

Complaint

72 F.T.C.

IN THE MATTER OF

MONSIEUR FOURRURE, INCORPORATED, ET AL.

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

Docket C-1272. Complaint, Nov. 27, 1967—Decision, Nov. 27, 1967

Consent order requiring an Everett, Wash., retail furrier to cease falsely
advertising 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 vested in it by said Acts, the Federal Trade Commission, having reason to believe that Monsieur Fourrure, Incorporated, a corporation, and John Martin Haugen and Robert A. Kilpatrick, 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 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 Monsieur Fourrure, Incorporated, is a corporation organized, existing and doing business under and by virtue of the laws of the State of Washington.

Respondents John Martin Haugen and Robert A. Kilpatrick are officers of the corporate respondent. They formulate, direct and control the acts, practices and policies of the said corporate respondent including those hereinafter set forth.

Respondents are retailers of fur products with their office and principal place of business located at 2421 Hewitt Avenue, Everett, Washington.

PAR. 2. Subsequent to the effective date of the Fur Products Labeling Act on August 9, 1952, respondents have been and are now 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 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 the said Act.

Among and included in the aforesaid advertisements but not limited thereto, were advertisements of respondents which appeared in issues of the Seattle Times, a newspaper published in the city of Seattle, State of Washington and having a wide circulation in Washington and in other States of the United States.

Among such false and deceptive advertisements, but not limited thereto, were advertisements which failed to show the true animal name of the fur used in any such fur product.

PAR. 4. 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 "Mink" when the fur contained in such fur product was, in fact, "Japanese Weasel" an animal formerly set forth in the Fur Products Name Guide as "Japanese Mink."

PAR. 5. 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 and deceptive acts and practices 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 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 Monsieur Fournure, Incorporated, is a corporation organized, existing and doing business under and by virtue of the laws of the State of Washington, with its office and principal place of business located at 2421 Hewitt Avenue, Everett, Washington.

Respondents John Martin Haugen and Robert A. Kilpatrick 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 Monsieur Fournure, Incorporated, a corporation, and its officers, and John Martin Haugen and Robert A. Kilpatrick, 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, 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 falsely or deceptively adver-

tising any fur product 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 any fur product, 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 made of fur from the "Japanese Weasel" formerly set forth in the Fur Products Name Guide as "Japanese Mink" as "Mink."

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

KANEBO U.S.A., INC., ET AL.

CONSENT ORDER, ETC., IN REGARD TO THE ALLEGED VIOLATION OF THE
FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION AND THE FLAMMABLE FABRICS ACTS

Docket C-1273. Complaint, Nov. 27, 1967—Decision, Nov. 27, 1967

Consent order requiring a New York City importer of fabrics to cease importing or selling any fabric so highly flammable as to be dangerous when worn.

COMPLAINT

Pursuant to the provisions of the Federal Trade Commission Act and the Flammable Fabrics Act, and by virtue of the authority vested in it by said Acts, the Federal Trade Commission, having reason to believe that Kanebo U.S.A., Inc., a corporation, and Shichiro Miyazaki, 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 Flammable Fabrics 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 Kanebo U.S.A., Inc., is a corporation organized, existing and doing business under and by virtue of the laws of the State of New York. Shichiro Miyazaki 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 importation, sale and distribution of fabrics, with their office and principal place of business located at 350 Fifth Avenue, New York, New York.

PAR. 2. Respondents, now and for some time last past, have sold and offered for sale, in commerce; have imported into the United States; and have introduced, delivered for introduction, transported and caused to be transported, in commerce; and have transported and caused to be transported for the purpose of sale or delivery after sale, in commerce; as "commerce" is defined in the Flammable Fabrics Act, fabric, as that term is defined therein, which fabric was, under Section 4 of the Flammable Fabrics Act, as amended, so highly flammable as to be dangerous when worn by individuals.

PAR. 3. The aforesaid acts and practices of respondent were and are in violation of the Flammable Fabrics Act and the Rules and Regulations promulgated thereunder, and as such 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 Flammable Fabrics 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 respond-

ents 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 Kanebo U.S.A., 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 350 Fifth Avenue, New York, New York.

Respondent Shichiro Miyazaki 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 Kanebo U.S.A., Inc., a corporation, and its officers, and Shichiro Miyazaki, individually and as an officer of said corporation, and respondents' representatives, agents and employees, directly or through any corporate or other device, do forthwith cease and desist from:

(a) Importing into the United States; or

(b) Selling, offering for sale, introducing, delivering for introduction, transporting, or causing to be transported, in commerce, as "commerce" is defined in the Flammable Fabrics Act; or

(c) Transporting or causing to be transported, for the purpose of sale or delivery after sale in commerce,

any fabric which, under the provisions of Section 4 of said Flammable Fabrics Act, as amended, is so highly flammable as to be dangerous when worn by individuals.

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.

Complaint

72 F.T.C.

IN THE MATTER OF

ATOMIC SPORTSWEAR CO., 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-1274. Complaint, Nov. 27, 1967—Decision, Nov. 27, 1967

Consent order requiring a New York City clothing manufacturer to cease misbranding 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 Atomic Sportswear Co., Inc., a corporation, and Leo Stahl, William Stahl and Elliott Schneiderman, individually and as officers of said corporation, hereinafter referred to as respondents, have violated the provisions of said Acts and 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 Atomic Sportswear Co., Inc., is a corporation organized, existing and doing business under and by virtue of the laws of the State of New York.

Respondents Leo Stahl, William Stahl and Elliott Schneiderman are officers of the corporate respondent. They formulate, direct and control the acts, practices and policies of the said corporate respondent including those hereinafter set forth.

Respondents are manufacturers of wool products with their office and principal place of business located at 650 Sixth Avenue, 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 the 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 Regu-

lations 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 wool product stamped, tagged, labeled, or otherwise identified by respondents as "70% Wool, 15% Fur Fibers, 10% Nylon, 5% Other Fiber," whereas in truth and in fact, said product contained substantially different fibers and amounts 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, was a wool product 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 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% 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.

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 Atomic Sportswear Co., 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 650 Sixth Avenue, New York, New York.

Respondents Leo Stahl, William Stahl and Elliott Schneiderman 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 Atomic Sportswear Co., Inc., a corporation, and its officers, and Leo Stahl, William Stahl and Elliott Schneiderman, 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, 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 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.

Complaint

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

MODERN JUNIORS, 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-1275. Complaint, Nov. 28, 1967—Decision, Nov. 28, 1967

Consent order requiring a New York City women's wear manufacturer to cease misbranding its wool and textile fiber products and furnishing its customers false guaranties.

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 Modern Juniors, Inc., a corporation, and William Paul, 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 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 Modern Juniors, 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 1407 Broadway, New York, New York.

Individual respondent William Paul is an officer of said corporation. He formulates, directs and controls the acts, practices and policies of the said corporation. His office and principal place of business is the same as that of said corporation.

The respondents manufacture and sell, among other items, ladies' wear composed in whole or in part of woolen materials.

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 bench warmers stamped, tagged, labeled, or otherwise identified by respondents as "85% Wool, 15% Other," whereas in truth and in fact, such products contained substantially different fibers and amounts 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, was a wool product, *viz.*, a bench warmer, with no label, and another, also a bench warmer, 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, when said percentage by weight of such fiber was 5% or more; and (5) the aggregate of all other fibers.

PAR. 5. Respondents furnished false guaranties by falsely representing that they had a continuing guaranty on file with the Federal Trade Commission, in violation of Rule 33(d) of the aforesaid Rules and Regulations and Section 9(b) of the Wool Products Labeling Act of 1939.

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 or practices, in commerce, within the intent and meaning of the Federal Trade Commission Act.

PAR. 7. Respondents 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. 8. 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 Regulations promulgated under said Act.

Among such misbranded textile fiber products, but not limited thereto, were textile fiber products with labels which failed to disclose the true generic names of the fibers present.

PAR. 9. Certain of said textile fiber products were misbranded in violation of the Textile Fiber Products Identification Act in that they were not labeled in accordance with the Rules and Regulations promulgated thereunder in that all parts of the required information were not conspicuously and separately set out on the same side of the label in such a manner as to be clearly legible and readily accessible to the prospective purchaser, in violation of Rule 16(b) of the aforesaid Rules and Regulations.

PAR. 10. 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 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 con-

sideration 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 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 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 Modern Juniors, 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 1407 Broadway, New York, New York.

Respondent William Paul 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 Modern Juniors, Inc., a corporation, and its officers, and William Paul, 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 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 product" are defined in the Wool Products Labeling Act of 1939, do forthwith cease and desist from misbranding such products by:

1. Falsely or deceptively stamping, tagging, labeling, or otherwise identifying such products as to the character or amount of constituent fibers included 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 Modern Juniors, Inc., a corporation, and its officers, and William Paul, individually and as an officer of said corporation, and respondents' representatives, agents and employees, directly or through any corporate or other device, do forthwith cease and desist from furnishing a false guaranty that any wool product is not misbranded under the Wool Products Labeling Act of 1939 and the Rules and Regulations promulgated thereunder, when there is reason to believe that such wool product so guaranteed may be introduced, sold, transported or distributed in commerce.

It is further ordered, That respondents Modern Juniors, Inc., a corporation, and its officers, and William Paul, 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, delivery 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:

1. Failing to affix labels to such products showing each element of information required to be disclosed by Section 4(b) of the Textile Fiber Products Identification Act.

2. Failing to set forth all parts of the required information conspicuously and separately on the same side of the label in such a manner as to be clearly legible and readily accessible to the prospective purchaser.

