


Wednesday, September 26, 2007



Mr. John Brady
Floorz
15505 Tamiami Trail N
Naples FL 34110

Federal Trade Commission/Office of the Secretary
Room H-135 (Annex K)
600 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20580

**Re: 16 CFR Part 303 – Textile Rule 8, Mohawk, DuPont, and PTT Canada Comment
Matter No. P074201**

To Whom It May Concern:

My name is John R. Brady and I am the president of J.R. Brady Acquisition Co. Inc, I have been an independent floor-covering retailer since 1991.

It is my understanding that you are seeking comments on creating a new subclass of polyester to be used with PTT. There are significant differences with the new PTT versus PET. I believe it is in the public's best interest to create this new subclass. Below are some of the reasons.

* PTT fiber, while having the general chemical composition of polyester, is a better product than what people traditionally think of as polyester since PET historically has not had good wear characteristics. If we have to call it polyester, it is misleading the consumer and the dealer as to how good the product really is.

* The product performs so much better than PET that it should be allowed a new name.

* Prior experience with PET has jaded dealers and caused them to not want to sell anything called polyester. Forcing a fiber, with much better performance than PET, to use the same name, will limit the consumer's ability to purchase the product.

Thank you for your consideration of this matter.

John R. Brady