

1095

Order

be a defense in any enforcement proceeding instituted hereunder for respondents to establish that said personnel have actually been trained at the factory of the manufacturer of the product;

(5) The products sold by respondents will last a lifetime or will never require painting or maintenance, for the life of the structure on which applied, or misrepresenting in any manner the efficacy, durability or efficiency of respondents' products;

(6) Any of respondents' products or installations are guaranteed unless the nature and extent of the guarantee, the identity of the guarantor, and the manner in which the guarantor will perform thereunder are clearly and conspicuously disclosed;

(7) Persons will receive a gift of a specified article of merchandise, or anything of value: *Provided, however*, That it shall be a defense in any enforcement proceeding instituted hereunder for respondents to establish that the item referred to as a gift was in fact delivered to each eligible person.

*It is further ordered*, That the respondents herein shall, within sixty (60) days after service upon them of this order, file with the Commission a report in writing setting forth in detail the manner and form in which they have complied with this order.

---

IN THE MATTER OF

DABROL PRODUCTS CORPORATION ET AL.

MODIFIED ORDER, ETC., IN REGARD TO THE ALLEGED VIOLATION OF  
THE FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION ACT

*Docket 5656. Complaint, Oct. 25, 1949—Decision, Oct. 17, 1966*

Order modifying a cease and desist order dated December 29, 1950, 47 F.T.C. 791, requiring a processor of lubricating oil to cease advertising and selling its product without disclosing that it is re-refined or reprocessed, by ordering such disclosure be made on the front panel or panels of the container.

ORDER REOPENING PROCEEDING AND MODIFYING ORDER TO CEASE  
AND DESIST

The Commission on December 29, 1950 [47 F.T.C. 791], having issued its order to cease and desist against respondents herein providing at paragraphs 4 and 5 as follows:

Order

70 F.T.C.

4. Advertising, selling or offering for sale any lubricating oil, previously used for lubricating purposes, without disclosing such prior use to the purchaser or potential purchaser, either directly or by appropriate statement to that effect on the container.

5. Packaging previously used lubricating oil for others for resale to the purchasing public in containers which do not clearly and conspicuously disclose such prior use.

And the Commission having on August 11, 1966, served upon respondents its order to show cause why this proceeding should not be reopened and paragraphs 4 and 5 be amended and paragraph 6 added as set forth in the Commission's order to show cause, and

Respondents having failed to file an answer to the Commission's order to show cause within the period provided in the Commission's rules, and

The Commission being of the opinion that the public interest will be best served by reopening the proceeding herein and modifying its order of December 29, 1950,

*It is ordered*, That this proceeding be, and it hereby is, reopened and the Commission's order of December 29, 1950 [47 F.T.C. 791], be, and it hereby is, modified by substituting the following paragraphs 4 and 5 for the correspondingly numbered paragraphs in its order to cease and desist of December 29, 1950, and adding the following paragraph numbered 6 to that order to cease and desist:

4. Advertising, offering for sale or selling, any lubricating oil which is composed in whole or in part of oil which has been reclaimed or in any manner processed from previously used oil, without disclosing such prior use to the purchaser or potential purchaser in the advertising and sales promotion material, and by a clear and conspicuous statement to that effect on the front panel or front panels on the container.

5. Packaging previously used lubricating oil for others for resale to the purchasing public in containers which do not clearly and conspicuously disclose such prior use on the front panel or front panels on the container.

6. Representing in any manner that lubricating oil composed in whole or in part of oil that has been manufactured, reprocessed or re-refined from oil that has been previously used for lubricating purposes, has been manufactured from oil that has not been previously used.

Commissioner Elman not concurring.

## Complaint

## IN THE MATTER OF

## SUPREME FOOD PRODUCTS COMPANY, INC., ET AL.

CONSENT ORDER, ETC., IN REGARD TO THE ALLEGED VIOLATION OF  
THE FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION ACT

*Docket 8699. Complaint, July 19, 1966—Decision, Oct. 19, 1966*

Consent order requiring a Philadelphia, Pa., food freezer corporation, to cease using false pricing, savings and quality claims and other deceptive practices in selling its food, freezers and freezer food plans.

## COMPLAINT

Pursuant to the provisions of the Federal Trade Commission Act, and by virtue of the authority vested in it by said Act, the Federal Trade Commission, having reason to believe that Supreme Food Products Company, Inc., a corporation, and Benjamin Jay Berman, individually and as an officer of said corporation, hereinafter referred to as respondents, have violated the provisions of said Act, and it appearing to the Commission that a proceeding by it in respect thereof would be in the public interest, hereby issues its complaint stating its charges in that respect as follows:

PARAGRAPH 1. Respondent Supreme Food Products Company, Inc., is a corporation, organized, existing and doing business under and by virtue of the laws of the State of Pennsylvania, with its principal office and place of business located at 4246-4250 Market Street in the city of Philadelphia, State of Pennsylvania. It also has done business under the names of Supreme Frozen Food Company, Foremost Products Co., and Foremost Food Service.

Respondent Benjamin Jay Berman is an individual and officer of Supreme Food Products Company, Inc. He formulates, directs and controls the acts and practices of said corporate respondent, including the acts and practices hereinafter set forth. His address is the same as that of the corporate respondent.

PAR. 2. Respondents are now, and for some time last past have been, engaged in the advertising, offering for sale, sale and distribution of freezers, food and freezer food plans to members of the purchasing public.

PAR. 3. In the course and conduct of their business respondents now cause, and for some time last past have caused, the aforesaid

freezers and food to be shipped from their aforesaid place of business in the State of Pennsylvania, and from the various places of business of their suppliers located in the State of Pennsylvania, to members of the purchasing public located in various other States of the United States, and maintain, and at all times mentioned herein have maintained, a substantial course of trade in said freezers and food in commerce, as "commerce" is defined in the Federal Trade Commission Act.

PAR. 4. In the course and conduct of their business, respondents have disseminated, and caused the dissemination of, certain advertisements concerning the said food and freezer food plans, by the United States mails and by various means in commerce, as "commerce" is defined in the Federal Trade Commission Act, for the purpose of inducing and which were likely to induce, directly or indirectly, the purchase of food as the term "food" is defined in the Federal Trade Commission Act; and have disseminated, and caused the dissemination of advertisement concerning the said food and freezer food plans by various means, including but not limited to those aforesaid, for the purpose of inducing and which were likely to induce, directly or indirectly, the purchase of freezers, food and freezer food plans in commerce, as "commerce" is defined in the Federal Trade Commission Act.

PAR. 5. By means of advertisement disseminated as aforesaid and by the oral statements of sales representatives, respondents have represented, directly or by implication:

1. That purchasers of their freezer food plan can buy their usual food requirements and a freezer for the same or a less amount of money than they have been paying for food alone.
2. That purchasers of respondents' freezer food plan will save enough money on the purchase of their food to pay for the freezer thereby receiving a freezer free of charge.
3. That the totals shown in respondents' sales contracts include all charges the purchaser must pay.
4. That respondents' regular and usual food prices are those charged for the initial order of food.
5. That purchasers can obtain all of their food needs through respondents' freezer food plan.
6. That all the food products sold by respondents are nationally advertised brands.
7. That the freezers sold by respondents are "frost free."
8. That all meats sold under respondents' freezer food plan are United States Government inspected and graded "choice."

1101

## Complaint

9. That purchasers of respondents' freezer food plans have but one payment per month to make covering both food and freezer.

10. That the initial food order supplied by the respondents will last purchasers four months.

11. That purchasers can become members of respondents' freezer food plan on a trial basis.

12. That purchasers of the aforesaid freezer food plan can sign blank contracts and notes with the assurance that when such instruments are filled in the terms and conditions and amounts as set forth therein will be the same as agreed upon and disclosed at the time of the sale.

PAR. 6. In truth and in fact:

1. Purchasers of respondents' freezer food plan cannot buy their usual food requirements and a freezer for the same or a less amount of money than such purchasers have paid for food alone.

2. Purchasers of respondents' freezer food plan do not save enough money on the purchase of their food to pay for the freezer and in fact must purchase and pay for said freezer.

3. The totals in respondents' sales contracts do not include all charges the purchaser must pay. Finance charges are later added to the amount which the purchaser must pay.

4. Respondents' regular and usual food prices are not those charged for the initial order of food. Respondents use lower than normal prices in the initial food order to induce purchasers to become members of their freezer food plan. On subsequent food orders customers pay the normal higher prices for food and the purported savings which induced purchasers to become members of the freezer food plan are no longer available.

5. Purchasers cannot buy all of their food needs through respondents' freezer food plan.

6. All the foods sold by respondents are not nationally advertised brands.

7. Freezers sold in connection with respondents' freezer food plan are not frost free, but accumulate frost and require manual defrosting.

8. All meats sold under respondents' freezer food plan are not United States Government inspected nor are they all United States Government graded "choice."

9. Purchasers of respondents' food plan are required to make two monthly payments, one for food and one for the freezer.

10. In many instances the initial food order supplied by re-

spondents will not last for four months but lasts for a substantially shorter period of time.

11. Purchasers of respondents' freezer food plan cannot enroll in such plan on a trial basis. The contracts entered into and promissory notes signed by them are noncancellable and irrevocable and they are bound by the terms thereof.

12. All the terms and conditions are not disclosed at the time of sale. In many instances when contracts and notes which have been signed in blank are filled in, the terms, conditions or amounts as set forth therein were not the same as agreed upon and disclosed at the time of the sale.

Therefore, the advertisements referred to in Paragraph Six were, and are misleading in material respects and constituted, and now constitute, "false advertisements" as that term is defined in the Federal Trade Commission Act, and the statements and representations referred to in Paragraph Six were, and now are false, misleading and deceptive.

PAR. 7. In the course and conduct of their business, and at all times mentioned herein, respondents have been in substantial competition in commerce, with corporations, firms and individuals engaged in the sale of freezers, food and freezer food plans.

PAR. 8. The use by respondents of the aforesaid false, misleading and deceptive statements, representations and practices has had, and now has, the capacity and tendency to mislead members of the purchasing public into the erroneous and mistaken belief that said representations were and are true, and into the purchase of substantial quantities of freezers, food and freezer food plans from respondents by reason of said erroneous and mistaken belief.

PAR. 9. The aforesaid acts and practices of the respondents, as herein alleged, including the dissemination by respondents of false advertisements as aforesaid, were and are all to the prejudice and injury of the public and the respondents' competitors, and constituted, and now constitute, unfair methods of competition in commerce, and unfair and deceptive acts and practices in commerce, within the intent and meaning of the Federal Trade Commission Act, and in violation of Sections 5 and 12 of said Act.

#### DECISION AND ORDER

The Commission having issued its complaint on July 19, 1966, charging the respondents named in the caption hereof with viola-

1101

## Decision and Order

tion of the Federal Trade Commission Act, and the respondents having been served with a copy of that complaint; and

The Commission having duly determined upon motion certified to the Commission that, in the circumstances presented, the public interest would be served by waiver here of the provision of Section 2.4(d) of its rules that the consent order procedure shall not be available after issuance of complaint; and

The respondents and counsel for the Commission having executed an agreement containing a consent order, an admission by respondents of all the jurisdictional facts of this proceeding, a statement that the signing of said agreement is for settlement purposes only and does not constitute an admission by respondents that the law has been violated as set forth in such complaint, and waivers and provisions as required by the Commission's rules; and

The Commission having considered the aforesaid agreement and having determined that it provides an adequate basis for appropriate disposition of this proceeding, the agreement is hereby accepted, the following jurisdictional findings are made, and the following order is entered:

1. Respondent Supreme Food Products Company, Inc., is a corporation organized, existing and doing business under by virtue of the laws of the State of Pennsylvania with its office and principal place of business located at 4246-4250 Market Street in the city of Philadelphia, State of Pennsylvania.

Respondent Benjamin Jay Berman is an officer of said corporation. He formulates, directs and controls the policies, acts and practices of said corporation, and his address is the same as that of said corporation.

2. The Federal Trade Commission has jurisdiction of the subject matter of this proceeding and of the respondents, and the proceeding is in the public interest.

## ORDER

## PART I

*It is ordered,* That respondents Supreme Food Products Company, Inc., a corporation, and its officers, trading under its own name or as Supreme Frozen Food Company, Foremost Food Products Co., or Foremost Food Service or under any other trade name or names, and Benjamin Jay Berman, individually and as an officer of said corporation, and respondents' representatives, agents and employees, directly or through any corporate or other

device, in connection with offering for sale, sale or distribution of freezers, food or freezer food plans in commerce, as "commerce" is defined in the Federal Trade Commission Act, do forthwith cease and desist from:

A. Representing, directly or by implication that:

1. Purchasers of their freezer food plan can buy their usual food requirements and a freezer for the same or a lesser amount of money than they have been paying for said food requirements alone.

2. Purchasers of their freezer food plan will save enough money on the purchase of their usual food requirements to pay for the freezer.

3. Food prices charged by respondents for the initial order are respondents' regular and usual price for each such item: *Provided, however,* That it shall be a defense in any enforcement proceeding instituted hereunder for respondents to establish that said initial prices are respondent's regular and usual prices for each such item at the time of the initial order.

4. Purchasers can obtain all of their food needs through respondents' freezer food plan.

5. All of respondents' food products, or any category thereof, are nationally advertised brands: *Provided, however,* That it shall be a defense in any enforcement proceeding instituted hereunder for respondents to establish that all such products, or any category thereof, are nationally advertised brands in conformity with the representation made.

6. The freezers sold by respondents are frost free: *Provided, however,* That it shall be a defense in any enforcement proceeding instituted hereunder for respondents to establish that such freezers are frost free.

7. The meat sold by respondents is either United States Government inspected or graded: *Provided, however,* That it shall be a defense in any enforcement proceeding instituted hereunder for respondents to establish that the meat so described has been inspected or graded in conformity with the representation made.

8. That purchasers have but one payment to make covering both food and freezer: *Provided, however,* That it shall be a defense in any enforcement proceeding

instituted hereunder for respondents to establish that only one payment is required for both food and freezer.

9. Any quantity of food ordered by the purchaser will be sufficient to last such purchaser any stated or specified period of time: *Provided, however,* That it shall be a defense in any enforcement proceeding instituted hereunder for respondents to establish that any representation in the foregoing respect constituted a bona fide estimate by respondents' representative of the purchaser's food requirements for the stated period of time based upon information secured in good faith from the purchaser.

10. Purchasers can become members of respondents' freezer food plan on a trial basis.

B. Misrepresenting in any manner the prices or the grade or quality of food sold by respondent or the savings realized by purchasers of respondents' food, freezers or freezer food plans.

C. Inducing purchasers to sign any contract to purchase, promissory note or other instrument which does not at the time of signing contain all the terms and conditions of the transaction and the total charges which the purchaser must pay.

#### PART II

*It is further ordered,* That respondents Supreme Food Products Company, Inc., a corporation, and its officers, trading under its own name or as Supreme Frozen Foods Company, Foremost Food Products Co., or Foremost Food Service, or any other trade name or names, and Benjamin Jay Berman, individually and as an officer of said corporation and respondents' representatives, agents and employees, directly or through any corporate or other device, in connection with offering for sale, sale or distribution of food, or any purchasing plan involving food, do forthwith cease and desist from:

1. Disseminating or causing to be disseminated any advertisement by means of United States mails or by any means in commerce, as "commerce" is defined in the Federal Trade Commission Act, which advertisement contains any of the representations or misrepresentations prohibited in Paragraphs A, B and C of Part I of this order.

2. Disseminating or causing to be disseminated any adver-

Complaint

70 F.T.C.

tisement by any means, for the purpose of inducing, or which is likely to induce, directly or indirectly, the purchase of any food or any purchasing plan involving food in commerce, as "commerce" is defined in the Federal Trade Commission Act, which advertisement contains any of the representations or misrepresentations prohibited in Paragraphs A, B and C of Part I of this order.

*It is further ordered,* That the respondents herein shall, within sixty (60) days after service upon them of this order, file with the Commission a report in writing setting forth in detail the manner and form in which they have complied with this order.

---

IN THE MATTER OF

BY-PRODUCTS INC., ET AL.

CONSENT ORDER, ETC., IN REGARD TO THE ALLEGED VIOLATION OF  
THE FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION AND THE TEXTILE FIBER PRODUCTS  
IDENTIFICATION ACTS

*Docket C-1131. Complaint, Oct. 19, 1966—Decision, Oct. 19, 1966*

Consent order requiring a Connerly Springs, N.C., buyer and seller of floor coverings made from textile waste to cease misbranding and falsely guaranteeing the fiber content of its products.

#### COMPLAINT

Pursuant to the provisions of the Federal Trade Commission Act and the Textile Fiber Products Identification Act, and by virtue of the authority vested in it by said Acts, the Federal Trade Commission, having reason to believe that By-Products Inc., a corporation, and D.B. Tate, individually and as an officer of said corporation, hereinafter referred to as respondents, have violated the provisions of said Acts and the Rules and Regulations promulgated under the Textile Fiber Products Identification Act, and it appearing to the Commission that a proceeding by it in respect thereof would be in the public interest, hereby issues its complaint stating its charges in that respect as follows:

PARAGRAPH 1. Respondent By-Products Inc., is a corporation organized, existing and doing business under and by virtue of the laws of the State of North Carolina.

Respondent D. B. Tate is an officer of the corporate respondent. He formulates, directs and controls the acts and practices of the corporate respondent, including the acts and practices hereinafter set forth. The respondents are engaged in the buying and selling of floor coverings made from textile waste. The respondents have their office and principal place of business at Connerly Springs, North Carolina.

PAR. 2. Subsequent to the effective date of the Textile Fiber Products Identification Act on March 3, 1960, respondents have been and are now engaged in the introduction, delivery for introduction, sale, advertising, and offering for sale, in commerce, and in the transportation or causing to be transported in commerce, and in the importation into the United States, of textile fiber products; and have sold, offered for sale, advertised, delivered, transported and caused to be transported, textile fiber products, which have been advertised or offered for sale in commerce; and have sold, offered for sale, advertised, delivered, transported, and caused to be transported, after shipment in commerce, textile fiber products either in their original state or contained in other textile fiber products; as the terms "commerce" and "textile fiber product" are defined in the Textile Fiber Products Identification Act.

PAR. 3. Certain of said textile fiber products were misbranded within the intent and meaning of Section 4(a) of the Textile Fiber Products Identification Act and the Rules and Regulations promulgated thereunder, in that they were falsely and deceptively stamped, tagged, labeled, invoiced, advertised, or otherwise identified as to the name or amount of constituent fibers contained therein.

Among such misbranded textile fiber products, but not limited, thereto, were floor coverings with labels which: set forth the fiber content as "25% Acrilan Acrylic, 25% Nylon, 25% Cotton, 25% Undetermined Fiber, Content Textile By Products" whereas, in truth and in fact, said product contained substantially different fibers and amount of fibers.

PAR. 4. Certain of said textile fiber products, were further misbranded in that they were not stamped, tagged, labeled or otherwise identified as required under the provisions of Section 4(b) of the Textile Fiber Products Identification Act, and in the manner and form as prescribed by the Rules and Regulations promulgated under said Act.

Among such misbranded textile fiber products, but not limited thereto, were textile fiber products with labels which failed:

1. To disclose the true generic names of the fibers present; and
2. To disclose the correct percentage of such fibers.

PAR. 5. The respondents have furnished false guaranties that their textile fiber products were not misbranded or falsely invoiced in violation of Section 10 of the Textile Fiber Products Identification Act.

PAR. 6. The acts and practices of the respondents as set forth above were and are in violation of the Textile Fiber Products Identification Act and the Rules and Regulations promulgated thereunder, and constituted and now constitutes unfair methods of competition and unfair and deceptive acts or practices, in commerce, under the Federal Trade Commission Act.

#### DECISION AND ORDER

The Federal Trade Commission having initiated an investigation of certain acts and practices of the respondents named in the caption hereof, and the respondents having been furnished thereafter with a copy of a draft of complaint which the Bureau of Textiles and Furs proposed to present to the Commission for its consideration and which, if issued by the Commission, would charge respondents with violation of the Federal Trade Commission Act and the Textile Fiber Products Identification Act; and

The respondents and counsel for the Commission having thereafter executed an agreement containing a consent order, an admission by the respondents of all the jurisdictional facts set forth in the aforesaid draft of complaint, a statement that the signing of said agreement is for settlement purposes only and does not constitute an admission by the respondents that the law has been violated as alleged in such complaint, and waivers and provisions as required by the Commission's rules; and

The Commission, having reason to believe that the respondents have violated said Acts, and having determined that complaint should issue stating its charges in that respect, hereby issues its complaint, accepts said agreement, makes the following jurisdictional findings, and enters the following order:

1. Respondent By-Products Inc., is a corporation organized, existing and doing business under and by virtue of the laws of the State of North Carolina, with its office and principal place of business located at Connerly Springs, North Carolina.

Respondent D. B. Tate is an officer of said corporation and his address is the same as that of said corporation.

2. The Federal Trade Commission has jurisdiction of the subject matter of this proceeding and of the respondents, and the proceeding is in the public interest.

## ORDER

*It is ordered,* That respondents By-Products Inc., a corporation, and its officers, and D. B. Tate, individually and as an officer of said corporation, and respondents' representatives, agents and employees, directly or through any corporate or other device, in connection with the introduction, delivery for introduction, sale, advertising, or offering for sale, in commerce, or the transportation or causing to be transported in commerce, or the importation into the United States of textile fiber products; or in connection with the sale, offering for sale, advertising, delivery, transportation, or causing to be transported, of any textile fiber products, which have been advertised or offered for sale in commerce; or in connection with the sale, offering for sale, advertising, delivery, transportation or causing to be transported, after shipment in commerce of any textile fiber products, whether they are in their original state or contained in other textile fiber products, as the terms "commerce" and "textile fiber product" are defined in the Textile Fiber Products Identification Act, do forthwith cease and desist from:

## A. Misbranding fiber products by:

1. Falsely or deceptively stamping, tagging, labeling, invoicing, advertising or otherwise identifying such products as to the name or amount of constituent fibers contained therein.

2. Failing to affix labels to such textile fiber products showing in a clear, legible and conspicuous manner each element of information required to be disclosed by Section 4(b) of the Textile Fiber Products Identification Act.

B. Furnishing false guaranties that textile fiber products are not misbranded or falsely invoiced under the provisions of the Textile Fiber Products Identification Act.

*It is further ordered,* That the respondents herein shall, within sixty (60) days after service upon them of this order, file with the Commission a report in writing setting forth in detail the manner and form in which they have complied with this order.

Complaint

70 F.T.C.

IN THE MATTER OF

ABINGTON SHOE COMPANY ET AL.

CONSENT ORDER, ETC., IN REGARD TO THE ALLEGED VIOLATION OF  
THE FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION ACT*Docket C-1132. Complaint, Oct. 21, 1966—Decision, Oct. 21, 1966*

Consent order requiring two affiliated Boston, Mass., manufacturers of men's shoes to cease deceptively representing their shoes as official, regulation or surplus United States Navy footwear.

## COMPLAINT

Pursuant to the provisions of the Federal Trade Commission Act, and by virtue of the authority vested in it by said Act, the Federal Trade Commission, having reason to believe that Abington Shoe Company, a corporation, Jade Footwear Company, a corporation, and Herman Swartz and Sidney Swartz, individually and as officers of said corporations, hereinafter referred to as respondents, have violated the provisions of said Act, and it appearing to the Commission that a proceeding by it in respect thereof would be in the public interest hereby issues its complaint stating its charges in that respect as follows:

PARAGRAPH 1. Respondents Abington Shoe Company is a corporation organized, existing and doing business under and by virtue of the laws of the State of Massachusetts, with its office and principal place of business located at 171 Camden Street, Boston, Massachusetts.

Respondent Jade Footwear Company is a corporation organized, existing and doing business under and by virtue of the laws of the State of Massachusetts, with its office and principal place of business located at 171 Camden Street, Boston, Massachusetts.

Respondents Herman Swartz and Sidney Swartz are officers of said corporate respondents. They formulate, direct and control the acts and practices of said corporate respondents including the acts and practices hereinafter set forth. Their business address is the same as that of respondent Abington Shoe Company.

The aforesaid respondents cooperate and act together in carrying out the acts and practices hereinafter set forth.

PAR. 2. Respondents are now, and for some time last past have been, engaged in the manufacturing, offering for sale, sale and distribution of footwear, including men's shoes which closely re-

semble in appearance shoes issued to members of the United States Navy, which are sold to dealers and others for resale to the public.

PAR. 3. In the course and conduct of their business, respondents now cause, and for some time last past have caused, said shoes, when sold to be shipped from their place of business in the State of Massachusetts to purchasers thereof located in various other States of the United States, and maintain, and at all times mentioned herein have maintained, a substantial course of trade in said products in commerce, as "commerce" is defined in the Federal Trade Commission Act.

PAR. 4. In the conduct of their business, at all times mentioned herein, respondents have been in substantial competition, in commerce, with corporations, firms and individuals in the sale of shoes of the same general kind and nature as those sold by respondents.

PAR. 5. The said shoes sold and distributed by respondents, in the course and conduct of their business as aforesaid, closely resemble the shoes issued and furnished to members of the United States Armed Forces in color material, pattern and style. Respondents also cause to be affixed to said shoes certain markings, writing and phrases respecting their manufacture, construction, inspection and specifications.

Typical and illustrative are the following:

GENUINE U.S. NAVY LAST  
U.S. NAVY LAST  
INSPECTED BY #203.

PAR. 6. Through the use of the terms "U.S. NAVY" in conjunction with the other statements and representations set out above, respondents represent, and have represented, directly or by implication:

1. That said shoes are official, regulation or surplus United States Navy shoes and are manufactured in accordance with United States Navy or Government specifications.
2. That said shoes are inspected by United States Navy or Government inspectors and approved as meeting United States Navy or Government specifications.

PAR. 7. In truth and in fact:

1. Said shoes are not official, regulation, surplus United States Navy or Government shoes and are not manufactured in accordance with Navy or Government specifications.

2. Said shoes are not inspected by United States Navy or Government inspectors and are not approved as meeting United States Navy or Government specifications.

Therefore, the statements and representations set forth in Paragraphs Five and Six hereof were and are false, misleading and deceptive.

PAR. 8. By selling and distributing to dealers and others said shoes having affixed to them the markings, writings and phrases hereinabove described, respondents furnish to such dealers and others, the means and instrumentalities by and through which they may mislead and deceive the purchasing public as to the origin, type, construction, manufacture and quality of their said shoes.

PAR. 9. The use by respondents of the aforesaid false, misleading and deceptive representations and practices has had, and now has, the capacity and tendency to mislead members of the purchasing public into the erroneous and mistaken belief that said statements and representations were and are true and into the purchase of substantial quantities of respondents' product by reason of said erroneous and mistaken belief.

PAR. 10. The aforesaid acts and practices of respondents, as herein alleged, were and are to the prejudice and injury of the public and of respondents' competitors, and constituted, and now constitute unfair methods of competition in commerce and unfair and deceptive acts and practices in commerce, in violation of Section 5 of the Federal Trade Commission Act.

#### DECISION AND ORDER

The Commission having heretofore determined to issue its complaint charging the respondents named in the caption hereof with violation of the Federal Trade Commission Act, and the respondents having been served with notice of said determination and with a copy of the complaint the Commission intended to issue, together with a proposed form of order; and

The respondents and counsel for the Commission having thereafter executed an agreement containing a consent order, an admission by respondents of all the jurisdictional facts set forth in the complaint to issue herein, a statement that the signing of said agreement is for settlement purposes only and does not constitute an admission by respondents that the law has been violated as set forth in such complaint, and waivers and provisions as required by the Commission's rules; and

The Commission, having considered the agreement, hereby accepts same, issues its complaint in the form contemplated by said agreement, makes the following jurisdictional findings, and enters the following order:

1. Respondent Abington Shoe Company is a corporation organized, existing and doing business under and by virtue of the laws of the State of Massachusetts, with its office and principal place of business located at 171 Camden Street, Boston, Massachusetts.

Respondent Jade Footwear Company is a corporation organized, existing and doing business under and by virtue of the laws of the State of Massachusetts, with its office and principal place of business located at 171 Camden Street, Boston, Massachusetts.

Respondents Herman Swartz and Sidney Swartz are officers of said corporations and their address is the same as that of said corporations.

2. The Federal Trade Commission has jurisdiction of the subject matter of this proceeding and of the respondents, and the proceeding is in the public interest.

#### ORDER

*It is ordered*, That respondents Abington Shoe Company, a corporation, and Jade Footwear Company, a corporation, and their respective officers, and Herman Swartz and Sidney Swartz, individually and as officers of said corporate respondents, and respondent's agents, representatives and employees, directly or through any corporate or other device, in connection with the offering for sale, sale or distribution of footwear in commerce, as "commerce" is defined in the Federal Trade Commission Act, do forthwith cease and desist from:

1. Representing, directly or by implication, that said footwear is official, regulation or surplus United States Navy or Armed Forces footwear or is manufactured in accordance with United States Navy or Government specifications.

2. Representing, directly or by implication, that said footwear has been inspected by United States Navy or Government inspectors or has been approved by said inspectors as meeting United States Navy or Government specifications.

3. Misrepresenting in any manner the parties, organizations, firms or corporations for whom said footwear was manufactured, or the specifications for or inspection of said footwear.

4. Furnishing or otherwise placing in the hands of retail-

Complaint

70 F.T.C.

ers of said products, or others, any means or instrumentalities by or through which they may mislead and deceive the public in the manner or as to the things hereinabove prohibited.

*It is further ordered,* That the respondents herein shall, within sixty (60) days after service upon them of this order, file with the Commission a report in writing setting forth in detail the manner and form in which they have complied with this order.

---

IN THE MATTER OF

PARENTS' MAGAZINE ENTERPRISES, INC., ET AL.

CONSENT ORDER, ETC., IN REGARD TO THE ALLEGED VIOLATION OF  
THE FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION ACT

*Docket C-1133. Complaint, Oct. 25, 1966—Decision, Oct. 25, 1966*

Consent order requiring a New York City publisher of a magazine for parents to cease deceptively representing that its "Commendation Seal" awarded to its advertisers is based on evaluation of the advertisers' products by independent individuals, laboratories, or organizations.

COMPLAINT

Pursuant to the provisions of the Federal Trade Commission Act and by virtue of the authority vested in it by said Act, the Federal Trade Commission, having reason to believe that Parents' Magazine Enterprises, Inc., a corporation, and George J. Hecht, Allison R. Leininger, and Edward A. Sand, individually and as officers of said corporation, hereinafter referred to as respondents, have violated the provisions of said Act, and it appearing to the Commission that a proceeding by it in respect thereof would be in the public interest, hereby issues its complaint stating its charges in that respect as follows:

PARAGRAPH 1. Respondent Parents' Magazine Enterprises, Inc., is a corporation organized, existing and doing business under and by virtue of the laws of the State of New York, with its principal office and place of business located at 52 Vanderbilt Avenue, in the city of New York, State of New York.

George J. Hecht is chairman of the board, Allison R. Leininger is chairman of the executive committee, and Edward A. Sand is

president, of the corporate respondent. These individuals direct, formulate and control the acts, practices and policies of the corporate respondent, including those hereinafter referred to. Their business address is the same as that of the corporate respondent.

PAR. 2. Respondents are now, and for some time last past have been, engaged in publishing various periodicals and magazines, and in the distribution and sale thereof to retailers for resale to the consuming public and directly to the consuming public. Among such publications is a magazine known as "Parents' Magazine."

Respondents are also engaged in the issuance of a seal of commendation to manufacturers who advertise in "Parents' Magazine."

PAR. 3. In the conduct of their business, at all times mentioned herein, respondents have been in substantial competition, in commerce, with corporations, firms and individuals in the sale of magazines and periodicals of the same general kind and nature as that sold by respondents.

PAR. 4. In the course and conduct of their business in connection with the sale and distribution of "Parent's Magazine" respondents now cause and for some time last past have caused, said magazine to be delivered to purchasers thereof, located in the various States of the United States other than the State of publication and in the District of Columbia. Respondents maintain, and at all times mentioned herein have maintained, a substantial course of trade in said publication and related enterprises in commerce, as "commerce" is defined in the Federal Trade Commission Act.

PAR. 5. In the course and conduct of their business and for the purpose of inducing advertisers to advertise their products and services in the said "Parents' Magazine" and for the purpose of inducing the purchase of the various products and services advertised therein, respondents have engaged in the following acts and practices:

Respondents with certain qualifications and requirements hereinafter set forth, offer to various advertisers in said "Parents' Magazine" the use of a seal which is circular in shape, and contains the language:

COMMENDED BY PARENTS' MAGAZINE as advertised therein

In each issue of said magazine there appears the following:

**WHAT THE PARENTS' MAGAZINE SEAL MEANS**

Products eligible for Parents' Magazine Commendation Seal are awarded the seal only after Parents' Magazines' technical staff and/or medical consultants have studied them and the claims made for them. The largest independent, diversified testing laboratory in the United States is employed on an annual retainer to do whatever tests are required.

Upon the granting of the use of commendation seal by respondents, advertisers in "Parent's Magazine" are entitled to display the commendation seal in advertisements placed in said magazine, and to use said seal elsewhere on and in connection with the products or services which have been awarded the commendation seal.

PAR. 6. By and through the use of the aforesaid commendation seal, and the above quoted statements, respondents have represented, directly or by implication, that "Parents' Magazine's" commendation seal is awarded to only those products or services that have been evaluated by qualified technicians, medical experts or an independent testing laboratory and found to fulfill all claims made for such products or services in Parents' Magazine advertisements.

PAR. 7. In truth and in fact the aforesaid commendation seal is not awarded to only those products or services that have been evaluated by qualified technicians, medical experts or an independent testing laboratory and found to fulfill all claims made for such products or services in Parents' Magazine advertisements. Some products or services are awarded the aforesaid commendation seal solely on the recommendation of "Parents' Magazine" staff members who are not qualified technicians or medical experts or on the basis of tests and reports submitted by the applicant for the seal, or on the basis of an editorial staff decision based on the reputation of the applicant.

Further, an advertising contract between the respondents and advertisers in said magazine is a condition precedent to any consideration for the awarding of the seal of commendation.

Moreover, respondents, by granting the seal of commendation to advertisers of products and services in said magazine place in the hands of said advertisers an instrumentality whereby such advertisers are enabled to mislead or deceive the consuming public.

Therefore, the statements and representations as set forth in Paragraphs Five and Six hereof were and are false, misleading and deceptive.

PAR. 8. The use by respondents of the aforesaid false, mislead-

ing and deceptive statements, representations and practices has had, and now has, the capacity and tendency to mislead members of the purchasing public into the erroneous and mistaken belief that such statements and representations were and are true and into the purchase of substantial quantities of the products and services advertised therein displaying the commendation seal by reason of said erroneous and mistaken belief.

PAR. 9. The aforesaid acts and practices of respondents, as herein alleged, were and are all to the prejudice and injury of the public and of respondents' competitors and constituted, and now constitute, unfair methods of competition in commerce and unfair and deceptive acts and practices in commerce, in violation of Section 5 of the Federal Trade Commission Act.

#### DECISION AND ORDER

The Commission having heretofore determined to issue its complaint charging the respondents named in the caption hereof with violation of the Federal Trade Commission Act, and the respondents having been served with notice of said determination and with a copy of the complaint the Commission intended to issue, together with a proposed form of order; and

The respondents and counsel for the Commission having thereafter executed an agreement containing a consent order, an admission by respondents of all the jurisdictional facts set forth in the complaint to issue herein, a statement that the signing of said agreement is for settlement purposes only and does not constitute an admission by respondents that the law has been violated as set forth in such complaint, and waivers and provisions as required by the Commission's rules; and

The Commission, having considered the agreement, hereby accepts same, issues its complaint in the form contemplated by said agreement, makes the following jurisdictional findings, and enters the following order:

1. Respondent Parents' Magazine Enterprises, Inc., is a corporation organized, existing and doing business under and by virtue of the laws of the State of New York, with its office and principal place of business located at 52 Vanderbilt Avenue, in the city of New York, State of New York.

Respondents George J. Hecht, Allison R. Leininger and Edward A. Sand are officers of said corporation and their address is the same as that of said corporation.

2. The Federal Trade Commission has jurisdiction of the sub-

ject matter of this proceeding and of the respondents, and the proceeding is in the public interest.

ORDER

*It is ordered*, That respondents Parents' Magazine Enterprises, Inc., a corporation, and George J. Hecht, Allison R. Leininger and Edward A. Sand, individually and as officers of said corporation, and respondents' officers, agents, representatives and employees, directly or through any corporate or other device, in connection with the solicitation of advertising, distribution of any publication, or the awarding of their commendation seal, or other similar device, in commerce, as "commerce" is defined in the Federal Trade Commission Act, do forthwith cease and desist from:

1. Representing, directly or by implication, that any award, seal or other commendation is granted, made or presented on the basis of evaluations or tests of products or services by individuals, laboratories or organizations to determine the quality or merits of such products or services or the validity of the claims made therefor: *Provided, however*, That it shall be a defense in any enforcement proceeding instituted for violation hereof for respondents to affirmatively establish that the award, seal or other commendation has been granted, made or presented (1) on the basis of good faith evaluations by employees of or consultants retained by respondents, whom respondents have reason to believe in good faith are qualified to determine the quality or merits of such products or services and the validity of the claims made therefor, or (2) on the basis of good faith evaluations by employees of or consultants retained by respondents, whom respondents have reason to believe in good faith are qualified therefor, of tests of products or services made by employees of or consultants retained by respondents whom, or individuals, laboratories or organizations which, respondents have reason to believe in good faith are qualified to determine the quality or merits of such products or services and the validity of the claims made therefor.

2. Granting, making or presenting any award, seal or other commendation which represents, directly or by implication, or which enables the recipient thereof to represent, directly or by implication, that any product or service receiving it has been evaluated or tested by individuals, laborator-

ies or organizations to determine the quality or merits of any such product or service or the validity of the claims made therefor: *Provided, however,* That it shall be a defense in any enforcement proceeding instituted for violation hereof for respondents to affirmatively establish that the award, seal or other commendation has been granted, made or presented (1) on the basis of good faith evaluations by employees of or consultants retained by respondents, whom respondents have reason to believe in good faith are qualified to determine the quality or merits of such products or services and the validity of the claims made therefor, or (2) on the basis of good faith evaluations by employees of or consultants retained by respondents, whom respondents have reason to believe in good faith are qualified therefor, of tests of products or services made by employees of or consultants retained by respondents whom, or individuals, laboratories or organizations which, respondents have reason to believe in good faith are qualified to determine the quality or merits of such products or services and the validity of the claims made therefor.

3. Failing to clearly disclose in connection with any statement in respondents' publications with respect to an award or other commendation conferred upon a particular product or service, the basis upon which such commendation was made, including the disclosure of the fact, when such is the case, that the evaluations or tests have been made, in whole or in part, by non-technical and/or non-medical persons; or misrepresenting in any manner the qualifications or training of those making respondents' evaluations or tests.

4. Misrepresenting in any manner the basis upon which respondents' awards, seals or commendations are granted.

*It is further ordered,* That the respondents herein shall, within sixty (60) days after service upon them of this order, file with the Commission a report in writing setting forth in detail the manner and form in which they have complied with this order.

Order

70 F.T.C.

IN THE MATTER OF

DAYCO CORPORATION

MODIFIED ORDER, ETC., IN REGARD TO THE ALLEGED VIOLATION OF  
THE FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION ACT*Docket 7604. Complaint, Oct. 1, 1959—Decision, Oct. 27, 1966*

Order modifying a cease and desist order of August 5, 1964, 66 F.T.C. 423, against a Dayton, Ohio, automotive parts manufacturer by vacating the price discrimination provision, pursuant to a remand order of the Court of Appeals, Sixth Circuit, 362 F. 2d 180 (8 S.&D. 327), and enforcing the prohibition against resale price fixing.

## ORDER MODIFYING ORDER TO CEASE AND DESIST

Respondent having filed in the United States Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit a petition to review and set aside the order to cease and desist issued herein on August 5, 1964 [66 F.T.C. 423]; and that court on June 17, 1966 [8 S.&D. 327], having issued its opinion and on July 5, 1966, having issued its order affirming and enforcing the portion of the order to cease and desist issued pursuant to Section 5 of the Federal Trade Commission Act; and vacating the portion of the order to cease and desist issued pursuant to Section 2(a) of the Clayton Act; and the court having remanded this matter to the Commission for further proceedings consistent with the court's opinion; and the Commission, having concluded after due consideration that no further proceedings are warranted:

*It is ordered,* That the order to cease and desist in this matter be, and it hereby is, modified to read as follows:

*It is ordered,* That respondent, Dayco Corporation, a corporation, and its officers, representatives, agents and employees, directly or through any corporate or other device in, or in connection with, the sale or distribution of automotive parts and related products in commerce, as "commerce" is defined in the Federal Trade Commission Act, do forthwith cease and desist from:

Putting into effect, continuing or maintaining any merchandising or distribution plan or policy under which agreements or understandings are entered into with resellers of such products which have the purpose

or effect of fixing, establishing, or maintaining the prices at which such products may be resold.

*It is further ordered*, That Count I of the complaint be, and it hereby is, dismissed.

*It is further ordered*, That the respondent herein shall, within sixty (60) days after service upon it of this modified order, file with the Commission a report, in writing, setting forth in detail the manner and form in which it has complied with this order.

---

IN THE MATTER OF

JEROME FRIEDMAN FURS, INC.

CONSENT ORDER, ETC., IN REGARD TO THE ALLEGED VIOLATION OF  
THE FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION AND THE FUR PRODUCTS LABELING  
ACTS

*Docket C-1134. Complaint, Oct. 27, 1966—Decision, Oct. 27, 1966*

Consent order requiring a New York City furrier to cease misbranding, falsely invoicing, and falsely advertising its fur products.

COMPLAINT

Pursuant to the provisions of the Federal Trade Commission Act and the Fur Products Labeling Act, and by virtue of the authority vested in it by said Acts, the Federal Trade Commission, having reason to believe that Jerome Friedman Furs, Inc., a corporation, hereinafter referred to as respondent, has violated the provisions of said Acts and the Rules and Regulations promulgated under the Fur Products Labeling Act, and it appearing to the Commission that a proceeding by it in respect thereof would be in the public interest, hereby issues its complaint stating its charges in that respect as follows:

PARAGRAPH 1. Respondent Jerome Friedman Furs, Inc., is a corporation with its office and principal place of business located at 5th Avenue at 47th Street, city of New York, State of New York.

Respondent is a retailer of fur products and leases the fur department in E. J. Korvette, a department store located at the same address.

PAR. 2. Subsequent to the effective date of the Fur Products Labeling Act on August 9, 1952, respondent has been and is now engaged in the introduction into commerce, and in the sale, advertising, and offering for sale in commerce, and in the transportation and distribution in commerce, of fur products; and has sold, advertised, offered for sale, transported and distributed fur products which have been made in whole or in part of furs which have been shipped and received in commerce, as the terms "commerce," "fur" and "fur product" are defined in the Fur Products Labeling Act.

PAR. 3. Certain of said fur products were misbranded in that they were falsely and deceptively labeled or otherwise falsely or deceptively identified with respect to the name of the country of origin of furs contained in such fur products, in violation of Section 4(1) of the Fur Products Labeling Act.

Among such misbranded fur products, but not limited thereto, were fur products labeled to show the country of origin of furs used in such fur products as "Canada" when the country of origin of such furs was, in fact, Norway.

PAR. 4. Certain of said fur products were misbranded in that they were falsely and deceptively labeled to show that fur contained therein was natural, when in fact such fur was pointed, bleached, dyed, tip-dyed, or otherwise artificially colored, in violation of Section 4(1) of the Fur Products Labeling Act.

PAR. 5. Certain of said fur products were misbranded in that they were not labeled as required under the provisions of Section 4(2) of the Fur Products Labeling Act and in the manner and form prescribed by the Rules and Regulations promulgated thereunder.

Among such misbranded fur products, but not limited thereto, were fur products which failed:

1. To show the true animal name of the fur used in the fur product.

2. To disclose that the fur contained in the fur product was bleached, dyed, or otherwise artificially colored, when such was the fact.

3. To show that the fur product was composed in whole or in substantial part of paws, tails, bellies, or waste furs when such was the fact.

PAR. 6. Certain of said fur products were misbranded in violation of the Fur Products Labeling Act in that they were not la-

beled in accordance with the Rules and Regulations promulgated thereunder in the following respects:

(a) The term "natural" was not used on labels to describe fur products which were not pointed, bleached, dyed, tip-dyed, or otherwise artificially colored, in violation of Rule 19(g) of said Rules and Regulations.

(b) Information required under Section 4(2) of the Fur Products Labeling Act and the Rules and Regulations promulgated thereunder was set forth in handwriting on labels, in violation of Rule 29(b) of said Rules and Regulations.

(c) Information required under Section 4(2) of the Fur Products Labeling Act and the Rules and Regulations promulgated thereunder was not set forth in the required sequence, in violation of Rule 30 of said Rules and Regulations.

(d) Information required under Section 4(2) of the Fur Products Labeling Act and the Rules and Regulations promulgated thereunder was not set forth separately on labels with respect to each section of fur products composed of two or more sections containing different animal furs, in violation of Rule 36 of said Rules and Regulations.

PAR. 7. Certain of said fur products were falsely and deceptively invoiced by the respondent in that they were not invoiced as required by Section 5(b)(1) of the Fur Products Labeling Act and Rules and Regulations promulgated under such Act.

Among such falsely and deceptively invoiced fur products, but not limited thereto, were fur products covered by invoices which failed:

1. To show the true animal name of the fur used in the fur product.

2. To disclose that the fur contained in the fur product was bleached, dyed, or otherwise artificially colored, when such was the fact.

3. To show the country of origin of imported furs used in the fur products.

PAR. 8. Certain of said fur products were falsely and deceptively invoiced with respect to the name or designation of the animal or animals that produced the fur from which the said fur products had been manufactured, in violation of Section 5(b)(2) of the Fur Products Labeling Act.

Among such falsely and deceptively invoiced fur products, but not limited thereto, were fur products which were invoiced as "Broadtail" thereby implying that the furs contained therein

were entitled to the designation "Broadtail Lamb" when in truth and in fact they were not entitled to such designation.

PAR. 9. Certain of said fur products were falsely and deceptively invoiced in violation of the Fur Products Labeling Act in that they were not invoiced in accordance with the Rules and Regulations promulgated thereunder in the following respects:

(a) Information required under Section 5(b)(1) of the Fur Products Labeling Act and the Rules and Regulations promulgated thereunder was set forth on invoices in abbreviated form, in violation of Rule 4 of said Rules and Regulations.

(b) The term "Persian Lamb" was not set forth on invoices in the manner required by law, in violation of Rule 8 of said Rules and Regulations.

(c) The term "Dyed Mouton Lamb" was not set forth on invoices in the manner required by law, in violation of Rule 9 of said Rules and Regulations.

(d) The term "Dyed Broadtail-processed Lamb" was not set forth on invoices in the manner required by law, in violation of Rule 10 of said Rules and Regulations.

(e) The term "natural" was not used on invoices to describe fur products which were not pointed, bleached, dyed, tip-dyed or otherwise artificially colored, in violation of Rule 19(g) of said Rules and Regulations.

PAR. 10. Certain of said fur products were falsely and deceptively advertised in violation of the Fur Products Labeling Act in that certain advertisements intended to aid, promote and assist, directly or indirectly, in the sale, and offering for sale of such fur products were not in accordance with the provisions of Section 5(a) of the said Act.

Among and included in the aforesaid advertisements, but not limited thereto, were advertisements of respondent which appeared in issues of the Daily News, a newspaper published in the city of New York, State of New York.

Among such false and deceptive advertisements, but not limited thereto, were advertisements which failed:

1. To show the true animal name of the fur used in the fur product.
2. To show that the fur contained in the fur product was bleached, dyed, or otherwise artificially colored, when such was the fact.

PAR. 11. By means of the aforesaid advertisements and others of similar import and meaning not specifically referred to herein, respondent falsely and deceptively advertised fur products in that certain of said fur products were falsely and deceptively identified with respect to the name or designation of the animal or animals that produced the fur from which the said fur products had been manufactured, in violation of Section 5(a)(5) of the Fur Products Labeling Act.

Among such falsely and deceptively advertised fur products, but not limited thereto, were fur products advertised as "Broadtail" thereby implying that the furs contained therein were entitled to the designation "Broadtail Lamb" when in truth and in fact they were not entitled to such designation.

PAR. 12. By means of the aforesaid advertisements and others of similar import and meaning not specifically referred to herein, respondent falsely and deceptively advertised fur products in violation of the Fur Products Labeling Act in that the said fur products were not advertised in accordance with the Rules and Regulations promulgated thereunder in the following respects:

(a) The term "Dyed Broadtail-processed Lamb" was not set forth in the manner required, in violation of Rule 10 of the said Rules and Regulations.

(b) The term "natural" was not used to describe fur products which were not pointed, bleached, dyed, tip-dyed or otherwise artificially colored, in violation of Rule 19(g) of the said Rules and Regulations.

PAR. 13. Respondent in introducing, selling, advertising, and offering for sale, in commerce, and in processing for commerce, fur products; and in selling, advertising, offering for sale and processing fur products which have been shipped and received in commerce, has misbranded such fur products by substituting thereon, labels which did not conform to the requirements of Section 4 of the Fur Products Labeling Act, for the labels affixed to said fur products by the manufacturer or distributor pursuant to Section 4 of said Act, in violation of Section 3(e) of said Act.

PAR. 14. The aforesaid acts and practices of respondent, as herein alleged, are in violation of the Fur Products Labeling Act and the Rules and Regulations promulgated thereunder and constitute unfair and deceptive acts and practices and unfair methods of competition in commerce under the Federal Trade Commission Act.

