

Complaint

IN THE MATTER OF

GUILFORD INDUSTRIES, INC.

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

Docket C-1318. Complaint, April 3, 1968—Decision, April 3, 1968

Consent order requiring a Guilford, Maine, fabric mill to cease misrepresenting
the fiber content of its wool products and furnishing false guaranties.

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 Guilford Industries, Inc., a corporation, hereinafter referred to as respondent, has 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 Guilford Industries, Inc., is a corporation organized, existing and doing business under and by virtue of the laws of the State of Maine, with its office and principal place of business at Guilford, Maine.

Respondent Guilford Industries, Inc., is a mill engaged primarily in the manufacture of woolen and woolen blend fabrics which are sold principally to manufacturers of women's wear.

PAR. 2. Respondent, now and for some time last past, has manufactured for introduction into commerce, introduced into commerce, sold, transported, distributed, delivered for shipment, shipped, and offered for sale in commerce, as "commerce" is defined in said Wool Products Labeling Act of 1939, wool products as "wool product" is defined therein.

PAR. 3. Certain of said wool products were misbranded by respondent 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 wool products, namely fabrics, labeled as "100% wool," when in truth and in fact, said products contained substantially different fibers and amounts of fibers other than as represented.

PAR. 4. Certain of said wool products were further misbranded by respondent 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, were woollen fabrics with labels 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 five per centum of the total fiber weight, of (1) wool fibers; (2) reprocessed wool; (3) reused wool; (4) each fiber other than wool, when said percentage by weight of such fiber was five per centum or more; and (5) the aggregate of all other fibers.

PAR. 5. The respondent furnished false guaranties that certain of its said wool products were not misbranded when respondent in furnishing such guaranties had reason to believe that the wool products so falsely guaranteed might be introduced, sold, transported or distributed in commerce, in violation of Section 9(b) of the Wool Products Labeling Act of 1939.

PAR. 6. The acts and practices of respondent as set forth above were, and are, in violation of the Wool Products Labeling Act of 1939 and of the Rules and Regulations promulgated thereunder, and constituted, and now constitute, unfair methods of competition in commerce and unfair and deceptive acts and practices in commerce, within the intent and meaning of the Federal Trade Commission Act.

PAR. 7. Respondent is now, and for some time last past, has been engaged in the offering for sale, sale, and distribution of certain products, namely fabrics. In the course and conduct of its business as aforesaid, respondent now causes and for some time last past has caused its said products, when sold, to be shipped from its place of business in the State of Maine, to purchasers located in various other States of the United States, and maintains and at all times mentioned herein has maintained, a substantial course of trade in said products in commerce as "commerce" is defined in the Federal Trade Commission Act.

PAR. 8. Respondent in the course and conduct of its business has made statements on invoices to its customers, misrepresenting the fiber content of certain of its products.

Among such misrepresentations, but not limited, were statements setting forth the fiber content thereof as "100% wool," thereby representing the products to be composed entirely of wool, whereas, in truth and in fact, the product was not 100% wool but contained substantially different fibers than represented.

PAR. 9. The acts and practices as set forth in Paragraph Eight have the tendency and capacity to mislead and deceive the purchasers of said products as to the true content thereof.

PAR. 10. The acts and practices of the respondent set forth in Paragraph Eight were, and are, all to the prejudice and injury of the public and respondent's competitors and constituted and now constitute unfair and deceptive acts and practices, 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 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 Wool Products Labeling Act of 1939; 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 respondent that the law has been violated as alleged in such complaint, and waivers and other provisions as required by the Commission's Rules; and

The Commission having thereafter considered the matter and having determined that it had reason to believe that the respondent has violated the said Acts, and that complaint should issue stating its charges in that respect, and having thereupon accepted the executed consent agreement and placed such agreement on the public record for a period of thirty (30) days, now in further conformity with the procedure prescribed in § 2.34(b) of its Rules, the Commission hereby

Decision and Order

73 F.T.C.

issues its complaint, makes the following jurisdictional findings, and enters the following order:

1. Respondent Guilford Industries, Inc., is a corporation organized, existing and doing business under and by virtue of the laws of the State of Maine, with its office and principal place of business at Guilford, Maine.

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 Guilford Industries, Inc., a corporation, and its officers, representatives, agents and employees, directly or through any corporate or other device, in connection with the manufacture for introduction into commerce, the introduction into commerce, or the offering for sale, sale, transportation, distribution, delivery for shipment or shipment in commerce, of wool products, as "commerce" and "wool products" are defined in the Wool Products Labeling Act of 1939, do forthwith cease and desist from misbranding wool products by:

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

2. 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 respondent Guilford Industries, Inc., a corporation, and its officers, representatives, agents and employees, directly or through any corporate or other device, do forthwith cease and desist from furnishing false guaranties that certain of their wool products are not misbranded when respondent in furnishing such guaranties has reason to believe that the wool products so falsely guaranteed might be introduced, sold, transported or distributed in commerce, in violation of Section 9(b) of the Wool Products Labeling Act of 1939.

It is further ordered, That respondent Guilford Industries, Inc., a corporation, and its officers, representatives, agents and employees, directly or through any corporate or other device, in connection with the offering for sale, sale or distribution of fabrics or other products, in commerce, as "commerce" is defined in the Federal Trade Commis-

565

Complaint

sion Act, do forthwith cease and desist from misrepresenting the character or amount of constituent fibers contained in such products on invoices or shipping memoranda applicable thereto, or in any other manner.

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

BEN RAY SPORTSWEAR, INC., ET AL.

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

Docket C-1319. Complaint, Apr. 8, 1968—Decision, Apr. 8, 1968

Consent order requiring a New York City manufacturer of sportswear to cease misbranding its wool and textile fiber products.

COMPLAINT

Pursuant to the provisions of the Federal Trade Commission Act, the Wool Products Labeling Act of 1939 and the Textile Fiber Products Identification Act, and by virtue of the authority vested in it by said Acts, the Federal Trade Commission, having reason to believe that Ben Ray Sportswear, Inc., a corporation, and Benjamin Metrano and Ray Robbins, individually and as officers of said 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 the Textile Fiber Products Identification 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 Ben Ray Sportswear, Inc., is a corporation organized, existing and doing business under and by virtue of the laws of the State of New York.

Individual respondents Benjamin Metrano and Ray Robbins are officers of said corporation. They formulate, direct and control the acts, practices and policies of the corporate respondent including the acts and practices hereinafter referred to.

Complaint

73 F.T.C.

Respondents are manufacturers of large size skirts and sportswear, both wool and textile, with their office and principal place of business located at 224 West 35th Street, New York, New York.

PAR. 2. Respondents, now and for some time last past, have manufactured for introduction into commerce, introduced into commerce, sold, transported, distributed, delivered for shipment, shipped, and offered for sale, in commerce, as "commerce" is defined in said Wool Products Labeling Act of 1939, 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, was a skirt stamped, tagged, labeled, or otherwise identified as containing 100 percent wool whereas in truth and in fact, such skirt 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, were wool products, namely skirts, with labels on or affixed thereto, which failed to disclose the percentage of the total fiber weight of the said wool products, exclusive of ornamentation not exceeding five per centum of said total fiber weight, of (1) wool; (2) reprocessed wool; (3) reused wool; (4) each fiber other than wool, when said percentage by weight of such fiber was five per centum 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 methods of competition and unfair and deceptive acts and practices in commerce, within the intent and meaning of the Federal Trade Commission Act.

PAR. 6. Respondents are now, and for some time last past have been engaged in the introduction, delivery for introduction, manufacture for introduction, sale, advertising, and offering for sale, in commerce,

and in the transportation or causing to be transported in commerce, and in the importation into the United States, of textile fiber products, and have sold, offered for sale, advertised, delivered, transported and caused to be transported, textile fiber products, which have been advertised or offered for sale in commerce; and have sold, offered for sale, advertised, delivered, transported and caused to be transported after shipment in commerce, textile fiber products, either in their original state or contained in other textile fiber products; as the terms "commerce" and "textile fiber product" are defined in the Textile Fiber Products Identification Act.

PAR. 7. Certain of said textile fiber products were misbranded by respondents in that they were not stamped, tagged, labeled, or otherwise identified as required under the provisions of Section 4(b) of the Textile Fiber Products Identification Act, and in the manner and form as prescribed by the Rules and Regulations promulgated under said Act.

Among such misbranded textile fiber products, but not limited thereto, was a textile fiber product with a label which failed:

1. To disclose the true generic name of the fibers present; and
2. To disclose the percentages of such fibers by weight.

PAR. 8. The acts and practices of respondents, as set forth above were, and are, in violation of the Textile Fiber Products Identification Act and the Rules and Regulations promulgated thereunder, and constituted, and now constitute unfair and deceptive acts and practices, in commerce, and unfair methods of competition 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, the Wool Products Labeling Act of 1939 and the Textile Fiber Products Identification 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

Decision and Order

73 F.T.C.

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

The Commission having thereafter considered the matter and having determined that it had reason to believe that the respondents have violated the said Acts, and that complaint should issue stating its charges in that respect, and having thereupon accepted the executed consent agreement and placed such agreement on the public record for a period of thirty (30) days, now in further conformity with the procedure prescribed in § 2.34(b) of its Rules, the Commission hereby issues its complaint, makes the following jurisdictional findings, and enters the following order:

1. Respondent Ben Ray Sportswear, Inc., is a corporation organized, existing and doing business under and by virtue of the laws of the State of New York, with its office and principal place of business located at 224 West 35th Street, New York, New York.

Respondents Benjamin Metrano and Ray Robbins are officers of said corporation and their 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 Ben Ray Sportswear, Inc., a corporation, and its officers, and Benjamin Metrano and Ray Robbins, individually and as officers of said corporation, and respondents' representatives, agents and employees, directly or through any corporate or other device, in connection with the manufacture for introduction into commerce, introduction into commerce, or offering for sale, sale, transportation, distribution, delivery for shipment or shipment, in commerce, of 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:

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

2. 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 respondents Ben Ray Sportswear, Inc., a corporation, and its officers, and Benjamin Metrano and Ray Robins, individually and as officers of said corporation, and respondents' representatives, agents and employees, directly or through any corporate or other device, in connection with the introduction, delivery for introduction, manufacture for introduction, sale, advertising or offering for sale, in commerce, or the transportation or causing to be transported in commerce, or the importation into the United States, of any textile fiber product; or in connection with the sale, offering for sale, advertising, delivery, transportation or causing to be transported, of any textile fiber product which has been advertised or offered for sale in commerce; or in connection with the sale, offering for sale, advertising, delivery, transportation, or causing to be transported, after shipment in commerce, of any textile fiber product, whether in its original state or contained in other textile fiber products, as the terms "commerce" and "textile fiber product" are defined in the Textile Fiber Products Identification Act, do forthwith cease and desist from misbranding textile fiber products by failing to affix a stamp, tag, label, or other means of identification to each such textile fiber product showing in a clear, legible and conspicuous manner each element of information required to be disclosed by Section 4(b) of the Textile Fiber Products Identification Act.

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

QUALITY THRIFT FURS, INC., TRADING AS HOPPER FURS
ET AL.

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

Docket C-1320. Complaint, April 8, 1968—Decision, April 8, 1968

Consent order requiring a St. Louis, Mo., retail furrier to cease misbranding and falsely invoicing its 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

Complaint

73 F.T.C.

vested in it by said Acts, the Federal Trade Commission, having reason to believe that Quality Thrift Furs, Inc., a corporation, trading under its own name and as Hopper Furs, and Edward Hopper, 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 Quality Thrift Furs, Inc., is a corporation organized, existing and doing business under and by virtue of the laws of the State of Missouri. The corporation trades under its own name and as Hopper Furs.

Respondent Edward Hopper is an officer of the said corporate respondent. He formulates, directs and controls the acts, practices and policies of the said corporate respondent.

Respondents are retailers of fur products with their office and principal place of business located at 425 North Seventh Street, St. Louis, Missouri.

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 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 and 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 disclose that the fur contained in the fur product was bleached, dyed, or otherwise artificially colored, when such was the fact.
2. To show the name, or other identification issued and registered by the Commission, of one or more of the persons who manufactured any such fur product for introduction into commerce, introduced it into commerce, sold it in commerce, advertised or offered it for sale, in commerce, or transported or distributed it in commerce.

PAR. 4. Certain of said fur products were misbranded in violation of the Fur Products Labeling Act in that they were not labeled in ac-

cordance with the Rules and Regulations promulgated thereunder in the following respects:

(a) The term "Dyed Mouton Lamb" was not set forth on labels in the manner required by law, in violation of Rule 9 of said Rules and Regulations.

(b) The term "assembled" was used on labels to describe fur products composed of pieces in lieu of the required terms, in violation of Rule 20(d) of said Rules and Regulations.

(c) 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.

(d) Required item numbers were not set forth on labels, in violation of Rule 40 of said Rules and Regulations.

PAR. 5. 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 fur products covered by invoices which failed:

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

2. To show that the fur products contained or were composed of used fur, when such was the fact.

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

4. To show the country of origin of imported fur used in any such fur product.

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) The term "natural" was not used on invoices 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.

(b) The disclosure "Second-hand," where required, was not set forth on invoices, in violation of Rule 23 of said Rules and Regulations.

(c) Required item numbers were not set forth on invoices, in violation of Rule 40 of said Rules and Regulations.

Decision and Order

73 F.T.C.

PAR. 7. 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 and 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 respondents that the law has been violated as alleged in such complaint, and waivers and other provisions as required by the Commission's Rules; and

The Commission having thereafter considered the matter and having determined that it had reason to believe that the respondents have violated the said Acts, and that complaint should issue stating its charges in that respect, and having thereupon accepted the executed consent agreement and placed such agreement on the public record for a period of thirty (30) days, now in further conformity with the procedure prescribed in § 2.34(b) of its Rules, the Commission hereby issues its complaint, makes the following jurisdictional findings, and enters the following order:

1. Respondent Quality Thrift Furs, Inc., is a corporation organized, existing and doing business under and by virtue of the laws of the State of Missouri, with its office and principal place of business located at 425 North Seventh Street, St. Louis, Missouri.

Respondent Edward Hopper is an officer of 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 Quality Thrift Furs, Inc., a corporation, trading under its own name or any other name or names, and Edward Hopper, 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 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 any fur product by:

1. Failing to affix a label to such product showing in words and in figures plainly legible all of 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 Mouton Lamb" on a label in the manner required where an election is made to use that term instead of the term "Dyed Lamb."

3. Setting forth the term "assembled" or any term of like import as part of the information required under Section 4(2) of the Fur Products Labeling Act and the Rules and Regulations promulgated thereunder to describe such fur product composed in whole or in substantial part of paws, tails, bellies, sides, flanks, gills, ears, throats, heads, scrap pieces or waste fur.

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

5. Failing to set forth on a label the item number or mark assigned to such fur product.

B. Falsely or deceptively invoicing any fur product by:

1. Failing to furnish an invoice, 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 by each of the subsections of Section 5(b)(1) of the Fur Products Labeling Act.

Complaint

73 F.T.C.

2. Failing to set forth the term "natural" as part of the information required to be disclosed on an invoice under the Fur Products Labeling Act and Rules and Regulations promulgated thereunder to describe such fur product which is not pointed, bleached, dyed, tip-dyed, or otherwise artificially colored.

3. Failing to disclose that such fur product is "Second-hand" when such fur product has been used or worn by an ultimate consumer and is subsequently marketed in its original, reconditioned, or rebuilt form with or without the addition of any furs or used furs.

4. Failing to set forth on an invoice the item number or mark assigned to such fur product.

It is further ordered, That the respondent corporation shall forthwith distribute a copy of this order to each of its operating divisions.

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.