

thereafter distributes any of said products under any of respondent's brand names or labels.

II

It is further ordered, That within sixty (60) days after this order becomes final, and annually thereafter, respondent shall furnish to the Federal Trade Commission a verified written report setting forth the manner and form in which it intends to comply, is complying, or has complied with paragraph I of this order.

III

It is further ordered, That in the event the Commission issues any order or rule which is less restrictive than the provisions of paragraph I of this order, in any proceeding involving the merger or acquisition of a snack food or milling or cereal company, then the Commission shall, upon the application of General Mills reconsider this order and may reopen this proceeding in order to make whatever revisions, if any, are necessary to bring the foregoing paragraph into conformity with the less stringent restrictions imposed upon respondent's competitors.

IV

It is further ordered, That the respondent corporation shall forthwith distribute a copy of this order to each of its operating divisions.

It is further ordered, That the respondent herein 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 this order.

IN THE MATTER OF

GREEN & ROTHMAN, ET AL.

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

Docket C-1502. Complaint, Mar. 11, 1969—Decision, Mar. 11, 1969

Consent order requiring a New York City manufacturing furrier to cease misbranding and falsely invoicing its fur products, and furnishing false guaranties that its fur products are not misbranded or falsely invoiced.

Complaint

75 F.T.C.

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 Green & Rothman, a partnership, and William Green and Zoltan Rothman, individually and as copartners trading as Green & Rothman, hereinafter referred to as respondents, have violated the provisions of said Act 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 Green & Rothman is a partnership, existing and doing business under and by virtue of the laws of the State of New York.

Respondents William Green and Zoltan Rothman are individual copartners trading as Green & Rothman.

Respondents are manufacturers of fur products with their office and principal place of business located at 214 West 30th Street, New York, New York.

PAR. 2. Respondents are now and for some time last past have been engaged in the introduction into commerce, and in the manufacture for 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 have manufactured for sale, 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 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. 4. 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 with labels which failed to disclose that the fur contained in the fur products was bleached, dyed, or otherwise artificially colored, when such was the fact.

PAR. 5. Certain of said fur products were misbranded in violation of the Fur Products Labeling Act in that they were not labeled in accordance with the Rules and Regulations promulgated thereunder inasmuch as information required under Section 4(2) of the Fur Products Labeling Act and the Rules and Regulations promulgated thereunder was set forth on labels in abbreviated form, in violation of Rule 4 of said Rules and Regulations.

PAR. 6. Certain of said fur products were falsely and deceptively invoiced by the respondents in that they were not invoiced as required by Section 5(b)(1) of the Fur Products Labeling Act and the 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 to disclose that the fur contained in the fur products was bleached, dyed, or otherwise artificially colored, when such was the fact.

PAR. 7. Certain of said fur products were falsely and deceptively invoiced in that said fur products were invoiced to show that the fur contained therein was natural, when in fact such fur was pointed, bleached, dyed, tip-dyed or otherwise artificially colored, in violation of Section 5(b)(2) of the Fur Products Labeling Act.

PAR. 8. Respondents furnished false guaranties that certain of their fur products were not misbranded, falsely invoiced or falsely advertised when respondents in furnishing such guaranties had reason to believe that fur products so falsely guaranteed would be introduced, sold, transported or distributed in commerce, in violation of Section 10(b) of the Fur Products Labeling Act.

PAR. 9. The aforesaid acts and practices of respondents, as herein alleged, are in violation of the Fur Products Labeling Act and the Rules and Regulations promulgated thereunder and constitute unfair methods of competition and unfair and deceptive acts and 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 Fur Products Labeling 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 respondents that the law has been violated as alleged in such complaint, and waivers and other provisions as required by the Commission's Rules; and

The Commission having thereafter considered the matter and having determined that it had reason to believe that the respondents have violated the said Acts, and that complaint should issue stating its charges in that respect, and having thereupon accepted the executed consent agreement and placed such agreement on the public record for a period of thirty (30) days, now in further conformity with the procedure prescribed in § 2.34(b) of its Rules, the Commission hereby issues its complaint, makes the following jurisdictional findings, and enters the following order:

1. Respondent Green & Rotham in a partnership existing and doing business under the laws of the State of New York, with its office and principal place of business located at 214 West 30th Street, city of New York, State of New York.

Respondents William Green and Zoltan Rothman are individual copartners trading as Green & Rothman and their address is the same as that of said partnership.

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 Green & Rothman, a partnership, and William Green and Zoltan Rothman, individually and as copartners trading as Green & Rothman or any other name or names, and respondents' representatives, agents and employees, directly or through any corporate or other device, in connection with the introduction, or manufacture for introduction, into com-

merce, or the sale, advertising or offering for sale in commerce, or the transportation or distribution in commerce, of any fur product; or in connection with the manufacture for sale, sale, advertising, offering for sale, transportation or distribution of any fur product which is made in whole or in part of fur which has been shipped and received in commerce, as the terms "commerce," "fur" and "fur product" are defined in the Fur Products Labeling Act, do forthwith cease and desist from:

A. Misbranding any fur product by:

1. Representing, directly or by implication, on a label that the fur contained in such fur product is natural when the fur contained therein is pointed, bleached, dyed, tip-dyed, or otherwise artificially colored.

2. Failing to affix a label to such fur product showing in words and in figures plainly legible all of the information required to be disclosed by each of the subsections of Section 4(2) of the Fur Products Labeling Act.

3. Setting forth information required under Section 4(2) of the Fur Products Labeling Act and the Rules and Regulations promulgated thereunder in an abbreviated form on a label affixed to such fur product.

B. Falsely or deceptively invoicing any fur product by:

1. Failing to furnish an invoice, as the term "invoice" is defined in the Fur Products Labeling Act, showing in words and figures plainly legible all the information required to be disclosed by each of the subsections of Section 5(b)(1) of the Fur Products Labeling Act.

2. Representing, directly or by implication, on an invoice that the fur contained in such fur products is natural when such fur is pointed, bleached, dyed, tip-dyed, or otherwise artificially colored.

It is further ordered, That the respondents Green & Rothman, a partnership, and William Green and Zoltan Rothman, individually and as copartners trading as Green & Rothman or any other name or names, and respondents' representatives, agents and employees, directly or through any corporate or other device, do forthwith cease and desist from furnishing a false guaranty that any fur product is not misbranded, falsely invoiced or falsely advertised when the respondents have reason to believe that such fur product may be introduced, sold, transported, or distributed in commerce.

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

THE B. F. GOODRICH COMPANY AND TEXACO, INC.
(Formerly The Texas Company)

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

Docket 6485. Complaint, Jan. 11, 1956—Decision, Mar. 12, 1969

Order modifying a cease and desist order dated January 14, 1966, 69 F.T.C. 22, pursuant to a decision and remand of the Supreme Court, 393 U.S. 223, by deleting numbered paragraphs 5 and 6 of the order directed against Texaco, Inc.

ORDER MODIFYING ORDER TO CEASE AND DESIST

Respondents having filed in the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit petitions to review and set aside the order to cease and desist issued herein on January 14, 1966; and that court on September 25, 1967, having rendered its opinion setting aside the Commission's order; and the Supreme Court of the United States on December 16, 1968, having issued its opinion reversing in part the judgment of the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit and remanding the case to that court for enforcement of the Commission's order to cease and desist with the exception of numbered paragraphs 5 and 6 of that portion of the order directed against Texaco; and the Supreme Court on January 10, 1969, having forwarded its judgment in lieu of mandate to the court of appeals; and the court of appeals on February 25, 1969, having issued its judgment in accordance with the mandate of the Supreme Court;

Now, therefore, it is hereby ordered, That the aforesaid order to cease and desist be, and it hereby is, modified by deleting numbered paragraphs 5 and 6 of that portion of the order directed against Texaco.

It is further ordered, That respondents, The B.F. Goodrich

Company, a corporation, and The Texas Company, a corporation, shall within sixty (60) days after service upon them of this order, file with the Commission reports in writing, setting forth in detail the manner and form in which they have complied with the order to cease and desist.

Chairman Dixon not participating.

IN THE MATTER OF

WASSNER SPORTSWEAR MFG., INC., ET AL.

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

Docket C-1503. Complaint, Mar. 13, 1969—Decision, Mar. 13, 1969

Consent order requiring four affiliated New York City importers and manufacturers of wearing apparel to cease misbranding their wool products and falsely advertising their textile fiber products.

COMPLAINT

Pursuant to the provisions of the Federal Trade Commission Act, the Wool Products Labeling Act of 1939 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 Wassner Sportswear Mfg., Inc., Gotham Men's & Boys' Wear, Inc., Olympic Shirts, Inc., and Lustberg, Nast & Co., Inc., corporations, and Isidor Wassner, David Wassner and Joseph Wassner, individually and as officers of said corporations, hereinafter referred to as respondents, have violated the provisions of the said Acts and the Rules and Regulations promulgated under the Wool Products Labeling Act of 1939 and 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. Respondents Wassner Sportswear Mfg., Inc., Gotham Men's & Boys' Wear, Inc., Olympic Shirts, Inc., and Lustberg, Nast & Co., Inc., are corporations organized, existing and doing business under and by virtue of the laws of the State of New York with their office and principal place of business located at 31 West 27th Street, New York, New York.

Respondents Isidor Wassner, David Wassner and Joseph Wassner are officers of the aforesaid corporations. They formulate, direct and control the acts, practices and policies of the said corporations. Their office and principal place of business are the same as that of the corporate respondents.

Respondents import, manufacture and distribute wool and textile fiber products.

PAR. 2. Respondents now and for some time last past, have manufactured for introduction into commerce, introduced into commerce, sold, transported, distributed, delivered for shipment, shipped and offered for sale in commerce, wool products, as the terms "commerce" and "wool product" are defined in the Wool Products Labeling Act of 1939.

PAR. 3. Certain of said wool products were misbranded by the respondents within the intent and meaning of Section 4(a)(1) of the Wool Products Labeling Act and the Rules and Regulations promulgated thereunder, in that they were falsely stamped, tagged, labeled, or otherwise identified with respect to the character and amount of the constituent fibers contained therein.

Also among such misbranded wool products, but not limited thereto, were men's jackets containing interlining material stamped, tagged, labeled, or otherwise identified as "90% Acrylic, 10% Other Fibers" whereas, in truth and in fact, such interlining material contained woolen fibers together with substantially different fibers and amounts of fibers than represented.

Also among such wool products, but not limited thereto, were men's jackets containing interlining material stamped, tagged, labeled, or otherwise identified as "90% Reprocessed wool, 10% other fibers" whereas, in truth and in fact, such interlining material contained substantially different amounts and types of fibers than as represented.

PAR. 4. Certain of said wool products were further misbranded by respondents in that they were not stamped, tagged, labeled, or otherwise identified as required under the provisions of Section 4(a)(2) of the Wool Products Labeling Act and in the manner and form prescribed by the Rules and Regulations promulgated under said Act.

Among said misbranded wool products, but not limited thereto, were certain men's jackets with labels on or affixed thereto which failed to disclose the percentage of the total fiber weight of the wool products, exclusive of ornamentation not exceeding 5 per centum of said total fiber weight of (1) wool; (2) reprocessed

wool; (3) re-used wool; (4) each fiber other than wool when said percentage by weight of such fiber was 5 per centum or more; and (5) the aggregate of all other fibers.

PAR. 5. Certain of said wool products were misbranded in violation of the Wool Products Labeling Act in that they were not labeled in accordance with the Rules and Regulations promulgated thereunder in the following respect.

The generic names of manufactured fibers established in Rule 7 of the Regulations promulgated under the Textile Fiber Products Identification Act were not used in naming such fibers in required information, in violation of Rule 8(b) of the aforesaid Rules and Regulations.

Among such misbranded wool products but not limited thereto were certain men's jackets with labels on or affixed thereto which described a portion of the fiber content as Orlon without using the generic name of said fiber, "acrylic."

PAR. 6. The acts and practices of the respondents as set forth above were and are in violation of the Wool Products Labeling Act of 1939 and the Rules and Regulations promulgated thereunder, and constituted and now constitute unfair and deceptive acts and practices and unfair methods of competition in commerce, within the intent and meaning of the Federal Trade Commission Act.

PAR. 7. Respondents now and for some time last past have been engaged in the introduction, the manufacture for 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, and 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. 8. Certain of such textile fiber products were falsely and deceptively advertised in that respondents in making disclosures or implications as to the fiber content of such textile fiber products in written advertisements used to aid, promote, or assist, directly or indirectly in the sale or offering for sale of such

products failed to set forth the required information as to fiber content as specified by Section 4(c) of the Textile Fiber Products Identification Act and in the manner and form prescribed by the Rules and Regulations promulgated under said Act.

Among such textile fiber products but not limited thereto were men's jackets which were falsely and deceptively advertised by means of a "catalogue" distributed by respondents throughout the United States in that the true generic names of the fibers contained in such textile fiber products were not set out in said catalogue.

PAR. 9. By means of the aforesaid advertisements and others of similar import and meaning not specifically referred to herein, respondents falsely and deceptively advertised textile fiber products in violation of the Textile Fiber Products Identification Act in that the said textile fiber products were not advertised in accordance with the Rules and Regulations promulgated thereunder in the following respects:

A. Fiber trademarks were used in advertising textile fiber products without the full disclosure of the fiber content information required by the said Act and the Rules and Regulations thereunder in at least one instance in the said advertisement, in violation of Rule 41(a) of the aforesaid Rules and Regulations.

B. Fiber trademarks were used in advertising textile fiber products containing more than one fiber and such trademarks did not appear in the required fiber content information in immediate proximity and conjunction with the fibers in plainly legible type or lettering of equal size and conspicuousness, in violation of Rule 41(b) of the aforesaid Rules and Regulations.

PAR. 10. The acts and practices of the respondents as set forth in Paragraphs Eight and Nine were, and are, in violation of the Textile Fiber Products Identification Act and the Rules and Regulations promulgated thereunder and constituted and now constitute, 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, the Wool Products Labeling Act of 1939 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 respondents that the law has been violated as alleged in such complaint, and waivers and other provisions as required by the Commission's Rules; and

The Commission having thereafter considered the matter and having determined that it had reason to believe that the respondents have violated the said Acts, and that complaint should issue stating its charges in that respect, and having thereupon accepted the executed consent agreement and placed such agreement on the public record for a period of thirty (30) days, now in further conformity with the procedure prescribed in § 2.34(b) of its Rules, the Commission hereby issues its complaint, makes the following jurisdictional findings, and enters the following order:

1. Respondents Wassner Sportswear Mfg., Inc., Gotham Men's & Boys' Wear, Inc., Olympic Shirts, Inc., and Lustberg, Nast & Co., Inc., are corporations organized, existing and doing business under and by virtue of the laws of the State of New York, with their office and principal place of business located at 31 West 27th Street, New York, New York.

Respondents Isidor Wassner, David Wassner and Joseph Wassner are officers of the aforesaid corporations and their address is the same as that of the 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 Wassner Sportswear Mfg., Inc., Gotham Men's & Boys' Wear, Inc., Olympic Shirts, Inc., and Lustberg, Nast & Co., Inc., corporations, and their officers, and Isidor Wassner, David Wassner and Joseph Wassner, individually and as officers of said corporations, 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, distribution, delivery for shipment or shipment, in commerce, of wool products as "commerce" and "wool product" are defined in the Wool Products Labeling Act of 1939, do forthwith cease and desist from misbranding wool products by:

1. Falsely or deceptively stamping, tagging, labeling, or otherwise identifying any such wool product as to the character or amount of constituent fibers contained therein.

2. Failing to securely affix to or place on each such wool product a stamp, tag, label, or other means of identification correctly showing in a clear and conspicuous manner each element of information required to be disclosed by Section 4(a)(2) of the Wool Products Labeling Act of 1939.

3. Failing to set forth the generic names of manufactured fibers established in Rule 7 of the Regulations promulgated under the Textile Fiber Products Identification Act, in naming such fibers in required informations on stamps, tags, labels, or other means of identification attached to wool products.

It is further ordered, That respondents Wassner Sportswear Mfg., Inc., Gotham Men's & Boys' Wear, Inc., Olympic Shirts, Inc., and Lustberg, Nast & Co., Inc., corporations, and their officers, and Isidor Wassner, David Wassner and Joseph Wassner, individually and as officers of said corporations, and respondents' representatives, agents and employees, directly or through any corporate or other device, in connection with the introduction, delivery for introduction, manufacture 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 any textile fiber product; or in connection with the sale, offering for sale, advertising, delivery, transportation, or causing to be transported, of any textile fiber product which has 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 product, whether in its 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 falsely and deceptively advertising textile fiber products by:

1. Making any representations, directly or by implication, as to fiber content of any textile fiber product in any written advertisement which is used to aid, promote or assist, directly or indirectly, in the sale or offering for sale of such textile fiber product, unless the same information required to be shown on the stamp, tag, label, or other means of identification under Section 4(b)(1) and (2) of the Textile Fiber Products Identification Act is contained in the said advertisement, except that the percentages of the fibers present in the textile fiber product need not be stated.

2. Using a fiber trademark in an advertisement without a full disclosure of the required content information in at least one instance in the said advertisement.

3. Using a fiber trademark in advertising textile fiber products containing more than one fiber without such fiber trademark appearing in the required fiber content information in immediate proximity and conjunction with the generic name of the fiber in plainly legible type or lettering of equal size and conspicuousness.

It is further ordered, That the respondent corporations shall forthwith distribute a copy of the Order to each of their operating divisions.

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

OPPORTUNITY PUBLISHING COMPANY

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

Docket C-1504. Complaint, Mar. 13, 1969—Decision, Mar. 13, 1969

Consent order requiring a Chicago, Ill., publisher of a monthly trade magazine to cease misrepresenting, exaggerating and changing the copy material supplied it by its advertisers in the preparation of its advertisements.

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 Opportunity Publishing Company, a corporation, hereinafter referred to as the respondent, has 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. Opportunity Publishing Company is a corporation organized, existing and doing business under and by virtue of the laws of the State of Delaware, with its principal office and place of business located at 850 North Dearborn Street, in the city of Chicago, State of Illinois.

PAR. 2. Respondent Opportunity Publishing Company is now, and for some time last past has been, engaged in the preparation, advertising, publishing and sale and distribution of a monthly trade magazine known as "Salesman's Opportunity," which is primarily designed for readers connected with the direct-selling industry. In the course and conduct of its business, respondent offers advertising space in said monthly publication for sale to various firms which wish to recruit direct-selling personnel to promote the sale of their respective products. To induce the sale of such advertising space, respondent now prepares, and for some time last past has prepared, for publication in its monthly magazine, advertising materials to promote the sale of its customers' products.

PAR. 3. In the course and conduct of its business as aforesaid, respondent now causes, and for some time last past has caused, copies of its monthly trade magazine, to be shipped from its place of business in the State of Illinois to purchasers thereof located in various other States of the United States, and maintains, and at all times mentioned herein has 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 course and conduct of its aforesaid business, respondent engages, and has engaged, in the following described unfair and false, misleading and deceptive acts and practices.

In the development and preparation of advertising material for its advertising customers, respondent includes, and has included, statements and representations not supplied by the advertisers and omits, and has omitted, facts and information supplied by the advertiser from such advertisements. In a substantial number of instances said inclusions or omissions have resulted in

