

Complaint

57 F.T.C.

September 1960, 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 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.

---

IN THE MATTER OF  
THE LAMSON BROTHERS COMPANY

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

*Docket 7892. Complaint, May 16, 1960—Decision, Sept. 29, 1960*

Consent order requiring Toledo, Ohio, furriers to cease violating the Fur Products Labeling Act by failing to set forth the terms "Persian Lamb" and "Dyed Broadtail processed Lamb" where required on invoices and in advertising, by advertising in newspapers which failed to disclose the names of animals producing certain furs or the country of origin of imported products or the fact that some furs were artificially colored, and which contained the names of animals other than the true producers, and by failing in other respects to comply with labeling and invoicing requirements.

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 The Lamson Brothers Company, 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. The Lamson Brothers Company is a corporation organized, existing and doing business under and by virtue of the laws of the State of Ohio with its office and principal place of business located at 600 Jefferson Street, Toledo, Ohio.

PAR. 2. Subsequent to the effective date of the Fur Products Labeling Act on August 9, 1952, respondent has been and is now engaged in the introduction into commerce, and in the sale, advertising, and offering for sale, in commerce, and in the transportation

and distribution, in commerce, of fur products; and has sold, advertised, offered for sale, transported and distributed fur products which have been made in whole or in part of fur which had been shipped and received in commerce, as the terms "commerce", "fur" and "fur products" are defined in the Fur Products Labeling Act.

PAR. 3. 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.

PAR. 4. 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 in the following respects:

A. Information required under Section 4(2) of the Fur Products Labeling Act and the Rules and Regulations promulgated thereunder was mingled with nonrequired information, in violation of Rule 29(a) of said Rules and Regulations.

B. Information required under Section 4(2) of the Fur Products Labeling Act and the Rules and Regulations promulgated thereunder was not completely set out on one side of labels, in violation of Rule 29(a) of said Rules and Regulations.

C. Information required under Section 4(2) of the Fur Products Labeling Act and the Rules and Regulations promulgated thereunder was not set forth separately on labels with respect to each section of fur products composed of two or more sections containing different animal furs in violation of Rule 31 of said Regulations.

D. Required item numbers were not set forth on labels in violation of Rule 40 of said Rules and Regulations.

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

PAR. 6. Certain of said fur products were falsely and deceptively invoiced in violation of the Fur Products Labeling Act in that they were not invoiced in accordance with the Rules and Regulations promulgated thereunder in the following respects:

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

(b) The term "Persian Lamb" was not set forth in the manner required where an election is made to use that term instead of Lamb in violation of Rule 8 of said Rules and Regulations.

(c) The term "Dyed Broadtail processed Lamb" was not set forth in the manner required where an election was made to use that term instead of Lamb in violation of Rule 10 of the Rules and Regulations.

PAR. 7. Certain of said fur products were falsely and deceptively advertised in violation of the Fur Products Labeling Act in that respondent caused the dissemination in commerce, as "commerce" is defined in said Act, of certain newspaper advertisements, concerning said products, which were not in accordance with the provisions of Section 5(a) of the said Act, and the Rules and Regulations promulgated thereunder; and which advertisements were intended to aid, promote and assist, directly or indirectly, in the sale and offering for sale of said fur products.

PAR. 8. Among and included in the advertisements as aforesaid, but not limited thereto, were advertisements of respondent which appeared in issues of the Toledo Blade, a newspaper published in the City of Toledo, State of Ohio, and having a wide circulation in said State and various other States of the United States.

By means of said advertisements and others of similar import and meaning not specifically referred to here, respondent falsely and deceptively advertised fur products in that said advertisements:

(a) Failed to disclose the name or names of the animal or animals that produced the fur contained in the Fur product as set forth in the Fur Products Name Guide, in violation of Section 5(a)(1) of the Fur Products Labeling Act.

(b) Failed to disclose that fur products contained or were composed of bleached, dyed or otherwise artificially colored fur, when such was the fact, in violation of Section 5(a) (3) of the Fur Products Labeling Act.

(c) Contained the name or names of an animal or animals other than those producing the fur contained in the fur product in violation of Section 5(a)(5) of the Fur Products Labeling Act.

(d) Failed to disclose the name of the country of origin of the imported furs contained in the fur products in violation of Section 5(a)(6) of the Fur Products Labeling Act.

(e) Failed to set forth the term Persian Lamb in the manner required where an election was made to use that term instead of Lamb in violation of Rule 8 of said Rules and Regulations.

(f) Failed to set forth the term "Dyed Mouton processed Lamb" in the manner required where an election was made to use that term

instead of Lamb in violation of Rule 9 of said Rules and Regulations.

PAR. 9. The aforesaid acts and practices of respondent, as herein alleged, are in violation of the Fur Products Labeling Act and the Rules and Regulations promulgated thereunder and constitute unfair and deceptive acts and practices in commerce under the Federal Trade Commission Act.

*Mr. DeWitt T. Puckett*, supporting the complaint.

*Marshall, Melhorn, Block & Belt* by *Mr. Edward F. Weber*, of Toledo, Ohio, for respondent.

INITIAL DECISION BY JOHN B. POINDEXTER, HEARING EXAMINER

The complaint in this proceeding alleges that The Lamson Brothers Company, a corporation, hereinafter referred to as respondent, misbranded, falsely and deceptively invoiced and advertised fur products in violation of the Federal Trade Commission Act and the Fur Products Labeling Act and the rules and regulations promulgated under the last named act.

After issuance and service of the complaint, the above-named respondent, its attorney, and counsel supporting the complaint entered into an agreement for a consent order. The agreement has been approved by the Director, Associate Director and Assistant Director of the Bureau of Litigation. The agreement disposes of the matters complained about.

The pertinent provisions of said agreement are as follows: Respondent admits all jurisdictional facts; the complaint may be used in construing the terms of the order; the order shall have the same force and effect as if entered after a full hearing and the said agreement shall not become a part of the official record of the proceeding unless and until it becomes a part of the decision of the Commission; the record herein shall consist solely of the complaint and the agreement; respondent waives the requirement that the decision must contain a statement of findings of fact and conclusions of law; respondent waives further procedural steps before the hearing examiner and the Commission, and the order may be altered, modified, or set aside in the manner provided by statute for other orders; respondent waives any right to challenge or contest the validity of the order entered in accordance with the agreement and the signing of said agreement is for settlement purposes only and does not constitute an admission by respondent that it has violated the law as alleged in the complaint.

Order

57 F.T.C.

The undersigned hearing examiner having considered the agreement and proposed order hereby accepts such agreement, makes the following jurisdictional findings, and issues the following order:

## JURISDICTIONAL FINDINGS

1. Respondent The Lamson Brothers Company is a corporation existing and doing business under and by virtue of the laws of the State of Ohio, with its office and principal place of business located at 600 Jefferson Street, Toledo, Ohio.

2. The Federal Trade Commission has jurisdiction of the subject matter of this proceeding and of the respondent hereinabove named and the proceeding is in the public interest.

## ORDER

*It is ordered,* That The Lamson Brothers Company, 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 fur products, or in connection with the sale, advertising, offering for sale, transportation, or distribution of fur products which are 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:

1. Misbranding fur products by:

A. Failing to affix labels to fur products showing in words and 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.

B. Setting forth on labels affixed to fur products information required under Section 4(2) of the Fur Products Labeling Act and the Rules and Regulations promulgated thereunder mingled with nonrequired information.

C. Failing to set forth on labels affixed to fur products all the information required under Section 4(2) of the Fur Products Labeling Act and the Rules and Regulations promulgated thereunder on one side of the labels.

D. Failing to set forth on labels attached to fur products composed of two or more sections containing different animal furs the information required under Section 4(2) of the Fur Products Labeling Act and the Rules and Regulations promulgated thereunder with respect to the fur comprising each section.

806

## Decision

E. Failing to set forth on labels the item number or mark assigned to a fur product.

2. Falsely or deceptively invoicing fur products by:

A. Failing to furnish to purchasers of fur products an invoice showing all the information required to be disclosed by each of the subsections of Section 5(b)(1) of the Fur Products Labeling Act.

B. Setting forth on invoices pertaining to fur products information required under Section 5(b)(1) of the Fur Products Labeling Act and the Rules and Regulations promulgated thereunder in abbreviated form.

C. Failing to set forth the term "Persian Lamb" when an election is made to use that term instead of Lamb.

D. Failing to set forth the term "Dyed Broadtail processed Lamb" when an election is made to use that term instead of Lamb.

3. Falsely or deceptively advertising fur products through the use of any advertisement, representation, public announcement or notice which is intended to aid, promote or assist, directly or indirectly, in the sale or offering for sale of fur products, and which:

A. Fails to disclose:

1. 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.

2. That the fur product contains or is composed of bleached, dyed or otherwise artificially colored fur when such is the fact.

3. The name of the country of origin of any imported furs contained in a fur product.

B. Sets forth the name or names of any animal or animals other than the name or names specified in Section 5(a)(1) of the Fur Products Labeling Act.

C. Fails to set forth the term "Persian Lamb" when an election is made to use that term instead of lamb.

D. Fails to use the term "Dyed Mouton processed Lamb" when an election is made to use that term instead of lamb.

## 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 29th day of September 1960, become the decision of the Commission, and, accordingly:

*It is ordered*, That respondent The Lamson Brothers Company, a corporation, shall within sixty (60) days after service upon it of this

