

tives and employees, directly or through any corporate or other device, in connection with the advertising, offering for sale, sale or distribution of courses of study and instruction in journalism, English, photography, sewing, beauty culture or any other subject, in commerce, as "commerce" is defined in the Federal Trade Commission Act, do forthwith cease and desist from:

1. Using the name "American Cultural Interchange, Inc." or any other name or names of similar import or meaning to describe or designate his business; or representing, in any manner, that respondent's business is other than that of a private commercial venture engaged in the sale of correspondence courses for a profit.

2. Representing, directly or by implication, that respondent's school or his courses have been accredited, approved or recognized by any educational authority in the United States.

3. Misrepresenting in any manner the status, accreditation or approval of respondent's business, his school or his courses.

4. Representing, directly or by implication, that respondent provides scholarships.

5. Representing, directly or by implication, that the instructional material and equipment provided as a part of respondent's courses are free, or misrepresenting, in any manner, the cost or nature of respondent's courses.

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

IN THE MATTER OF

LACONIA SHOE COMPANY, ET AL.

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

Docket C-1622. Complaint, Nov. 12, 1969—Decision, Nov. 12, 1969

Consent order requiring a Laconia, N.H., manufacturer and distributor of shoes to cease selling shoes made of simulated leather material without conspicuously disclosing by stamp, tag or label affixed to the shoes the true nature of the material.

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 Laconia Shoe Company, a corporation, and Eugene Brindis and Robert J. Selig, 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 Laconia Shoe Company is a corporation organized, existing and doing business under and by virtue of the laws of the State of New Hampshire, with its principal office and place of business located at 59 Water Street, in the city of Laconia, State of New Hampshire, 03246.

Respondents Eugene Brindis and Robert J. Selig are officers of the corporate respondent. They formulate, direct and control the acts and practices of the corporate respondent including the acts and practices hereinafter set forth. 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 the manufacturing, offering for sale, sale and distribution of shoes to retailers 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, their said products, when sold to be shipped and transported from their place of business in the State of New Hampshire 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 course and conduct of their aforesaid business, some of respondents' shoes which are offered for sale, sold and distributed to retailers for resale to the public have the appearance of being composed either in whole or in part of leather or split leather, when in fact one or more of the visible or partly visible parts of such shoes are composed of non-leather materials processed to simulate the appearance of leather or split leather. The fact that such material is nonleather is not clearly and conspicuously disclosed on such shoes by a stamp, tag or label embed-

ded in or attached thereto and so affixed as to remain thereon until completion of the sale to retail customers.

Respondents' practice of offering for sale, selling and distributing shoes containing one or more visible or partly visible parts composed of non-leather material processed to simulate the appearance of leather or split leather, without clear and conspicuous disclosure of such fact on a stamp, tag or label embedded in or attached to such shoes is misleading and deceptive and has the capacity and tendency to lead members of the purchasing public to believe that the parts of shoes so composed, other than heels, are made of leather or split leather.

PAR. 5. In the conduct of their business at all times mentioned herein, respondents have been, and now are, in substantial competition, in commerce, with corporations, firms and individuals in the sale of shoes of the same general kind and nature as that sold by respondents.

PAR. 6. The use by respondents of the aforesaid misleading and deceptive acts and practices has had, and now has, the capacity and tendency to mislead members of the purchasing public into the mistaken and erroneous belief that visible or partly visible parts of shoes composed of non-leather materials processed to resemble leather or split leather are, in fact, leather or split leather, and into the purchase of substantial quantities of respondents' shoes by reason of said mistaken and erroneous belief, and by reason of said misleading and deceptive acts and practices.

PAR. 7. 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 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 that draft of complaint which the Bureau of Industry Guidance 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 respondents and counsel for the Commission having thereafter executed an agreement containing a consent order, and admission by the respondents of all the jurisdictional facts set forth in the aforesaid draft of complaint, a statement that the 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 Act, 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 described 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 Laconia Shoe Company is a corporation, organized, existing and doing business under and by virtue of the laws of the State of New Hampshire, with its principal office and place of business located at 59 Water Street, in the city of Laconia, State of New Hampshire.

Respondent Eugene Brindis is an individual and an officer of said corporation and his business address is the same as that of said corporation.

Respondent Robert J. Selig is an individual and an officer of said corporation and his business 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 Laconia Shoe Company, a corporation and its officers, and Eugene Brindis and Robert J. Selig, 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 manufacturing, offering for sale, sale or distribution of shoes or other footwear, in commerce, as "commerce" is defined in the Federal Trade Commission Act, do forthwith cease and desist from:

1. Offering for sale, selling, distributing or placing in the hands of others for distribution or sale purposes, footwear products containing one or more visible or partly visible parts, other than heels, which are composed of non-leather material having the appearance of leather or split leather, without clearly and conspicuously disclosing (1) the identity of the part or parts of such products so composed and (2) either that the material is simulated or imitation leather or the general nature of the material in such manner as will show it is not leather or split leather; such disclosures to appear on a stamp, tag or label embedded in or attached to such products, of such degree of permanency as to remain thereon until consummation of consumer sale of the products, and of such conspicuousness as to be likely observed and read by purchasers and prospective purchasers making casual inspection of the products.

2. Misrepresenting, in any manner, or by any means, directly or indirectly, the kind or type of leather or other materials used in the manufacture of respondents' products or any part thereof.

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 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

GEON INTERCONTINENTAL CORPORATION, ET AL.

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

*Docket C-1623. Complaint, Nov. 12, 1969—Decision, Nov. 12, 1969**

Consent order requiring two importers and distributors of replacement parts for foreign-made automobiles located in Melville and Woodbury, N.Y., to cease restricting competition in the foreign automotive parts business by threatening or coercing suppliers of such parts not to sell to potential new entrants into the field.

* Published as modified by Commission's order of Feb. 26, 1970, by modifying paragraph VI of the order.

Decision and Order

76 F.T.C.

COMPLAINT

The Federal Trade Commission has reason to believe that the parties listed in the caption hereof, and hereinafter more fully described, have violated and are now violating the provisions of Section 5 of the Federal Trade Commission Act, 15 U.S.C. Sec. 45, and it appears to the Commission that a proceeding by it in respect thereof would be in the public interest. Accordingly, the Commission hereby issues its complaint, stating its charges with respect thereto as follows:

PARAGRAPH 1. Respondent Geon Intercontinental Corporation, hereinafter referred to as Geon, is a corporation organized, existing and doing business under the laws of the State of New York, with its offices and principal place of business at 101 Crossways Park West, Woodbury, New York.

On January 3, 1969, respondent Geon acquired all the outstanding shares of British Auto Parts Inc., and on that date merged British Auto Parts Inc., into respondent Geon; as a result, British Auto Parts is now a division of Geon. Prior to the merger British Auto Parts engaged in the unlawful acts and practices described herein. The combined sales of Geon and British Auto Parts in 1968 were approximately \$8,000,000.

PAR. 2. Respondent Beck/Arnley Corp., formerly Beck Distributing Corp., hereinafter referred to as Beck/Arnley, is a corporation organized, existing and doing business under the laws of the State of New York, with its principal office and place of business located at 548 Broad Hollow Road, Melville, Long Island, New York. In 1968, the combined sales of Beck/Arnley and its subsidiary Beck Distributing Corp., of California were approximately \$8,000,000.

PAR. 3. Respondents are engaged in the business of importing and distributing replacement parts for foreign-made vehicles. Respondents distribute in the United States through jobbers, who resell to franchised foreign car dealers, independent garages, service stations, other jobbers, and end users. Respondents are among the nation's largest independent importers of foreign-made parts for foreign vehicles.

PAR. 4. In the course and conduct of their business, respondents are now and have been at all times referred to herein, engaged in commerce, as "commerce" is defined in the Federal Trade Commission Act. Respondents import substantial quantities of foreign automotive replacement parts into the United States, and cause

these products to be shipped from States wherein they do business with purchasers located in other States. There is and has been at all times mentioned herein, continuous and substantial current of trade in interstate commerce in automotive replacement parts by and between respondents and their customers located among the several States of the United States and the District of Columbia.

PAR. 5. Except to the extent that competition has been hindered, prevented, frustrated, lessened or eliminated as set forth in this complaint, respondents have been and are now in substantial competition with other corporations, individuals and partnerships engaged in the importation and distribution of foreign automotive replacement parts.

PAR. 6. Beginning in 1968 and continuing to the present time, respondents have and do now maintain, effectuate and carry out an agreement, understanding, combination, conspiracy, or planned course of action or course of dealing to prevent the entry of new companies into the business of importation and distribution of foreign automotive replacement parts.

PAR. 7. As part of, pursuant to and in furtherance of the aforesaid plan to eliminate competition, respondents have agreed, conspired, combined, acquiesced and cooperated between and among themselves to eliminate potential competition in the importation of foreign auto parts by various means of which the following are examples:

1. Threatened not to buy from any foreign supplier who sold to a potential new entrant.
2. Conditioned their future purchasers on the refusal of suppliers to sell to a potential new entrant.
3. Communicated with each other on plans and tactics for combining their efforts to eliminate a potential entrant.

PAR. 8. The acts and practices of respondents as alleged herein have had and do now have the tendency or effect of unduly hindering, lessening, restraining or eliminating competition in the importation and sale of foreign automotive parts; have deprived distributors, retailers and consumers of the benefits of full and free competition and have hampered their free choice in the selection of suppliers; are all to the prejudice and injury of the public, and constitute unfair methods of competition and unfair acts or practices in commerce in violation of Section 5 of the Federal Trade Commission Act.

Decision and Order

76 F.T.C.

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 Restraint of Trade 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 respondents, their attorneys 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 Act, 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 Section 2.34 (b) of its Rules, the Commission hereby issues its complaint, makes the following jurisdictional findings, and enters the following order:

1. Respondent Beck/Arnley Corporation is a corporation which has its office and principal place of business at 548 Broad Hollow Road, Melville, Long Island, New York, and respondent Geon Intercontinental Corporation is a corporation which has its office and principal place of business at 101 Crossways Park West, Woodbury, New York.

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

I. *It is ordered*, That respondents, Geon Intercontinental Corporation, a corporation, and Beck/Arnley Corp., a corporation,

their subsidiaries, successors, assigns, officers, directors, agents, representatives and employees, directly or through any corporate or other device, in connection with the importation, sale, or distribution of imported automotive parts in commerce as "commerce" is defined in the Federal Trade Commission Act, forthwith cease and desist from entering into, maintaining, effectuating, carrying out, cooperating in or continuing any agreement, understanding, combination, conspiracy, or planned course of action or course of dealing, between or among any of said respondents or between any one or more of the said respondents and one or more of respondents' competitors not parties hereto, to do or perform any of the following:

1. Refusing to buy or threatening to refuse to buy automotive parts from any manufacturer.
2. Inducing, persuading, compelling, or coercing any manufacturer from selling automotive parts to any particular person or group or class of persons.
3. Purchasing or offering to purchase automotive parts from any manufacturer under the condition or understanding that such manufacturer will not sell to any particular person or to any group or class of persons.
4. Communicating directly or indirectly with any manufacturer for the purpose of inducing such manufacturer not to sell automotive parts to any particular person or to any group or class of persons.
5. Suppressing, hindering, restricting or limiting competition in the importation or distribution of automotive parts.

II. *It is further ordered*, That each of the individual corporate respondents herein, their subsidiaries, successors, assigns, officers, directors, agents, representatives and employees, directly or through any corporate or other device, individually cease and desist from performing any of the following:

1. Inducing, persuading, threatening, compelling, coercing or attempting to induce, persuade, threaten, compel or coerce any manufacturer not to sell imported automotive parts to any competitor or potential competitor: *Provided, however*, Nothing contained herein shall prevent any respondent from unilaterally and independently exercising its legal right to maintain, select or terminate any supplier.
2. Seeking, negotiating or entering into, directly or indirectly, any exclusive distributorship arrangement with any

manufacturer listed on Attachments A or B of this order for five (5) years: *Provided, however*, Nothing contained herein shall prevent any respondent from continuing any exclusive distributorship arrangement in effect on March 1, 1968.

III. *It is further ordered*, That respondent Beck/Arnley Corp. shall within sixty (60) days after service upon it of this order, serve by mail on each company listed in Attachment A, a copy of this order and a copy of attached Letter C; and that respondent Geon Intercontinental Corporation shall within sixty (60) days after service upon it of this order, serve by mail on each company listed in Attachment B, a copy of this order and a copy of Letter C attached to this order. For respondent Beck/Arnley Corp.: *It is ordered*, That attached Letter C be signed by Franklin B. Beck, William M. Arnowitz and Randolph C. St. John. For respondent Geon Intercontinental Corporation: *It is ordered*, That attached Letter C be signed by Peter H. Neuwirth and Biarne Qvale.

IV. *It is further ordered*, That respondent corporation herein shall forthwith forward a copy of this order to all of their operating divisions.

V. *It is further ordered*, That respondents herein 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.

VI. *It is further ordered*, That respondents notify the Commission at least 30 days prior to any proposed change in the corporate respondent which may affect compliance obligations arising out of the order, such as: dissolution, assignment or sale resulting in the emergence of a successor corporation, or the creation or dissolution of subsidiaries.

ATTACHMENT A

- 1) AUTOMOTIVE PRODUCTS COMPANY, LTD.
Automotive House
19 Langham Street
London W-1, England
- 2) ASSOCIATED ENGINEERING, LTD.
Forster House—Forster Square
Bradford 1, Yorkshire
England
- 3) J. PAYEN LTD.
Edinburgh Ave., Slough, Bucks
England

595

Decision and Order

- 4) RANSOM & MARLES BEARING CO., LTD.
Newark-on-Trent, England
- 5) W. G. JAMES LTD.
Kingsbury Works
Kingsbury Road
London NW., England
- 6) FICHTEL & SACHS VERKAUFS-KG
Schweinfurt, West Germany
- 7) SALERI ITALO & C.
25065 Lumezzane
Brescia, Italy
- 8) VANDERVELL CANADA LTD.
401 Kipling Avenue South
Toronto 18, Canada
- 9) QUINTON HAZELL LTD.
Colwyn Bay
North Wales, Gt. Britain

ATTACHMENT B

- 1) HEITMANN & BRUNN G.M.B.H.
Gerhart-Hauptmann-Platz 14
2 Hamburg 1, West Germany
- 2) QUINTON HAZELL LTD.
Colwyn Bay
North Wales, Gt. Britain
- 3) P. MITCHELL & CO. LTD.
135 Edmund St.
Birmingham 3, England
- 4) AUTOMOTIVE PRODUCTS COMPANY LTD.
Automobile House
19, Langham St.
London W-1, England
- 5) ASSOCIATED ENGINEERING, LTD.
Forster House—Forster Square
Bradford 1, Yorkshire
England
- 6) HALLS GASKET LTD.
Stirling Road
Slough, Bucks
England
- 7) RANSOM & MARLES BEARING CO. LTD.
Newark-on-Trent, England
- 8) FARNBOROUGH ENGINEERING CO. LTD.
Farnborough Orpington
Kent, England
- 9) FICHTEL & SACHS VERKAUFS-KG
Schweinfurt, West Germany

Decision and Order

76 F.T.C.

LETTER C

(Geon Intercontinental Corporation and Beck/Arnley Corp. official letter-heads)

(Date)

Gentlemen:

The Federal Trade Commission, an Agency of the United States Government, has entered an order against Beck/Arnley Corp. and Geon Intercontinental Corporation prohibiting them from inducing, threatening, persuading, compelling or coercing your company from selling to any competitor or potential competitor in the United States. A copy of this order is attached. Furthermore, by its order, the Commission has prohibited Geon Intercontinental Corporation and Beck/Arnley Corp. from negotiating or entering into any form of exclusive distribution arrangement with your company for five (5) years subject to any exclusive distributorship arrangement in effect on March 1, 1968.

This is to advise you that despite any past communication from our company, we have no objection to your sale of automotive parts to any competitor or potential competitor in the United States. You are further advised that our future purchases from your company will in no way be conditioned on your refusal to sell to any other competitor or potential competitor in the United States. However, we reserve the right to make a unilateral determination on whether to maintain or terminate our relationship with your company for business reasons.

Very truly yours,

IN THE MATTER OF

MCBRATNEY'S, INC.

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

Docket C-1624. Complaint, Nov. 17, 1969—Decision, Nov. 17, 1969

Consent order requiring a Monrovia, Calif., department store to cease 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 McBratney's 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 McBratney's Inc., is a corporation organized, existing and doing business under and by virtue of the laws of the State of California.

Respondent operates a department store and retails various commodities including fur products. Its office and principal place of business is located at 421-7, South Myrtle Avenue, Monrovia, California.

PAR. 2. Respondent is now and for some time last past has been 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 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 advertising flyers of respondent which were circulated in the State of California and other States of the United States.

Among such false and deceptive advertisements, but not limited thereto, were advertisements which failed to show that the fur contained in the fur products was bleached, dyed or otherwise artificially colored when such was the fact.

PAR. 4. 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 Section 5(a) (5) of the Fur Products Labeling Act and Rule 44(a) of the Rules and Regulations. In the aforesaid adver-

tisements, fur products were offered for sale by the respondent at prices designated as being "Below Wholesale Cost." By means of the aforesaid respondent represented that the fur products were being offered to the consuming public at prices which were less than the prices paid by the respondent in acquiring the said fur products and that savings were afforded to the purchasers of said products. In truth and in fact, the designated prices were not "Below Wholesale Cost" but in fact were in excess of the prices paid for the products by the respondent and savings were not afforded to the purchasers thereof as represented.

PAR. 5. 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 "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.

(b) All parts of the information required under Section 5(a) of the Fur Products Labeling Act and the Rules and Regulations promulgated thereunder were not set forth in type of equal size and conspicuousness and in close proximity with each other, in violation of Rule 38(a) of the aforesaid Rules and Regulations.

PAR. 6. 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 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 respondent named in the caption hereof, and the respondent 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 respondent with violation of the Federal Trade Commission Act and the Fur Products Labeling Act; and

The respondent and counsel for the Commission having thereafter executed an agreement containing a consent order, an admission by the respondent 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 respondent 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 respondent has violated the said Acts, and that complaint should issue stating it 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 McBratney's, Inc., is a corporation organized, existing and doing business under and by virtue of the laws of the State of California with its office and principal place of business located at 421-7 South Myrtle Avenue, Monrovia, California.
2. The Federal Trade Commission has jurisdiction of the subject matter of this proceeding and of the respondent, and the proceeding is in the public interest.

ORDER

It is ordered, That respondent McBratney's, Inc., a corporation, and its officers, and respondent's representatives, agents and employees, directly or through any corporate or other device, in connection with the introduction into commerce, 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 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 falsely or deceptively advertising any fur product through the use of any advertisement, representation, public announcement or notice which is intended to aid, promote or assist, directly or indi-

