

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  
HARNEY COUNTY LAND DEVELOPMENT  
CORPORATION ET AL.

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

*Docket 8568. Complaint, May 1, 1963—Decision, Jan. 4, 1967*

Order removing complaint against two Oregon land development companies from suspense calendar and dismissing it on the ground of insufficient public interest.

## 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 Harney County Land Development Corporation, a corporation, and John M. Phillips, Jack C. Cherbo and Richard D. Walker, individually and as officers of said corporation; and Harney County Escrow Company, Inc., a corporation, and Willis F. Bardwell, individually and as an officer 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 Harney County Land Development Corporation is a corporation organized, existing and doing business under and by virtue of the laws of the State of Oregon, with its office and principal place of business located at 417 South Jefferson Street, Chicago, Illinois.

Respondents John M. Phillips, Jack C. Cherbo, and Richard D. Walker are officers of said corporate respondent. They formulate, direct and control the acts and practices of the corporate respondent, including the acts and practices hereinafter set forth. Their address is the same as that of said corporate respondent.

Respondent Harney County Escrow Company, Inc., is a corporation organized, existing and doing business under and by virtue of the laws of the State of Oregon, with its office and principal place of business located at 150 West Washington Street, Burns, Oregon. Respondent Willis F. Bardwell is an officer of this corporate respondent. He formulates, directs and controls the acts and practices of this corporate respondent, including the acts and practices hereinafter set forth. His address is the same as that of this corporate respondent.

PAR. 2. Respondents are now, and for some time last past have been, engaged in the advertising, offering for sale and sale of lots or parcels of real estate located in the State of Oregon to the public in various parts of the United States by means of the United States mails and through agents and sales representatives. The said land is known as Lake Valley.

PAR. 3. Respondents, in conducting the business aforesaid, have sent and transmitted, and have caused to be sent and transmitted, letters, contracts, checks, deeds and other papers and documents of a commercial nature from their places of busi-

ness in the States of Illinois and Oregon to purchasers and prospective purchasers located in various other States of the United States and have thus engaged in extensive commercial intercourse, in commerce, as "commerce" is defined in the Federal Trade Commission Act.

PAR. 4. Respondents, for the purpose of inducing the purchase of said parcels of real estate, have placed advertisements in metropolitan newspapers and have distributed form letters and advertising circulars to members of the public by means of the United States mails. Typical of the statements and representations in said advertising materials, but not all inclusive thereof, are the following:

LAND In The West's Greatest Recreation Area \* \* \* LAKE VALLEY OREGON \* \* \* A Paradise For Sportsmen \* \* \* For Healthful, Outdoor Living \* \* \* HUNT! FISH! SWIM!

You have swimming and skiing, camping and boating \* \* \* outdoor barbecues \* \* \* Four Seasons of Outdoor Life \* \* \* just minutes and you are in Burns, the friendliest town in the West \* \* \*.

Ten Years Ago, an acre of Land in New Mexico Sold for \$1,000. Today, it is priced at \$20,000 up. The same thing has happened in Oregon's neighboring States—Nevada and California—where land values have jumped as high as 5000% in the last ten years.

Electricity is available to you from the Harney Electric Cooperative, Inc. \* \* \* Water is available from wells \* \* \* approximately 120 to 150 feet in depth \* \* \*.

A fertile valley of untold beauty \* \* \* Sunny, invigorating climate \* \* \* 300 days of warm, wonderful sunshine throughout the year. \* \* \* big money lies ahead \* \* \*.

Harney County is Reached by two U.S. Highways—U.S. 20—fastest all-weather route from Coast to Coast, and U.S. 395—the three flag highway from Canada to Mexico.

PAR. 5. By and through the use of the above-quoted statements and others of similar import not specifically set out herein, and by the use of pictures and photographs, respondents have represented that:

1. The land offered for sale is located in the West's greatest recreation area.

2. Said land is located in close proximity to hunting, fishing, swimming, skiing, boating and similar recreational facilities.

3. Said land has a moderate or temperate climate with warm sunshine for 300 days a year and year round outdoor living.

4. An adequate supply of water is available to purchasers of said land.

5. Electricity for home use is readily available to purchasers of said land.

6. Said land has a value greater than the offering price and is likely to increase in value as much as 5000% of the present value.

7. Said land is adjacent to, or is located in close proximity to, U.S. Highway 20 and U.S. Highway 395.

8. Said land lies in a fertile valley and is suitable for cultivation.

PAR. 6. In truth and in fact:

1. Said land is not located in the West's greatest recreation area.

2. Said land is not located in close proximity to hunting, fishing, swimming, skiing, boating or similar recreational facilities.

3. Said land does not have a moderate or temperate climate with 300 days of warm sunshine a year or year round outdoor living.

4. An adequate supply of water is not available to purchasers of said land.

5. Electricity for home use is not readily available to purchasers of said land since the purchaser must bear the cost of bringing the current from the existing power lines to his property.

6. Said tracts or parcels of land do not have a value greater than the offering price nor are they likely to increase in value as much as 5000% of the present value, or any other such large percentage.

7. Said land is not adjacent to, nor is it located in close proximity to, U.S. Highway 20 or U.S. Highway 395 or any other U.S. Highway.

8. Said land does not lie in a fertile valley nor is it suitable for cultivation.

Therefore, the statements and representations set forth in Paragraphs Four and Five hereof were and are false, misleading and deceptive.

PAR. 7. At all times herein mentioned, respondents have been, and are, in substantial competition in commerce, with corporations, firms and individuals in the sale of real estate of the same general kind and nature as that sold by respondents.

PAR. 8. The use by respondents of the aforementioned false, misleading and deceptive statements, representations and practices has had, and now has, the capacity and tendency to mislead and deceive a substantial portion of the purchasing public into the erroneous and mistaken belief that such statements were, and are, true, and into the purchase of substantial quantities of respondents' lots by reason of said mistaken and erroneous belief.

PAR. 9. 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.

#### ORDER DISMISSING COMPLAINT

This matter is before the Commission upon the motion of complaint counsel filed December 13, 1966, and joined in by respondents by a paper filed December 19, 1966, requesting the Commission to remove this proceeding from the suspense calendar and to dismiss the complaint on the ground that there is not sufficient public interest in the matter to warrant further proceedings; and

It appearing to the Commission that the complaint herein was issued May 1, 1963, and that the matter was placed in suspense June 19, 1963, until further order of the Commission since it appeared that the individual respondents named were defendants in a criminal proceeding in the United States District Court in Portland, Oregon, charged with use of the mails to defraud on matters relating to those in this proceeding; and

The Commission having determined that because the evidence which covered a period prior to the latter part of 1962 is now old and stale the complaint should be dismissed:

*It is ordered*, That the complaint be, and it hereby is, dismissed without prejudice, however, to the right of the Commission to issue a new complaint or to take such further or other action against the respondents at any time in the future as may be warranted by the then existing circumstances.

---

#### IN THE MATTER OF

FASHION SEWING CENTER, INC., TRADING AS  
BRANT'S SEWING AND APPLIANCE CENTER ET AL.

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

*Docket C-1156. Complaint, Jan. 9, 1967—Decision, Jan. 9, 1967*

Consent order requiring two Cincinnati, Ohio, distributors of sewing machines to cease using deceptive promotional methods in selling their sewing machines and other merchandise.

## 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 Fashion Sewing Center, Inc., a corporation, trading as Brant's Sewing and Appliance Center, and Maxine Brant, individually and as an officer of said corporation, and Milton Brant, a stockholder of said corporation, and Brant Sewing Machine Co., Inc., a corporation, and Milton Brant, individually and as an officer 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 Fashion Sewing Center, Inc., is a corporation organized, existing and doing business under and by virtue of the laws of the State of Ohio, with its principal office and place of business located at 1722 Race Street, Cincinnati, Ohio. It does business under the name Brant's Sewing and Appliance Center.

Respondent Maxine Brant is an individual and an officer of said Fashion Sewing Center, Inc., and her husband, respondent Milton Brant is a stockholder thereof. They formulate, direct and control the acts and practices of said respondent corporation, including the acts and practices hereinafter set forth. Their address is the same as that of the corporate respondent.

Respondent Brant Sewing Machine Co., Inc., is a corporation organized, existing and doing business under and by virtue of the laws of the State of Ohio, with its principal office and place of business located at 1720-22 Race Street (at Findlay Market), Cincinnati, Ohio.

Respondent Milton Brant is an officer of respondent Brant Sewing Machine Co., Inc., and he directs and controls the acts and practices of said corporation, including the acts and practices hereinafter set forth.

The aforementioned respondents cooperate and act together in carrying out the acts and practices hereinafter set forth.

PAR. 2. Respondents are now, and for some time last past have been, engaged in the advertising, offering for sale, sale and distribution of sewing machines, TV sets and phonographs to the public.

PAR. 3. In the course and conduct of their business, respond-

ents now cause, and for some time last past have caused, their said products, when sold, to be shipped from their place of business in the State of Ohio 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 business, and for the purpose of inducing the purchase of their products, respondents now make, and have made, certain statements and representations with respect to contests, drawings, free goods, selection of customers and discounts in direct mail advertising, through oral representations of respondents and their salesmen, and by other means.

Typical and illustrative of said advertising and promotional material, but not all inclusive thereof, are the following:

**FREE DRAWING! REGISTER NOW!**

Name

Address

City

Zone

State

Phone No.

**GRAND PRIZE!**

**WIN Nelco Deluxe Sewing Machine Complete with Cabinet!**

**PLUS Consolation Awards Nelco Sewing Machines**

Sewing machines do not include cabinet. Selected participants to receive award with purchase of an inexpensive cabinet to contain their machine. One must be 16 years old to enter. You do not have to be present to win.

\* \* \* \* \*

As the NECCHI and NELCO Sewing Machine franchised distributor in the area \* \* \* we are assisting the manufacturer in an extensive advertising campaign.

We are authorized to give away a limited number of new Automatic Zig-Zag and Deluxe Sewing Machine Heads.

You have been selected from the entries at our drawings \* \* \* to receive your choice of three models, Necchi #500 Deluxe, Nelco #110 Automatic Zig-Zag, or Model #826 Straight Stitch, determined by the cabinet. You are to pay absolutely nothing for the sewing machine itself. All you must purchase to receive it is a new cabinet to contain it from our excellent selection. New cabinet prices range from \$39.95 depending on style, size, finish and wiring.

\* \* \* \* \*

\* \* \* This offer is limited to the time period of ten days from this date. If you have not taken advantage of this award by then, it will be cancelled and another person selected as we intend to place the new machines as soon as possible.

\* \* \* \* \*

This letter is your authorization to receive the machine. The only Sewing Center authorized to honor it is listed below. We suggest you take immediate advantage of this sincere offer.

PAR. 5. By and through the use of the aforementioned statements and representations, by oral statements of respondents or their salesmen, and by other written statements of similar import and meaning not specifically set out herein, respondents represent, and have represented, directly or by implication:

1. That they are conducting bona fide drawings and that persons other than the grand prize winner whose names are drawn from among entrants will win valuable prizes or prizes of specified value referred to as "consolation awards."

2. That the manufacturers of Necchi and Nelco sewing machines are conducting said advertising campaign assisted by respondents and that said manufacturers have authorized respondents to give away a number of their sewing machines.

3. That the offer of a free sewing machine is made only to a limited number of specially selected persons for a limited period of ten days.

4. That they are making bona fide offers to give a limited number of the advertised sewing machines free to purchasers of a sewing machine cabinet as part of a promotion to sell the advertised sewing machines.

5. That customers who elect to purchase one of their regular lines of sewing machines, rather than one of the machines referred to in their promotional letter will be granted discounts or allowances from the prices usually charged by respondents for said regular line of sewing machines equal to the advertised price of the sewing machine or some other equally substantial amount and that savings are thereby afforded.

PAR. 6. In truth and in fact:

1. Respondents do not conduct bona fide drawings for the aforesaid consolation awards. Their purpose in having persons register for drawings is to obtain leads to prospective purchasers of their sewing machines. Almost every purchaser who buys pursuant to such promotion receives as a prize an "award" or "Contest Winner's Discount" which is an amount deducted from the represented price of the product. However, said deduction is made not from respondents' regular and customary price of the product but from a higher price and therefore the prize given to purchasers is illusory.

2. The said manufacturers are not conducting said advertising

campaign nor have they authorized respondents to give away their products in the said promotion. Instead, the said sales promotion is the sole endeavor of respondents conducted in furtherance of their own retail sales of said products.

3. Respondents' said offers were not made to only a limited number of or to specially selected persons but were made generally to members of the purchasing public on the basis of their addresses to obtain the greatest coverage possible. Said offers were not limited to ten days but were open to recipients of respondents' letters beyond that period of time.

4. They were not making bona fide offers to give a limited number of the advertised sewing machine heads free to purchasers of a sewing machine cabinet as part of a promotion to sell the advertised sewing machines. On the contrary, respondents' said offers were made to attract prospective purchasers of respondents' higher priced sewing machines.

5. Customers who elected to buy a sewing machine from respondents' regular line rather than one of the sewing machines referred to in respondents' promotional letter were not granted said discounts or allowances since said purported deductions are based on amounts higher than the net prices at which said regular line of sewing machines are usually and customarily sold by respondents in the normal course of their business and the represented savings were not afforded.

Therefore, the statements and representations as set forth in Paragraphs Four and Five hereof were and are false, misleading and deceptive.

PAR. 7. In the conduct of their business, at all times mentioned herein, the respondents have been in substantial competition in commerce with corporations, firms and individuals engaged in the sale of sewing machines, TV sets and phonographs of the same general kind and nature as those sold by respondents.

PAR. 8. The use by the respondents of the aforesaid false, misleading and deceptive statements, representations and practices has had, and now has, the capacity and tendency to mislead members of the purchasing public into the erroneous and mistaken belief that said statements and representations were, and are, true and into the purchase of substantial quantities of respondents' products by reason of said erroneous and mistaken belief.

PAR. 9. The aforesaid acts and practices of respondents, as herein alleged, were and are all to the prejudice and injury of the public and of the 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 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 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. Respondent Fashion Sewing Center, Inc., is a corporation organized, existing and doing business under and by virtue of the laws of the State of Ohio, with its principal office and place of business located at 1722 Race Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.

Respondent Maxine Brant is an officer of said Fashion Sewing Center, Inc., and her address is 1722 Race Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.

Brant Sewing Machine Co., Inc., is a corporation organized, existing and doing business under and by virtue of the laws of the State of Ohio, with its principal office and place of business located at 1720-22 Race Street (at Findlay Market), Cincinnati, Ohio.

Milton Brant is an officer of said Brant Sewing Machine Co., Inc., and a stockholder of said Fashion Sewing Center, Inc. His address is 1722 Race Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.

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 Fashion Sewing Center, Inc., a

said corporate respondents. They formulate, direct and control the acts and practices of said corporate respondents including the acts and practices hereinafter set forth. Their business address is the same as that of respondent Sportwelt Shoe Co., Inc.

The aforesaid respondents cooperate and act together in carrying out the acts and practices hereinafter set forth.

PAR. 2. Respondents are now, and for some time last past have been, engaged in the manufacturing, offering for sale, sale and distribution of footwear, including men's shoes which closely resemble in appearance shoes issued to members of the United States Navy, which are sold to dealers and others 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, said shoes, when sold to be shipped from their place of business in the State of New Hampshire and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico 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 conduct of their business, at all times mentioned herein, respondents have been in substantial competition, in commerce, with corporations, firms and individuals in the sale of products of the same general kind and nature as those sold by respondents.

PAR. 5. The said shoes sold and distributed by respondents, in the course and conduct of their business as aforesaid, closely resemble the shoes issued and furnished to members of the United States Armed Forces in color, material, pattern and style. Respondents also cause to be affixed to said shoes and their containers certain markings, labels, and tags respecting their manufacture, construction, inspection and specifications.

Typical and illustrative, but not all inclusive of such statements and representations, are the following:

GENUINE U.S. NAVY LAST  
D.R. SHERBURN, INSPECTOR.

MADE ON THE AUTHENTIC GOVERNMENT  
U.S. NAVY LAST. Surplus Last.

INSPECTOR NO. 43  
U.S. NAVY LAST.

Authentic Gov't Surplus Last  
NAVY SHOE.

Genuine U.S. Gov't Specifications  
R. Sullivan, Inspector.

PAR. 6. Through the use of the terms "U.S. Navy" and "U.S. Government" alone and in conjunction with the other statements and representations set out above, and other terms of similar import and meaning but not specifically set out herein, in and on markings, labels and tags, respondents represent, and have represented, directly or by implication:

1. That said shoes are official, regulation or surplus United States Navy shoes and are manufactured in accordance with United States Navy or Government specifications.

2. That said shoes are inspected by United States Navy or Government inspectors and approved as meeting United States Navy or Government specifications.

PAR. 7. In truth and in fact:

1. Said shoes are not official, regulation, surplus United States Navy or Government shoes and are not manufactured in accordance with Navy or Government specifications.

2. Said shoes are not inspected by United States Navy or Government inspectors and are not approved as meeting United States Navy or Government specifications.

Therefore, the statements and representations set forth in Paragraphs Five and Six hereof were and are false, misleading and deceptive.

PAR. 8. By selling and distributing to dealers and others said shoes having affixed to them or their containers the markings, labels, and tags hereinabove described, respondents furnish to such dealers and others the means and instrumentalities by and through which they may mislead and deceive the purchasing public as to the origin, kind, type, construction, manufacture and quality of their said shoes.

PAR. 9. The use by respondents of the aforesaid false, misleading and deceptive representations and practices has had, and now has, the capacity and tendency to mislead members of the purchasing public into the erroneous and mistaken belief that said statements and representations were and are true and into the purchase of substantial quantities of respondents' product by reason of said erroneous and mistaken belief.

PAR. 10. 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 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 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. Respondent Sportwelt Shoe Co., Inc., is a corporation organized, existing and doing business under and by virtue of the laws of the State of Massachusetts, with its office and principal place of business located at 51 Lake Street, in the city of Nashua, State of New Hampshire.

Respondent Wilson Shoe Co., Inc., is a corporation organized, existing and doing business under and by virtue of the laws of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, with its office and principal place of business located in Santa Isabel, Puerto Rico.

Respondents Emanuel Alberts and Muray Alberts are officers of said corporations and their address is the same as that of respondent Sportwelt Shoe Co., Inc.

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 Sportwelt Shoe Co., Inc., a corporation, and Wilson Shoe Co., Inc., a corporation, and their respective officers, and Emanuel Alberts and Murray Alberts,

individually and as officers of said corporate respondents, and respondents' agents, representatives and employees, directly or through any corporate or other device, in connection with the offering for sale, sale or distribution of footwear in commerce, as "commerce" is defined in the Federal Trade Commission Act, do forthwith cease and desist from:

1. Representing, directly or by implication, that said shoes are official, regulation or surplus United States Navy shoes or Armed Forces shoes or are manufactured in accordance with United States Navy or Government specifications: *Provided, however*, It shall be a defense in any enforcement proceeding instituted hereunder for respondents to establish that said shoes are genuine surplus shoes manufactured for and in accordance with specifications of such Armed Forces or Government.

2. Representing, directly or by implication, that said shoes have been inspected by United States Navy or Government inspectors or that they have been approved by said inspectors as meeting United States Navy or Government specifications: *Provided, however*, It shall be a defense in any enforcement proceeding instituted hereunder for respondents to establish that said shoes have been inspected and approved by said United States Navy or Government inspectors.

3. Misrepresenting in any manner the parties, organizations, firms or corporations for whom said shoes were manufactured, or the specifications for or inspection of said shoes.

4. Furnishing or otherwise placing in the hands of retailers of said products, or others, any means or instrumentalities by or through which they may mislead and deceive the public in the manner or as to the things hereinabove prohibited: *Provided, however*, That nothing hereinabove shall be construed to prohibit the respondents from truthfully and non-deceptively stamping or marking shoes manufactured by respondent *Sportwelt* as (1) "Navy-type shoes [or Navy-type oxfords] made on surplus United States Navy lasts [or duplicates thereof, whichever is the case] by Sportwelt Shoe Co., Inc." or as (2) "Navy-type shoes [or Navy-type oxfords] made on surplus United States Navy lasts [or duplicates thereof, whichever is the case] by and inspected by Sportwelt Shoe Co., Inc."; or from similarly stamping or marking shoes made by respondent *Wilson* as (1) "Navy-type shoes [or Navy-type oxfords] made on surplus United States Navy lasts [or duplicates thereof, whichever is the case] by Wilson Shoe Co., Inc."

Complaint

71 F.T.C.

or as (2) "Navy-type shoes [or Navy-type oxfords] made on surplus United States Navy lasts [or duplicates thereof, whichever is the case] by and inspected by Wilson Shoe Co., Inc."

*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.

---