

is pointed, bleached, dyed, tip-dyed, or otherwise artificially colored.

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

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
THE PARISEAU CORP. ET AL.

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

Docket C-576. Complaint, Sept. 10, 1963—Decision, Sept. 10, 1963

Consent order requiring a Massachusetts wholesaler and two New Hampshire retailers of furs, to cease violating the Fur Products Labeling Act by failing on labels and invoices and in advertising, to describe as "natural" fur products that were not artificially colored; failing in invoicing and advertising, to show the country of origin of imported furs and to disclose that certain furs were bleached, etc.; failing on invoices, to show the true animal name of fur and when the product contained cheap or waste fur; failing to use the term "Persian Lamb" as required on invoices, and "Dyed Broadtail—processed Lamb" in advertising; representing prices falsely as reduced from so-called regular prices which were fictitious, and as "25 to 30% off" and reduced "up to 50% and more"; failing to maintain adequate records as a basis for pricing claims; substituting nonconforming labels on fur products for those affixed by the manufacturer, etc., and failing in other respects to comply with labeling, invoicing and advertising 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 Pariseau Corp., Rooks, Inc., and Rooks, Inc. of Lynn, corporations, and their officers, and Alexander Rooks, individually and as an officer of said corporations, and George Younger and Isadore Rooks, individually and as officers of The Pariseau Corp., and Jack Younger, individually and as manager of the fur department of The Pariseau Corp., hereinafter referred to as respondents

have 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. Respondents The Pariseau Corp. and Rooks, Inc., are corporations organized, existing and doing business under and by virtue of the laws of the State of New Hampshire.

Respondent Rooks, Inc. of Lynn is a corporation organized, existing and doing business under and by virtue of the laws of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts.

Respondents Isadore Rooks, Alexander Rooks, and George Younger are officers of corporate respondent The Pariseau Corp., and along with respondent Jack Younger formulate, direct and control the acts, practices and policies of said corporate respondent including those hereinafter set forth.

Respondent Jack Younger is manager of the fur department of corporate respondent, The Pariseau Corp., and assists in formulating, directing and controlling the acts and practices of such corporate respondent with respect to the aforesaid fur department.

Respondent Alexander Rooks is also an officer of corporate respondents Rooks, Inc., and Rooks, Inc. of Lynn, and formulates, controls and directs the acts, practices and policies of said corporate respondents including those hereinafter set forth.

Respondents The Pariseau Corp. and Rooks, Inc., are retailers of fur products and have their office and principal place of business located at 1001 Elm Street, Manchester, New Hampshire.

Respondent Rooks, Inc. of Lynn is a wholesaler and retailer of fur products and has its office and principal place of business at 313 Union Street, Lynn, Massachusetts.

The office and principal place of business of individual respondent Alexander Rooks is the same as that of corporate respondent Rooks, Inc. of Lynn.

The office and principal place of business of individual respondents George Younger, Jack Younger and Isadore Rooks is the same as corporate respondent The Pariseau Corp.

PAR. 2. Subsequent to the effective date of the Fur Products Labeling Act on August 9, 1952, respondents have been and are 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 have 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

Complaint

63 F.T.C.

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 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 set forth in abbreviated form, in violation of Rule 4 of said Rules and Regulations.

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

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

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

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

PAR. 4. 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 invoices pertaining to such fur products which failed:

1. To show the true animal name of the fur used in the fur product.
2. To show the country of origin of imported furs used in the fur products.
3. To disclose that the fur contained in the fur product was bleached, dyed or otherwise artificially colored, when such was the fact.
4. To show that the fur product was composed in whole or in substantial part of paws, tails, bellies or waste fur, when such was the fact.

PAR. 5. Certain of said fur products were falsely and deceptively invoiced with respect to the name of the country of origin of imported

furs used in such products, in violation of Section 5(b)(2) of the Fur Products Labeling Act.

Among such falsely and deceptively invoiced fur products, but not limited thereto, were fur products invoiced to show the name of the country of origin of furs contained in such fur products as Russia when the country of origin of such furs was, in fact, Finland.

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 on invoices in the manner required by law, in violation of Rule 8 of said Rules and Regulations.

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

(d) Required item numbers were not set forth on invoices, in violation of Rule 40 of said 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 certain advertisements intended to aid, promote and assist, directly or indirectly, in the sale and offering for sale of such fur products were not in accordance with the provisions of Section 5(a) of the said Act.

Among and included in the aforesaid advertisements but not limited thereto, were advertisements of respondents which appeared in issues of the Manchester Union Leader, a newspaper published in the City of Manchester, State of New Hampshire.

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

1. To show that the fur contained in the fur product was bleached, dyed or otherwise artificially colored, when such was the fact.
2. To show the country of origin of imported furs contained in fur products.

PAR. 8. By means of the aforesaid advertisements and others of similar import and meaning not specifically referred to herein, respondents falsely and deceptively advertised fur products in that certain of said fur products were falsely or deceptively identified with

Complaint

63 F.T.C.

respect to the name or designation of the animal or animals that produced the fur from which the said fur products had been manufactured, in violation of Section 5(a)(5) of the Fur Products Labeling Act.

Among such falsely and deceptively advertised fur products, but not limited thereto, were fur products advertised as "Coney" when the fur contained in such fur products was, in fact, "Rabbit".

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 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) Information required under Section 5(a) 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 the said Rules and Regulations.

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

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

PAR. 10. By means of the aforesaid advertisements and other advertisements of similar import and meaning not specifically referred to herein, respondents falsely and deceptively advertised fur products in that said advertisements represented that the prices of fur products were reduced from regular or usual retail prices and that the amount of such price reductions afforded savings to the purchasers of respondents' products, when the so-called regular or usual retail prices were, in fact, fictitious in that they were not the prices at which said merchandise was usually sold by respondents in the recent regular course of business and the represented savings were not thereby afforded to the purchasers, in violation of Section 5(a)(5) of the Fur Products Labeling Act and Rule 44(a) of the Rules and Regulations promulgated under the said Act.

PAR. 11. In advertising fur products for sale as aforesaid respondents represented through such statements as "All furs reduced 25 to 30% off" and "Save up to 50% and more" that prices of fur products were reduced in direct proportion to the percentages stated and that the amount of said reduction afforded savings to the purchasers of

respondents' products when in fact such prices were not reduced in direct proportion to the percentages stated and the represented savings were not thereby afforded to the said purchasers, in violation of Section 5(a)(5) of the Fur Products Labeling Act.

PAR. 12. By means of the aforesaid advertisements and others of similar import and meaning not specifically referred to herein, respondents falsely and deceptively advertised fur products in that said advertisements misrepresented prices as being "offered at below cost" and thereby also misrepresented the savings available to purchasers of said products, in violation of Section 5(a)(5) of the Fur Products Labeling Act and Rule 44(a) of the Rules and Regulations promulgated under the aforesaid Act.

PAR. 13. In advertising fur products for sale, as aforesaid, respondents made pricing claims and representations of the types covered by subsections (a), (b), (c), and (d) of Rule 44 of the Rules and Regulations promulgated under the Fur Products Labeling Act. Respondents in making such claims and representations failed to maintain full and adequate records disclosing the facts upon which such pricing claims and representations were based, in violation of Rule 44(e) of said Rules and Regulations.

PAR. 14. Respondents in introducing, selling, advertising, and offering for sale, in commerce, and in processing for commerce, fur products; and in selling, advertising, offering for sale and processing fur products which have been shipped and received in commerce, have misbranded such fur products by substituting thereon, labels which did not conform to the requirements of Section 4 of the Fur Products Labeling Act, for the labels affixed to said fur products by the manufacturer or distributor pursuant to Section 4 of said Act, in violation of Section 3(e) of said Act.

PAR. 15. 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 and deceptive acts and practices and unfair methods of competition in commerce under the Federal Trade Commission Act.

DECISION AND ORDER

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

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

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

1. Respondents The Pariseau Corp. and Rooks, Inc., are corporations organized, existing and doing business under and by virtue of the laws of the State of New Hampshire with their offices and principal places of business located at 1001 Elm Street, in the city of Manchester, State of New Hampshire.

Respondent Rooks, Inc. of Lynn is a corporation organized, existing and doing business under and by virtue of the laws of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts with its office and principal place of business located at 313 Union Street, in the city of Lynn, Commonwealth of Massachusetts.

Respondents Isadore Rooks, Alexander Rooks and George Younger are officers of The Pariseau Corp. Respondent Jack Younger is manager of the fur department of the Pariseau Corp.

Respondent Alexander Rooks is also an officer of Rooks, Inc., and Rooks, Inc. of Lynn, and his address is the same as that of Rooks, Inc. of Lynn. The address of George Younger, Jack Younger and Isadore Rooks is the same as that of the Pariseau Corp.

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 The Pariseau Corp., and Rooks, Inc. and Rooks, Inc. of Lynn, corporations and their officers and Alexander Rooks, individually and as an officer of said corporations and George Younger and Isadore Rooks, individually and as officers of The Pariseau Corp. and Jack Younger, individually and as manager of the fur department of The Pariseau Corp., and respondents' representatives, agents and employees, directly or through any cor-

porate 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 "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. Setting forth information required under Section 4(2) of the Fur Products Labeling Act and the Rules and Regulations promulgated thereunder in abbreviated form on labels affixed to fur products.

2. Failing to set forth the term "Dyed Broadtail-processed Lamb" on labels in the manner required where an election is made to use that term in lieu of the term "Dyed Lamb".

3. Failing to set forth the term "Natural" as part of the information required to be disclosed on labels under the Fur Products Labeling Act and the Rules and Regulations promulgated thereunder to describe fur products which are not pointed, bleached, dyed, tip-dyed, or otherwise artificially colored.

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

5. Failing to set forth information required under Section 4(2) of the Fur Products Labeling Act and the Rules and Regulations promulgated thereunder on labels in the sequence required by Rule 30 of the aforesaid Rules and Regulations.

B. Falsely or deceptively invoicing fur products by:

1. Failing to furnish invoices to purchasers of fur products showing in words and figures plainly legible all the information required to be disclosed in each of the subsections of Section 5(b)(1) of the Fur Products Labeling Act.

2. Misrepresenting in any manner, directly or by implication, the country of origin of the fur contained in fur products.

3. Setting forth information required under Section 5(b)(1) of the Fur Products Labeling Act and the Rules

and Regulations promulgated thereunder in abbreviated form.

4. Failing to set forth the term "Persian Lamb" in the manner required where an election is made to use that term instead of the word "Lamb".

5. Failing to set forth the term "Natural" as part of the information required to be disclosed on invoices under the Fur Products Labeling Act and Rules and Regulations promulgated thereunder to describe fur products which are not pointed, bleached, dyed, tip-dyed or otherwise artificially colored.

6. Failing to set forth on invoices the item number or mark assigned to fur products.

C. 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 any fur product, and which:

1. Fails to set forth in words and figures plainly legible all the information required to be disclosed by each of the subsections of Section 5(a) of the Fur Products Labeling Act.

2. Falsely or deceptively advertising any fur product with respect to the name or designation of the animal or animals that produced the fur contained in such fur product.

3. Sets forth information required under Section 5(a) of the Fur Products Labeling Act and the Rules and Regulations promulgated thereunder in abbreviated form.

4. Fails to set forth the term "Dyed Broadtail-processed Lamb" in the manner required where an election is made to use that term instead of the words "Dyed Lamb".

5. Fails to set forth the term "Natural" as part of the information required to be disclosed in advertisements under the Fur Products Labeling Act and the Rules and Regulations promulgated thereunder to describe fur products which are not pointed, bleached, dyed, tip-dyed or otherwise artificially colored.

6. Represents, directly or by implication, that any price, when accompanied or unaccompanied by any descriptive language, was the price at which the merchandise advertised was usually and customarily sold at retail by the respondents

unless such advertised merchandise was in fact usually and customarily sold at retail at such price by respondents in the recent past.

7. Represents directly or by implication through percentage savings claims that prices of fur products are reduced to afford purchasers of respondents' fur products the percentage of savings stated when the prices of such fur products are not reduced to afford purchasers the percentage of savings stated.

8. Misrepresents in any manner the savings available to purchasers of respondents' fur products.

9. Falsely or deceptively represents in any manner that prices of respondents' fur products are reduced.

10. Falsely or deceptively represents directly or by implication that the prices of fur products are at or below cost.

D. Making claims and representations of the types covered by subsections (a), (b), (c) and (d) of Rule 44 of the Rules and Regulations promulgated under the Fur Products Labeling Act unless there are maintained by respondents full and adequate records disclosing the facts upon which such claims and representations are based.

It is further ordered, That respondents The Pariseau Corp., and Rooks, Inc. and Rooks, Inc. of Lynn, corporations and their officers and Alexander Rooks, individually and as an officer of said corporations and George Younger and Isadore Rooks, individually and as officers of The Pariseau Corp. and Jack Younger, individually and as manager of the fur department of The Pariseau Corp., and respondents' representatives, agents and employees, directly or through any corporate or other device, in connection with the introduction, sale, advertising or offering for sale, in commerce, or the processing for commerce, of fur products; or in connection with the selling, advertising, offering for sale, or processing of fur products which have been shipped and received in commerce, do forthwith cease and desist from misbranding fur products by substituting for the labels affixed to such fur products pursuant to Section 4 of the Fur Products Labeling Act labels which do not conform to the requirements of the aforesaid Act and the Rules and Regulations promulgated thereunder.

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

Complaint

63 F.T.C.

IN THE MATTER OF

H. GREENBLATT COMPANY, INC., TRADING AS
GREENBLATTS BRAZY BROTHERS FURRIERS ET AL.CONSENT ORDER, ETC., IN REGARD TO THE ALLEGED VIOLATION OF THE
FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION AND THE FUR PRODUCTS LABELING ACTS*Docket C-577. Complaint, Sept. 11, 1963—Decision, Sept. 11, 1963*

Consent order requiring retail furriers in South Bend, Ind., to cease violating the Fur Products Labeling Act by removing required labels prior to delivery of fur products to the ultimate consumers, and by substituting nonconforming labels for those originally attached; failing, on labels and invoices and in advertising, to name the country of origin of imported furs and to use the term "Natural" for furs not artificially colored; labeling imported furs as products of the United States; failing, on tags and invoices, to give the true animal name of the fur, to disclose on labels that fur products contained cheap or waste fur, and labeling "Blue Fox" as "Fox"; failing on invoices to disclose when fur was artificially colored and to set forth the term "Dyed Mouton Lamb" as required, and invoicing "Japanese Mink" as "Mink"; advertising prices of fur products falsely as "up to 70% off", failing to maintain adequate records to maintain pricing claims; and failing in other respects to conform with requirements of the law.

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 H. Greenblatt Company, Inc., a corporation trading as Greenblatts Brazy Brothers Furriers and Sylvia Brazy, Lee Brazy, and Simon Brazy individually and as officers of the said corporation, hereinafter referred to as respondents have 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 H. Greenblatt Company, Inc., is a corporation organized, existing and doing business under and by virtue of the laws of the State of Indiana. The corporate respondent trades under the name of Greenblatts Brazy Brothers Furriers.

Respondents Sylvia Brazy, Lee Brazy and Simon Brazy are officers of the corporate respondent and formulate, direct and control the acts, practices and policies of the said corporate respondent including those hereinafter set forth.