

June 30, 2006

Federal Trade Commission
Office of the Secretary
Room H-135 (Annex W)
600 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, D.C. 20580

RE: Business Opportunity Rule R511993

Dear Sirs:

I am writing this letter in opposition to the above mentioned rule. This rule is excessive and unnecessary and would harm the very important and valuable business that I am involved in. This business is valuable in the sense that it not only produces a respectable income for those who pursue habits of persistence and good business practices, but more importantly, this business is about changing lifestyles for a healthier America. As a long term practicing family physician and emergency department physician at a Level II trauma hospital, I can tell you that the attention to wellness and personal responsibility for one's health that Usana has brought to tens of thousands of individuals has made a very real and measurable decrease in the adverse impact of degenerative disease in their lives.

I am opposed to the imposition of a 7-day waiting period for people to make a decision to be involved in this business and a part of this wellness program. This not only demeans persons' decision making ability, but delays their access to important wellness adjuncts and casts a shadow on this very sterling business opportunity. The FTC would be more properly watching out for the consumer to have a 7-day waiting period for televisions or purchases of hamburgers, both of which have been shown to be harmful to persons and society. How ludicrous that you would allow the above, yet shape a discouraging cloud around well meaning independent business people working to create a wellness oriented business program. Furthermore, the waiting period is unnecessary because Usana already has a 100% buy back policy for all products, including sales kits purchased, within the initial 30 days, and a 90% buy back for products purchased within the last 12 months!

The rule also calls for full disclosure on filed lawsuits, regardless of the outcome. As we know, unfounded trivial lawsuits have become a big business for hungry lawyers. The vast majority of these lawsuits are unfounded and thrown out. This poorly written legislation would not discriminate between legitimate problems and the vast majority of nuisance suits.

Finally, and equally noisome as the other portions of this rule, is the requirement to disclose names and contact information for a minimum of ten previously enrolled associates. In this day and age of identify theft, this invasion of privacy is preposterous. Would you require that every car or television purchased in the United States be accompanied by a list of ten others who had purchased it -- I think not!

This rule is overreaching, unnecessary and in some aspects, even absurd. It is harmful to commerce, private enterprise and optimal health and should be erased, buried and forgotten!

Thank you your serious consideration of this letter.

Sincerely,

C. W. Wagner, M.D.