such as nationally advertised “Built in the USA” vans manufactured abroad,22 and pillows and essential oils falsely marketed as able to treat chronic disease.23 The website functions as a clearinghouse, receiving consumer complaints about suspicious practices, which TINA.org investigates, and, when appropriate, takes up with businesses and regulatory authorities. The website is a repository of information relating to consumer protection lawsuits and regulatory actions.

Through its collaborative approach and attention to emerging issues and complexities, TINA.org has become a trusted source of expertise on matters relating to consumer fraud. TINA.org regularly draws on this expertise to advocate for consumer interests before the FTC

and other governmental bodies and appear as *amicus curiae* in cases raising important questions of consumer protection law.24

**III. Fraud, deception and scams during the COVID-19 crisis**

During this pandemic, consumers nationwide have been inundated with deceptive marketing campaigns seeking to exploit and capitalize on the global public-health crisis.25 While some scams deplete bank accounts and retirement savings, others have drastic consequences for consumers’ health and safety.

**a. Deceptive health claims**

Deceptive advertising peddling unapproved treatments, cures, and preventatives for a virus that has killed more than 400,000 people in the United States26 flood the internet. Not only do many of these deceptive ads target particularly susceptible populations, including parents of young children, first responders, military veterans and senior citizens, many also promote products that are inherently dangerous – some can cause severe health consequences while others are advertised as negating the need to follow standard COVID-19 prevention and treatment recommendations, thereby increasing the risk that consumers contract and spread COVID-19 or fail to obtain medically necessary treatment.

---


Since the initial coronavirus outbreak, TINA.org has invested considerable resources to investigate and track such scams.\(^27\) In February 2020, TINA.org wrote about an ingestible silver solution falsely marketed as able to kill the coronavirus from within. Not only was the treatment claim false, but the marketers also failed to disclose the possible risks of consuming silver, which include cancer and birth defects.\(^28\) A few months later, TINA.org outed more than 40 wellness centers across the country deceptively promoting intravenous supplement/vitamin therapies as a way to prevent and treat COVID-19, several of which specifically targeted first responders.\(^29\) Following this investigation, TINA.org exposed a multilevel marketing company misleadingly marketing supplements as able to boost children’s immune systems and keep them “virus free,” at a time when parents across the country were grappling with whether or not to send their children back to school.\(^30\)

TINA.org has also tracked reports of industrial bleach advertised under the name “Miracle Mineral Solution” as a treatment for COVID-19,\(^31\) accounts of CBD products marketed to


military veterans as a coronavirus treatment, and Department of Justice cases and civil lawsuits regarding toothpastes and teeth-whitening products claiming to prevent COVID-19.

It is critical to note that while silver shards suspended in liquid, bleach, CBD, and toothpaste may sound like suspect COVID-19 treatments and cure-alls, one must remember that our country – and the world – is living through a time of unprecedented uncertainty and fear, one that has prompted panic, heightened stress and anxiety levels, and exacerbated mental health issues. Consequently, consumers, desperate to care for themselves and their loved ones, are more susceptible to the compelling and persuasive marketing tactics used to sell these bogus products.

The pandemic has also spurred ads deceptively promoting products aimed at protecting consumers from the virus. TINA.org stopped the maker of alcohol-free hand sanitizers from deceptively claiming that its products “kill” the coronavirus for up to 24 hours. Consumers have also complained of scammers advertising and selling – but never delivering – N95 masks and other PPE. And a TINA.org investigation revealed more than two dozen eBay sellers falsely claiming their face masks were “FDA approved” or illegally using the FDA’s logo on

---

product packaging or other marketing to boost sales. There have also been numerous reports of schemes targeting older Americans, including the offering of sham “COVID Wellness Kits” containing hand sanitizer and/or face masks to Medicare beneficiaries in order to steal their Medicare numbers and other personal identifying information.

These deceptive advertising tactics not only scam consumers out of their hard-earned money, but may leave consumers unnecessarily vulnerable to the COVID-19 virus. In short, the surge in exploitative health schemes employed during this pandemic have risked, and continue to risk, the health and safety of consumers across the country.

b. Fraudulent economic claims

Unfortunately, pandemic-related deception does not stop with outrageous health claims; many are also exploiting the economic desperation brought on by this pandemic. TINA.org has exposed – in news stories, regulatory complaints and a warning letter – numerous MLM companies taking advantage of the pandemic to promote what they claim to be lucrative business opportunities despite the fact that most people who get involved in multilevel marketing make little to no money.

---


As with the onslaught of deceptive health claims, marketers making unsubstantiated financial claims have similarly targeted vulnerable populations including retirees, students in debt, and small businesses struggling to stay afloat during this pandemic.

IV. **The need for equitable relief under section 13(b) of the FTC Act**

During these unprecedented times, it is imperative that the FTC not only stop deceptive marketing as quickly as possible but also expeditiously return ill-gotten gains to victims struggling to make ends meet. At present, the Commission’s only resource for accomplishing such twin objectives is Section 13(b).
Congress, realizing that the FTC’s slow-moving administrative regime did not protect consumers from imminent harm and deception, added Section 13(b) to the FTC Act in 1973 to provide the Agency with a fast and effective means to halt illegal conduct.\(^47\) Section 13(b) provides, in pertinent part, that the FTC “may seek, and after proper proof, the court may issue, a permanent injunction.”\(^48\)

Though the statute does not specifically reference equitable relief, until the Seventh Circuit’s decision in FTC v. Credit Bureau Center, every circuit court to consider the issue (including the Seventh Circuit 30 years ago) had held that Section 13(b) implicitly authorizes a wide range of equitable remedies, including restitution, rescission and disgorgement.\(^50\) The rationale for equitable relief was first articulated in the 18th century when courts recognized that the authority to issue an injunction carried with it the right to make victims whole because, as they reasoned, “the wrong-doer should not profit ‘by his own wrong.’” While the issue of whether 13(b) provides for equitable relief is now pending before the U.S. Supreme Court in the AMG v. FTC case,\(^51\) the scope of 13(b) could – and should – be resolved legislatively.

The FTC brought its first case for a 13(b) permanent injunction in 1979. Since then, 13(b) has become a mainstay of the FTC’s enforcement program with dozens of cases brought under

---

\(^47\) See Fed. Trade Comm’n v. Shire, 917 F.3d 147, 155 (3d Cir. 2019), available at https://www2.ca3.uscourts.gov/opinarch/181807p.pdf. (‘‘Section 13(b) thus empowers the FTC to speedily address ongoing or impending illegal conduct, rather than wait for an administrative proceeding to conclude.’’)


\(^50\) After Credit Bureau, the Third Circuit held that Section 13(b) of the FTC Act does not permit equitable relief. See Fed. Trade Comm’n v. AbbVie Inc., 976 F.3d 327, 376 (3d Cir. 2020), available at https://www2.ca3.uscourts.gov/opinarch/182621p.pdf (“If Congress contemplated the FTC could sue for disgorgement under Section 13(b), it probably would not have required the FTC to show an imminent or ongoing violation. That requirement suggests Section 13(b) does not empower district courts to order disgorgement.”).

this section every year – among them Volkswagen,\textsuperscript{52} Herbalife,\textsuperscript{53} DeVry University,\textsuperscript{54} Office Depot\textsuperscript{55} and Uber.\textsuperscript{56} In fact, from 2016 to 2020, the FTC returned approximately $1.1 billion to consumers using 13(b).\textsuperscript{57} As the coronavirus pandemic continues to ravage our nation, the need for Section 13(b)’s swift and equitable authority is greater than ever.

Moreover, a decision in \textit{AMG}’s favor will have dramatic and dire consequences for the dozens of Section 13(b) cases the FTC currently has pending.\textsuperscript{58} The FTC’s docket includes its antitrust complaint against Facebook,\textsuperscript{59} pyramid scheme cases against Neora\textsuperscript{60} and Success By Health,\textsuperscript{61} its case against the makers of the deceptively marketed memory supplement Prevagen,\textsuperscript{62} and the action it filed against a house-flipping scam, which includes real estate

\textsuperscript{58} Recent FTC Cases Resulting in Refunds, https://www.ftc.gov/enforcement/cases-proceedings/refunds (last visited Feb. 1, 2021).
celebrities Dean Graziosi and Scott Yancey as defendants. In all of these 13(b) cases the FTC will be foreclosed from seeking monetary relief, even if it prevails, if the Supreme Court rules in AMG’s favor.

And to make matters worse, in 2019, the Third Circuit Court of Appeals ruled in FTC v. Shire ViroPharma, Inc. that the FTC could not seek equitable relief under Section 13(b) if the alleged violation occurred in the past and the defendant was not “violating” or “about to violate” the law. As a result, wrongdoers that line their pockets with money they have illegally obtained can sail off into the sunset just as long as they retire their scams before the FTC catches up with them.

In order to effectively police wrongdoers and protect consumers, legislative action must be taken to give the FTC the authority it needs to obtain monetary remedies for past acts as well as present ones. The glaring reality is that unless Congress acts, the FTC may be left with a law giving the worst wrongdoers an absolute right to retain funds they took from unwitting victims, which will undoubtedly make consumers and the economy more vulnerable to harm.

V. Equipping the FTC with penalty authority

The common thread that runs through all COVID-19 scams is the wrongdoers’ desire for financial gain. At the same time, the FTC is powerless to issue penalties for first-time violations of the FTC Act regardless of how outrageous and harmful the scam may be. Equipping the FTC with the ability to issue civil penalties would serve as a valuable deterrent against deliberate,

---


egregious violators that are using this pandemic to take advantage of some of the most vulnerable populations in our society.

The FTC has nationwide jurisdiction and an unparalleled view of the landscape. It maintains data on millions of consumer complaints and has unique statutory authority to operate across national borders. Even with its finite resources, the FTC is able to undertake investigations and develop facts necessary to prove cases against sophisticated corporate wrongdoers for large illegalities. But this is where the agency’s efficacy ends. The FTC’s ability to hold offenders accountable for their transgressions is sorely lacking.

Time and again, the FTC is forced to bring a second action against a lawbreaker because the company found it economically advantageous to ignore the initial consent agreement or closing letter. Not only does this waste the FTC’s limited resources but it ensures that illegal behavior continues to exploit consumers for longer than is necessary. Until the FTC has the authority to

65 Facebook entered into a consent agreement with the FTC in 2012 requiring the social media platform to stop its illegal practice of disclosing unauthorized private, identifying user information. See Decision and Order, In the Matter of Facebook, Inc., No. 19-cv-2184 (D.D.C. July 27, 2012), available at https://www.ftc.gov/sites/default/files/documents/cases/2012/08/120810facebookdo.pdf. Unable to penalize Facebook for its transgressions, the FTC only obtained a promise that Facebook would abide by the law going forward. As this reprimand was effectively toothless, Facebook reverted to its deceptive privacy practices, requiring the FTC to file a complaint in federal court in 2019 to hold the platform accountable yet again for its failure to follow the law and protect consumers’ privacy. See Complaint for Civil Penalties, Injunction, and Other Relief, U.S.A. v. Facebook, Inc., No. 19-cv-2184 (D.D.C. July 24, 2019), available at https://www.ftc.gov/system/files/documents/cases/182_3109_facebook_complaint filed 7-24-19.pdf. Only at this point, was the FTC able to punish Facebook with a $5 billion penalty. Had the FTC been able to penalize Facebook initially, it is likely that consumer privacy rights would have been better protected years earlier and Facebook less likely to flout the law.

66 In June 2018, the FTC sent a closing letter to Williams-Sonoma following an investigation into the company’s marketing of certain Chinese-made products as “Crafted in America.” Fed. Trade Comm’n Closing Letter to Williams-Sonoma, Inc. (June 13, 2018), available at https://www.ftc.gov/system/files/documents/closing_letters/nid/musa_williams-sonoma_closing_letter.pdf. The FTC did not pursue its investigation due to the company’s corrective actions and assurances that it was an isolated error. This representation was false. Between April and May 2019, TINA.org collected more than 800 examples of products that were marketed as made in the USA but were either imported or made with imported materials. (Examples collected were drawn from seven of Williams-Sonoma’s sites — Williams-Sonoma, Williams-Sonoma Home, Rejuvenation, Pottery Barn, PBteen, Pottery Barn Kids and West Elm.) As a result of these findings, the FTC filed an administrative action against Williams-Sonoma, which settled the charges for $1 million. Decision, In the Matter of Williams-Sonoma, Inc., No. C-4724 (F.T.C. July 13, 2020), available at https://www.ftc.gov/system/files/documents/cases/2023025c4724williamssonomaorder.pdf. See also, TINA.org’s Petition for Rulemaking to Promulgate Regulations for Made in the USA Claims, https://www.truthinadvertising.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/08/TINA_org-Petition-for-Rulemaking-to-Promulgate-Regulations-for-Made-in-the-USA-Claims.pdf.
turn on the penalty switch in appropriate cases, companies will find it highly profitable to flout FTC laws.

Further, penalties are a vital necessity in cases in which the precise economic harm to consumers is difficult to measure. For example, penalty authority could have a major impact on social media influencer marketing where influencers frequently do not disclose their material connections to the brands they promote. TINA.org’s investigations of the Kardashians, Ciroc, and influencers on Instagram who received FTC warning letters are illustrative of the problem. If companies and influencers were exposed to monetary penalties each time a promotional post failed to adequately disclose the material connection at issue, social media marketers would be less likely to deceive consumers, many of who are children and young adults.

VI. The need for a civil penalty fund

The benefits of imposing penalties do not need to stop at deterring wrongdoers from repeating illegal acts. If authorized, the FTC could use penalty funds to make consumers, who have been economically harmed, monetarily whole again.

At present, FTC redress is limited to the amount of money it can obtain directly from the wrongdoer(s). But because many defendants have the means and inclination to dissipate assets through lavish spending, bankruptcy protection, hiding funds in inaccessible accounts/locations, or are otherwise insolvent, it is often the case that consumers who have a right to redress receive

---

70 Of course, any such legislation should give the FTC discretion so that nano-influencers and micro-influencers with smaller followings are not treated the same as sophisticated, career influencers who know their legal responsibilities.
pennies on the dollar, if they receive anything. It is for this exact reason that other federal agencies use collected penalty funds to compensate victims, including the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau’s Civil Penalty Fund and the SEC’s Fair Fund.

For the sake of providing complete and timely consumer redress, particularly now when many in our country are in an economic freefall and consumers do not have the luxury of time, the FTC should be authorized to establish such a consumer reimbursement fund, rather than being required to arbitrarily deposit penalties in the U.S. Treasury, as is the current practice.

VII. Additional considerations to better protect consumers during the pandemic

TINA.org would also like to highlight areas of law that may be strengthened to better protect consumers with respect to online marketing during this pandemic.

---


73 15 U.S.C § 7246.

a. Require funeral homes to disclose their pricing online

More than 400,000 individuals have died of COVID-19.\textsuperscript{75} And the overwhelming grief of family members forced to put their loved ones to rest during this pandemic is exacerbated by the fact that funeral service providers are not required to post their price lists on their websites. Funeral service providers who advertise online should be required by law to post their price lists on their websites in order to conform to consumers’ shopping behavior and allow consumers to meaningfully price-shop from the comfort of their own homes before committing to a purchase.\textsuperscript{76}

Not only are transactions in the funeral industry inherently fraught with emotion and stress, they are also ones with which consumers tend to have little experience or familiarity and ones that require making important and costly decisions under tight time constraints. Moreover, such a law would also allow the FTC to more easily review funeral homes’ sales and business practices without imposing any significant burden on the funeral service providers.\textsuperscript{77}

b. Require companies that use negative-option offers to simplify cancelation and provide clearer renewal information

As U.S. consumers shelter at home during this pandemic, many are turning to online shopping for their purchasing needs – from PPE to toilet paper to grocery items and medication. Inevitably, some are also unintentionally enrolling in unwanted negative-option offers that siphon money off of already strained budgets.\textsuperscript{78} Unfortunately, deceptive negative-option offers have become a multibillion-dollar industry. On a regular basis, consumers find that they have

\textsuperscript{76} Such a rule would also align with stay-at-home recommendations during the COVID-19 outbreak. See also TINA.org’s Funeral Rule Comment, https://www.truthinadvertising.org/wp-content/uploads/2020/06/TINA-Funeral-Rule-Comment.pdf.
\textsuperscript{78} Consumer complaints (very often from senior citizens) concerning negative-option offers are one of the most common types of complaints that TINA.org receives. Consumers generally complain about unwittingly being enrolled in a negative-option plan and then finding it impossible to cancel the subscription.
been charged for long-forgotten subscriptions,⁷⁹ or that they are unable to cancel a trial before being charged. Indeed, losses relating to such offers in just 14 cases the FTC pursued over the past decade have totaled more than $1 billion.⁸⁰

Companies that use negative-option offers should be required to (1) permit consumer cancelation of negation options in an easy and specific manner – at minimum, if the subscription was entered into online, then it should be able to be canceled online,⁸¹ (2) provide timely reminders to consumers before recurring charges are initiated,⁸² and (3) notify consumers of any material changes to the terms of a subscription and provide an opportunity to cancel the subscription before the terms go into effect.⁸³

Recognizing the multitude of consumer vulnerabilities associated with negative-option offers, two bills were introduced in the 116th U.S. House of Representatives – the Unsubscribe Act (116 H.R. 2683) and TRUE Fees Act (116 H.R. 1220) – which sought to address various aspects of negative-option offers. The passage of such bills would provide significant and meaningful protection to consumers unwittingly enrolled in negative-option offers.

---

⁷⁹ This issue is likely exacerbated, in part, by increasing rates of digitization: without a physical item, like a book, arriving in the mail, or paying by writing a check, the only indication a consumer may have of a long-forgotten, converted subscription is an ambiguously labelled, recurring charge on their credit card. See Sophia Wang, One Size Does Not Fit All: The Shortcomings of Current Negative Option Legislation, 26 Cornell J. L. & Pub. Pol’y 197, 200 (Fall 2016).


⁸¹ ROSCA mandates only that, for goods and services offered on the internet, there be “simple mechanisms for a consumer to stop recurring charges,” but provides no specifics and no requirement that cancelation be online. See 15 U.S.C. §8403(3).

⁸² When consumers relinquish control, they incur the additional burden of tracking their various subscriptions. If a consumer forgets about an expiring trial or a recurring charge, it can result in an inefficient allocation of consumer resources. Indeed, 48 percent of consumers have had a free trial convert to a paid subscription without realizing it. See Brady Porche, Poll: Recurring charges are easy to start, hard to get out of, Creditcards.com (Aug. 22, 2017), available at https://www.creditcards.com/credit-card-news/autopay-poll.php.

Moreover, legislation that prohibits marketers from surreptitiously tying “free” trial offers to future, ongoing charges would be beneficial. TINA.org continually receives complaints from consumers who report being charged repeatedly after signing up for what they thought was a free trial offer.\textsuperscript{84} Unless further action is taken to protect consumers, the trend of consumers being unwittingly trapped in deceptive trial offers and automatically renewing subscriptions will only grow.

c. Exclude Section 230 of the Communications Decency Act protection for commercial speech

When Section 230 of the Communications Decency Act was enacted in 1996, neither Google nor Facebook existed and Amazon had just arrived on the scene as an online bookseller. The law was enacted to protect young internet service providers at a time when the world wide web was just beginning to gain popularity,\textsuperscript{85} protecting multibillion-dollar companies from liability for deceptive marketing statements made about products sold on their websites and from which they profit was not on the agenda.

However, fast-forward 25 years, and that is exactly what Amazon and others argue – that Section 230 shields them from liability for the deceptive marketing statements that lure consumers to purchase bogus products sold on their websites by third parties and from which these shopping platforms turn a handsome profit. Such unfettered impunity has led to widespread

\textsuperscript{84} Between 2015 and 2017, consumer complaints about free trials more than doubled in the U.S. Over that same span, the Better Business Bureau identified nearly 37,000 complaints – the average loss being $186. The FBI’s Internet Crime Complaint Center also recorded a rise in complaints about free trial offers between 2015 and 2017, with losses totaling more than $15 million over that time span. Corresponding with this consumer dissatisfaction, more than 100 federal class actions have been filed on behalf of U.S. consumers complaining about various negative option terms and conditions since 2014. And during this same time period, the FTC has brought 23 cases under ROSCA and pursued at least 5 cases against payment processors linked to deceptive negative option and free trial offers. See TINA.org’s Comment to the FTC regarding Negative Option Offer Rule, https://www.truthinadvertising.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/12/12_19-comment-to-FTC-re-NOO-Rule.pdf.

\textsuperscript{85} U.S. Dep’t of Justice, Section 230 – Nurturing Innovation or Fostering Unaccountability?: Key Takeaways and Recommendations (June 2020), available at https://www.justice.gov/file/1286331/download.
deceptive marketing issues online, issues that will continue to multiple at an unprecedented rate as consumers pivot to online shopping as a result of the COVID-19 pandemic.\textsuperscript{86}

By way of example, Amazon actively promotes and profits from more than 100 deceptively marketed brain supplements primarily sold to senior citizens on its website.\textsuperscript{87} Amazon is not just turning a blind eye to claims that these unproven products improve memory, among other purported health benefits, it is actively promoting these claims by independently publishing its own marketing content to amplify the deceptive marketing messages of third-parties.\textsuperscript{88}

Similarly, a TINA.org investigation found that the e-commerce website eBay was promoting more than two dozen eBay sellers spanning 45 listings that falsely claimed their face masks were “FDA approved” and/or illegally used the FDA’s logo to boost sales of their products.\textsuperscript{89} eBay was not only allowing the sale of these falsely marketed face masks, it was also giving some items greater exposure by listing them as “sponsored” or “promoted products” in exchange for a fee.

To date, online department stores like Amazon and eBay have largely succeeded in fending off all attempts to hold them accountable for false and deceptive commercial speech on their


\textsuperscript{88} Deceptive health claims are given increased visibility on the website through sponsored search results, designations such as “Amazon’s Choice” and “Editorial recommendations,” star ratings, and other Amazon-specific marketing materials. Amazon also plays an important role in the processing of many of these deceptively marketed brain supplements, collecting customer shipping information, fulfilling orders and even gift-wrapping some items when requested.

websites using Section 230 as their impenetrable defense shield. Removing this bulwark from online commercial speech would allow the FTC to hold online stores to the same legal standards as brick and mortar stores, and ensure that online websites are held accountable for the deceptive marketing they promote and profit from.

VIII. CONCLUSION

Deceptive marketing and similar forms of commercial dishonesty are a scourge of the American economy, inflicting billions of dollars in losses to cheated consumers and distorting the efficient allocation of resources, rewarding those who hone ingenious frauds and punishing honest competitors. Many of the deceptive marketing schemes and frauds exploiting the COVID-19 pandemic go well beyond inflicting economic injuries – they result in physical harm and in some instances even death. Consumers are foregoing appropriate preventative measures and medically advantageous treatments for useless products that are falsely marketed. At this juncture, there is a real risk that the deceptive marketing practices enumerated today will only multiple as the agency primarily charged with policing these deceptive acts and practices, the FTC, lacks the necessary authority to claw back ill-gotten gains, punish egregious wrongdoers and fully reimburse victims of fraud.

TINA.org looks forward to working with the Subcommittee and Congress to address the issues articulated above, and I would be happy to answer your questions.

---

90 A push has begun to remove certain elements of Section 230 protection from online commercial speech. For example, the Country Of Origin Labeling Online Act, or COOL Online Act (S. 3707), which sought to require clear disclosure of seller location and country-of-origin labeling for products advertised online, was introduced in the 116th Congress.