substituted false labels in this fashion was merely corroborative. (See initial decision, finding no. 14, 66 F.T.C. 1290, 1296.) The Commission's decision and order would be the same even if the evidence were completely discounted.

It is ordered, That, for the reasons set forth above, respondent's motion to reopen the above-captioned proceeding be, and it hereby is, denied.

COLUMBIA BROADCASTING SYSTEM, INC., ET AL.

Docket 8512. Order, Mar. 15, 1965

Order denying respondent's request to file a 200-page answering brief.

Order Denying Motion

On January 25, 1965, the Commission issued an order granting respondents' motion for an additional 2 months in which to file their answering brief. Considering at the same time respondents' motion for leave to file an answering brief not exceeding 200 pages, the Commission granted leave to file a brief of 150 pages in length, including all appendices. Respondents have now renewed their request that they be granted leave to file an answering brief not exceeding 200 pages in length and they request that the filing date be further extended to May 19, 1965. The sole reason given by respondents for requiring a 200-page answering brief is that it is necessary to answer in detail what they regard as "the appeal brief's distortions of the record." The Commission is of the view that the authorization heretofore granted respondents should enable them to make a clear and complete presentation of the issues of the case and that they have failed to demonstrate the "reasonableness and necessity" of filing a brief so greatly in excess of the limit set forth in Section 3.22(e) of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure. *Shulton, Inc.*, Docket No. 7721, order issued February 14, 1964. Since respondents' accompanying motion for an extension of time until May 19, 1965, has been premised entirely upon the ground that additional time would be needed to prepare a brief of 200 pages in length, denial of the latter motion also requires a denial of the former. Accordingly,

It is ordered, That respondents' motion be, and it hereby is, denied in all respects.

FRUEHAUF TRAILER COMPANY

Docket 6608. Order, Mar. 25, 1965

Order directing that oral reargument be held before Commission on April 22, 1965, with each side allotted 45 minutes to present its views.

Order Directing Oral Reargument

This matter is before the Commission on the appeals of complaint counsel and respondent from the initial decision of the hearing examiner. The Commission has determined that the appeals should be orally reargued. The Commission invites counsel to focus their attention on reargument on two areas: (1) evidence in the record with respect to post-acquisition events; and (2) the significance of that evidence with respect to the application of Section 7 of the Clayton Act, as amended, to the acquisitions involved in the appeals. Accordingly,

It is ordered, That oral reargument of the appeals in the above-captioned matter be held before the members of the Commission on April 22, 1965, at 2 p.m., in Room 532 of the Federal Trade Commission Building, Washington, D.C., with each side alloted 45 minutes to present its views.

TOPPS CHEWING GUM, INC.

Docket 8463. Order, April 5, 1965

Order reopening proceeding to admit into the record additional documentary evidence.

Order Ruling on Petitions to Reopen

Respondent has filed two motions pursuant to Section 3.27 of the Commission's Rules of Practice for a reopening of the record for the reception of additional evidence. The first of these motions, filed February 24, 1965, seeks the reopening "for the purpose of introducing into evidence the attached player agreement and Exhibits A and B attached to its reply brief." Complaint counsel did not oppose this petition, but requested that a document attached to their answer be similarly accepted into the record. On March 17, 1965, respondent filed an answer thereto stating that it did not oppose complaint counsel's petition, but went on to "answer the additional comments" in complaint counsel's papers.

We cannot say, at least at this point, that the three (3) documents offered by respondent and the one (1) document offered by complaint counsel, all of which apparently concern matters that arose after the