

IN MATTER OF  
THE GUMMED INDUSTRIES ASSOCIATION, INC., ET AL.

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

*Docket 7079. Complaint, Mar. 3, 1958—Decision, Oct. 3, 1958*

Consent order requiring a trade association and six of its seven members, together producing almost 100 per cent of the gummed paper products manufactured in the United States, to cease fixing and maintaining uniform prices and terms of sale for flat gummed paper and differentials for variations in products, or selling at zone delivered prices; and requiring such manufacturer-members to cease quoting or selling their products at prices determined in accordance with a geographical zone delivered price system, and using the Association as a clearing house to exchange price information.

As to the seventh manufacturer respondent, Minnesota Mining and Manufacturing Company, complaint was dismissed without prejudice on Mar. 7, 1959, p. 1409, herein.

By *Earl J. Kolb*, hearing examiner.

*Mr. Andrew C. Goodhope* and *Mr. John Perechinsky* for the Commission.

*Sawyer & Marion*, of New York, N.Y., by *Mr. Albert E. Sawyer*, for The Gummed Industries Association, Inc., and *Philip O. Deitsch*.

*Mr. William H. Leahy*, of Framingham, Mass., for Dennison Manufacturing Company.

*Nutter, McClennen & Fish*, of Boston, Mass., for Nashua Corporation.

*Covington & Burling*, of Washington, D.C., by *Mr. H. Thomas Austern*, for Ludlow Papers, Inc.

*Frost & Jacobs*, of Cincinnati, Ohio, by *Mr. John C. Egbert*, for The Brown-Bridge Mills, Inc.

*Mr. Homer Crawford*, of New York, N.Y., for The Gummed Products Company.

*MacCoy, Evans & Lewis*, of Philadelphia, Pa., by *Mr. Mark Willcox, Jr.*, for Paper Manufacturers Company.

INITIAL DECISION AS TO CERTAIN RESPONDENTS

The complaint in this proceeding charges the respondents named therein with having entered into a combination and conspiracy to fix prices in violation of Section 5 of the Federal Trade Commission Act.

After the issuance of the complaint, the respondents, except Minnesota Mining and Manufacturing Company, a corporation, entered into an agreement containing a consent order to cease and desist with counsel supporting the complaint disposing of all the issues in this proceeding.

Said agreement provides, among other things, that said respondents admit all of the jurisdictional allegations in the complaint; that the record on which the initial decision and the decision of the Commission shall be based shall consist solely of the complaint and agreement; that the inclusion of findings of fact and conclusions of law in the decision disposing of this matter is waived, together with any further procedural steps before the hearing examiner and the Commission; that the order hereinafter set forth may be entered in disposition of the proceeding, such order to have the same force and effect as if entered after a full hearing, said respondents specifically waiving any and all rights to challenge or contest the validity of such order; that the order may be altered, modified, or set aside in the manner provided for other orders of the Commission; that the complaint may be used in construing the terms of the order; and that the agreement is for settlement purposes only and does not constitute an admission by said respondents that they have violated the law as alleged in the complaint.

The hearing examiner has considered such agreement and the order therein contained, and it appearing that said agreement and order provides for an appropriate disposition of this proceeding, the same is hereby accepted and is ordered filed upon becoming part of the Commission's decision in accordance with Sections 3.21 and 3.25 of the Rules of Practice, and, in consonance with the terms of said agreement, the hearing examiner finds that the Federal Trade Commission has jurisdiction of the subject matter of this proceeding and of the respondents hereinafter named and that this proceeding is in the interest of the public; and issues the following order:

Respondent, The Gummed Industries Association, Inc., is an incorporated trade association organized and existing under and by virtue of the laws of the State of Delaware with its office and principal place of business located at 11 West 42d Street, New York 36, N.Y.

Respondent Philip O. Deitsch is an individual, and is secretary-treasurer and managing director of said respondent Association. Respondent's address is 11 West 42d Street, New York 36, N.Y.

Order

55 F.T.C.

Respondent Dennison Manufacturing Company is a corporation organized and existing under and by virtue of the laws of the State of Massachusetts with its office and principal place of business located in Framingham, Mass.

Respondent Nashua Corporation (erroneously named in the complaint as a Massachusetts corporation and member of respondent The Gummed Industries Association, Inc.) is a corporation organized and existing under and by virtue of the laws of the State of Delaware with its office and principal place of business located at 44 Franklin Street, Nashua, N.H.

Respondent Ludlow Papers, Inc., is a corporation organized and existing under and by virtue of the laws of the State of Massachusetts with its office and principal place of business located at Needham Heights, Mass.

Respondent The Brown-Bridge Mills, Inc., is a corporation organized and existing under and by virtue of the laws of the State of Ohio with its office and principal place of business located at Water Street, Troy, Ohio.

Respondent The Gummed Products Company is a corporation organized and existing under and by virtue of the laws of the State of Ohio with its office and principal place of business located at South Union Street, Troy, Ohio.

Respondent Paper Manufacturers Company is a corporation organized and existing under and by virtue of the laws of the State of Pennsylvania with its office and principal place of business located at 9800 Bustelton Avenue, Philadelphia, Pa.

## ORDER

*It is ordered,* That respondent The Gummed Industries Association, Inc., an incorporated trade association, its officers, agents, representatives, and employees; respondent Philip O. Deitsch, individually and as secretary-treasurer and managing director of said association; and the corporate respondents Dennison Manufacturing Company, Ludlow Papers, Inc., The Brown-Bridge Mills, Inc., The Gummed Products Company, and Paper Manufacturers Company, independently and as members of said association, and Nashua Corporation, their respective officers, agents, representatives and employees, in or in connection with the offering for sale, sale or distribution in commerce, as "commerce" is defined in the Federal Trade Commission Act, of flat gummed paper, do forthwith cease and desist from entering into, continuing, cooperating in, or carrying out any planned common course

500

## Order

of action, understanding, agreement, combination or conspiracy between or among any two or more of said respondents, or between any one or more of said respondents and others not parties hereto, to do or to perform any of the following things:

1. Establishing, fixing or maintaining uniform and identical prices, terms or conditions of sale for any kind of flat gummed paper, or adhering to any prices, terms or conditions of sale so established, fixed or maintained.

2. Quoting or selling flat gummed paper at prices calculated or determined in whole or in part pursuant to or in accordance with a zone delivered price system, or quoting or selling flat gummed paper pursuant to or in accordance with any other plan or system which results in identical price quotations or prices for flat gummed paper at points of quotation or sale or to particular purchasers by any two or more sellers of flat gummed paper using such plan or system, or which prevents purchasers from finding any advantage in price in dealing with one or more as against another seller.

3. Using in the quotation and sale of flat gummed paper the geographical zones, or the price differentials between such zones heretofore fixed for pricing purposes, or establishing, fixing or maintaining any geographical areas for pricing purposes, or any differentials in price between any such areas for use in quoting or selling flat gummed paper.

4. Exchanging or relaying, directly or through The Gummed Industries Association, Inc., or any other trade association, clearing house or agency, price lists or other information as to prices, discounts, terms or conditions of sale for flat gummed paper for the purpose or with the effect of restraining price competition in the sale and distribution of flat gummed paper.

5. Establishing, fixing or maintaining, in the quotation and sale of flat gummed paper, uniform and identical differentials in price for variations in color, size, weight, trim, type, quantity or packing of flat gummed paper, or adhering to any such differentials so established, fixed or maintained.

*It is further ordered,* That the corporate respondents, Dennison Manufacturing Company, Nashua Corporation, Ludlow Papers, Inc., The Brown-Bridge Mills, Inc., The Gummed Products Company, and Paper Manufacturers Company, their officers, agents, representatives and employees, in or in connection with the offering for sale, sale or distribution of flat gummed paper in commerce, as "commerce" is defined in the Federal Trade Commis-

Decision

55 F.T.C.

sion Act, do forthwith cease and desist from quoting or selling flat gummed paper at prices calculated or determined in whole or in part pursuant to or in accordance with a zone delivered price system for the purpose or with the effect of systematically matching the delivered price quotations or the delivered prices of other sellers of flat gummed paper and thereby preventing purchasers from finding any advantage in price in dealing with one or more sellers as against another.

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION AND ORDER TO FILE  
REPORT OF COMPLIANCE

Pursuant to Section 3.21 of the Commission's Rules of Practice, the initial decision as to certain respondents of the hearing examiner shall, on the 3d day of October 1958, become the decision of the Commission; and, accordingly:

*It is ordered,* That respondents The Gummed Industries Association, Inc., Philip O. Deitsch, Dennison Manufacturing Company, Nashua Corporation, Ludlow Papers, Inc., The Brown-Bridge Mills, Inc., The Gummed Products Company, and Paper Manufacturers Company 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 the order to cease and desist.

## Decision

IN THE MATTER OF  
COLE STEEL EQUIPMENT CO., INC.CONSENT ORDER, ETC., IN REGARD TO THE ALLEGED VIOLATION OF  
THE FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION ACT*Docket 7127. Complaint, Apr. 18, 1958—Decision, Oct. 3, 1958*

Consent order requiring manufacturers of steel filing cabinets, with principal place of business in New York City, to cease representing falsely in catalogs and insert sheets furnished to their distributors that certain of their said filing cabinets were used in U.S. Government offices for the protection and preservation of secret and confidential documents and were suitable for such use by the Government and private industry.

*Mr. Frederick McManus* for the Commission.

*Walzer & Walzer*, of New York, N.Y., by *Mr. Martin J. Walzer*, for respondent.

## INITIAL DECISION BY EARL J. KOLB, HEARING EXAMINER

The complaint in this proceeding issued April 18, 1958, charges the respondent Cole Steel Equipment Co., Inc., a corporation, located at 415 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y., with violation of the provisions of the Federal Trade Commission Act in the manufacture, sale and distribution of steel filing cabinets.

After the issuance of the complaint, said respondent entered into an agreement containing consent order to cease and desist with counsel in support of the complaint, disposing of all the issues in this proceeding, which agreement was duly approved by the director and assistant director of the Bureau of Litigation.

It was expressly provided in said agreement that the signing thereof is for settlement purposes only and does not constitute an admission by said respondent that it has violated the law as alleged in the complaint.

By the terms of said agreement, the said respondent admitted all the jurisdictional facts alleged in the complaint and agreed that the record herein may be taken as if the Commission had made findings of jurisdictional facts in accordance with the allegations.

By said agreement, the parties expressly waived any further procedural steps before the hearing examiner and the Commission; the making of findings of fact or conclusions of law; and all the rights they may have to challenge or contest the validity

Decision

55 F.T.C.

of the order to cease and desist entered in accordance with the agreement.

Respondents further agreed that the order to cease and desist, issued in accordance with said agreement, shall have the same force and effect as if made after a full hearing.

It was further provided that said agreement, together with the complaint, shall constitute the entire record herein; that the complaint herein may be used in construing the terms of the order issued pursuant to said agreement; and that said order may be altered, modified or set aside in the manner prescribed by the statute for orders of the Commission.

The hearing examiner has considered such agreement and the order therein contained, and, it appearing that said agreement and order provides for an appropriate disposition of this proceeding, the same is hereby accepted and is ordered filed upon becoming part of the Commission's decision in accordance with §3.21 and §3.25 of the Rules of Practice, and, in consonance with the terms of said agreement, the hearing examiner finds that the Federal Trade Commission has jurisdiction of the subject matter of this proceeding and of the respondent named herein, that this proceeding is in the interest of the public, and issues the following order:

ORDER

*It is ordered*, That the respondent Cole Steel Equipment Co., Inc., a corporation, and its officers, and its representatives, agents and employees, directly or through any corporate or other device, in connection with the offering for sale, sale or distribution of steel filing cabinets in commerce, as "commerce" is defined in the Federal Trade Commission Act, do forthwith cease and desist from representing, directly or by implication, that any of its steel filing cabinets are used by the United States Government, or any of its offices, for the protection or preservation of secret or confidential documents or any of its steel filing cabinets are suitable for use for such purposes by the United States Government, or private industry, unless such is the fact.

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION AND ORDER TO FILE  
REPORT OF COMPLIANCE

Pursuant to Section 3.21 of the Commission's Rules of Practice, the initial decision of the hearing examiner shall, on the 3d day of

505

Decision

October 1958, become the decision of the Commission; and, accordingly:

*It is ordered,* That respondent Cole Steel Equipment Co., Inc., a corporation, shall, within sixty (60) days after service upon it of this order, file with the Commission a report in writing, setting forth in detail the manner and form in which it has complied with the order to cease and desist.



IN THE MATTER OF  
F. HOLLANDER & SON, INC., ET AL

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

*Docket 7145. Complaint, May 8, 1958—Decision, Oct. 3, 1958*

Consent order requiring manufacturers in New York City to reveal the rayon or acetate content of coverings of their umbrellas.

*Mr. Alvin D. Edelson* supporting the complaint.

*Mr. Walter M. Weisberg*, of New York, N.Y., for respondents.

INITIAL DECISION OF JOHN LEWIS, HEARING EXAMINER

The Federal Trade Commission issued its complaint against the above-named respondents on May 8, 1958, charging them with the use of unfair and deceptive acts and practices and unfair methods of competition, in commerce, in violation of the Federal Trade Commission Act, by failing to disclose the rayon and acetate content of umbrellas manufactured and sold by them where the coverings of such umbrellas simulate silk and in certain instances are advertised as "satin." After being served with said complaint respondents appeared by counsel and entered into an agreement, dated July 24, 1958, containing a consent order to cease and desist purporting to dispose of all of this proceeding as to all parties. Said agreement, which has been signed by all respondents, by counsel for said respondents, and by counsel supporting the complaint, and approved by the director and assistant director of the Commission's Bureau of Litigation, has been submitted to the above-named hearing examiner for his consideration, in accordance with Section 3.25 of the Commission's Rules of Practice for Adjudicative Proceedings.

Respondents, pursuant to the aforesaid agreement, have admitted all the jurisdictional facts alleged in the complaint and agreed that the record may be taken as if findings of jurisdictional facts had been duly made in accordance with such allegations. Said agreement further provides that respondents waive any further procedural steps before the hearing examiner and the Commission, the making of findings of fact or conclusions of law and all of the rights they may have to challenge or contest the validity of the order to cease and desist entered in accordance with such agreement. It has been agreed that the order to

508

Order

cease and desist issued in accordance with said agreement shall have the same force and effect as if entered after a full hearing and that the complaint may be used in construing the terms of said order. It has also been agreed that the record herein shall consist solely of the complaint and said agreement, and that said agreement is for settlement purposes only and does not constitute an admission by respondents that they have violated the law as alleged in the complaint.

This proceeding having now come on for final consideration on the complaint and the aforesaid agreement containing consent order, and it appearing that the order provided for in said agreement covers all the allegations of the complaint and provides for an appropriate disposition of this proceeding as to all parties, said agreement is hereby accepted and is ordered filed upon this decision's becoming the decision of the Commission pursuant to Sections 3.21 and 3.25 of the Commission's Rules of Practice for Adjudicative Proceedings, and the hearing examiner, accordingly, makes the following jurisdictional findings and order:

1. Respondent F. Hollander & Son, 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 114-20 West 30th Street, New York, N.Y.

The individual respondents Irving Hollander and Stanley H. Pollinger are officers of the corporate respondent and maintain business residences at the same address as that of the corporate respondent.

2. The Federal Trade Commission has jurisdiction of the subject matter of this proceeding and of the respondents hereinabove named. The complaint states a cause of action against said respondents under the Federal Trade Commission Act, and this proceeding is in the interest of the public.

#### ORDER

*It is ordered,* That respondents F. Hollander & Son, Inc., a corporation, and its officers, and Irving Hollander and Stanley H. Pollinger, individually and as officers of said corporation, and respondents' agents, representatives and employees, directly or through any corporate or other device, in connection with the offering for sale, sale and distribution of umbrellas or any other products in commerce, as "commerce" is defined in the Federal Trade Commission Act, do forthwith cease and desist from:

Decision

55 F.T.C.

Failing to conspicuously disclose by tag or label on the products themselves, and in advertisements and invoices, that their said products are composed, in whole or in part, of rayon or acetate, when such is the fact.

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION AND ORDER TO FILE  
REPORT OF COMPLIANCE

Pursuant to Section 3.21 of the Commission's Rules of Practice, the initial decision of the hearing examiner shall, on the 3d day of October 1958, become the decision of the Commission; and, accordingly:

*It is 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 the order to cease and desist.

## Decision

IN THE MATTER OF  
THOMAS & NOA FURS, INC., ET AL.

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

*Docket 7153. Complaint, May 21, 1958—Decision, Oct. 3, 1958*

Consent order requiring a furrier in Lowell, Mass., to cease violating the Fur Products Labeling Act by tagging fur products with names of animals other than those producing the fur, and by failing to comply in other respects with labeling and invoicing requirements.

*Mr. S. F. House* for the Commission.

No appearance for respondents.

INITIAL DECISION BY EARL J. KOLB, HEARING EXAMINER

The complaint in this proceeding issued May 21, 1958, charges the respondents Thomas & Noa Furs, Inc., a corporation, and Charles Thomas, individually and as an officer of said corporation, located at 25-33 Prescott Street, Lowell, Mass., with violation of the provisions of the Federal Trade Commission Act and the Fur Products Labeling Act in the sale and distribution of fur products.

After the issuance of the complaint, respondents entered into an agreement containing consent order to cease and desist with counsel in support of the complaint, disposing of all the issues in this proceeding, which agreement was duly approved by the director and assistant director of the Bureau of Litigation.

It was expressly provided in said agreement that the signing thereof is for settlement purposes only and does not constitute an admission by respondents that they have violated the law as alleged in the complaint.

By the terms of said agreement, the respondents admitted all the jurisdictional facts alleged in the complaint and agreed that the record herein may be taken as if the Commission had made findings of jurisdictional facts in accordance with the allegations.

By said agreement, the parties expressly waived any further procedural steps before the hearing examiner and the Commission; the making of findings of fact or conclusions of law; and all the rights they may have to challenge or contest the validity of the order to cease and desist entered in accordance with the agreement.

Order

55 F.T.C.

Respondents further agreed that the order to cease and desist, issued in accordance with said agreement, shall have the same force and effect as if made after a full hearing.

It was further provided that said agreement, together with the complaint, shall constitute the entire record herein; that the complaint herein may be used in construing the terms of the order issued pursuant to said agreement; and that said order may be altered, modified or set aside in the manner prescribed by the statute for orders of the Commission.

The hearing examiner has considered such agreement and the order therein contained, and, it appearing that said agreement and order provides for an appropriate disposition of this proceeding, the same is hereby accepted and is ordered filed upon becoming part of the Commission's decision in accordance with Sections 3.21 and 3.25 of the Rules of Practice, and, in consonance with the terms of said agreement, the hearing examiner finds that the Federal Trade Commission has jurisdiction of the subject matter of this proceeding and of the respondents named herein, that this proceeding is in the interest of the public, and issues the following order:

## ORDER

*It is ordered,* That Thomas & Noa Furs, Inc., a corporation, and its officers, and Charles Thomas, 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 into commerce, or the sale, advertising, offering for sale, transportation or distribution of fur products in commerce, or in connection with the sale, advertising, offering for sale, transportation or distribution of fur products which have been made in whole or in part of fur which has been shipped and received in commerce, as "commerce," "fur" and "fur product" are defined in the Fur Products Labeling Act, do forthwith cease and desist from:

## A. Misbranding fur products by:

## 1. Failing to affix labels to fur products showing:

(a) The name or names of the animal or animals producing the fur or furs contained in the fur product as set forth in the Fur Products Name Guide and as prescribed under the Rules and Regulations;

(b) That the fur product contains or is composed of used fur, when such is the fact;

(c) That the fur product contains or is composed of bleached,

511

Order

dyed or otherwise artificially colored fur, when such is the fact;

(d) That the fur product is composed in whole or in substantial part of paws, tails, bellies or waste fur, when such is the fact;

(e) The name or other identification issued and registered by the Commission, of one or more persons who manufactured such fur product for introduction into commerce, introduced it into commerce, sold it in commerce, advertised, or offered it for sale in commerce, or transported or distributed it in commerce;

(f) The name of the country of origin of any imported furs used in the fur product;

2. Failing to show on labels attached to fur products the item numbers or marks assigned to fur products as required by Rule 40(a) of the Rules and Regulations.

3. Setting forth on labels affixed to fur products:

(a) Information required under Section 4(2) of the Fur Products Labeling Act and the Rules and Regulations thereunder which is intermingled with nonrequired information;

(b) The name or names of any animal or animals other than the name or names specified in Section 4(2)(A) of the Fur Products Labeling Act.

B. Falsely or deceptively invoicing fur products by:

1. Failing to furnish invoices to purchasers of fur products showing:

(a) The name or names of the animal or animals producing the fur or furs contained in the fur product, as set forth in the Fur Products Name Guide and as prescribed under the Rules and Regulations;

(b) That the fur product contains or is composed of used fur, when such is the fact;

(c) That the fur product contains or is composed of bleached, dyed or otherwise artificially colored fur, when such is the fact;

(d) That the fur product is composed in whole or in substantial part, of paws, tails, bellies, or waste fur, when such is the fact;

(e) The name and address of the person issuing such invoice;

(f) The name of the country of origin of any imported furs contained in a fur product.

2. Setting forth in invoices, information required under Section 5(b)(1) of the Fur Products Labeling Act and the Rules and Regulations thereunder, in abbreviated form.

Decision

55 F.T.C.

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION AND ORDER TO FILE  
REPORT OF COMPLIANCE

Pursuant to Section 3.21 of the Commission's Rules of Practice, the initial decision of the hearing examiner shall, on the 3d day of October 1958, become the decision of the Commission; and, accordingly:

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

## Decision

IN THE MATTER OF  
KRUMHOLZ FIBRE CO., INC., ET AL.

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

*Docket 7162. Complaint, May 28, 1958—Decision, Oct. 3, 1958*

Consent order requiring a manufacturer in New York City to cease violating the Wool Products Labeling Act by labeling as "100% reprocessed wool," rolls of batting which contained a substantial percentage of nonwoolen fibers, and by failing to label certain of such wool products as required.

*Mr. Alvin D. Edelson* supporting the complaint.

Respondents, *pro se*.

## INITIAL DECISION BY JOHN LEWIS, HEARING EXAMINER

The Federal Trade Commission issued its complaint against the above-named respondents on May 28, 1958, charging them with having violated the Wool Products Labeling Act of 1939 and the Rules and Regulations promulgated thereunder, and the Federal Trade Commission Act, through the misbranding of certain wool products and falsely identifying the constituent fibers thereof. After being served with said complaint, respondents appeared and entered into an agreement containing consent order to cease and desist, dated August 7, 1958, purporting to dispose of all of this proceeding as to all parties. Said agreement, which has been signed by all respondents and by counsel supporting the complaint, and approved by the Director and Assistant Director of the Commission's Bureau of Litigation, has been submitted to the above-named hearing examiner for his consideration, in accordance with section 3.25 of the Commission's Rules of Practice for Adjudicative Proceedings.

Respondents, pursuant to the aforesaid agreement, have admitted all the jurisdictional facts alleged in the complaint, and have agreed that the record may be taken as if findings of jurisdictional facts had been duly made in accordance with such allegations. Said agreement further provides that respondents waive any further procedural steps before the hearing examiner and the Commission, the making of findings of fact or conclusions of law, and all of the rights they may have to challenge or contest the validity of the order to cease and desist entered in accordance with said agreement. It has been agreed that the order to cease



Order

55 F.T.C.

and desist issued in accordance with said agreement shall have the same force and effect as if entered after a full hearing and that the complaint may be used in construing the terms of said order. It has also been agreed that the aforesaid agreement is for settlement purposes only and does not constitute an admission by respondents that they have violated the law as alleged in the complaint.

This proceeding having now come on for final consideration on the complaint and the aforesaid agreement containing consent order, and it appearing that the order provided for in said agreement covers all the allegations of the complaint and provides for an appropriate disposition of this proceeding as to all parties, said agreement is hereby accepted and is ordered filed upon this decision's becoming the decision of the Commission pursuant to Sections 3.21 and 3.25 of the Commission's Rules of Practice for Adjudicative Proceedings, and the hearing examiner, accordingly, makes the following jurisdictional findings and order:

1. Respondent Krumholz Fibre Co., Inc., is a corporation, organized and existing under and by virtue of the laws of the State of New York, with its principal place of business located at 4242 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.

The individual respondent, William Krumholz is President of the corporate respondent and his business address is the same address as the corporate respondent.

2. The Federal Trade Commission has jurisdiction of the subject matter of this proceeding and of the respondents hereinabove named. The complaint states a cause of action against said respondents under the Wool Products Labeling Act of 1939 and the Federal Trade Commission Act, and this proceeding is in the interest of the public.

## ORDER

*It is ordered,* That respondents, Krumholz Fibre Co., Inc., a corporation, and its officers, and William Krumholz, individually and as an officer of the corporation, and respondents' representatives, agents and employees, directly or through any corporate or other device, in connection with the introduction or manufacture for introduction into commerce, or the offering for sale, sale, transportation or distribution in commerce, as "commerce" is defined in the Federal Trade Commission Act, and the Wool Products Labeling Act of 1939, of wool products as "wool prod-

