

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

Docket C-1544. Complaint, June 11, 1969—Decision, June 11, 1969

Consent order requiring a Lowell, Mass., manufacturer of men's and boys' outerwear to cease misbranding the fiber content of its wool products.

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 Braeburn Mfg. Co., a corporation, and John Marcus, 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 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 Braeburn Mfg. Co. is a corporation organized, existing and doing business under and by virtue of the laws of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts with its office and principal place of business located at 95 Bridge Street, Lowell, Massachusetts.

Respondent John Marcus is an officer of said corporation. He formulates, directs and controls the policies, acts and practices of said corporation, and his address is the same as that of the corporate respondent.

Respondents are engaged in the manufacture of men's and boys' outerwear. They ship and distribute such products to various customers in the United States.

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, were wool products, namely coats, labeled as containing "85% wool, 15% camel hair" whereas, in truth and in fact, the said products contained substantially different amounts and types of fibers than as 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 coats, 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 5 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 5 per centum or more; and (5) the aggregate of all other fibers.

PAR. 5. Certain of said wool products were misbranded in violation of the Wool Products Labeling Act of 1939 in that they were not labeled in accordance with the Rules and Regulations promulgated under the Wool Products Labeling Act of 1939, in the following respects:

(a) The generic names of manufactured fibers, established in Rule 7 of the Regulations promulgated under the Textile Fiber Products Identification Act were not used in naming such fibers in required information, in violation of Rule 8 of the Rules and Regulations under the Wool Products Labeling Act of 1939.

(b) The name of a specialty fiber, namely Camel hair, was used in lieu of the word "wool" in setting forth the required fiber content information on labels affixed to wool products when certain of the fibers so described were not entitled to such designation, in violation of Rule 18(a) of the aforesaid Rules and Regulations.

PAR. 6. 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.

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 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 Braeburn Mfg. Co. is a corporation organized, existing and doing business under and by virtue of the laws of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, with its office and principal place of business located at 95 Bridge Street, Lowell, Massachusetts.

Respondent John Marcus 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 Braeburn Mfg. Co., a corporation, and its officers, and John Marcus, 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, or manufacture for introduction, into commerce, or the offering for sale, sale, transportation, distribution, delivery for shipment or shipment, in com-

merce, 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 such 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.

3. Failing to set forth the generic names of manufactured fibers established in Rule 7 of the Regulations promulgated under the Textile Fiber Products Identification Act, in naming such fibers in required information on stamps, tags, labels or other means of identification attached to wool products.

4. Using the name of a specialty fiber permitted in Section 2(b) of the Wool Products Labeling Act in lieu of the word "wool" in setting forth the required information on labels affixed to wool products unless the fibers so described are entitled to such designation and are present in at least the amount stated.

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.

IN THE MATTER OF

SCOTT FINKS CO., INC., ET AL.

CONSENT ORDER, ETC., IN REGARD TO THE ALLEGED VIOLATION OF
SEC. 2 (c) OF THE CLAYTON ACT

Docket C-1545. Complaint, June 13, 1969—Decision, June 13, 1969

Consent order requiring a Kansas City, Mo., produce wholesaler to cease making unlawful brokerage payments