IN THE MATTER OF

RAYMOND LENOBEL TRADING AS RAY LENOBEL

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

Docket C-1195. Complaint, Apr. 17, 1967—Decision, Apr. 17, 1967

Consent order requiring a Chicago, Ill., independent commission salesman to cease misbranding and falsely advertising his 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 Raymond Lenobel, an individual trading as Ray Lenobel, sometimes 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 Raymond Lenobel, an individual trading as Ray Lenobel, is an independent commission salesman of fur products with his office and principal place of business located at 162 North State Street, Chicago, Illinois.

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 misbranded in that they were not labeled as required under the provisions of Section 4(2) of the Fur Products Labeling Act in the manner and form prescribed by the Rules and Regulations promulgated thereunder.

Among such misbranded fur products, but not limited thereto, were fur products with labels which failed:

1. To show the true animal name of the fur used in the said fur products.

2. To disclose that the fur contained in the said fur products was bleached, dyed, or otherwise artificially colored, when such was the fact.

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:

1. 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.

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

3. Information required on labels 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 the said Rules and Regulations.

PAR. 5. Certain of the fur products were misbranded in that they falsely and deceptively labeled, or otherwise falsely or deceptively identified as the labels affixed to the fur products contained a purported "Appraisal Price" which represented, directly or by implication, that the fur products had been appraised by a qualified and impartial appraiser, having no pecuniary or other interest in the fur products, and that the fur product had a value as represented. In truth and in fact the said fur products were not appraised by a qualified and impartial appraiser, having no pecuniary or other interest in the fur products and was in violation of Section 4(1) of the Fur Products Labeling Act.

PAR. 6. Certain of the 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 said Act.

Among and included in the aforesaid false and deceptive advertisements, but not limited thereto, were advertisements of the respondent which appeared in issues of the Chicago Tribune, and of the Chicago Daily News, newspapers published in the city of Chicago, State of Illinois, and having a wide circulation in the State of Illinois and other States of the United States.

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

1. To show the true animal name of the fur used in any such fur product.

2. To show the country of origin of any imported furs contained in such fur products.

PAR. 7. By means of the aforesaid advertisements and others of similar import and meaning not specificially 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:

1. The term "Broadtail Lamb" was not set forth in advertisements in the manner required by law, in violation of Rule 8(b) of the said Rules and Regulations.

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

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

PAR. 8. 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 that certain of said fur products were falsely or deceptively identified with 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 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 "Broadtail" thereby implying that the fur contained therein was entitled to the designation of "Broadtail Lamb" when in truth and in fact it was not entitled to such designation.

PAR. 9. By means of the aforesaid advertisement and others of similar import and meaning not specifically referred to herein, respondent falsely and deceptively advertised fur products with respect to the name of the country of origin of imported furs contained in such fur products, 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 to imply that the country of origin of fur contained in such fur products was the United States, when the country of origin of such furs was, in fact, Argentina.

PAR. 10. By means of the aforesaid advertisements, and others of similar import not specifically referred to herein, the respondent falsely and deceptively advertised fur products in that said advertisements represented that the said fur products came from "One of New York's Largest Wholesale Furriers—Justine Furs, New York, New York" and "From The Vaults of One of The Largest Fine Fur Wholesalers, Justine Furs, New York, New

York." In truth and in fact only an infinitesimal number of the fur products offered for sale came from Norton Furs (successor in interest to Justine Furs), with the remaining fur products being furnished from various other sources. The aforementioned representations were in violation of Section 5(a)(5) of the Fur Products Labeling Act and Rule 44(g) of the Rules and Regulations promulgated under the aforesaid Act.

PAR. 11. By means of the aforesaid advertisements and others of similar import not specifically referred to herein, the respondent falsely and deceptively advertised fur products in that said advertisements represented, contrary to truth and fact, that the sale of the fur products was "By Order of the Creditors" in violation of Section 5(a)(5) of the Fur Products Labeling Act and Rule 44(g) of the Rules and Regulations promulgated under the aforesaid Act.

PAR. 12. Certain of said fur products were falsely and deceptively advertised in that the labels affixed to the fur products contained a purported "Appraisal Price" which represented, directly or by implication, that the fur products had been appraised by a qualified and impartial appraiser, having no pecuniary or other interest in the fur products, and that the fur products had values as represented. In truth and in fact the said fur products were not appraised by a qualified and impartial appraiser having no pecuniary or other interest in the fur products and was in violation of Section 5(a)(5) of the Fur Products Labeling Act, and Rule 44(c) of the Rules and Regulations promulgated thereunder.

PAR. 13. 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 or 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 the respondent that the law has been violated as alleged in such complaint, and waivers and provisions as required by the Commission's rules; and

The Commission, having reason to believe that the respondent has violated the said Acts, and having determined that complaint should issue stating its charges in that respect, hereby issues its complaint, accepts said agreement, makes the following jurisdictional findings, and enters the following order:

1. Respondent is an independent commission salesman of fur products, with his office and principal place of business located at 162 North State Street, Chicago, Illinois.

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 Raymond Lenobel, an individual trading as Ray Lenobel, or under any other name, 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:

A. Misbranding fur products by:

1. Failing to affix labels to fur products showing in words and figures plainly legible all the information required to be disclosed by each of the subsections of Section 4(2) of the Fur Products Labeling Act.

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 instead 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 bleached, dyed, tip-dyed, or otherwise artificially colored.

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

5. Using the term "Appraisal Price" on labels, or terms of similar import or meaning, to represent the value of fur products being offered for sale, unless such evaluations and prices are based upon authentic and bona fide appraisals of value by a qualified appraiser having no pecuniary or other interest in the fur products.

B. 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:

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 identifies any such fur product as to the name or designation of the animal or animals that produced the fur contained in the fur product.

3. Falsely or deceptively identifies any fur products as to the country of origin of fur contained in such fur products.

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

5. 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."

6. 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 such fur products which are not pointed, bleached, dyed, tip-dyed or otherwise artificially colored.

7. Misrepresents, directly or by implication, that any such fur products came from a particular source for the purpose of the sale.

8. Misrepresents, directly or by implication, that any such fur products were secured by respondent from a source that is or was in financial or other distress.

9. Misrepresents, directly or by implication, that the fur products being offered for sale have been appraised as to value by authentic and bona fide appraisals made by a qualified appraiser having no pecuniary or other interest in the fur product.

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

DYNAMIC IMPORTS, INC., ET AL.

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

Docket C-1196. Complaint, April 17, 1967—Decision, April 17, 1967

Consent order requiring two New York City importers of women's wool slacks to cease misbranding the fiber content of their merchandise.

COMPLAINT

Pursuant to the provisions of the Federal Trade Commission Act and the Wool Products Labeling Act of 1939, and by virtue of the authority vested in it by said Acts, the Federal Trade Commission, having reason to believe that Dynamic Imports, Inc., a corporation, and Dynamic Fashions, Inc., a corporation, hereinafter referred to as respondents, have violated the provisions of said Acts and the Rules and Regulations promulgated under the Wool Products Labeling Act of 1939, 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 Dynamic Imports, Inc., is a corporation organized, existing and doing business under and by virtue of the laws of the State of New York. Its office and principal place of business is located at 1370 Broadway, New York, New York. Said corporate respondent imports and sells, among other items, women's slacks composed in whole or in part of wool.

Respondent Dynamic Fashions, Inc., is a corporation organized, existing and doing business under and by virtue of the laws of the State of New York. Its office and principal place of business is located at 1370 Broadway, New York, New York. Said corporate respondent imports and sells, among other items, women's slacks composed in whole or in part of wool.

PAR. 2. Subsequent to the effective date of the Wool Products Labeling Act of 1939, respondents have introduced into commerce, sold, transported, distributed, delivered for shipment, shipped and offered for sale in commerce, as "commerce" is defined in said Act, wool products as "wool product" is defined therein.

PAR. 3. Certain of said wool products were misbranded by the respondents within the intent and meaning of Section 4(a)(1) of the Wool Products Labeling Act of 1939 and the Rules and Regulations promulgated thereunder, in that they were falsely and deceptively stamped, tagged, labeled or otherwise identified with respect to the character and amount of the constituent fibers contained therein.

Among such misbranded wool products, but not limited thereto, were women's slacks stamped, tagged, labeled, or otherwise identified by respondents as "Finest Reprocessed Wool 92%-Nylon 8%," "Finest Reprocessed Wool 75%; Stretch Nylon 25%," "90% Reprocessed Wool, 10% Nylon," and "95% Reprocessed Wool, 5% Nylon," whereas in truth and in fact, said products contained substantially different fibers and amounts of fibers than represented.

PAR. 4. Certain of said wool products were further misbranded by respondents in that they were not stamped, tagged, labeled, or otherwise identified as required under the provisions of Section 4(a)(2) of the Wool Products Labeling Act of 1939 and in the manner and form as prescribed by the Rules and Regulations promulgated under said Act.

Among such misbranded wool products, but not limited thereto, was a wool product, *viz.*, women's slacks, with a label on or affixed

thereto which failed to disclose the percentage of the total fiber weight of the said wool product, exclusive of ornamentation not exceeding 5% of the total fiber weight, of (1) wool; (2) reprocessed wool; (3) reused wool; (4) each fiber other than wool present in the wool product when said percentage by weight of such fiber was 5% or more; and (5) the aggregate of all other fibers.

PAR. 5. The acts and practices of the respondents as set forth above were, and are in violation of the Wool Products Labeling Act of 1939 and the Rules and Regulations promulgated thereunder, and constituted, and now constitute, unfair and deceptive acts and practices and unfair methods of competition in commerce, within the intent and meaning 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 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 respondents with violation of the Federal Trade Commission Act and the Wool Products Labeling Act of 1939; and

The respondents 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 the respondents that the law has been violated as alleged in such complaint, and waivers and provisions as required by the Commission's rules; and

The Commission, having reason to believe that the respondents have violated said Acts, and having determined that complaint should issue stating its charges in that respect, hereby issues its complaint, accepts said agreement, makes the following jurisdictional findings, and enters the following order:

1. Respondents Dynamic Imports, Inc., and Dynamic Fashions, Inc., are corporations organized, existing and doing business under and by virtue of the laws of the State of New York, with their office and principal place of business located at 1370 Broadway, New York, 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

It is ordered, That respondents Dynamic Imports, Inc., a corporation, and its officers, and Dynamic Fashions, Inc., and its officers, and respondents' representatives, agents and employees, directly or through any corporate or other device, in connection with the introduction into commerce, or the offering for sale, sale, transportation, distribution, or delivery for shipment or shipment in commerce, of women's slacks composed in whole or in part of wool, or other wool products, as "commerce" and "wool product" are defined in the Wool Products Labeling Act of 1939, do forthwith cease and desist from misbranding wool products by:

A. Falsely or deceptively stamping, tagging, labeling, or otherwise identifying such products as to the character or amount of constituent fibers included therein.

B. Failing to securely affix to, or place on, each such product a stamp, tag, label, or other means of identification showing in a clear and conspicuous manner each element of information required to be disclosed by Section 4(a)(2) of the Wool Products Labeling Act of 1939.

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

PICK GALLERIES, INC., ET AL.

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

Docket C-1197. Complaint, Apr. 18, 1967—Decision, Apr. 18, 1967

Consent order requiring a Winnetka, Ill., retailer and auctioneer of various commodities, including fur products, to cease falsely invoicing and advertising his 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 Pick Galleries, Inc., a corporation, and Harold R. Pick, individually and as an officer of 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 Pick Galleries, Inc., is a corporation organized, existing and doing business under and by virtue of the laws of the State of Illinois. Respondent Harold R. Pick is the president of said corporate respondent. He formulates, directs and controls the acts, practices and policies of said corporation.

The respondents are engaged in the retail sale and auctioneering of various commodities, including fur products, with their office and principal place of business located at 886 Linden Avenue, Winnetka, Illinois.

PAR. 2. Respondents are now, and for some time last past have 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 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 received in commerce, as the terms "commerce," "fur" and "fur product" are defined in the Fur Products Labeling Act.

PAR. 3. Certain of the 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 fur products covered by invoices which failed:

1. To show the true animal name of the fur used in the fur products.

2. To show the country of origin of imported furs used in fur products.

PAR. 4. Certain of said fur products were falsely and decep-

tively 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 that the term "Dyed Broadtail-processed Lamb" was not set forth on invoices in the manner required by law, in violation of Rule 10 of said Rules and Regulations.

PAR. 5. Certain of the 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 said Act.

Among and included in the aforesaid false and deceptive advertisements, but not limited thereto, were advertisements of the respondents which appeared in issues of the Chicago Tribune, and of the Chicago Daily News, newspapers published in the city of Chicago, State of Illinois, and having a wide circulation in the State of Illinois and other States of the United States.

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

1. To show the true animal name of the fur used in such fur products.

2. To show the country of origin of imported furs contained in such fur products.

PAR. 6. 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:

1. The term "Broadtail Lamb" was not set forth in advertisements in the manner required by law, in violation of Rule 8(b) of said Rules and Regulations.

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

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

PAR. 7. 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 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 "Broadtail" thereby implying that the fur contained therein was entitled to the designation of "Broadtail Lamb" when in truth and in fact it was not entitled to such designation.

PAR. 8. By means of the aforesaid advertisement and others of similar import and meaning not specifically referred to herein, respondents falsely and deceptively advertised fur products with respect to the name of the country of origin of imported furs contained in such fur products, 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 to imply that the country of origin of fur contained in such fur products was the United States, when the country of origin of such furs was, in fact, Argentina.

PAR. 9. By means of the aforesaid advertisements, and others of similar import not specifically referred to herein, the respondents falsely and deceptively advertised fur products in that the said advertisements represented that the said fur products came from "One of New York's Largest Wholesale Furriers—Justine Furs, New York, New York" and "From the Vaults of One of the Largest Fine Fur Wholesalers, Justine Furs, New York, New York." In truth and in fact only an infinitesimal number of the fur products offered for sale came from Norton Furs (successor in interest to Justine Furs), with the remaining fur products being furnished from various other sources. The aforementioned representations were in violation of Section 5(a) (5) of the Fur Products Labeling Act and Rule 44(g) of the Rules and Regulations promulgated under the aforesaid Act.

PAR. 10. By means of the aforesaid advertisements and others of similar import not specifically referred to herein, the respondents falsely and deceptively advertised fur products in that the said advertisements represented, contrary to truth and fact, that the sale of the fur products was "By Order of the Creditors" in violation of Section 5(a) (5) of the Fur Products Labeling Act and Rule 44(g) of the Rules and Regulations promulgated under the aforesaid Act.

PAR. 11. 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 methods of competition, and unfair and deceptive acts or 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 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 Textiles and Furs 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 Fur Products Labeling Act; and

The respondents 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 the respondents that the law has been violated as alleged in such complaint, and waivers and provisions as required by the Commission's rules; and

The Commission, having reason to believe that the respondents have violated said Acts, and having determined that complaint should issue stating its charges in that respect, hereby issues its complaint, accepts said agreement, makes the following jurisdictional findings, and enters the following order:

1. Respondent Pick Galleries, Inc., is a corporation organized, existing and doing business under and by virtue of the laws of the State of Illinois, with its office and principal place of business located at 886 Linden Avenue, Winnetka, Illinois.

Respondent Harold R. Pick is an officer of the said corporation and his 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 Pick Galleries, Inc., a corporation, and its officers, and Harold R. Pick, individually and as an

officer of said corporation, and respondents' 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:

A. Falsely or deceptively invoicing fur products by:

1. Failing to furnish invoices, as the term "invoice" is defined in the Fur Products Labeling Act, 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. Failing 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."

B. 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:

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 identifies any such fur product as to the name or designation of the animal or animals that produced the fur contained in the fur product.

3. Falsely or deceptively identifies any such fur product as to the country of origin of the fur contained in such fur product.

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

5. 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."

6. 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 such fur products which are not pointed, bleached, dyed, tip-dyed, or otherwise artificially colored.

7. Misrepresents, directly or by implication, that any such fur products came from a particular source for the purpose of the sale.

8. Misrepresents, directly or by implication, that any such fur products were secured by respondents from a source that is or was in financial or other distress.

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.