6/94

OFFICIAL TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS

BEFORE THE

No by

Federal Trade Commission

DOCKET NO.2/5-28

In the Matter of: COOLING OFF PERIOD FOR DOOR-TO-DOOR SALES

Place

Chicago, Illinois

Date

March 23, 1971

Pir Tox

Pages

608-778 plus A

Alderson Reporting Company, Inc.

Official Reporters

300 Seventh St., S. W. Washington, D. C.

NA 8-2345

${\color{red} \textbf{C}} \ {\color{red} \textbf{E}} \ {\color{red} \textbf{R}} \ {\color{red} \textbf{T}} \ {\color{red} \textbf{I}} \ {\color{red} \textbf{F}} \ {\color{red} \textbf{I}} \ {\color{red} \textbf{C}} \ {\color{red} \textbf{A}} \ {\color{red} \textbf{T}} \ {\color{red} \textbf{E}}$

This is to certify that the following pages and related exhibits are a transcript of hearings before the FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION in the matter of:

CASE TITLE - COOLING OFF PERIOD FOR DOOR-TO-DOOR SALES

PLACE - Chicago, Illinois

DATE - March 23, 1971

PAGES NUMBERED 608 to 778 INCLUSIVE,

which were had as therein appears, and that this is the original transcript thereof for the files of the Commission.

Alderson Reporting Co., Inc.
Official Reporter

(Title of Official)

CONTENTS

WITNESSES	STATEMENT	EXAMINATION
Diane McKaig _	611	623
Paul Hamer	627	636
William Lemke	646	653
Lee Ellis	658	660
George P. Graves	661	669
Elizabeth McCarth	y 674	676
Eve Galanter	683	689
Dan Milan	707	719
David Shipman	721	735
Kenan Heise	736	744
Charles Betz	744	760
Alvin Freidman	769	773

EXHIBITS:

None.

	608
1	BEFORE THE
2	FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION
3	
4	COOLING OFF PERIOD FOR DOOR-TO-DOOR SALES:
5	
6	Room 204-A, Everett McKinley Dirksen
7	Building, 219 South Dearborn Street,
	Chicago, Illinois.
9	Tuesday, March 23, 1971.
10	Met, pursuant to adjournment, at 10:00 o'clock a.m.
11	BEFORE:
12	WILLIAM D. DIXON, Hearing Officer.
13	APPEARANCES:
14	HENRY CABELL, Esq., for the Federal Trade Commission
15	JEROME LAMET, Esq., for the Federal Trade Commission
16	
17	KIMBERLEY D. COLEMAN, Community Thrift Clubs,
18	6400 South Stewart, Chicago, Illinois 60637.
19	JOEL GAUM, Community Thrift Club, 6400 South
20	Stewart, Chicago, Illinois 60637.
21	KENAN HEISE, Action Line Column, Chicago Today,
22	441 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Illinois 60657.
23	ALVIN FREIDMAN, Vice-President, Amalgamated Trust
24	& Savings Bank, Chicago, Illinois. 60603.
25	RALPH F. GADICKE, 910 Lake Shore Drive, Chicago,

Illinois 60611.

1 APPEARANCES: (Continued.) 2 ELLEN P. HOWELL, Business Week, 645 North Michigan 3 Avenue, Chicago, Illinois 60611. 4 ORANTE C. RONIONE, 219 Circle Forest Park, 5 Chicago, Illinois. 6 A. CAPRINI, 705 North County Line Road, Hinsdale, 7 Illinois. 8 CHARLES BETZ, THADDEUS SIDELL and B. A. BURNSIDE, 9 Water Conditioning Foundation, 1780 Maple Street, Northfield, 10 Illinois 60093. 11 DANIEL A. MILAN, Wisconsin Department of Agriculture, 12 801 West Badger Road, Madison, Wisconsin 53713. 13 EVE GALANTER, President, Consumer Federation of 14 Illinois, 53 West Jackson, Chicago, Illinois 60615. 15 JOSEPH F. PRELOZNIK, Director, Wisconsin Judicare, 16 520 University Avenue, Madison, Wisconsin 53703. 17 ELIZABETH A. McCARTHY, Federation of Settlements, 18 Hull House Association, 3212 North Broadway, Chicago, 19 Illinois 60657. 20 LYNDON J. WHITLOCK, Trans Union Corporation, 111 West 21 Jackson, Chicago, Illinois 60604. 22 GWEN KESTEL, Fairchild Publications, 105 West 23 Adams, Chicago, Illinois 60603. 24 JACK LEWIN. Home Improvements Magazine, 200 South

Prospect, Park Ridge, Illinois 60068.

1 APPEARANCES: (Continued.) 2 PAUL E. HAMER, Village of Wheeling, 255 West Dundee 3 Road, 60090, Wheeling, Illinois. 4 AUSTIN CONE. 3601 West Devon, Chicago, Illinois 5 60645, Educational Book Club. 6 LEE A. ELLIS, Village Manager, Village of Winnetka, 7 510 Green Bay Road, Winnetka, Illinois 60093. 8 SALLY GOODYEAR, Chicago Tribune. 9 R. LAMET, 6231 North Albany Avenue, Chicago, 10 Illinois 60645. 11 EDWARD H. EULENBERG, Chicago Daily News, 401 North 12 Wabash, Chicago, Illinois 60611. 13 JAMES EGAN, 135 Hawthom, Glencoe, Illinois 60022. 14 DIANNE McKAIG, Michigan Consumers Council, 525 15 Hollister Building, Lansing, Michigan 48933. 16 WILLIAM LEMKE, Professor of Law, 41 East Pearson, 17 Chicago, Illinois 60611, University of Loyola, Loyola Law 18 School. 19 GEORGE P. GRAVES. Chief. Western Springs Police, 20: 740 Hill Grove Avenue, Western Springs, Illinois. 21 J. P. SMOKEY, Community Thrift Clubs, 6410 South 22 Stewart, Chicago, Illinois 60637. 23 EDWARD McCULLOUGH, Law Student, Loyola University, 24 649 West Oakdale, Chicago, Illinois 60657.

25

CO-02

PROCEEDINGS

HEARING OFFICER DIXON: May we come to order, please.

This is a continuation of a public hearing relating
to the proposed trade regulation rule concerning a Cooling
off-Period for Door-to-Door Sales, which adjourned yesterday.

My name is William D. Dixon. I am Assistant Director for Industry Guidance in the Commission's Bureau of Consumer Protection.

To my right is Mr. Henry Cabell, the attorney in the Division of Industry Guidance who has been responsible for developing this Rule and these proceedings.

The gentleman to my left is Mr. Jerome Lamet, the attorney in the Chicago Office who has been in charge of developing these hearings.

Our first witness this morning is Diane McKaig. Whereupon,

DIANE McKAIG,

was called as a witness, was examined and testified as follows:

DIRECT EXAMINATION

MRS McKAIG: My name is Diane McKaig. I am from the Consumer Council in Michigan which was established by legislation to protect the individual consumer.

We have had a comprehensive program for only a year and in that time we have dealt with about 800 cases.

It is primarily from that viewpoint we are represented here today.

I am pleased the Federal Trade Commission is taking up the subject of door-to-door sales since it has been a source of never-ending trouble to both the consumers and the Consumer Protection Agency.

In Michigan it seems as soon as we take care of a certain abuse on an individual grievance, six others popup to take its place.

We think one of the problems with door-to-door sales is it is based on the precepts something is sold that the buyer doesn't want.

Door-to-door vendors can -- so that he can sell his product, he must create the customer's supposed need and desire for the product. To accomplish this, the vendor often resorts to a variety of questionable tactics including high-pressure, enticement gimmicks, and outright misrepresentation. And, since many door-to-door sales involve the sale of goods on a hit-and-run, future delivery basis, the industry lends itself to the practice of unloading inferior merchandise at inflated costs.

Inasmuch as door-to-door selling does lend itself to abuses, and since there is no effective way to police every doorstep, obviously the only way to eliminate the problem is to phohibit door-to-door selling altogether.

Many localities have attempted in effect to do just that, by a variety of local regulations. But since there are a few businesses that have adapted the door-to-door sales technique to the legitimate marketing of their product, we face the problem of how effectively to regulate out the undesirables while not unduly hindering the legitimate. Considering the scope of the problem, this is no small order.

Through our complaint service, the Michigan

Consumers Council has had contact with many of the problems

which consumers experience with door-to-door sales.

Out of 800 complaints addressed to our office in the past year, 68 or eight and a half percent were from consumers with problems resulting from door-to-door sales.

We do not suggest that these figures represent a statistically reliable sampling. However, they are sufficient to convince us that abuses of door-to-door selling comprise a significant portion of current consumer problems. And since only a fraction of the consumer grievances in Michigan come to our attention, we anticipate that we have seen merely the tip of the iceberg.

We find that a multitude of things in the way of goods and services are sold door-to-door.

In our complaint files, magazine subscriptions and encyclopedias head the list.

The list also includes vacuum cleaners, sewing machines, cookware and cutlery, home improvement jobs, home fire alarm systems, discount buying services, photographic services, greeting cards, and cemetery plots.

But more important than identifying goods and services sold, our experience with consumers has served clearly to identify the specific types of abuses inherent to door-to-door selling. We find that these fall mainly into five categories.

High Pressure: Probably the most common and widely recognized abuse, is the blitzkrieg technique.

High pressure, in one degree or another, is an element in virtually all of our direct selling complaint cases.

One consumer after another reports that they have been pressured into signing a sales contract by a barrage of fast talk, colorful brochures, and the sheer staying power of the salesman, who just wouldn't leave until a sale was made.

Essentially, the high pressure salesman is trading on the inherent good manners of people. It's always embarrassing to ask someone to leave your house. Knowing this a door-to-door salesman will stay, and stay, and stay until he thoroughly wears down a consumer's sales resistance.

Also the high pressure salesman is taking advantage of what amounts to a basic inequity of bargaining between himself and the consumer.

A good salesman is highly trained in how to "make the kill." He may deliver his sales pitch a hundred times a week; so he knows all the angles.

The consumer, of course, is a novice and is certainly not on equal bargaining ground with the experienced salesman. There is an inherent unconscionability about such sales contracts issuing from such circumstances.

By the way of example, a complainant from Hamilton, Michigan told us of a cookware salesman who called when his daughter was the only one home. This salesman high-pressured the girl, who was a minor, into a sale and even convinced her that it was all right to sign her father's name to the contract.

A consumer from Onstead, Michigan, told us of his experience with another type of high-pressure tactic, the scare tactic. Frightened by the salesman's story and pictures of small children burning to death in their beds, the consumer purchased an expensive home fire alarm system. After the system was installed the consumer discovered that it did not work as represented.

Another offense is blatant misrepresentation by the salesman. This, of course, is verbal misrepresentation and hard to prove. Even though the consumer has been lied to verbally, he is stuck with a piece of paper and bound by the legal implications thereof.

A consumer in Dearborn, Michigan, was told that she was purchasing a well-known brand of cookware. It actually turned out to be a different, lesser-known brand.

In this same case, the price in the contract was greater than that verbally quoted to the consumer, and the contract itself was found by the Michigan Attorney General's office to be in violation of the State Retail Installment Sales Act on three counts.

Misrepresentation of purchase price is common in magazine subscription sales. A customer may be told verbally that he will be paying so much a month for his subscription, while the actual contract requires that he pay that same amount on a weekly basis.

We have received a number of complaints against a company for whom this sort of a thing is apparently standard operating procedure.

Misrepresentation of course can be of a much more subtle shade, and as such sometimes all the more devastating.

The encyclopedia salesman is usually an artist at subtle, psychologically aimed misrepresentation.

The consumer is led to believe that the presence of a set of reference books in his home is going to enhance his children's chances of performing well in school and thus, by implication, advancing into college and into well paying careers. This is a tremendous play on family ego and on a

parent's regard for the welfare of his children.

As to inferior merchandise, remember that merchandise sold door-to-door is very often purchased sight-unseen. When the goods are ultimately delivered, it is not uncommon for them to be much less than anticipated: of inferior quality, sometimes even defective.

A consumer in Sumner, Michigan, purchased a sewing machine from a door-to-door salesman. Shortly after delivery the machine stopped working. The consumer was unable to obtain the promised warranty service.

She could not locate the salesman who had sold the machine to her, and the manufacturer had gone out of business. Because it was an off-brand machine, she had a difficult time finding anyone who would service it.

Generally speaking, we have found that high quality, brand name merchandise is seldom peddled door-to-door, and that the warranty on inferior, off-brand merchandise is usually meaningless.

Overpricing -- merchandise sold door-to-door is often grossly overpriced. The lady who bought the sewing machine referred to above paid \$280. Comparative shopping could have produced a comparable, name-brand machine for half that price.

Often a consumer pays an exorbitant price for a product or service, which he subsequently learns is useless

2 3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

to him. Many an encyclopedia set just gathers dust.

A Lansing complainant reports that he paid \$500 for a membership in a discount buying club which purportedly would have enabled him to purchase all sorts of durable goods at great savings.

Of course, many name-brand items which are fair traded are not available to him through this service. As it turned out, he didn't have occasion to use this service, certainly not to the extent of making up his \$500 membership fee.

Another consumer paid \$300 for an anti-bed-wetting device for her child. The device turned out to be totally useless. It was supposed to shock the child out of his habit. It shocked him all right, so traumatically that the habit is worse than ever.

Gimmicks -- the last abuse we mention is the use of gimmicks to induce the customer to listen to the sales pitch or to clinch the sale.

A common door opening gimmick is "you have been specially selected to participate in our program." -

And we are all familiar with the old encyclopedia salesman's gimmick, "we will place this set of books in your home free of charge, if you permit us to use your name in our advertising.

All you must do is pay a modest charge for the

annual yearbook to keep your set up to date." This "modest charge" generally amounts to \$500 on a three-year contract, or the usual price of the set.

Then, of course, there is the referral sales gimmick which, though illegal in many localities, is still in use,

These, then, are some of the offensive practices of door-to-door selling.

As a remedy, the Commission has proposed a rule providing a three-day cooling-off-period. The rule stipulates that the purchaser has the right to cancel the transaction if he notifies the seller of this desire within three business days of the date of the transaction.

Also, it is required that the consumer be informed by the seller, both verbally and in writing, of this right.

We do not think that this rule is strong enough.

As we mentioned, 68 of our consumer complaints involved door-to-door selling.

We looked at each file in relation to the Commission's proposed rule, and we noted that in only seven of those 68 cases, had the consumer himself petitioned the seller within three business days for rescission of the transaction, always without result.

We conclude that the proposed rule would have helped out only seven of these people.

It would also be reasonable to assume that a notice

of the cooling off period, printed in the contract, might prompt reconsideration of the part some additional consumers who wouldn't otherwise have petitioned for a rescission within three days.

Some consumers could have been prompted to realize that they had in fact been high-pressured into purchases they never would have made on their own. Thus, a few more people could benefit.

But remember that the effectiveness of the proposed rule depends entirely upon the very indefinite expectation that the consumer is going to absorb and fully comprehend the rule, and is going to exercise an expected degree of vigilance and initiative.

This is a kind of a negative option procedure - contact us if you don't want the product or service. And such negative option devices, as the Commission itself has pointed out in the past, tend to favor the seller.

It has been our experience that many consumers do not comprehend sanctions available to them, even when those sanctions are spelled out to them in writing.

Consumers in Michigan still sign blank contracts which bear the required clause "do not sign this contract before you read it or if it contains blank spaces."

Remember also, that when a consumer puts his name on a contract he hasusually been the subject of a rather

thorough "sell job."

Ĭ

He has probably convinced himself that he really needs what he is buying and that he has made a smart deal.

Presumably he has signed the contract after reading it thoroughly, including any cooling off period clause.

We question whether he is going to be inclined, within three days, to admit that he has made a mistake.

Then, of course, if he signed without reading the contract, the chances are that he won't read it later. The salesman may, or may not, orally inform him of his rights to cancel.

We realize that the Commission does not suppose that its proposed rule would prove an answer to all door-to-door sales problems. However, while the proposed rule is a move in the direction of a solution, we would recommend a bolder move.

For example, we mentioned that the proposed rule is a negative option favoring the seller, and suggest that the Commission consider a rule stipulating a positive option; in other words, that unless the purchaser sends the seller written verification of the sale, the transaction is void.

Granting the purchaser three days time for consideration and positive verification would circumvent the hinderances of negative option.

Failing this, another alternative might be considered.

Many consumers realize no apparent cause to cancel a door-to-door sale until after delivery of the merchandise.

If the merchandise is less than anticipated, is defective, or incomplete, then the consumer realizes a very real cause to cancel. But if three days have gone by since the original transaction, this consumer is going to find cancellation very difficult.

We submit, therefore, that consideration might be given to a rule that affords cancellation within three business days or three days after actual receipt of the goods.

In summary, as we stated at the outset, the many problems which consumers experience with door-to-door selling certainly do warrant the attention of this Commission.

We support the intention of the Commission's proposed cooling off period rule and recognize that it would assuredly be a benefit to some consumers.

But we are hopeful that we have spoken as well to the limited effectiveness of the proposed rule, suggesting alternatives which would allow for positive verification by the purchaser, or cancellation after receipt of goods.

Again, we have appreciated this opportunity to appear and speak on this issue.

HEARING OFFICER DIXON: Thank you, Mrs. McKaig.
Mr. Cabell.

EXAMINATION

MR. CABELL: Mrs. McKaig, with regard to your suggestion that the cooling off period commence upon delivery of the goods, have you considered the problem when a consumer buys a particular service such as the installation of a fence or the installation of some other product in the home.

MRS. MC KAIG: When the consumer makes a positive act, he goes downtown or calls this person who is going to install the fence, this person needs the fence. He wants to buy a fence and says, "Please come down and talk to me about putting in a fence," that is completely different from the door-to-door home improvement man that comes by and says, "Gee, your fence is falling down. Let me sell you one."

It depends upon who initiates the transaction.

MR. CABELL: Well, in that instance how would you work this cooling off period?

MRS. MC KAIG: I think the postive act of the consumer would take care of it. The law could be written so the consumer asked for the purchase rather than being asked to sell would eliminate most of the problem.

MR. CABELL: Has your state given any consideration to banning door-to-door selling altogether?

MRS. MC KAIG: Actually we are doing quite a bit

about it. We have a bill pending to ban deceptive practices

Any deceptive practice would make a contract cancelable.

MR. CABELL: We have a provision in this proposed rule which provides in substance that the salesman must identify himself and state the purpose of the contact to make a sale. He is supposed to do this initially.

Now, a number of industry members have recommended as alternative to this that the salesman simply be forbidden to use any sort of deception to gain entrance into the home.

Do you care to commend on that?

MRS. MC KAIG: I think it would be useful to the person who comes to the door to know who they are dealing with.

If we have a salesman selling X product, that should be stated. But I am not too hopeful that would be easy to police.

We find so many misrepresentations: two weeks after the fact, we can't reconstruct it. One man says something and another man says something else. It is one word against another.

MR. CABELL: Do you be lieve the oral cancellation should be retained in the rule?

MRS. MC KAIG: I would retain it but it would be helpful to follow up with a written cancellation. We can't prove the oral cancellation.

We have better luck with things in writing.

MR. CABELL: Thank you.

HEARING OFFICER DIXON: Mr. Lamet.

MR. LAMET: Yes. Let me ask, under your suggestion the rule be reversed from a negative to a positive, would it be your suggestion there would be a three day period; that within three days unless the consumer says, "I want the goods," that the sale is automatically cancelled.

MRS. MC KAIG: That is right.

MR. LAMET: You are proposing.

MRS. MC KAIG: It is.

MR. LAMET: Would you say that three-day period is enough time or should it be a different period?

MRS. MC KAIG: Three days effective would be all right, as long as you make it a positive verification be needed.

MR. LAMET: Going somewhat into what Mr. Cabell was saying concerning the question of delivery, we have had other witnesses, incidentally, testify in a similar vain. They feel the cooling off period ought to start with the delivery of the goods.

Would you think it would be possible to exempt services and say only those things that actually involve the sale of merchandise and would the three-day cooling off period begin at the time of delivery with regard to

services, the alternative would be at the time of the contract, would that be feasible?

MRS. MC KAIG: That would be feasible but it might be better to provide, except in cases of emergency, the fence would be put up three days after the contract was entered into. In that event you would still have full time for positive verification.

I think it is a completely situation where the consumer calls the plumbing company and says, "My bathtub is leaking," because he initiated that he wants it.

No one is trying to put in a new bathtub.

MR. LAMET: That means it doesn't bother you that even in the case of the fence, even though he has started to put up the fence or has put up the fence, the three day cancellation period is still in existence, it is your testimony, apparently what you are saying is the seller has come to the door of the consumer and therefore, he must trade at his jeopardy in a sense.

MRS. MC KAIG: Or wait three days to put up his fence.

MR. LAMET: Have you had an opportunity to look at the arbitration provision (c)?

Do you have any comment on the provision in the rule which calls for arbitration at the home of the consumer for any of the disputes?

We had

1 MRS. MC KAIG: We have nothing similar. 2 nothing from our files to bring to that. 3 MR. LAMET: Do you have a cooling off period in 4 the State of Michigan? 5 MRS. MC KAIG: No. 6 MR. LAMET: Thank you, Mrs. McKaig. 7 HEARING OFFICER DIXON: Thank you, Mrs. McKaig. 8 (Witness excused.) 9 HEARING OFFICER DIXON: Next is Mr. Paul Hamer. 10 Whereupon, 11 PAUL HAMER, 12 was called as a witness, was examined and testified as 13 follows: 14 DIRECT EXAMINATION 15 MR. HAMER: Good morning, Mr. Chairman. 16 My name is Paul Hamer, H-a-m-e-r. 17 I am the Village Attorney for the Village of 18 Wheeling, Illinois. I have been authorized by the 19 corporate authorities of the Village of Wheeling to 20 appear here today and testify in favor of the proposed 21 bi11. 22 The Village of Wheeling is a fast-growing suburb 23 of northwest Cook County which has been plagued by door-24 to-door sales solicitors. 25

We enacted three ordinances in the Village of

Wheeling, that being a licensing ordinance, second, an unwanted or uninvited solicitation ordinance identical to that upheld by the United States Supreme Court in the case of Biard versus City of Alexandria.

We enacted an ordinance which prohibited trespassing on private property.

The validity of all these ordinances were all challenged by a door-to-door solicitor and the Appellate Court there held that the Village of Wheeling was without the statutory authority to enact all three ordinances.

Since that time the Illinois Legislature seen fit to permit the municipalities to enact a trespass ordinance and to date this ordinance has remained unchallenged.

However, we are still plagued by these hit and run mass solicitations.

The previous witness testified as to the manner in which this is done. They will obtain a group of 20 or 30 young people and they will besiege a community en masse for a two to three day period.

I would like to give some examples of the door-to-door solicitors which were brought to my attention during the course of examining the citizens of the Village of Wheeling in preparation for the trial of the case I previously mentioned.

In one case the gentleman was at home preparatory

to bringing his wife home from the hospital. There was a knock on the front door and a representative of a solicitor was there from the baby studio wanting to take pictures of the newborn baby.

I don't know where they got their information from, but at any rate, the baby was stillborn. It was dead.

Can you imagine the reaction of the housewife had she been home just fresh from the hospital with this memory still fresh in her mind of the baby dying, being confronted with a baby photographer to take a picture of the newborn

babe.

The gentleman testified he did all within his power to keep from killing the man right on the spot.

Another instance, a man was sleeping. He worked on the night shift on one of the railroads. He testified the doorbell rang at his house for several times. After an extensive length of time he finally got up, went to the door and it was an encylcopedia salesman.

He advised the encyclopedia salesman he had already purchased a set through his weekly purchases at one of the chain food stores.

The door-to-door solicitor advised him that that set was a cheap set, and it wasn't worth the money he put into it and he should buy his set costing several hundred dollars.

Now, the Chief of Police of the Village of Wheeling testified at the hearing that many people posed as solicitors to gain entrance to a house to commit crimes, or in one case, he testified they posed as solicitors to plan proposed crimes to get the layout of the particular apartment.

Under our licensing ordinance we introduced into evidence the fact we had rejected over 16 persons with known criminal records. Some of the crimes were deviant sexual conduct, indecent liberties, confidence games, contributing to the delinquency of minors, burglary, fraud, larceny, pimping, breaking and entering.

One salesman had 32 convictions of various offenses yet, the courts here in Illinois have held that the municipalities do not have the right to license door-to-door solicitors.

Now, all of these citizens who testified at this hearing testified they were either performing household chores or entertaining friends or neighbors.

In one particular case the lady was caring for a sick child at the time of the interruption. They had been annoyed or disturbed by this interruption.

The local school superintendent also testified he had been besieged by calls relative to this purported survey that was taking place.

In fact, they wrote a letter which we introduced

in evidence advising the partents of the school children in our community that no survey was in fact being taken and that the school district had not approved these particular encyclopedia.

Now, the technique that was used by these door-to-door solicitors in that case worked as follows. The gentleman testified he had what is known in the trade as the reverse directories put out by one of the phone companies which shows the address of each house on the street by street name and the owner or person who resides at the house.

The salesman, before he went to that door knew the name of the person who lived at the house according to this reverse directory. He had in his hand a little pad with that name and that address written on there before hand. He would approach the door and say, ring the bell and address the occupant by his or her name.

He states their name and for the most part a lot of these sales persons were in fact school teachers. If they were a school teacher they would say, "I am a school teacher in district 109." They wouldn't identify the area other than that particular school district or some district. Most people don't know what school district they live in. They would assume naturally, that it was a school teacher in their district.

He said he was calling on the parents of school

of her children and what grade they are in and whether or not she belonged to the PTA and whether or not her husband is working.

The salesman then inquired if the person is a teacher or whether she has any knowledge of the new teaching methods that are being used in the school or whether she knows of the new materials being used in the schools.

The answers to these questions are written down by the salesman who is taking these notes. Then once inside the down the salesman explained how his material fit in the school curriculum and how the material would aid the child in school.

If, for example, a child is at home he would ask the child to read from a sample book and then he goes into his regular sales pitch.

In summary, relative to this technique the testimony of the citizens was that the salesman had led them to believe that they were in fact conducting a survey on behalf of the local school.

This is why it was necessary for the school superintendent to send out these notices to the parents saying there was not in fact a survey being made and too, the representation was made by one of the sales persons the local school district had approved this.

They had approved the set of encyclopedias. And the superintendent had to overcome that allegation.

Now, your federal proposed law will not prohibit this door-to-door solicitation, but we believe that it will reduce the possible fraud.

The Village of Wheeling was plagued by a series of vacuum cleaner salesmen prior to this encyclopedia incident. In that particular case this was the referral sales gimmick by which if you purchased a central vacuum cleaner system — they had a central vacuum cleaner with pipe running underneath the house into the house walls, you simply took your hose around and plugged in each room like you would an electrical vacuum cleaner. This was the product.

I think that the product was around -- cost \$900. You paid the \$900 and then you gave them a list of some 25 persons. Then, if one of those persons purchased the central vacuum cleaner system you got \$25 back on your purchase price.

As I say, the total contract was priced between \$800 and \$900. The actual same product could be bought in a retail store for \$195.

Ultimately we got a ruling here in Illinois on a consent decree on a suit brought by the attorney general to eliminate that referral sales gimmick.

Another example of the type of fraud I think your

proposed law would aid in reducing is the magazine salesman.

We had one lady testify she did not testify at the hearing, but she was one of the witnesses examined prior to the hearing.

She testified that the magazine salesman had come to the door in the morning and she had refused to take the subscriptions. The salesman said, "Well, in the afternoon my supervisor will be by to see if I have treated you fairly." She had refused the sale in the morning.

The so-called supervisor came by in the afternoon and put the high pressure on her. He indicated she would receive the subscriptions free. All that she had to do was pay this handling charge.

So, she signed the contract and he said, "Well, you have to give me \$3.95." She said, "Well, I haven't got \$3.95." So, he said, "Well, do you have \$3.95 worth of S & H Green Stamps? I will take the green stamps."

Now, perhaps the most enlightening discussion heard on door-to-door solicitations is to be found in the Opinion in Moyne versus Burrough, New Jersey 528, reported at 154, Atlantic, Second, page nine which is a 1959 decision of the New Jersey Supreme Court.

At page 17 it states and I will quote, "There can be no doubt the business of soliciting and canvassing is

a proper subject for regulation under the police powers as is peddling and has been so considered for generations.

The way in which the business is necessarily conducted open the way for fraud, deceit and dishonest dealing by the unscrupulous, even though by only a minority of those engaged in it with redress difficult or practically impossible. The solicitor is very frequently a stranger and quickly gone from the locality.

The resort may also easily be had in the business by the criminally minded for the purpose of obtaining admittance to private homes and furtherance of the present and future unlawful object."

We have carefully reviewed the proposed regulations and believe them to be workwhile regulations.

We suggest three changes, however,

We would suggest the amount be reduced to \$5 and we believe that this will cover practically all of the purchases.

We would suggest the cooling off period be increased to five working days, on the grounds, for the most part, the husbands are now home. They may be travelling. They may be out of town for one reason or another. They may want to cancel the contract for one reason or another, if the wife is easily swayed.

So, we would suggest it be increased to five working

days.

We also feel the positive option which the prior witness had talked to is a possible alternative which should be explored by the Commission, primarily we feel because there is no meeting of the minds that a contract is really meant to be entered into at that time in the situation where you are almost in a hot box under high pressure to purchase this, whereby, maybe in the calm reflection, and after much discussion with the housewife, the husband is rather irate at this stage of the game.

Perhaps that positive option would be an additional solution to this.

In conclusion, we are of the opinion the enactment of a federal rule would materially aid in reducing fraud in door-to-door sales because of the fact we believe it would deter the fly-by-night operators while not interfering with the legitimate operations of the door-to-door salesman who may be authorized by the home owner to call upon them in their home.

Thank you.

HEARING OFFICER DIXON: Thank you, Mr. Hamer.

Mr. Cabell.

EXAMINATION

MR. CABELL: Mr. Hamer, could you tell us a little more about the Village of Wheeling. What is the economic

status of it?

MR. HAMER: It is middle class income people. We have a population of about 15,000. It is still growing. Most of our problems were in the early stages when there were large developments coming in, the new homes going up would be besieged by armies of salesmen in all types of rug salesmen, vacuum cleaner salesmen and this type.

MR. CABELL: Do you have any idea of the average income range of your people?

MR. HAMER: I would say it would be \$9,000 to \$12,000 a year.

MR. CABELL: What does this trespass ordinance do you passed. It is still in effect?

MR HAMER: Yes.

We enacted the identical law which is under the Criminal Statutes here in Illinois.

If the property is posted at the main entrance to the property no solicitor can go on. Once the solicitor goes on the property, if he is asked to leave either orally or in writing and refuses to leave, then he violates our local ordinance.

I was also Chairman of the Committee here in Illinois which prepared another type of ordinance which was in effect by the City of Naperville. They have a combination licensing and implied invitation. I forget

exactly how it works, but I think if you have for example, a certain type of colored decal on your door or your window, then you are inviting solicitors to come to your house. They can come to your house if they are registered with the City of Naperville.

When another color decal is shown then you cannot come on the property. We are advised that has worked very well.

We have enacted the model ordinances and submitted them to the Illinois Municipal League. We have given the municipalities the option of selecting one or the other.

I do not know how many municipalities here in Illinois have chosen to enact either one or the other of those.

MR. CABELL: Have you invoked your trespass ordinance?

MR. HAMER: So far it has not been challenged. We give them the warning. We go out there and say, "Here is a copy of our Ordinance." For the most part they will leave the village.

We have been besieged here in the last two months by the large groups decending on the village at night. By the time our police officers can get out there they have usually gone from the community.

They strike in sereval hours it seems by the time

you get there and trace them down they are usually gone.
But so far no one has challenged the validity of our ordinance.

We have not made any arrests under our ordinance.
We have found it to be effective, merely by serving the warnings.

MR. CABELL: What if any effect has the Illinois cooling off law had on the Village?

MR. HAMER: Not too much because it is a high amount. Attempts were made to reduce it. I believe it is \$50 in Illinois, the amount.

MR. CABELL: Do the people know about it?

MR. HAMER: Yes.

We try to advise them. Even in our own ordinances we found the people reluctant to file charges.

We had one incident where a woman was raped over in Arlington Heights. She refused to even bring charges against the door-to-door solicitor.

People do not want to get involved in this thing.

We must have talked to 150 witnesses we screened, citizens in Wheeling preparatory to testifying in this case. We interviewed them.

We were narrowed down by the court order to introducing only witnesses who could identify t hat particular salesman or that particular product.

So, these people would come up and would be interviewed in the Village Hall; but they would not want to go down to court.

We found we had to subpoen athe witnesses to bring them into court to enforce a prior ordinance.

MR. CABELL: If the people are not using the Illinois cooling off law, why do you think they will use the Federal Trade Regulation Rule?

MR. HAMER: One of the problems has been in the enforcement of the Illinois law is that the companies claim they are protected under the Federal Constitution by virtue of the interstate commerce clause.

In certain cases the Supreme Court has held this would be an unlawful interference with interstate commerce traffic.

That is why I feel the Federal Law would obviate that defense, if you would. I think companies would respect it.

MR. CABELL: Did your ordinances pretty much bann door-to-door selling?

MR. HAMER: No, the licensing ordinance, there is a rental fee for the identification badge. There was an initial licensing fee such as \$1 a day rental for the badge.

The main objection was the fingerprinting. These people did not want to be fingerprinted. Many felt it was

offensive to them. The fingerprinting was the stickler in the licensing ordinance.

This is how, for example, we picked up all of these offenses. We would send the fingerprints into the FBI and get these reports.

We tried to set up guidelines with the door-to-door solicitors here in Illinois at the last session of the legislature or the session before, one or the other; we got no where.

One group would say most of their solicitors are women and they don't want to go and be fingerprinted.

We just got absolutely no where trying to get legislation through here in Illinois dealing with the licensing of door-to-door solicitors.

Most of the people in the industry themselves could not agree on a bill. We had many meetings with the industry and could not agree on a bill.

Finally, as a result, we went to the trespass ordinance. The home owner may by posting his property indicate if he wants a solicitor to come on the premises or not.

MR. CABELL: On the uninvited situation we have evidence on our record the door-to-door sellers employ all sorts of means to pave the way for the seller into the home.

Suppose they run an advertisement in the Sunday

Supplement -- get a free estimate for carpets and drapes.

So, the consumer calls and the door-to-door salesman comes.

Now, in that situation would you exclude the transaction from the cooling off regulation?

MR. HAMER: No, I think it should still be subject to that because -- I don't know if any of you gentlemen have been subjected to the pressure tactics, but anybody who has would feel that it is just high pressure sales tactics.

I still think in that stage of the game there has been no meeting of the minds on a contract. I think this is why the cooling off period is necessary to reflect on it. Perhaps one or the other of the spouses makes the decision without consulting the other one. The other one comes home, then I feel they should have the right to rescind under the cooling off period.

MR. CABELL: While your trespass ordinance would not apply in the situation that you have just mentioned, you still have the cooling off period applicable to any sale made in the home.

MR. HAMER: Correct.

MR. CABELL: With regard to reducing this limit I believe our rule has \$10 and the Illinois law, \$50; the industry has recommended \$25.

Now, our problem here is the routine door-to-door salesman, cosmetics, Fuller Brushes, dry cleaning, dairyman, perhaps the newspaper going out as the subscription prices go up, how do you exclude this sort of a transaction if you lower the limit to \$5?

MR. HAMER: Well, I think my suggestion to lower the limit to \$5 to cover the transactions you speak of; the Fuller Brush, the Avon Products. For the most part they would be exempt under the \$10 limit.

We won the case against Fuller Brush. They refused to take it up on appeal. I think the purchases in those instances were under \$10 for the most part; a single brush or toothbrush or something of that nature.

MR. CABELL: You have had consumer complaints on that type of action?

MR. HAMER: Yes.

They felt it was an invasion of their right of privacy in their own home. They were annoyed and disturbed. They felt this was a nuisance.

As I say, we tried to emphasize the point it was a nuisance. It annoyed or disturbed them. They were performing household chores of some kind.

Whereas, if you invite a salesman into your home and they say they will be there at 7:00 o'clock, you are prepared and get the house cleaned up. You have set aside

12:

most of the household chores for the purpose of talking to the salesman. These were interruptions.

MR. CABELL: Thank you.

HEARING OFFICER DIXON: Mr. Lamet.

MR. LAMET: With regard to the -- following up what Mr. Cabell was talking about; have you had the problem with regard to newspaper solicitation or some complaints for fund-raising or otherwise, newspapers have used the gimmick of soliciting newspaper subscriptions for a short period of time.

Has that been a problem?

MR. HAMER: Yes.

The Chicago American challenged our ordinance alleging freedom of the press as their right to subject the home owner to the high pressure sales techniques for the purpose of purchasing subscriptions to their papers.

I feel after reading the Briard decision they
may have a protected right, a constitutional right. It
is hard for me to visualize it but in the Briard decision
which involved a magazine salesman, this was a little
different situation. They weren't advocating a cause
or anything like that whereas, and this is the argument
that we used in the encyclopedia cases, the encyclopedia
is not advocating a cause and probably not protected because
it is printed material. They have this commercial aspect.

The newspapers are borderline situation by virtue 1 of their editorial. We did not challenge or take it up 2 3 on appeal. MR. LAMET: Were the sales under \$5? 4 5 MR. HAMER: Yes. 6 We heard testimony yesterday with regard to in-7 cluding in this three day cooling off period the time 8 it starts would be the time of the delivery. 9 Would you like to make any comment on that? 10 MR. HAMER: I think it would probably be a good 11 thing to include it from the date of delivery. 12 Relative to the fence you talked about earlier 13 I think the consumer would be protected by the implied 14 warranty that that is going to be fit for that particular 15 use. 16 Where the prior witnesses testified the goods 17 were different than the sample it is going to be very 18 difficult to prove, although I think the arbitration 19 clause might be good in that situation. 20 On the large items then I think the implied 21 warranty may be the answer to the situation. 22 MR. LAMET: Thank you, Mr. Hamer. 23 HEARING OFFICER DIXON: Thank you, Mr. Hamer. 24 (Witness excused.) 25 HEARING OFFICER DIXON: Next is Mr. William Lemke,

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

12

13

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

2 Whereupon, 3 WILLIAM F. LEMKE, was called as a witness, was examined and testified as follows: DIRECT EXAMINATION MR. LEMKE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Cabell and Mr. Lamet. First, I would like to take this opportunity to thank you for inviting me to testify regarding this trade 11 regulation rule. Secondly, I would like to commend the Federal Trade Commission on coming out to the field to get the views of members of the public who are unable or unwilling to make the usual journey to Washington, D. C, for the purpose of having their views expressed in a situation of this type. We certainly hope that this will be a regular practice by the Commission. We feel it is a very desirable and progressive step. I have not identified myself. I am William F. Lemke. I am an attorney and also, at this time, a Professor of Law at Loyola University School of Law. I appear expressing my own viewpoints. I cannot purport to express or represent the viewpoints of Loyola

Professor of Law, Loyola Law School.

2

3 4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

University School of Law.

Prior to becoming a Professor of Law I was an employee of the Federal Trade Commission for a good many So, most of my career was spent in the field.

Therefore, in the course of this career I feel I have had the opportunity to contact and meet probably meet as many consumers who were shall we say, the victims of house-to-house selling, as I suspect any employee of the Federal Trade Commission.

I have seen most of the areas as the Commission has had experience in the field of house-to-house selling.

I would not at this time purport to relate specific incidents or particular experiences other than to say that what had struck me throughout that period of time with the Federal Trade Commission with the contacts that I had with with the consumers themselves was that it was rather striking to see that a non-complaining witness was often the one who was most thoroughly deceived by deceptive practices.

Many times the witness who would never complain to anyone was really the person who was most generally affected.

I recall one instance where an encyclopedia blitz had hit the City of Fort Wayne, Indiana. It was rather interesting to observe that in going through whole

communities of very definitely sub-level housing, people who obviously did not have the means to buy the bare necessities of life had been sold a beautiful set of books which in most cases had never been opened.

Therefore, the Commission itself is well aware of situation and it has been well covered by other witnesses.

What I would like to do is first of all state I heartily endorse the cooling off period trade regulation rule. I think it is a very desirable one.

I would like to comment just briefly on what I might say here today about the rule itself leaving the necessity for the rule to have been demonstrated by other witnesses who have already testified.

First of all, the definition of consumer goods.

I wonder if this might not be expanded somewhat. It would appear to me there is at least a good possibility the definition as currently expressed would not cover some situations as the vending machine type of franchise sale, the sale of Chinchilla rabbits who can get richaquick by raising these.

These are old transactions and types of operations which often times involve deception of the consumer and often times may be transactions the consumer under a mature consideration would be very likely to change his mind and as to which he may very well wish to exercise

the opportunity to rescind.

.7

The other point and definition I note the definition of consumer goods and services reads - "goods or services purchased primarily for personal, family or household use, and not for resale or for use or consumption in a trade or business."

I again wonder if this definition of consumer goods and services will cover such situations as the home siding and home improvement situation where the products are purchased for family or home improvement, but perhaps there might be some question as to whether this is for household or family use.

I merely suggest these points as possible matters to be considered in the wording of this part of the rule.

Unlike the prior witnesses who have testified here this morning, I find the \$10 limit, in my-view, is perhaps too low rather than too high.

I am concerned in this respect that the Commission may find a great deal of trivia involved and it would be based again, primarily on my own experience.

It would be my observation the situations involving the major deception, major desire to reconsider in the consumer home field, home sale field involve items generally somewhat more than \$10.

Therefore, again it would appear to me to perhaps

to have a strong and meaningful trade regulation rule it would be desirable to set this figure at a slightly higher level.

I note the exemption or the exception to a door-to-door sale made in the presence of the buyer's attorney. Of Course, I wonder if this situation would be very likely to exist and whether this exception is particularly necessary.

In relation to the notice to the buyer which is covered in paragraph 1 of the trade regulation. Paragraph 1(a) of the Trade Regulation Rule, I notice the buyer is advised he may cancel this contract or sale for any reason at any time.

I would suggest here perhaps the words "for any reason" might be stricken from the rule. It might appear to me this reason for a reason being required by the buyer is not really implicit in the rule. The buyer is supposed to have a cooling off period. I am wondering whether some buyers may feel they must come up with a good reason for cancelling of a contract and thereby through their own inhibitions tend not to cancel or perhaps through the persuasion of an artful seller the buyer will be persuaded not to exercise this option which the buyer is given.

The question of oral notice, the notice to buyer,

I would agree that the prior witness who indicated she felt
written notice are really the most desirable, and perhaps,

be used. I do not know if she specifically confined herself to this, but it would be my thought perhaps an oral notice would be more conducive to controversy and have more difficulty of proof than the desirability of including than it is worth and, perhaps, particularly if the buyer is given a notice along with the transaction it would be desirable to specify written notice.

Another point on the rule itself is the requirement the merchandise be returned in its original condition.

Again, perhaps this may not always be possible. I am wondering whether amendments of these words to some such phrase
as "good condition" might be desirable.

I am thinking perhaps, the home freezer situation where the buyer is delivered food items and so on along with the applicance he purchases. Conceivably there may be situations where he would be unable to return this merchandise, always back to its original condition. Perhaps some other phraseology might be considered.

Also, in relation to the buyer's notice, the buyer's right to keep merchandise. I believe it is provided that if the seller does not pick the merchandise up within 20 business days after cancellation, then the buyer will have a right to retain the merchandise, and I assume without cost to the buyer.

I would urge or suggest that perhaps some requirement

should be made that the buyer at least make the merchandise at least reasonably available to the seller for pick up purposes.

I think here there is some possibility of buyer fraud involved in the situation like this. If a mere flat period of time is provided and the buyer does not make it possible for the seller to pick up the merchandise, then perhaps it is not what the rule would desire.

The comment I feel is of some importance and I would envision a Trade Regulation Rule as really having two primary purposes.

One, it would furnish a guideline and direction for members of the various industries which would be subjected to and under the jurisdiction of the Commission in relation to the Trade Regulation Rule.

Obviously it can be of great value and of course,

I should not overlook the fact it would also would be a

guideline and provide direction to the consumer who is

also the party involved in the buyer-seller relationship.

It appears to me along with providing these guidelines, it will be necessary for the Commission to vigorously enforce Trade Regulations rule which it adopts.

It may well be that you might say the legitimate group of merchandisers which may well constitute by far the majority of the merchandisers in any type of merchandising

activity will scrupulously observe the trade regulation rule. But, I would suggest that based on prior experience, certainly of the Commission, there is a certain fringe element which ordinarily is responsible for violating any of the Commission statutes or regulations.

This element is not particularly concerned with trade regulation rules or statutes or anything else, unless they are subjected to a strong enforcement.

This particular element I suspect is very well aware of the fact the Federal Trade Commission has proceeded in many, many cases against the deceptive selling tactics in the encyclopedia business and the deceptive selling tactics used in the home siding business or in the cooking utensil industry.

I would like to close this statement by urging that along with the adoption of the very desirable trade regulation rule that there be a strong enforcement in the program.

Thank you, very much.

HEARING OFFICER: DIXON: Thank you, Mr. Lemke.
Mr. Cabell.

EXAMINATION

MR. CABELL: Mr. Lemke, from your testimony here this morning it is apparent you made a pretty thorough analysis of the rule.

So, I would like to ask you this question. Basically the rule gives the consumer a three day cooling off period to cancel the sale.

Now, in its evolution to this point, and, if we adopt the many suggestions we have received in the course of the hearing to expand the coverage it seems to me as some people are seeking to make this rule a vehicle for the regulation of the door-to-door sales industry.

I wonder what you think about a simple and clear-cut rule in which we have eliminated all sorts of words and verbiage and would simply give the consumer a right to cancel a door-to-door sale without any arbitration provision and without any provision for a sale made in the presence of a buyer's attorney; without any provision about the pick up or return of the goods?

MR. LEMKE: I do not know whether you are saying a right to cancel at any time.

MR. CABELL: Within three days?

MR. LEMKE: And retain the merchandise, it has been delivered?

MR. CABELL: No, just to give the consumer a right to cancel a sale within three days and let the rule end there.

MR. LEMKE: Again, if there were limits on the amount involved. I can't basically see any objection. I

think it should be limited however, when you get to what I would regard as trivia area purchases. I am not so sure it is desirable.

MR. CABELL: Thank you, sir.

HEARING OFFICER DIXON: Mr. Lamet.

MR. LAMET: Mr. Lemke, do you believe if the Commission would adopt a rule of that kind, this rule as it is presently stated, of course, attempts to get the buyer, notice to the buyer as to his rights.

Do you believe if we just adopted a rule that said the buyer has a right to cancel within three days that would be any different situation than that the State of Illinois has right now without any notice provision being included?

In your experience with the Commission in calling on these door-to-door salesmen, consumer salesmen; did they know about their rights under the contract?

MR. LEMKE: Well, I am assuming, Mr. Lamet, maybe I misunderstood the question, the buyer would be notified of this right and this perhaps would be included in the sales contract or in some other form they would be aware of it.

Am I correct in that?

MR. LAMET: Either way.

MR. LEMKE: I would say generally speaking the

consumer would not be aware of such a rule or right unless it was brought to his attention.

The consumer does not have the opportunity to become informed for example, I suspect probably most consumers in Illinois are unaware of the cooling off period unless it has been brought to their attention.

MR. LAMET: The experiences that you have had in talking to consumers, assuming for a moment that you did have notice of cancellation within three days of the transaction and this was prior to the delivery of the merchandise, would that have helped many of these consumers.

We have heard testimony here today as you know, and yesterday too, that we should include the three day cooling off period should start the day the goods is delivered in some instances.

MR. LEMKE: I don't know.

It is hard to analyze what a consumer would do it would seem to me in many cases if you were aware of this option certainly you would be helped.

I suspect ina good percentage of the cases it would be desirable to rescind. The consumer is aware of his making a wrong decision before three days have elapsed.

Mormally it has been suggested the housewife makes a purchase or the husband makes a purchase and then we have the meeting of the minds when the two of them

get together. At this point if there were the opportunity to rescind, I suspect in many cases it would be exercised. But here again, this is where the enforcement by the Commission would have to come into play.

There are many consumers who would just not take advantage of the notice to cancel.

MR. LAMET: Mr. Lemke, would you state what dollar amount you think the rule should be limited to.

MR. LEMKE: I would say \$25. I am not particularly firm on it. It is \$50 in Illinois; perhaps that is a little too high. But usually in a situation of \$10 or less you do not get into the situation where the salesman stays there all night. He can't make a living that way. That is not going to be the type of situation where you could call it extreme high pressure.

MR. LAMET: Thank you.

HEARING OFFICER DIXON: Thank you, Mr. Lemke.

(Witness excused.) .

HEARING OFFICER DIXON: We will now take a five minute recess.

(Short recess taken.)

HEARING OFFICER DIXON: Come to order, please.

Our next witness is Mr. Lee Ellis, Village Manager,

Village of Winnetka.

Whereupon,

STATEMENT OF LEE ELLIS, VILLAGE MANAGER, VILLAGE OF WINNETKA

MR. ELLIS: My name is Lee Ellis. I am the Village Manager of Winnetka, Illinois, a suburb and community of 14,000 to the north of Chicago.

We have previously filed with you a resolution duly adopted by our Village Board of Trustees, supporting the proposed rule.

I won't bother to re-read that resolution for you at this time.

Our concern in terms of the experience we have relates principally to the magazine salesman and the problems they have presented to us.

Ours is a mature community, so we are not bothered by the siding people and some of the others.

The problems, just to give you a feel of the scope run something like this; here is the case of a salesman convincing a 12 year old girl to forge her mother's signature to a check for \$101.10 for the purchase of magazines.

Here is a case of an 80 year old woman who is high pressured into buying magazines totalling \$232.50. The salesman was not satisfied with that and came back on two more occasions in this particular case and rather than try to sell magazines they were seeking a solicitation of cash donation to a home for the needy which never was

identified.

They were not satisfied with miling the woman of \$200, they wanted more.

The third example is a case of outright theft:.

There was some reference to this earlier in the testimony today that in this case the salesman, while the housewife had gone to get her checkbook, stole credit cards from the household. He made the mistake of trying to use the credit cards and was apprehended.

All of these problems of theft, fraud, coercion, deception have been practiced in our community, almost exclusively as I have said by the magazine type salesman.

The people in our community complained bitterly to me. We are not effectively able to deal with this kind of a salesman. They hide behind the Freedom of the Press arguments. These are the encyclopedia salesmen and refuse even to be registered -- we have a requirement that peddlers be registered.

We are effectively unable to cope with the problem on the local level, being the low Governmental rung of the ladder.

We do need help. Our Board of Trustees has asked me to come here today and to thank you very much for calling the hearing and allowing it to be held here in Chicago, and to give us the opportunity to tell you we very much endorse

1 what you propose to do. ... 2 Thank you. 3 HEARING OFFICER DIXON: Thank you. 4 Mr. Cabell. 5 EXAMINATION 6 MR. CABELL: Mr. Ellis, can you tell us the economic 7 level of the people in your Village? 8 MR. ELLIS: Rather high, sir. I don't have any 9 official figures, but I have been told the median income is 10 above \$20,000 a year. 11 MR. CABELL: Is there a very high percentage of 12 old people there? 13 MR. ELLIS: Not a very high percentage; no, sir. 14 The preliminary census figures I have seen are 15 on the order of eight to ten percent over 65. 16 MR. CABELL: Has the Illinois three day cooling 17 off period been of any benefit? 18 MR. ELLIS: No, sir, largely because of ignorance, 19 I believe. 20 MR. CABELL: Why do you think your people would be 21 more likely to know about the Federal Trade Regulation Rule 22 than --23 MR. ELLIS: The notice provision, sir, we think is 24 important on the contract. The notice provision would bring

this to light. If we had such a regulation, we have been

dealing so long with this exemption by the press, the published word. It has been exempt from the regulations in the past effectively. Our people have called me and my answer is, I can't help you.

This would be a completely new regulation and it should be helpful to us. It would give power to regulate where there is none now.

We could, locally, of course, it would mean national publicity and we would support it locally.

MR. CABELL: Do you have any recommendations regarding the dollar limit on the rule?

MR. ELLIS: You can see from the figures that I have cited here, even with magazines we are dealing with fairly high dollars.

The type of a salesman trying to sell these things is not satisfied with a \$10 sale. He wants more. \$25 might be on the upper limit of that. I would say that \$10 is the lower limit.

MR. CABELL: Thank you.

HEARING OFFICER DIXON: Mr. Lamet?

MR. LAMET: No questions.

HEARING OFFICER DIXON: Thank you, Mr. Ellis.

(Witness excused.)

HEARING OFFICER DIXON: Our next witness is Mr.

George P. Graves, Chief of Police of Western Springs, Illinois.

STATEMENT OF GEORGE P. GRAVES, CHIEF OF POLICE, WESTERN SPRINGS, ILLINOIS

MR. GRAVES: Gentlemen, I am George P. Graves, Chief of Police of Western Springs, Illinois.

I have been Chief five and a half years and a police officer in my community for 12 and a half years.

As Mr. Ellis stated, my primary problem in door-to-door sales is with the magazine salesman.

In preparing to come here today I went back through my records on a yearly basis on my problems with door-to-door salesmen.

I think first off I would want to give you a brief description of what our cobservations have been relative to the people who make up the door-to-door salesmen crew.

They are generally from out of state. They generally represent companies who don't have offices in our state.

It is not uncommon for us to have a crew of magazine solicitors in the California licensed vehicle with people from all types of states all numbers of states and identification from numerous states such as I have a crew currently in my community today.

My problems have been this; the magazine solicitor generally does not tell the people that he is there to sell magazines.

Some of the door opening experiences I have had going back to our first experienced we documented back in 1965 was a solicitor representing himself as a Job Corp worker. They represented themselves as being from the Office of Economic Opportunity or that they were from Poverty Appeal Programs.

The problems that we experienced in 1965 primarily were in the area of deceptive practice whereby people were asked to sign contracts just to prove to the crew managers who follow through later that the man had in fact called on the house and unknown to the people they were filled out at a later time with high dollar value of purchases, Mr. Ellis had mentioned before. I think the highest was for some \$256, with the magazines to be purchased over a three year period of time.

I also had problems with the high pressure sales tactics. We have had problems with the solicitors having consumed alcohol and becoming rather belligerent with the residents of the home.

Generally they called during the day when the housewife is home alone and usually busy with their own work and they interrupt the work of the housewife and often times just to get rid of the salesman they will sign the document or make some token purchase and he will be on his way.

In 1966 we had the same experience, reference, high pressure tactics and drinking solicitors. We had a problem where solicitors would state that they were registered with the Central Registry of Magazine Solicitors out of New York City which is an industry attempt, I believe to regulate the conduct of soliciting for all firms.

In 1967 we had a problem with an encyclopedia firm who would offer a free cookbook. Of course, it ended up the resident would end up with a cookbook which was not really free. There would be strong, strong, high pressure sales tactics to purchase this particular item because you want your children to be better than somebody else. You want them to be in the green group and not in the red group as some schools might classify a student by abilities.

It was in this year we began to start an identification registration program whereby we issued an
identification to the solicitor with his picture displayed
thereupon on their garment when they called the home our
residents would know they are registered with us.

In 1968 we had quite a bit of activity with the various solicitor firms. Again, we had high pressure salesmen and some people called saying in fact they were being terrorized.

Also, in 1968 at this particular time I was personally threatened to have a racial demonstration in one

4 5

of my local institutions because the institution refused to cash the checks of the crew manager upon receipt of the checks from the people of the community.

This demonstration never did come off, but there was a strong indication it was going to come off with several hundred minority group people brought to the institution and cause disturbances.

In 1969 we had the same problem again, except we ran into high pressure tactics where they misrepresented their purpose.

We had the problem this year when people would pay by check or cash, in full, we had a great number of non-delivery of merchandise by the magazines that had been ordered.

It turned out the people made the sales in cash and did not turn the sales into the crew manager. They cashed the checks themselves or had the checks made out to them instead of the company. The checks were made out to the individuals who had made the sale.

These are some of the instances we have had with the door-to-door salesmen.

This continued in 1970 and currently in 1971. The problems are in the sales approach. If they are rejected we seem to have a great deal of emphasis then placed on the fact if a man, if he is in a minority group, the person is

Ą

not buying because he is prejudiced or has some racial bias.

I have brought with me documented statements from citizens of my community that we have worked with in the past stating that this is a fact.

When I was home on vacation a sales crew was working in my community. The salesman did not use that tack when I would not buy magazines myself, personally. I didn't buy because he felt that I was racially oriented and refused on that basis.

He had a black folder and he said, "You don't have to be afraid of this because it is black, too." There seemed to be a great deal of racial incident mentioned in it.

In my work as the Chief of Police I have many opportunities to discuss problems with the Chief of Police throughout the State of Illinois. You can be assured it has been a problem for many communities.

Some of the instances you may be familiar with.

Recently in 1970 where a woman and her daughter were

murdered in a west suburban community.

Another incident I know of where a party posing as a cosmetic saleswoman entered a home knowing there would be no sale. This party had refused the sale previously. The woman asked if she could use the washroom and the party so allowed.

As the lady walked into the house to use the washroom

she noticed the insurance salesman was approaching the property and she held the door and let him in. They were talking about their insurance business. The insurance man made note of the fact the party had been in the washroom a long period of time. When they went to investigate they found it was in fact a man and not a woman and he had completely removed his clothes and was apparently planning a sexual attack on the woman.

As to the Federal Trade Regulation Rule that has been proposed I would say I support it as it is. I think, perhaps, some consideration should be given to the lowering of the figure to \$5. Most of the people who seem to be bilked in our community if it is only \$10 to remove the salesman from their premises.

A great deal of the problem results when the husband gets home that evening to find out the wife has signed some particular contract and when the figures are checked it is found the figure is much higher than is intended.

I would think the part of the regulation that has reference to the oral cancellation would be a very serious problem for us to cope with. It is a matter of whose word and who said it and who said what.

I think the person would or should be orally advised that she has the ability to withdraw from the

Ą

O

contract as well as having the printed word on the contract.

Perhaps it does not have to be the lengthy verbiage that is now proposed, but it should be spelled out so the person has knowledge they may withdraw from the purchase.

You see, at the time the person does not have a great deal of time to make the decision. The salesman makes the sale and that same day generally the crew manager will follow through with a verification which may be in only half an hour's time.

Another problem in our community is where these salesmen have been housed in the motels have been a disorderly conduct situation. There has been damage to property and things of this sort.

The Central Registry of Magazine Solicitors in New York has been of some help to us in our community in that they availed themselves to report to us whether or not the companies are in fact registered with them or their salesmen are registered with them.

However, I find the disciplinary section of this particular organization is made up of the heads of the various publishing firms.

Recently, after a continued activity of what I considered malpractice on the part of salesmen I wrote to this organization and I asked if I could not appear before them and receive some kind of a reasonable explanation as to

why they continue to certify salesmen who continue to violate the regulations. This correspondence went unanswered.

I think I should tell you my community has approximately 13,000 people. We are about 14 miles from the Chicago Loop on the Burlington Northern Route. Our income is said to be \$15,000 average.

HEARING OFFICER DIXON: Thank you, Chief.
Mr. Cabell.

EXAMINATION

MR. CABELL: Have your people made any use of the Illinois cooling off law?

MR. GRAVES: Yes, sir, some of my citizens have. They have primarily been informed of it only upon receipt of a complaint informing them of their rights.

We have also attempted through a local publication to keep them advised of their rights and of the solicitors' rights. This publication is mailed to them quarterly.

MR. CABELL: Thank you.

HEARING OFFICER DIXON: Mr. Lamet.

MR. LAMET: Chief, would it be possible for us to have the documents that you have brought here to the hearing today and have them entered into the record.

Are you prepared to do that?

MR. GRAVES: These are the only copies that I have.

These are letters from my citizens. I brought them as samples. I will be more than happy to make copies and provide them to you.

MR. LAMET: That would be fine, Chief.

MR. GRAVES: Another problem we have had is what we call cash crews. These are magazine solicitor crews that come to your community normally late at night and, apparently because of a low gross they come to a community and maybe in a half hour or 45 minutes attempting to increase their sales. We have had experiences with that.

We have difficulty in ascertaining who they are they are. I brought copies of these.

In one case I brought with me and I will send a copy to you was a sexual advance to a woman in the evening whose husband was gone and he demanded hard liquor for refreshment.

MR. LAMET: Let me ask you this, one of the problems with regard to the magazine salesmen is the consumer has found later on the man sold them and the magazines really did not show up. In other words, it was a non-delivery problem.

MR. GRAVES: Yes.

MR. LAMET: It has been suggested today and yesterday the cooling off period on a -- should start on the day of delivery of the merchandise. Of course, in this

instance it would probably the the first day you got the first magazine.

Would you like to comment on whether that would solve that particular problem?

MR. GRAVES: I think it would be a real problem for the magazine industry. There would be a question as to how long the sale is going through the administrative process, through the publisher, through the distribution. I think it may be a problem for the magazine industry as well as the consumer.

I have currently a woman brought a problem where she purchased magazines and actually forgot she purchased them and she found she did not receive the merchandise over a long period of time. It was very difficult to handle that.

Too, we have the problem these crews are only in the area a few days generally. Many violations of the law are brought to our attention and the violators were non-existent or out of our area. We do not know where they are at.

I think the magazine industry should take a serious look at itself and try to upgrade its standards of salesmen and its purposes so they properly present their products.

We in law enforcement had to improve our image and

instance it would probably the the first day you got the first magazine.

Would you like to comment on whether that would solve that particular problem?

MR. GRAVES: I think it would be a real problem for the magazine industry. There would be a question as to how long the sale is going through the administrative process, through the publisher, through the distribution. I think it may be a problem for the magazine industry as well as the consumer.

I have currently a woman brought a problem where she purchased magazines and actually forgot she purchased them and she found she did not receive the merchandise over a long period of time. It was very difficult to handle that.

Too, we have the problem these crews are only in the area a few days generally. Many violations of the law are brought to our attention and the violators were non-existent or out of our area. We do not know where they are at.

I think the magazine industry should take a serious look at itself and try to upgrade its standards of salesmen and its purposes so they properly present their products.

We in law enforcement had to improve our image and

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

standards so we could give a better service.

MR. LAMET: I think you did mention the fact that when you did get a complaint from the consumer at that time you indicated they had a three-day cooling off period under the Illinois statute.

Are you testifying prior to telling them that they were not aware of that right?

MR. GRAVES: Yes.

MR. LAMET: You think the people out there are not aware of the three-day cooling off period?

The only time they are aware of it MR. GRAVES: is when they have called us and have complaints over the fact they received misrepresented products. We then inform them they have that right.

We have also attempted to educate them then through the news media and also to work it out that way.

Let me make one other comment. Earlier a witness testified as to the newspaper solicitation in the community. That has not really been a problem in our community. We found the publication mentioned earlier worked closely with us and in cooperation with us relative to their solicitation for increased circulation.

MR. LAMET: Chief, what organization was it that you wrote to requesting to appear?

MR. GRAVES: It was the Central Registry of

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Magazine Solicitors. It is called the Magazine Publishers 1 Association, Incorporated. They are located in New York. 2 3 I think they were at 575 Lexington and they have moved. It is an organization that serves sort of as a policeman for 5 the agency. They advertise the fact people registered with 6 them are competent salesmen and solicit and represent 7 reputable firms. They are issued an I. D. Card which they show to represent that they are supposedly trained salesmen representing a bona fide company.

They serve as I understand somewhat as a discipline organization. When they receive complaints on magazine solicitors they attempt to intercede with the home or parent company in making corrections of violations that are reported to them.

HEARING OFFICER DIXON: You wrote to them requesting an opportunity to appear to tell your story?

MR. GRAVES: Yes. I asked them in correspondence last year if they would allow me, I was going to be out east for a meeting, if they would allow me to appear before their board and to explain my story to them.

I was just curious as to how they could continue to give central registry certification to a firm who continually violated their own rules.

As of this time I find a large percentage of the people who comprise the board are really the presidents and vice-presidents of the circulating company.

HEARING OFFICER DIXON: What response did you get to that letter?

MB. GRAVES: I did not get any response. I followed up with it and never did receive the invitation to go up and talk to them. They all said they had my letter and they were sorry for the delay, it was a communications problem in their system.

HEARING OFFICER DIXON: That ended it?

MR. GRAVES: Yes, sir.

HEARING OFFICER DIXON: Thank you, sir.

(Witness excused.)

HEARING OFFICER DIXON: Santos Perez does not seem to be here.

Next will be Mrs. Elizabeth McCarthy.

STATEMENT OF ELIZABETH MC CARTHY

MRS. MC CARTHY: I am Elizabeth McCarthy. I am speaking for a client of mine. I am a social worker. My client is not here today.

The incident occurred when my client wrote to a company, a motel management training company requesting written information in pamphlet form regarding their training program they advertised.

At that time someone called her and requested to come out and explain it to her rather than to send her the

. .

information. She did say that he could come out.

when he came out his sales tactics were such, he said that he came out to evaluate her ability to become a motel manager.

He did not ask for any credentials, previous job experience. My client had once worked as a lamp wirer. He relied upon the psychological aspects of my client being a divorcee. She was receiving Social Security and Veterans benefits for herself and her two minor children.

He indicated such things as a guaranteed job for her life and she would have security.

He further indicated she would be doing her race a favor by joining his or accepting the opportunity to become a motel manager because black people had traditionally not been involved in this type of a profession.

At that time I did not know the Illinois law allowed for the two day cooling off period. When she came back for her next interview with me, she was seeing another social worker for reasons I cannot explain, I did not know it but I did know she had already signed the contract.

Eventually through an attorney we got it straightened out and she paid only \$200 on a \$600 contract.

I have chosen this as one incident although I have known of quite a few others that have come to my attention as a social worker.

Our procedure at this point is to refer them to a legal advice clinic.

HEARING OFFICER DIXON: Thank you.

Mr. Cabell.

EXAMINATION

MR. CABELL: For whom do you work?

MRS MC CARTHY: I work for Hull House Association.

MR. CABELL: Is that a private --

MRS. MC CARTHY: Yes, it is.

MR. CABELL: Do you recall where your client saw this advertisement to which she responded?

MRS. MC CARTHY: I believe it was in a magazine.

I am not absolutely certain.

I have neglected one very small point I think is very essential. My client has a paralyzed ligament in her throat. That is probably why she isn't here today. She begins speaking and gets anxious and her voice goes away completely. Her voice is always very difficult to hear.

A tracheotomy has been recommended for her but she would not accept it. In my opinion, this is a definite handicap to a position such as a motel manager.

MR. CABELL: Is this a local school?

MRS. MC CARTHY: No, it was not.

MR. CABELL: It was a home study course?

MRS. MC CARTHY: Right.

MR. CABELL: Do you believe the three-day cooling off provision in our rule would be of assistance to situations like this?

MRS. MC CARTHY: Yes, but it wasn't within three business days by the time that she came back to me. As a social worker even if I had known about it, I could not have helped her with my ignorance.

MR. CABELL: Do you recall if this school was accredited by any of the accrediting associations?

MRS. MC CARTHY: Quite frankly, I did not even think about that. I was thinking more in terms of she had already signed the contract. I don't know.

MR. CABELL: I think it would be more helpful if you would send us a little more detail about this including the names and the name and the address of the school if you can recall it.

MRS. MC CARTHY: Yes, I certainly will.

We have it on file at the Legal Advice Clinic.

MR. CABELL: Thank you.

HEARING OFFICER DIXON: Mr. Lamet.

MR. LAMET: You said you had other people come to you about door-to-door sales. Could you give us some idea of some of the other cases.

MRS. MC CARTHY: Yes, someone is now soliciting in the community solicing for the sale of grapefruit by the

case as a guarantee to dieting problems. The grapefruit is something like \$15 a case. I suggested to my clients they talk to their doctor about the value of grapefruit used for dieting.

In addition to this many people have been caught in the magazine sales routine. The approach is it is primarily for the postage involved in mailing the magazines to them.

Other instances have included drapery selling of poor quality where a high price is paid. Since it is a Chicago Housing Authority Project the salesman will know the measurements of the windows and he comes in and the drapes fit, which is of course, an advantage when you go to buy something.

Those are the blatant instances that come to mind.

MR. LAMET: Could you describe the types of

clients you have.

Are these people who are low income? What kind of clients are you dealing with at Hull House?

MRS. MC CARTHY: This is a black community. It is a very poor community to be qualified for Chicago Housing Authority.

There is a quality of wanting a better life in the community. I think this contributes to their being able to willing to -- excuse me, I am not well prepared; I

wish I were. They are being taken by the salesman and because the salesmanship is very good. These are beneficial things that we all want. Their educational level is low.

For the most part the people I serve are just beginning to be able to buy things and it is that kind of a community.

MR. LAMET: Well, now, as you know under the Trade Regulation Rule it would require the buyer be given a written notice and also, an oral notice with regard to the three-day cooling off period.

MRS. MC CARTHY: Yes.

MR. LAMET: The question is whether or not we should include the oral cancellation notice.

MRS. MC CARTHY: Yes.

MR. LAMET: With regard to your clients would there be any difficulty with just a written notice. Do they all read?

MRS. MC CARTHY: No.

They would be helped with the written notice, but I would prefer the oral notice be included.

MR. LAMET: Would they understand what a threeday cancellation privilege is?

MRS. MC CARTHY: The individual might not but I believe the husband when he comes home at night would or the neighbors would talk with them within three days.

And this happens. The wife goes to the coffee clutch with her next door neighbor. Quite frequently another neighbor has had a similar experience in the past. She begins to explain just what happened.

I think in this instance the written notice of cancellation would be helpful. There is also included in the rule a statement with regard to arbitrating disputes.

MR. LAMET: Have you had an opportunity to look at that?

MRS. MC CARTHY: Yes, I have.

MR. LAMET: Would you have any comment on that?

MRS. MC CARTHY: I --

MR, LAMET: Have you any comment on the settling of consumer disputes by arbitration with regard to the people you deal with?

MRS. MC CARTHY: In looking back now I believe that is when the attorney I mentioned in the first case I brought did. He arbitrated both between my client and the seller for what seemed to be a reasonable settlement. She had already paid \$140 as of the time of the signing and she opened or paid for all courses not opened. The rest that had not been opened were turned back. She would not have to pay for those.

MR. LAMET: You feel he really arbitrated the dispute between the two parties?

MRS. MC CARTHY: Right.

MR. LAMET: When you clients become aware of the fact they have been taken by some form of consumer fraud whether that be door-to-door or some other type, do they know that they have a right to go to court and sue on this and collect and get their money back or have some recourse from the courts.

Do they discuss their rights as far as the courts are concerned with you.

MRS. MC CARTHY: For the most part, no; 99 percent of the time, no. What happens is we are explaining our rights after the fact in which case I also are able to point out that there are attorneys they can afford to take it to if they so wish.

MR. LAMET: Do they usually go to the attorneys after they do that?

MRS. MC CARTHY: About 50 percent of my clients have utilized the Legal Advice Clinics.

MR. LAMET: Why have the other 50 percent not utilized it?

MRS. MC CARTHY: They feel it would not be helpful to them.

MR. LAMET: Thank you, Mrs. McCarthy.

HEARING OFFICER: DIXON: Thank you, Mrs. McCarthy.

That concludes the schedule for this morning. The

hearings will now adjourn to reconvene at 2:00 o'clock p.m., this afternoon.

(Whereupon, at 12:05 o'clock p.m., the hearing in the above-entitled matter was recessed, to reconvene at 2:00 o'clock p.m., the same day.)

AFTERNOON SESSION

HEARING OFFICER DIXON: The hearing will come to order please.

This is a continuation of the public hearings of the Federal Trade Commission's proposed trade regulation rule concerning a cooling off period for door-to-door sales.

For the benefit of those who were not here before my name is William Dixon, Assistant Director of Industry Guidance in the Commission's Bureau of Consumer Protection.

To my right is Mr. Henry Cabell, the attorney who is in charge of developing this rule in these proceedings and to my left is Mr. Jerome Lamet, the attorney in the Chicago office who is in charge of these hearings.

Our first witness for this afternoon is Eve Galanter, President, Consumer Federation of Illinois.

STATEMENT OF EVE GALANTER, PRESIDENT, CONSUMER FEDERATION OF ILLINOIS.

MRS. GALANTER: My name is Eve Galanter. I am
President of the Consumer Federation of Illinois.

The Consumer Federation of Illinois, consisting of families, labor, civic, community and cooperative organizations throughout Illinois, seeks to advance and protect the interests of the more than 11 million consumers in our State.

We commend the Federal Trade Commission for holding

~ **13**·

this hearing in Chicago in order that we may directly communicate our concerns and our commitments to increased consumer protection.

One of our purposes as a voluntary citizens organization is to serve as a clearing house for consumer information.

In the past years, this has been more widely interpreted by consumers who have come to us with a great variety of unresolved problems and complaints.

A frequent source of complaint arises from unsatisfactory experiences with door-to-door salesmen. It is unfortunate that all of these complainants are unable to be here today to testify in their own behalf. But the reason for the absence of some of them is also an indication of the urgency and need for the regulation you are proposing.

Those people are not here today, because many of them are welfare recipients, already attempting to live on a restricted budget, who have been persuaded, cajoled, misled, and often coerced into purchasing items from a door-to-door salesman, and they fear that public disclosure of their names might mean retribution by the welfare department. It could mean, they believe, a decrease in their allotments. But then, why did they buy?

Mrs. H., a widow with three children, was told by a glib salesman that he had been informed that her children

were exceptionally bright (he never disclosed who told him), and, for that reason he had come to offer her the opportunity to provide these exceptional children with the additional education they deserved.

All the things she -- an uneducated woman -- was unable to teach them, could be taught by a set of encyclopedia.

The set was described as a "ticket to college" and insurance against a future of welfare dependency for her family.

Mrs. H. had informed the salesman that she was receiving welfare and could not afford such a purchase early in the conversation, but the salesman's arguments and warning that if she didn't purchase the encyclopedia that evening, she would never have another opportunity to do so, finally clinched the deal.

Mrs. H. says that she knew it was a lot of money, \$568.00, and that such books must be very, very costly, but that the future of her children was at stake and that even the salesman knew how bright they were.

It was the \$568.00 indebtedness, however, that worried her and cuased her telephone call to us later that week.

Knowledge of her right to a "cooling off period" would have provided Mrs. H with the protection she so des-

perately needed from the unseemly tactics of a door-to-door salesman.

Mrs. G had been in Chicago only one month when a friendly Spanish-speaking salesman called on her. He was a welcome guest to Mrs. G. who can speak very few words in English. The salesman said that her neighbors had suggested he call on her and welcome her to the community. He was "muy simpatico" related Mrs. G., as he warned her about trying to shop for household necessities in stores where no Spanish was spoken and where she would surely be "robbed".

Instead, he was willing to show her, in her own apartment, the kinds of pots and pans she should have in her kitchen -- used in almost every kitchen throughout America.

And, Mrs. G., absorbed in his obvious concern for her, bought over \$200 worth of these "American" pots and pands. She even invited him to return at some later date.

After attempting to thank one of her neighbors for this friendly deed, she discovered that the salesman was unknown to her neighbor and that he had made many misrepresentations.

She immediately thought of telephoning the salesman. But no telephone number was listed on her piece of paper -- only the amount of her indebtedness and her name.

Mrs. G. is still paying for the pots and pans she could have purchased for under \$50 in most stores.

Mrs. H and Mrs. G are but two examples of the many consumers for whom I am the spokesman today.

The poor and the uneducated are not the only ones who suffer from the abuses of some door-to-door salesmen. Some of our complainants, with incomes alloweing them to be homeowners, were similarly misled into a wide variety of purchases by door-to-door salesmen.

What homeowner is not a prospective customer for new vinyl siding, a vacuum cleaning system, paved driveway, landscaping or a huge freezer stocked with "quality" meats for life?

On March 8, 1971, in the Business and Finance Section of the Chicago Daily News, I noted the following item: "G. B. Frank, Inc., is marketing a pocket-sized charge-card imprinter called the Prt-a-Print Pocket Imprinter, It's designed so that door-to-door salesmen can crank out charge-card sales in the customer's home."

Door-to-Door sales, whether consummated in the apartment of a poor, uneducated consumer or cranked out on a portable charge card imprinter in the presence of a homeowner, must be regulated in such a manner as to provide the greatest possible protection for that consumer.

The Consumer Federation of Illinois endorses all

18.

aspects of the Trade Regulation Rule concerning a coolingoff period for door-to-door sales as proposed by the Federal
Trade Commission.

We would like particularly to emphasize the importance of:

One, the right to cancel a contract or sale by telephone as a valid alternative to written cancellation alone as stated in the printed "Notice to buyer."

Second, orally informing each buyer prior to signing a contract or purchasing goods or services of his right to cancel.

Three, revealing clearly to the prospective buyer at the time of initial contact, that the purpose of the contact is to sell goods or services and expressly stating the nature of these goods or services.

Four, honoring a timely notice of cancellation by a buyer and upon such notice, returning to him all notes or any other paper indicating indebtedness in connection with the cancelled sale, thereby precluding the assignment of such papers to a third party.

Five, not allowing this Rule, when adopted, to supersede or pre-empt state or local laws wherein the consumer is afforded either greater protection or access to remedies.

The Consumer Federation of Illinois commends the

Federal Trade Commission on its proposed Trade Regulation Rule, and its efforts to provide the consumer with increased protection.

We strongly urge its early enactment.

Thank you.

HEARING OFFICER DIXON: Thank you.

Mr. Cabell.

EXAMINATION

MR. CABELL: Miss Galanter, a number of people have testified here earlier have suggested that the oral cancellation provision may not be in the best interest of the consumer because he would have no way to prove he actually made the telephone call.

Would you agree with that aspect of the matter?

MISS GALANTER: That aspect of the matter was

considered also. I think the fact I chose of course, these
two instances or case histories that were examples of cases

-- one example is the case where a person who wanted to

make the telephone call and was unable to do so his first
thought was to make the telephone call and not of sitting
there and trying to write a letter, something which would
have been foreign to a foreign speaking person.

We believe that the problems that might arise from attempting to prove having made a telephone call would be greatly overcome by just the ability to have this valid

alternative of sitting down and writing a letter. For some of our citizens the problems of merely getting out to mail such a letter, we think this would be -- you know, the problems in trying to prove these would be greatly overshadowed by just having such an alternative available.

MR. CABELL: Do you think there is a need to have the notice printed in more than one language?

MISS GALANTER: I would say that perhaps a notice, if the notice would be oral notice, the written notice and the oral notice were to coincide, if the oral notice was being given by the Spanish speaking salesman in handing a document written in English might provide some difficulties.

I would say if there should be a second language, indeed, the second language would be Spanish.

HEARING OFFICER DIXON: Mr. Lamet.

MR. LAMET: Mrs. Galanter, I would like you, if you would to tell us whether the Consumer Federation of Ill-inois attempts to settle consumer disputes between buyers and sellers.

Are you doing any of that work in your Federation?

MESS GALANTER: Yes, we are.

MR. LAMET: How is it working out?

MESS GALANTER: We are right now receiving up to about 100 complaints a week in terms of volume. Many people have been to larger agencies and not found any settlement or

resolution.

Our normal procedure is to immediately write to
the business involved with a copy of the telephone conversation of the complainant or a copy of whatever communication
we have from them in writing setting out the facts.

These are the facts as we know them now as communicated to us by the complainant. We would like, as soon as possible, to have you respond to this so we can resolve any particular disagreement as quickly as possible.

The procedure then in the last six to ten months with great consistency we have had within ten days a response from the business, telling us that -- setting out what their view of the circumstances. Very often the very same view; occasionally, a very different version of the circumstances.

We then write another letter asking them if there is some way any difference between the two versions of this story, the two situations, they are either wanting their money or the complainant wanting the product he thought he was purchasing or the repairs he thought he had ordered and resolving it for both of them.

What we have done in the majority of cases is reach some kind of compromise when feasible to resolve the problem for the consumer.

MR. LAMET: So, in a sense you are arbitrating the disputes between buyers and sellers?

MISS GALANTER: That is right.

MR. LAMET: Would you like to comment on the provision of the rule with regard to arbitration on door-to-door sales.

Does your Association have any particular position on this?

MISS GALANTER: The Consumer Federation of Illinois is endorsing the entire Trade Regulation Rule, including the arbitration aspect.

You are quite correct in saying we are already engaging in a very small scale in some kind of arbitration, very successfully I believe.

I think it is showing and I think in the last year that such things can be done successfully. Both consumer and seller are willing to arbitrate the issues.

I think that this is one of the very few recourses available to the consumer.

MR. LAMET: That is my last question. In your experience in your associations with handling of consumer disputes, why don't some of the consumers use the law, courts in order to satisfy their demand or to get their recourse.

Why don tethey go to Small Claims Court and file a suit?

MISS GALANTER: In many disputes they have no idea

that such a right exists for them, Mr. Lamet. For many people the law is as on the books and the law the way it is now to them, it really doesn't make much sense to these consumers.

I might give you an example of some of the problems that go into Small Claims Court. A consumer who had had a difficulty with a car and having it repaired and got what she considered to be an astronomical bill for the repair of her car and she refused to pay the bill. It was turned over to a collection agency. She refused to pay.

She was sent a court date. She called me at our office and said, "I'm going into court tomorrow. My friends told me that I don't need a lawyer because the plaintiff always wins."

It is very frightening to think of consumers who have to have this particular image on the courts and their role in the courts. To them it is an experience and they really have absolutely no idea how to cope with it.

HEARING OFFICER DIXON: Miss Galanter, would the consumers that you are talking about understand this three day cooling off period?

Would they read it in the contract and make use of it?

MESS GALANTER: I think the combination of being told about it and reading it, yes, I think very definitely.

I think the term itself is sufficiently easy to understand. The notion to just have time to just cool off.

I have talked with many of these people, two of whose cases I have spoken about today. I explained why I wanted them to come and I explained about the proposed cooling off period. This made a great deal of sense to these people, to have time to sit down and really think about it. They really understood this. It made a great deal of sense and said, "Why didn't I know about this before."

So, it is something when presented to them they were indeed capable of comprehending. I think they could have provided themselves with the kind of protection they needed.

HEARING OFFICER DIXON: One other question with respect to the people with whom you worked. What difference would it make to them if the salesman were required initially at the door to make this disclosure of who they are and what they are there for?

MISS GALANTER: I think the nature of the door-to-door salesman coming in to in many cases the privacy of a person's home with either a statement such as, "You know your neighbors have said that I should come welcome you to the community," thereby wiping out whatever initial defenses these people might have against a stranger coming

into their homes making a pretense of awarding a free gift or taking a survey or taking two or three hours in someone's home discussing the filling out of the questionnaire it gets around to the point, "You know, I would like to sell you something now that we have become such great friends."

I think that this would make a great deal of difference if immediately these people were aware that this is going to be a selling and buying situation and not any other categories that it could be put, surely not just a social visit by a neighbor.

HEARING OFFICER DIXON: Do you think a lot of them would be turned away?

MISS GALANTER: I think that you would be giving the people the opportunity to decide for themselves immediately whether crnot they would turn this person away.

HEARING OFFICER DIXON: Thank you.

(Witness excused.)

HEARING OFFICER DIXON: The next witness is Joseph P. Preloznik, Director of Judicare.

> STATEMENT OF JOSEPH F. PRELOZNIK, DIRECTOR, JUDICARE.

MR. PRELOZNIK: Good afternoon. Mynamelis Joseph F. Preloznik.

I am a director of the Wisconsin Judicare program. The Wisconsin Judicare Program is a legal assistance program sponsored by the State Bar of Wisconsin and funded by

22

23

24

25

the office of Economic Opportunity.

Many of the clients our program serves have problems with door-to-door sales. I am also a member of the Advisory Consumer Council of the State Department of Agriculture in Wisconsin.

I am also a member of the task force that was recently appointed by Governor Lucey for the purposes of recommending consumer protection legislation to him.

The cooling off period of three days as it applies to door-to-door sales has been clearly needed for many years although most of the attention for this need has developed only recently.

As early as 1944, the courts were aware of the abuses that were taking place in the consumer area, and in Charles of the Ritz Distributing Company vs FTC (1944), 143 F. 2nd 767 the court said:

"The law is not made for experts but to protect the public -- that vast multitude which includes the ignorant, the unthinking and the credulous, who, in making purchases, do not stop to analyze."

Today, we have also come to realize that there are other factors which may induce persons to purchase items that they do not want and do not need.

They may be too shy or timid to tell the salesman to leave their homes, and may sign a contract, essentially

undread or misunderstood, merely to get the man out of the house.

They may be fearful, and sign to accomplish the same end. And, as the court stated in the Ritz case they may merely be unable to understand just what they are doing at the time.

Although the FTC proposal will not solve all of the problems of today's beseiged consumer, the proposed statute will undoubtedly help a great deal.

This can be amply illustrated by Wisconsin's experience with regulations affecting home food freezer plans.

When Wisconsin first began providing legal assistance through the program numerous complaints were received as to the high pressure tactics of salesmen selling home food freezer plans.

There were also many complaints of overcharging, poor food, poor service and questionable weight of the food delivered.

Since the adoption of rules by the State Department of Agriculture, the complaints have just about disappeared.

Since Mr. Milan of the Wisconsin Department of
Agriculture is here this afternoon to testify in person as
to the regulations adopted and their experience, I will
limit my comment on that regulation to the extent that it is

4 5

While the proposed regulation is worthwhile and should be supported, there are a number of areas in which it could be strengthened.

similar to the one proposed here by this commission.

Definition of "Door-to-Door Sale" and seller should be broadened to include the transient or the itinerant merchant who sets up his business in a motel or temporary location.

Experience in Wisconsin has shown that many consumers are victimized by merchants who temporarily locate in a community and employ questionable, high pressure sales techniques of the kind deplored in "Door-to-Door Sales.".

I note that the proposed regulation uses cancellation instead of affirmation in voiding the contract. The National Consumer Act takes the position that with respect to outside transactions, or "door-to-door" as is noted in this proposed regulation, the burden should be on the seller to show that he has an agreement and requires an additional act by the buyer before there is such an agreement.

The National Consumer Act employs cancellation only as to inside transactions which are sales made at the seller's place of business.

By using affirmation instead of cancellation, much of the concern for notice which was mentioned by the previous speaker or witness is eliminated as the seller will need a

further act by the buyer before he has an agreement.

The Task Force on Consumer Protection, appointed by the Governor of the State of Wisconsin, has recommended that the Governor support legislation providing a cooling-off period of three days, such as is proposed in this regulation. The proposed recommendations to the Governor include the suggestions made here.

It is my belief that the provisions that deal with the elimination of the cognovit note and prevent the buyer from waiving the rights he receives under the regulation are important and necessary.

While cognovit notes are not being used as extensively as they were before the Wisconsin Legislature made them unavailable for use in garnishment actions, cognovit notes are still used in limited circumstances in Wisconsin.

Finally, the section which provides that the contract cannot be assigned for five business days could be strengthened by eliminating the Holder in Due Course Doctrine as to these transactions.

Assignment has posed a problem for the buyer because defenses the buyer could have raised against the seller were not available because of the Holder in Due Course Doctrine.

In Wisconsin, there appears to be substantial support from all areas of the business community that the Holder in Due Course Doctrine should not be available to

transactions made outside of the seller's place of business.

The Governor's Task Force on Consumer Protection has unanimously agreed to recommend to the Governor the repeal of this doctrine.

It is the opinion of that committee and myself that it will not affect the business world adversely and will provide a measure of protection that the consumer should not be without.

HEARING OFFICER DIXON: Thank you, sir.

Mr. Cabell.

EXAMINATION

MR. CABELL: Mr. Preloznik, in the course of this Judicare Program do you have occasion to defend a number of consumers who have been caught in these contracts?

MR. PRELOZNIK: Yes, we have. It arises generally in a number of ways, usually when the person becomes so heavily in debt that he needs assistance; there are garnishments pending, there are law suits pending at this point and then the client usually comes into the law office and needs help. Generally it is much too late for the type of assistance we have been talking about here.

MR. CABELL: What economic level are these people, primarily?

MR. PRELOZNIK: All the people our program serves under OEO are those who meet the poverty guidelines.

We also get complaints from those who do not qualify for our program because our program is sponsored by the State Bar. We find those types of problems have been recommended to private counsel as opposed to taking care of it ourselves.

MR. CABELL: It has been suggested even if this rule were adopted the people who need it the most wouldn't be aware of it and if they were aware of it they wouldn't understand how to exercise their rights under it.

MR. PRELOZNIK: This is one of the reasons why we concluded an affirmation is much more effective than cancellation.

MR. CABELL: The type of a person we are talking about wouldn't this really mean the seller would have to go back and if not resell the product or service fill out the form for the consumer or take it to mail for him?

MR. PRELOZNIK: Yes, absolutely, but it would give the individual an opportunity to think over what he had done and it would eliminate some of the notice.

It was pointed out to me that some of the encyclopedia salesmen cleaverly put a label over that part so it is not really easily read or seen.

Again, some of those notices problems would be eliminated where it would require the salesman or the seller to go back to the buyer and get him to affirm before it can

be legitimately called a contract.

This also takes care of your problem of assignment which you referred to; the contract cannot be assigned for five particular days as long as there is no contract there is no ability to assign. Then it automatically takes care of itself.

MR. CABELL: One of the things that concerns me about the affirmative approach you and some of the other witnesses have recommended is how do you distinguish the transactions where the consumer has actually invited the salesman into the home.

I am not talking about a phony advertisement or anything like that but a legitimate transaction the person needs a rug, she calls the local Sears or Montgomery Ward and says, send someone out with some rug samples. I want to buy a rug.

MR. PRELOZNIK: If you are concerned about this small segment we could perhaps include in the legislation unless the individual was specifically invited into the home by the buyer.

But I wouldn't negate the entire concept of affirmation as to all the other transactions in which they are not invitees.

I think that the bulk of the situations occur where there is no invitation.

MR. CABELL: The thing that disturbs me about this is we see a whole range of selling practices. Some companies put the burden of getting into the house on the door-to-door salesman. He goes down the street banging on doors and he gets into so many they know how many he is going to get in.

Other companies will attempt to pave his way into the home ranging from a simple device to a very elaborate one which may well result in the consumer inviting the man into the homes. Once he gets there all these practices we have heard described so graphically are employed.

I think your proposed regulation could be clarified because I can see some difficulty when you describe the door-to-door sale, I think it would be important to know whether it is initiated other than in the home.

For example, an automobile salesman, the person may go to the car dealer and the matter may be consummated at the buyer's home. I think perhaps some consideration ought to be made where the sale is initiated and the manner in which it is initiated to give the kind of protection we are talking about.

If it is initiated by the buyer, I think the buyer then perhaps ought not to be in a position where affirmation would be his relief, but perhaps, at that point, cancellation could be considered.

It would be considered in Wisconsin, for example,

cancellation would be used on all inside transactions. We have not come up with a recommendation at this time.

MR. CABELL: The only problem we have you see is distinguishing the situation in which the consumer actually initiated the contact and the situation in which he has been inveigled; how do you draw the distinction between the advertisement in the Yellow Pages of the Telephone Directory, for example, and the advertisement in the Sunday supplement in the newspapers.

MR. PRELOZNIK: I don't think it is necessary.

I think the high pressure salesman is capable of exerting all types of pressure even though the initial act was initiated by the buyer.

I think in many instances even in the department store sales there is the kind of high pressure tactic that there should be some relief available to the consumer. It may not be as harsh as affirmation, but I think there ought to be the cancellation relief even in the situations where the buyer ititiates it.

There is high pressure tactics involved and there is a great deal of that. Many of our credit problems are debtor problems that our program has experienced are as the result of people overbuying and very often they are overbuying because there are effective sales techniques employed and employed on consumers and people buy more than they

1 |

ought to.

Ī

Had they considered I am sure that they would probably have cancelled.

MR. CABELL: Thank you.

HEARING OFFICER DIXON: Mr. Lamet.

MR. LAMET: Is there something about the sale being made in the home that makes it unique?

You mentioned there might be some pressures exerted in the store. Is there something about the environment of the home itself that makes this rather unique?

MR. PRELOZNIK: Yes.

As I indicated we find that younger people are overwhelmed. They can be intimidated. Older women have been intimidated by aggressive salesmen. They are willing to sign anything just to get rid of the salesman.

Once they sign the particular contract the question is how do you revoke. Generally, if they have given a down payment they are not able to get that back. Many of them can't afford legal assistance.

The prior witness indicated many of them really don't understand they have a legal problem that can be resolved.

Our program has made an effort to explain the rights of the consumer, but very often people are ashamed

that they have been taken advantage of and as a result, are unwilling to even talk about it to their friends.

We find out only much later where there are debtor kind of problems mount to such an extent they need a Chapter 13 or a bankruptcy or they have had a garnishment action taken against them.

MR. LAMET: Now you have testified that the State does have a law with regard to freezer food plans and it has been fairly successful in eliminating many of the problems.

We have had testimony here before concerning the possibility of the problems concerning the trade regulation rule perhaps preempting the state regulation.

Would you like to comment on that. You already have one law on the books and it is my understanding from your testimony that you are considering a broader cooling off period for the entire state.

MR. PRELOZNIK: As it applies to Wisconsin it may not have as much impact as it would in other areas.

When I testified in support of this I am also mindful many states have had absolutely no protection and may not have that kind of protection; therefore, it is sorely needed.

MR. LAMET: What period is your Advisory Committee considering with regard to cooling off for all sales? The

same thing you have in the freezer food plan?

MR. PRELOZNIK: Three days.

Three business days.

The National Consumer Act had recommended ten days. The committee thought that was unduly long although the National Consumer Act has a provision whereby a waiver could be established in an emergency situation.

Our committee was of the opinion that by eliminating any possibility of waiver and utilizing three days could accomplish the most effective protection for the consumer.

HEARING OFFICER DIXON: Thank you, Mr. Preloznik.

(Witness excused.)

HEARING OFFICER DIXON: The next witness is Mr.

Dan Milan, Director, Bureau of Consumer Protection, Wisconsin

Department of Agriculture.

STATEMENT OF DAN MILAN, DIRECTOR, BUREAU OF CONSUMER PROTECTION, WISCONSIN DEPART-MENT OF AGRICULTURE

MR. MILAN: My name is Dan Milan. I am the Director of the Bureau of Consumer Protection, Wisconsin Department of Agriculture.

In order that we might get some perspective as to why the Department of Agriculture is interested in consumer protection in Wisconsin, the Department of Agriculture has the primary responsibility for enforcement of trade practice laws. We will get into all forms of business

transactions other than banks, savings and loans, insurance and public utilities. Beyond that we have a very broad jurisdiction.

One of the reasons I was asked to testify here today I believe was to stress the importance of trade practice rules.

As has been mentioned, the Wisconsin Department of Agriculture, by statute, has been given the authority to hold hearings and develop the general orders which are the same which you would call trade practice rules with this exception, by State law a violation of one of our general orders is an offense, it is not a mere guide. It is an offense and it can result in violations of the Code. It can result in very stiff civil forfeitures and injunctions and criminal prosecution or private damage suits.

Under the statute people who have been damaged are entitled to double damages, plus attorneys' fees and costs.

I believe it is very important for the regulatory agencies to define what is unfair, what is deceptive, what is misleading. It is an important regulatory tool as well as providing protection for consumers and legitimate businessmen.

Further, it provides guidance to courts and local prosecutors when you define what is an unfair trade practice

because I don't think the courts and many local prosecutors at this stage are that -- recognize that growing area of consumer protection.

I am sure what constitutes unfair business practices. Our Wisconsin business experience has been that we have issued what we would call consumer protection trade practice rules. Among them are the freezer, meat and food service plan.

We have one on building and home improvements, Gasoline advertising, real estate advertising, deceptive offers of employment, referral selling plans and chain distributor schemes.

Some questions have come up specifically as to what we have experienced in Wisconsin Administrative Code AG-109. That is the freezer meat and food service plan.

Now, just by way of explanation understand this rule covers two different industries one of which is called the freezer meat or careas meat sellers and the other is what you would call the food service plan.

This is the type of a plan where you might pay a membership plan fee and they are entitled to certain alleged benefits.

To start out with I would estimate there are probably more than a dozen food service plan operators in Wisconsin when this was being so considered, but they

12:

were causing a great deal of problems, as has been mentioned.

After they went into effect we noticed the number of complaints has gone down steadily. We certainly still get operators who come in and some are legitimate, many come in from across the State line and we try to get on them right away.

What was the result of this? For one thing the Code what it does is has a cooling off period, and it destroyed negotiability really on promissory notes and the commercial paper.

It would be my opinion the destroying of negotiability was probably the major factor in cutting down on the fraudulent and deceptive operators because they simply weren't able to get financing.

This is the key. However, I don't want to play down the aspect of the desirability of a cooling off provision in our code. I think it is important.

A third factor which perhaps also added to the decline of some of the operators was the bad reputation the industry was getting. I think the people were pretty well aware of this. When we had prosecutions and we publicized the code, this also helped knocked them off.

The legitimate operators still in Wisconsin so far as I know the cooling off hasn't hurt them one bit.

I want to stress the complaints about the high

pressure tactics that are occurring at homes are not imaginary. People are not being given time to think about the deal they are entering into or to compare values or to check on representations made.

I think perhaps one question came up from one of you gentlemen as to the distinction about a home sale presentation. People are in a position where most of the time they are more courteous to ask a salesman to leave or pick up the phone and call the police if he doesn't leave.

Furthermore, they really don't have time to compare values or check on the representations that are made. The pressure is there whether it is high or low-keyed and they say it is a "once in a lifetime deal" and the salesman will not be coming back this way.

I think there is a distinction there that there are actual cases of late hours of people, the salesman will spend all hours of the night just to get the people to sign and people don't examine the documents until after he leaves.

One recommendation that I would make relates to a realistic recognition that the type of sales requiring a cooling off period does not necessarily those that would be customarily classified as home solicitation sales or door-to-door sales.

There is an increasing amount of installment contract selling being perpetrated outside the area or situs

of the consumer's home. This is a normal result really of the increased adverse publicity given to the so-called door-to-door or home solicitation sales and consumer abuse or consumer fraud which end up with the same type of problems as the home solicitation sales are being consummated outside the home of the consumer, a temporary sales location.

I think the cooling off legislation or rules directed at the situs of the contract or the so-called bifurcated sale in which part of the transaction may take place in the home such as the initial contact, the sales or bait presention and the actual contract signing may occur elsewhere.

In other words, I think the rule should cover locations where the buyer's signature is obtained other than at the home which are not the seller's fixed or regular place of business and would include transient or types of sales.

I am going to deviate from my comments and specific provisions of your proposed code just to give an example of what I am talking about, on these transient sales. They are very real and they are increasing in number.

This is an actual case which occurred in the last month, two months. Our investigators picked up the trail of some encyclopedia salesman. They were going around the college campuses. Their method of operation was this, they would send out a post card which on top would say, "final

notice. You name is entered in our national contest. You are a winner of a valuable prize and you also qualify for some other type of an award. No purchase or obligation is involved. We must hear from you before the expiration date given below along with our notice." Please call such and such a person between such and such hours.

The thing that happened, these were sent out perhaps a week, two weeks in advance. The two salesmen would then come to a motel. They would set up in separate rooms and they would start running the prospects through.

They made a sales presentation and it was replete with misrepresentations. I won't go into the details, the precise deception and fraud and misrepresentations.

Subsequently, the buyers would try to cancel and this is what happened in their own words, and I will read from a statement that was taken from one of the college students that happened to sign up. I will delete names, but I will give the picture.

When this was talked about the next morning I decided I didn't want the deal and I called the motel to see if I could cancel the contract. The woman that answered the phone told me that X salesmen were not there.

On the following morning I got a ride to the motel and I went there to see if they were still there but it appeared that the room was being cleaned and obviously were

out a day after the sales meeting.

After our investigators and the local policemen listened to the sales pitch and intervened. They got out after that.

Action is still going to be taken. When I arrived home I received a phone call from the encyclopedia company, no name was given as to who was calling, the person calling to confirm these things I was to receive.

I asked if there was any way I could get out of the contract because I was going into the Peace Corps and I didn't think that I could make the payments. The voice on the phone said that I had signed the contract and never really answered my request.

I asked them if they had already sent my card in to have me ship me the books and he said they already sent a card in. I was not aware that I supposedly had four days to cancel because that portion of the card or contract or on my copy had a sticker reading "special delivery," pasted over it.

Now, if this particular contract provided for this encyclopedia company the provision was this agreement will be verified within four business days to secure your final acceptance. Right over the portion of the contract was put a special sticker. This is no accident. It appeared on several contracts.

If you want this in your record you can have them. I would be happy to submit them as an exhibit.

Again, I stress I think as you get more and more cooling off regulations that are directly only to the situs of the home you are going to have the unscrupulous companies setting up shop in a temporary, transient locations; you are going to have the same problem all over again unless it is covered in your Code.

Another point that I would like to make in your definition of consumer goods and services, it would be our opinion that such goods and services should also include those that are leased.

We are informed by members of the Advisory Council and through our own experience that leasing is a current trend. We anticipate many of the same misrepresentations and deceptions and frauds will be adopted to the leasing field.

Therefore, I would urge you to give consideration to just adding the word "leasing" into your definition of consumer goods and services and then correct it of course, throughout the Code.

I would have a comment in your definition of door-to-door sale, why should sales made in the presence of attorneys be excluded.

I think, while as a practical matter this circum-

stance would appear to be remote, that is, have an attorney present. I can assure you that it may be difficult for anyone, including attorneys, including myself, I am also an attorney, to see the gimmick when you first look at the thing. Sometimes it is very difficult at first glance to see what the gimmick is on the sales presentation when it is made.

As far as your definition of business place -- or excuse me, business day, this is satisfactory and may be more precise if the rule read, legal holiday instead of just holiday.

With respect to your notice to the buyer, I have mixed emotions on this. I think that you have done a good job in laying out the things a buyer can do, but it seems to me it is a little too long and would tend to be confusing. I am not sure people would take the time to read through that lengthy a document.

As to the paragraph on arbitration I would have this question: Does this preclude the buyer from bringing a law suit for damages?

In other words, is this an estoppel so to speak.

Does it bind him to arbitration. If so, I don't think this should be so. I believe if a person wants to bring a lawsuit he should be able to do so.

In Wisconsin there are some remedies along the lawsuit

route.

I would stress, I believe it is very important the rule, and yours does have a provision which restricts waiver of the right of cancellation because one of the first thoughts of a seller, especially the unscrupulous ones is to stop or set up some sort of an estoppel or waiver agreement.

I urge you to keep that in there.

As far as the provision of orally informing the buyer of the right to canel, I would think from an enforcement standpoint, from a regulatory agency standpoint it is probably going to be difficult to enforce unless we get a pattern of testimony where people are saying the salesmen are not doing this and we are able to establish a pattern.

Furthermore, what does it mean when you say you have to orally inform the buyer. Does that mean he has to read the entire notice.

If this is what you mean maybe you could sharpen up the language a little bit on that score.

I think it is important to have a provision where the salesman says right off what he is there for. It has been our experience the initial contact is where people get their first impression as to what's going on. I think if the salesman is required, is going to misrepresent, if a salesman calls at the home he ought to start right off

.

what he is there for.

We think that -- some people have said the cooling off period should run from the time he is advised of his monthly payments and the company that would collect those payments.

In other words, I think it is all right the way you have it starting to run three days afterwards. I just bring up the point some people think it should be starting to run from the time they receive their first payment from the finance company, when they receive their first payment book from the finance company.

To sum up the argument, it is frequently heard direct sales companies are being picked on. It is said merchants operating at a fixed location use bait advertising and selling tactics and may result in just as much injury to the consumer.

This may be true, however, the remedy must be fashioned to meet the particular circumstances or tactics involved.

Bait selling can be controlled by surveillance and other investigational techniques of the regulatory agencies.

The same regulatory law enforcement measures cannot as a practical matter be used where business is conducted on a door-to-door transient level of location.

Thank you.

HEARING OFFICER DIXON: Thank you, sir.

Mr. Cabell.

EXAMINATION

MR. CABELL: I would like to have those documents if you will hand them to me when you finish I will have them introduced into the record.

I have no questions.

HEARING OFFICER DIXON: Mr. Lamet, do you have any questions?

MR. LAMET: No, no questions.

HEARING OFFICER DIXON: You raised one question,
Mr. Milan about whether or not the proposed rule would
foreclose the buyer from filing suit and the proposed rule
dealing with arbitration.

Are you aware of the fact arbitration at the buyer's option?

MR. MILAN: Perhaps I missed that.

HEARING OFFICER DIXON: And it reads, "Fail to include in each door-to-door sales contract a clear and conspicuous statement that the seller agrees to arbitrate any dispute arising under the contract at the buyer's option."

MR. MILAN: I take it back. I guess I missed that, sir.

HEARING OFFICER DIXON: Thank you, sir.

2

(Witness excused.)

3

4

HEARING OFFICER DIXON: One other question. Do you have any information as to how these lease arrangements

5

work and what type of products are being leased.

6

at this point. But we have been informed by attorneys on

MR. MILAN: Well, we don't have a lot of information

7

our advisory council who are in this, in commercial trans-

8

actions and quite knowledgeable tell us that this is the

10

coming field.

11

As more regulations are put on selling techniques

12

on the sale, many companies are going to revert to some

13

other form of then getting their merchandise out.

14

All I can say is that we are informed and we are starting to work on it and check into it, that leasing is

15

the coming thing. If it is not covered there is going to

16 17

be a great big loophole.

18

HEARING OFFICER DIXON: Several other witness have

19

testified to the same effect. It must be new. All of them

20

are somewhat hazy as to exactly how it is done and what type

21

products are being leased.

22

But your suggestion as I understand it would be the definition of sale would be expanded to include, lease.

23

MR. MILAN: That is true.

24

HEARING OFFICER: DIXON: Thank you.

25

(Witness excused.)

HEARING OFFICER DIXON: With the permission of the other witnesses, Mr. Shipman who is scheduled last today and has connection problems and has asked to come next.

I will call Mr. David Shipman.

STATEMENT OF DAVID SHIPMAN, CHAIRMAN, FEDERAL BAR ASSOCIATION COMMITTEE ON ARBITRATION

MR. SHIPMAN: Mr. Dixon, Mr. Cabell, Mr. Lamet, a word of apology, I notice the excellent materials prepared by the other speakers; unfortunately, a little bug got ahold of me about ten days ago and I was in the hospital last week and couldn't prepare properly.

Mr. Lamet asked me to testify anyway, and I made some rough notes here this afternoon.

I have been asked to concentrate on the arbitration clause.

First, a bit of bibliography about myself and about my interest and philosphy, because I think one must evaluate the contributions of the witnesses in a case like this with their experience and their prejudices.

I am a lawyer who has practiced in the City of Chicago for some 35 years. I am also an arbitrator, a Master in Chancery in the United States District Court and now Special Master.

I have also acted as a referee. I will try to explain the difference if it is relevant to the discussion.

Now, the general practice of law, I don't believe I am the best lawyer in town, I am not saying this to be funny, or the best arbitrator in town, or even the most experienced among the upper ten percentile, but I think I am perhaps one of those few who has perhaps really been around and experienced trial work and arbitration work, Master's Work and as a lawyer presenting before Masters in Courts and as an active arbitrator.

I have handled cases never for any labor union.

I have been a business lawyer. I happen to number among my clients one of the largest corportations in the country.

I worked for Clarence Darrow and Samuel Insull, not at the same time but I did a job for each of them.

I once sued a cleaner who wrongfully disposed of a \$2.50 pair of gloves of a student nurse. We put him out of business for a week until he paid it with costs.

I was also successful after fighting 21 years in recovering an award of almost \$1 million.

I say this because I was involved in doing it and got a very substantial fee in recovering this award. Incidentally, it was on behalf of an inventor who couldn't finance the litigation and he made an invention and died penniless. It took me doing that all over again if I got

\$2 million for it --

Now, my philosophy is that and arbitration is part of my philosophy, I have what these people now call a hang up or my bag on arbitration.

I think it is not Utopia. Utopia is a misleading thing. Utopia is a beautiful thing. Plato had one one. St. Thomas had one and Bellamy had one and Butler had one. The Communist Party has got one and even the Nazis had one.

The problem is how do you get from here to there. Usually you get there, you just never get there. You get into either tyranny or chaos.

We have some things to work with in this society of ours. As a lawyer I have been trained to understand these things, to transmit them to anyone that is interested.

I think that our judicial system, for instance, is a tremendous and sacred thing, particularly in the due process provisions it makes for the protection of people accused of crimes and people involved in satisfying civil rights and people who are sued.

There are very many, and perhaps, a majority, I don't know of great Judges, but this legal system, and I am an officer of the court and as I have indicated I am a Master in Chancery of the Federal Court. I am an officer in the federal court.

I think the judicial system is facing a breakdown.

I have a clipping from Chief Justice Burger. We just can't keep up with this wonderful legal system of ours with the burgeoning of the social and physical and material and development of our society.

People go day after day without receiving justice and sometimes receiving a great deal of injustice. There has got to be a way out of this.

The legal system can grow and I think it will grow one way, one road I think in that direction is the road of arbitration.

I think that one of the things that arbitration

-- one of the things we have to do in arbitration which

will contribute to it also, is to restore the confidence

of our people, of our young people, of our old people, in

our institutions and our Government leadership and our

educational leadership.

What I am particularly interested in is our business leadership.

Now, this has broken down. I am a lawyer with a lot of education and I am afraid to enter into a contract to purchase without thorough examination. There are still a few good old institutions like Marshall Field or Zenith I have a lot of confidence in. I hope that they can continue. There are many good businessmen I am sure, just as there are

many good people who buy merchandise. Probably you gentlemen know this better than anyone else because this is your field.

The competition of the bad one, the competition of the crooked ones, the competition of the incompetent ones or the ignorant ones drags the whole level down.

Now, what we have got to do is to restore this confidence. I heard some of these idealistic young people and if I had to trade between idealistic young person or a practical old person I would take the idealistic young person because they are going to become practical later.

we want to give the customer the option of suing as well as of going to arbitration. Actually your rule provides that and I say that is all right, but I wouldn't make too much of a point of that because there are some customers that make it very difficult for the seller, not very many I am sure, but there are all victims of this process.

Arbitration is not going to turn the tables but it is going to be one of the ways and that is why I am interested. I want to do my little bit. I want to work with the system.

I think the differences between litigation and arbitration and things arbitration can do, I think I made it clear I sympathize with the seller who wants to render

a service or provide a commodity and make a profit and in sympathy with the buyer who wants competent services and decent merchandise and are willing to pay a reasonable price for it.

Now, I do not think this is new to anyone here, litigation involves delay. As I have mentioned it took me 21 years to get the rights for this inventor and he died after 10 years and his sister who was the only heir died a few years after we collected and it is expensive litigation and you just can't afford to litigate for the kind of grievances the average small person runs into.

I know as a lawyer, I am not trying to run down lawyers, but we have to make a living. We have to pay our help, we have to pay our offices. We just can't get involved. Many of us are willing to give a certain amount of our time and this is relevant also then to the question later one as to what will be the charge for arbitration.

As soon as you get involved in litigation almost inevitably you are at war with all of the war psychology, the conflict psychology.

I had a case as a Master and a man came to me and he said, "I haven't slept for five years. I thought they were going to kill me." Now, this is how bitter the legal conduct got and it started with something little and developed into a lawsuit.

When you deal with arbitration you deal with the kind of a situation which could be very simple and very prompt. An arbitration can take an hour, it can take 15 minutes, sometimes it will take longer.

I think anyone who has any familiarity both with arbitration and with litigation would say that arbitration is incomparably short, shorter proceeding.

Now, arbitration also is a very inexpensive proceeding. It is true the cost of litigation is concealed because the Government pays so much of it. Maybe something can be done about that.

Also, in connection with arbitration almost every one I have had has been a friendly situation. I am not a man of the cloth but sometimes I feel the thrill the man of a cloth may feel when a couple of people come and say, "We will see Father so and so; Rabbi so and so and let him settle it." This is the general atmosphere that should in turn and often does more exist in arbitration that doesn't exist in law.

Now, there is another thing arbitration can be confidential. A businessman may find an advantage in the arbitration procedure as it is confidential. It is quiet. He gets no adverse publicity someone is suing him for \$1 million because that iron was used and someone burned the house down or something like that.

Furthermore, arbitration enables agreement. I
do not think this point is usually touched on. I think it
is extremely relevant here. For this reason I have read
the literature of the Publishers Association; it is excellent.
They don't provide for arbitration. I would like to state I
think that it is in their interest to do so.

First, because there is a reaction building up and it is unjust against the good sellers, there is a reaction building up in the public and in the Government, yes and the relatively conservative Government we have now, in favor of class suits. Lawyers have plenty of material to work on and I wish I were a young lawyer, I would work on it myself; exemplary damages, conspiracy and other remedies against sellers.

Now, if I were in the selling business or as a seller if a client asked my advice I would say, "Heck, arbitration is a wonderful way out for you. If you don't have it you are going to have something very much worse."

I am not mentioning protests or what.

I will mention very briefly, I hope that I am not taking too much time, one of the experiences I had points this up. Three or four years ago you may remember — Jerry, you are familiar with this, you can stop me if I am getting out of line, three or four years you may remember there were a number of rent strikes against "slum landlords."

I was representing a Government agency together with some associates of mine and reviewing the correspondence there was a financial agency which happened to take over this distressed financial property. We inherited a little village of 84 townhouses.

This letter disclosed that there was a strike up there. They weren't paying their rent. The recommendation was to throw them out.

I immediately got in touch with Washington and made an investigation. We started to negotiate with these people. It is a long and interesting story but I just want to point up the arbitration angle. We finally were able to communicate with these people represented by a very sharp union lawyer and we worked out what was considered a model landlord-tenant relationship or arrangement.

Where arbitration came into the picture was that it was about 3:00 o'clock in the morning. The chairman of the bargaining committee for the tenants was much younger and stronger than I was. We were really pretty woozy and they were thinking; these people were very bright. I just didn't have the stamina to continue on with this to get an agreement.

So, I made a little speech about arbitration, and about how labor and business use arbitration not only in the process of carrying out the contract but in the process

of getting the contract.

In other words, we got to a point in negotiations where they just have to, you know end it up and end the strike and make a settlement. They said, well, we will leave it to arbitration.

So, perhaps we can use arbitration, I suggest this to the sellers, too, for those details upon which we come to agree and if we can't agree on all these details, if we can agree on general principals as specific as possible, if we can and let arbitration carry forward in the interpretation of the agreements.

As a lawyer I recommend arbitration clauses in any agreement I have. I recommend it in closed corporations and what are extremely tragic is the partnerships. One partner dies and one wife says she will sell the business and the other says something and something happens and then they get into court. They are in court for five, 10, 15 years and the business goes to pot.

When the arbitration clause is there and not used to go back to the tenant situation, these people had a grievance procedure to come into our headquarters and fill out a complaint and one, two, three steps and then we will arbitrate.

They never used it. They settled it on the ground the man we appoint everyone knew the thing would be settled

and settled darn quick.

So, I think I am addressing myself largely to the business firms. I say to them, you want to welcome arbitration. It is going to make your customers happier. It is going to do away with a great deal of litigation. It is going to do away with changes of common law and legislative law that will be adverse to you. It will build up your reputation.

Now, arbitration depends on confidence in exchange for these wonderful protections and due process under our Constitution that someone back in England and Great Britain did some years ago due to these things we have these wonderful protections. They are extremely costly.

They are so costly what is the use of having the protection in exchange for these wonderful protections and due process of our constitution, and they are so costly what is the use of having the protection when you just can't get justice.

In many situations you are perfectly willing, I know I am in most situations to say, I will give up all this due process which requires a record and review and all the technical rules of evidence and 10 or 15 years and all the legal fees, I will give it up because I have confidence in the institution here that will provide an impartial person to hear my claim in summary fashion, according

v

4 5

to law, equity and conscience and dispose of it.

I would like to see this arbitration become completely voluntary. In the sense we say compulsory arbitration, it is a contradiction in terms. The thing that makes the arbitration constitutional is that you voluntarily agree to waive these procedural protections of due process, by agreeing to arbitration. That is the way it should be.

Now, the question is can you force someone to arbitrate. Now, I do not want to be playing antics with semantics the way Sidney Harris says. There is a serious constitutional question in my mind when you try to force someone to give up his procedural protections and arbitrate. I am not saying you can't do it under the rules, I don't frankly know.enough about the powers and sanctions of the Federal Trade Commission where you have very good lawyers.

I know that we have very good lawyers representing the American Arbitration Association. I think this problem can be met. If the leaders of industry would agree to sit down and work out a sensible arbitration clause.

This particular arbitration clause is a good one in the sense it shows a good heart and needs some work and I will make one or two suggestions. I think if they don't agree I think that either your lawyers will have to tell you this, you can force them to because of some section you have

in situations like this when the industry is in this shape or by providing a minimum of review. You can have what you call compulsory arbitration which is really a kind of mini-administrative procedure where the review is limited to in effect I am speaking roughly and I can't give Mr. Lamet the case if I haven't already done so, one case in New York you can limit it to, if the arbitrator seems to be acting fairly and not irrationally then the court says it is all right if you provide a review of that nature.

Then it will probably held constitutional. This is not a considered opinion. It is just a hunch I have I have already suggested to Jerry, but I think along those lines you will find the solution if you don't find a better one.

Now, as to the expense of arbitration I know and I have talked and I act on a panel of arbitration for labor cases for commercial cases for International Law and I am also on the panel of the Chief Judge of the United States Court of Appeals in our district.

I was talking with the Regional Director of the AAA here and I mentioned to him I thought that \$50 was quite a charge for somebody who has or thinks he is cheated of \$10.

Also, I am sure there are lawyers who would devote some time free of charge to act as arbitrators.

.

I want to say just as emphatically, it would be unfair if this thing works to make a permanent arrangement expecting lawyers to give their time and effort and the money they need to run their offices more than anybody else.

But I am sure there are lawyers that would give all the time necessary to get a thing like this underway and to provide you with some experience.

As to the cost it strikes me in some of these cases economies can be effected in arbitration. Maybe it isn't necessary to have an arbitrator or lawyer whoever else the arbitrator is travel to 134th and Ewing, if there is such a location or somewhere south, east or west and hold the arbitration. Perhaps there could be a central place or places at a given time and the people could present their claims for arbitration, perhaps 50 of them can be handled in one afternoon, at a very low cost and perhaps the American Arbitration Association would consider say sharing in these reductions.

Now, this is what I think in a general way that which I think about arbitration.

If I may make one suggestion; the American Arbitration Association has been in business I think in its present form since the 1920's, but it succeeded other organizations of a similar nature. I think maybe they go back to the Middle Ages.

The stock in trade of the American Arbitration

Association is the confidence and it is the only stock in trade, the confidence of the people who use it.

The American Arbitration Association wouldn't last a week if the unions and the employers and the business people and the lawyers who use it thought they weren't absolutely fair, and competent. This is their stock in trade and this is something we should play on in the development of our economic and social society.

They have developed rules governing arbitration; they have developed a clause, a very simple clause that can be used which will provide that they will run the arbitration and their rules will be effective to govern the absence of that you get into all kinds of hassles about how the arbitrator should be or what rules would apply.

These are the thoughts I would like to convey or hope to convey. I hope some of them have been of some value.

I have told Mr. Lamet I would be glad to do whatever else I can in here or in Washington in connection with the development of the arbitration procedures in the rule and as well as in other areas.

HEARING OFFICER DIXON: We appreciate that, Mr. Shipman.

You also mentioned you had not had time to prepare

3

4 5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

STATEMENT OF KENAN HEISE. AS READ BY DIANNE WITKOWSKI.

MISS WITKOWSKI: Last year, as editor of the Action Line column in Chicago Today newspaper, I handled 3.000 to 5,000 complaints dealing with door-to-door salesmen and their firms.

Because the newspaper took an interest in these problems, we were able to resolve many of them. But never did we get the feeling we were stopping the situation from coming up again in next week's mail.

We have warned people about specific companies. about certain practices and about the necessity of checking with a financial or legal advisor before signing any contract. We have told them repeatedly what has happened to people who didn't take these precautions.

We know such advice has helped. We have also learned why it hasn't been more effective.

Ask any housewife if she wants to spend \$450 for pots and pans and she'll ask you back whether you are out of your head. But twist it into a few dollars a week, throw in the idea that she'll get a membership in an organization that allows her to buy everything from diapers to a car wholesale, wear her resistance down and pressure her to the point where she will be relieved to get rid of you and you have a sale.

4.

Afterwards, she will be able to sort out the facts that the salesman's approach adroitly minimized or evaded. A hopped-up husband will often help her.

In Illinois, she can then get out of it -- if the husband is direct enough to contact the firm in writing within three days.

Such firms have learned to get around "the problem of the angry husband." They want him there for the sales pitch.

A firm such as Mr. & Mrs. International, for example, say they have a present from a donor (for a recent marriage or birth) and want to deliver it when both husband and wife will be home.

The point I want to make very clearly is that it is not simply lack of knowledge on the customer's part that gets him to buy something he doesn't want from a door-to-door salesman at a price his family can't begin to afford.

People who write to our column display a fantastic sense of confusion as to why they made the deal. It is very common for us to hear, "I was frightened of the man." "I didn't know how to get rid of him." "I didn't know I was signing a contract."

"He asked me to sign a slip so he could show his boss."

"I really felt sorry for her." "He was so kind."

"I was lonely and he was somebody to talk to."

Afterwards, comes the reality. "I can't afford it." "I just lost my job." "My child is very sick and needs hospitalization." "I'm getting married."

Many, at this point, add that the encyclopedias, books or pots and pans have never been taken out of the box.

The companies talk of those people as welshers and are simply people unwilling to carry out their part of the agreement, while the company is living up religiously to its obligations.

As usual, the firm's arguments are an attempt to lead directly away from the central issues.

The individual has been persuaded to buy items
he or she can't afford -- especially if the least financial
setback hits him.

Too often, it is also something such people don't need and won't use. They buy out of confusion, pressure and a vague sense of obligation to the character that the salesman tries to portray to them.

We have, of course, had plenty of complaints of very crass actions by door-to-door salesmen. The perennial one is the salesman who sells magazines to the person who cannot speak English or to the individual on a temporary pass home from a mental hospital.

There are, too, of course, the thieves who take the customer's money and never send the magazines. We know a quite intelligent Catholic priest who complained to us he had been taken over for \$180 by such a magazine salesman.

The simplest tool that the door-to-door salesman can use against a prospective customer is the lie. He can say and some do, that no matter what the contract says, the individual can get out of it if he wants or needs to. People under pressure believe that.

The facts are that hustlers who can't make it any where else -- people fired for dishonesty, young people without responsibilities, cheats and thieves -- are given almost any opportunities they want to go into people's homes with a contract in their hands selling anything from home study courses to cemetery lots. They are under only one pressure -- to sell -- and they will lie to do it.

The companies act self-righteous when they are caught with such an employee openly and brazenly deceiving people. Yet, they know who their hustlers are long before it comes to a head.

Many of them are their top salesmen. Certainly, they are the ones with the most complaints against them.

The Government has to start holding these companies

responsible for such employees. It is not enough that such a company purge itself by firing a man after he has been caught by some Government agency or Action Line column.

The Federal Government should require that all door-to-door salesmen working for larger firms or going from one state to another be bonded so that one, they can't slip away after raping an area and two, they will meet at least the minimal responsibility standards of bonding.

On a state or federal level, there also has to be some kind of uniformity of licensing for door-to-door salesmen. Currently, more affluent suburbs force such salesmen to sell elsewhere, exclusively in middle or lower middle areas because of their strict rules and enforcement concerning door-to-door sales.

Either the wealthy should get the opportunity to get taken by door-to-door salesmen or the poorer people should be better protected from them. One of the two -- not one to the detriment of the other.

I have a selfish interest in all of this. I'd like to see it so that next year I'd only get 2,000 or 3,000 complaints against firms that sell door-to-door salesmen.

These merchants at your door step can fulfill an excellent function in society. I may say that I myself started when I was five years old selling woodfibre flowers

door-to-door during the depression.

I don't recommend that society encourage that form of child labor, but there does have to be room for the little guy with a product to sell that isn't available in the supermarket or even the company which agressively wants to take its wares to the people, be they magazines or encyclopedias.

But experience has more than taught that customers in such situations now lack basic protection from fraud and deceit.

A situation exists whereby a contract can be signed and the firm can use the full force of the courts which can be pulled in after the facts, by the company, then the Government has the obligation before hand to check the ground rules.

The FTC as the empowered arm of the Government has to make it very clear to companies that such door-to-door sales must be speak a free and voluntary act on the part of the purchaser.

He doesn't need time to "change his mind," he needs several days rather to make it up away from pressures that have nothing to do with his needs, wants or financial capacity.

Illinois has such a period and our column has been a party to helping many people make use of it. We've also

seen that it doesn't always answer the need.

It may be difficult for people to understand about others or themselves that they don't always mail letters as quickly as they want or need to.

Some people have a hard time getting to a post office to mail a registered letter when they work the same hours as the Post Office is open.

The answer is obvious that a person should have the right to cancel via telephone. For many -- expecially those who have difficulty writing -- it is the only answer.

The option should be open -- particularly in large cities -- that the person can write or call a Government agency such as the FTC, attorney general or consumer complaint office and cancel through them so that it can be a matter of record, something not afforded by a direct phone call or non-registered letter.

Even more radical solutions ought to be considered at this point.

Basically, we should consider whether or not door-to-door selling employing legally binding contracts should simply be banned.

People could still go door-to-door promoting encyclopedias, but they would have to go to a store or office to make the actual purchase.

Magazines could be subscribed to in a person's

home, but on a cancelable basis. These contracts are thorns in the laws of this nation and some friend is going to do more than keep pulling them out. He is going to remove the bramble bush.

I suggest that friend be the Federal Trade Commission.

MR HEISE: Thank you.

HEARING OFFICER DIXON: Thank you, both.

MR. CABELL: No questions.

HEARING OFFICER DIXON: Mr. Lamet.

EXAMINATION

MR. LAMET: In your contacts with the people involved in door-to-door sales could you tell us if there was a printed notice on the contract and they were told orally about the three day cooling off period, would they have actually cancelled the contract?

MR. HEISE: There are people who wouldn't and there are people who if they were told that, I mean, we get many, many people coming back to me and the company replies back, sends a photostatic copy of such a contract and the person was told at the time, there it is in large print.

They still do not cancel and the person wants to cancel later, very shortly after. I think the visibility of this problem is in the middle class and it exists tremendously among the lower economic class.

Iet me give you a dramatic example in Englewood,

a black family and the boy had been shot in a bar and
in two hours a representative of a funeral home soliciting
in the same sense magazine salesmen solicits came to that
home, sold that family a funeral that they couldn't possibly
afford. Eight days later they still hadn't buried that
boy because they wanted cash to bury him.

The woman borrowed some money from the loan sharks, it still wasn't enough and that is where I did come into it, I did loan them enough money and finally got the guy in the ground.

So, this kind of a problem does exist and it is much more dramatic than the visible problems that we see with the magazine salesmen or the home study courses, etcetera and etcetera.

I think we have to cut deeply and we need a radical solution and rather than solutions that use technical terms to explain to the people.

MR. LAMET: Do you think the statement included in the rule is too technical?

Will people read it or is it too long?

MR. HEISE: No, that is not the point. The point is we can't be too optimistic about it. If we do enforce this; if we get this rule in effect we have got to be looking to the less visible aspect of the problem and see what we can do there.

13⁻

HEARING OFFICER DIXON: Thank you, Mr. Heise.

(Witness excused.)

HEARING OFFICER DIXON: Our next witness is Mr.

Charles Betz, representing the Water Conditioning Foundation.

STATEMENT OF CHARLES BETZ, WATER CONDITIONING FOUNDATION

MR. BETZ: Good afternoon.

My name is Charles Betz. I am here this afternoon representing the Water Conditioning Foundation, an organization which I serve as a director.

I am also President of Lindsay Division of Ecodyne Corporation which manufactures water conditioning equipment. Ecodyne in turn is a wholly owned subsidiary of Trans Union Corporation.

Perhaps you are more familiar with home water softeners than other types of water conditioning equipment. If you have lived in one of the many hardwater areas of the country you, and certainly your wife, are well aware of our products and the benefits of soft water which our industry provides.

With me today are Bradley Burnside, executive director of the Water Conditioning Foundation, and Thaddeus S. Snell, our general counsel.

The Water Conditioning Foundation is a trade association representing some 60 manufacturers of water

conditioning equipment and supplies which account for over 70 percent of sales of water softeners in the United States.

In addition to water softeners, our industry makes equipment which removes iron, sulphur and other undesirable elements from water, reduces acidity and corrects unpleasant tastes. odors or colors.

Although the basic product in our home equipment
line is the water softener, the fact that we can do and are
asked to do many things to improve water quality for home
use points out the complexity of the problem with which
the Commission is faced when it undertakes to regulate "door-todoor sales."

As an initial impression, it may appear that a sale made in a home is simply a sale made in a home. If it can be so simply identified and if there is a need for regulation, then regulation itself is a simple matter.

Nothing could be further from reality. There is no more similarity between sales made in the home than there is similarity between sales made in the home than there is similarity between the products which are sold to a home-owner or between the salesman who sell such products.

To even think of home selling as an "industry" is fallacious, and I believe the personalized, technical aspects of the particular products which we sell will point up the distortions which result from attempting to

lump together all selling which is done away from a business establishment.

Water conditioning equipment ranges in retail price from \$125 to over \$700 for the more sophisticated fully automatic equipment which fills a variety of needs.

Water conditioning equipment is distributed through six major channels of distribution. These are:

One, direct to appliance stores.

Two, direct to other types of retail establishments.

Three, to plumbers.

Four, to farm cooperatives.

Five, to home builders for installation as original equipment in newly constructed homes and, six, independent dealers specializing in sales, installation and servicing of water conditioning equipment.

The large bulk of in-home sales are made by the independent dealers who specialize in water conditioning equipment. Members of our foundation spend a great amount of money training and qualifying their personnel.

These dealers employ over 25,000 individuals for in-home selling. Of course, the number of people in the industry affiliated with and affected by in-home sales is many times that number. In-home sales total at least \$40 millions annually.

In talking with you today, I would like to

concentrate on the more personal factual aspects of our industry and the effect of the proposed rules on us.

I will not even attempt to discuss those objections to the proposed rule based on such legal points as:

One, the FTC's authority to impose such a rule; or, two, the question of duplication of preemption of other already existing legislation; or, three, the constitutional questions, as these "legal" objections, as I like to call them, are clearly presented in the written statement of the Water Conditioning Foundation which we have filed with the Commission.

Instead, I will discuss the practical application of these rules, which I believe would be ruinous to the water conditioning industry.

I will divide my comments into two categories:

One, general comments on the overall theory of the proposed rule; and, two, specific comments on various provisions of the proposed rule.

At the outset, I want to make it clear that the WCF members do not condone fraudulent sales or sales made by means of deceptive or unfair practices.

We want to see the unethical door-to-door salesman disappear from the American scene as he reflects his bad image upon all in-home sellers.

However, we believe just as strongly that unethical,

fraudulent, unfair or deceptive sellers are not found exclusively selling in the home. Regardless of the sales medium, such practices should be eliminated.

Of course, while we are realistic enough to recognize that all unethical salesmen will not be eliminated in the foreseeable future, we seriously object to burdensome regulation upon honest, ethical salesmanship based on the place where the sale is made.

As a matter of social philosophy, it is certainly a responsibility and a fine objective of the Commission to protect the consumer from unfair and deceptive acts and practices.

However, it is also a basic objective of the Commission to promote equal opportunity between sellers so that competition may be fostered on a fair and equitable basis without discrimination in any form.

It is, therefore, somewhat startling to find the Commission proposing a Trade Regulation Rule which would condemn certain acts and practices and impose certain specific requirements on sales made in a home when such acts and practices are not condemned and such specific requirements are not imposed upon sales made at a business establishment.

The clear implication of this regulation is that the Federal Trade Commission with all of its prestige as

"don't buy from those fraudulent, deceptive, dishonest salesmen who call on you at your home; do your buying at an established place of business."

It is equally startling that such a result is being accomplished not through normal judicial processes where the accused is confronted by the accuser and the evidence against him, but in a proceeding where the accused is invited to come and defend himself against charges which are not defined, which he has had no opportunity to investigate, and the magnitude of which is not disclosed.

I would be the first to admit that there may have been some salesman of water conditioning equipment somewhere, sometime who went further than he should have gone in his desire to make a sale.

I would like to ask the representative of any business establishment in this country to stand up and say with all honesty that "This has never occurred in my store."

Does the Commission propose to sterilize all salesmen?

Selling is by definition the art of persuading a prospect to buy some type of goods or services.

Selling is not simply writing up an order, filling in the blanks, or taking the money from someone who has already decided what he wants to buy.

Such people are clerks or cashiers. You find them at the check-out counter of every mass merchandising establishment. Is this the only way merchandise is to be sold?

As long as there are salesmen, there is going to be persuasion. If the consumer must be protected from persuasion, then we must not only eliminate the salesmen but advertising and promotion as well.

But if the salesman is to remain, then he should be viewed for what he is, and he should not be regimented down to the minutest detail, from describing the content of his opening statement, to his closing remarks, and then telling him that once he has made a sale he must encourage the customer to change his mind.

If salesmen are to be so regulated, then all salesmen should be so regulated and not just those who make their living by calling on the customer in his home.

After all what is really so bad about in-home selling?

Let's look at the Water Conditioning salesman.

The water conditioning equipment salesman, who makes in-home sales is not the invisible, non-locatable salesman who is dropped off in a neighborhood, canvasses the area, makes his sales, and disappears, never to be seen or heard from again.

The water conditioning equipment salesman is a member of the community. He works out of an established sales office. He represents a company listed in the telephone directory. He can be found easily and makes himself readily available to serve a customer.

The water conditioning equipment he sells is not a standard item. These units vary in size, capability, cost, and performance. It is important for the customer to get the proper unit, the unit that is capable of filling his needs.

The proper piece of equipment cannot be determined without knowing details such as the number of people in the family, their ages, the number of bath rooms in the house, and the number of faucets in the house. The type and location of the plumbing must be examined to determine the cost of installation.

Finally, the water must be analyzed for hardness, taste, acidity, color and odor. All of these things can best be done at the home by trained sales personnel.

So few calls are made "cold" as to be almost totally nonexistent. Almost all calls at homes are made as the result of ads, inquiries or responses of some kind showing interest in an analysis of water, a demonstration of water conditioning equipment or the benefits which water conditioning can provide.

The water conditioning equipment salesman, a specialist in his field, is providing a valuable service that cannot be duplicated in a business establishment -- why penalize him for providing a valuable service.

We simply do not subscribe to the philosophy that, once a sale has been made, and an agreement negotiated and signed, the buyer should then be encouraged to change his mind.

How many stores permit you to buy merchandise, take it home, try it out, install it, often another party is involved, i.e., plumbing contractor or professional installer is required, and then change your mind, and call them to come and get their merchandise, take it out if it has been installed and refund your money in full without even a service charge or a cancellation penalty of some kind?

Under the proposed Rule, several days after his water softener has been installed the purchaser can call up and say "come take it out, "I've changed my mind."

This could be almost a week later, with holidays and weekends.

Is this a right which he should have as a matter of public policy, even in the absence of any fraud, deception or misrepresentation? If so, should he not have this right regardless of where he buys the water softener?

The Commission proposes to define the offense as the failure to permit the customer to change his mind, the failure to make a particular point at the very beginning of an opening statement, or the failure to use a certain size type, or a certain color of ink, or certain specific words in a contract.

There is no reason why these requirements could not be made universally applicable to all salesmen. A contract is a contract, and the size of the type, the color of the ink and the precise form and location of words can be controlled just as easily when the contract is signed in a store as when it is signed in a home.

I would like to reiterate that our industry does not condone deceptive practices or fraudulent tactics.

I dare say that the overwhelming majority of dealers who sell primarily in the home do permit a customer to change his mind and cancel the sale without penalty until the equipment is installed, and after it is installed probably would take the equipment back with a reasonable service charge for removing the equipment.

We also are aware of the existence of laws in a number of communities and states imposing some restrictions on in-home selling.

These facts are not justification for this type of regulation, in our opinion.

I confess that in my lifetime I have made a few purchases that I later regreted, that most of them were made in stores or automobile showrooms and being human, perhaps I like to think that I was high-pressured into buying something, or that the product was misrepresented, or that in some other way I was "sold" on something that I really didn't want.

However, I equally candidly say to you that I do not think that the weaknesses and foibles of human nature that can be eliminated by a Trade Regulation Rule.

False, misleading and deceptive acts and practices are already outlawed by the Federal Trade Commission Act.

We simply do not believe that the circumstances justify the Commission in telling a large segment of American industry how, when, where and pursuant to what kind of a contract it can sell its goods as long as such practices are not, in fact, deceptive, false or misleading.

As to the specifics of the Proposed Rule, I will make only a few comments.

We have reviewed Mr. Sherwood's suggested Alternative to the FTC's Proposed Trade Regulation Rules.

With certain exceptions, our industry would not find the alternative rule impractical provided it was applied on a uniform basis to all engaged in selling water conditioning equipment regardless of where the sale was made.

selling is guilty and in-store selling is not.

We cannot accept the proposition that home

We cannot accept the basic premise that in-home

We cannot accept the proposition that home solicitation sales should be regulated whereas sales from a business establishment should not be regulated to the same extent.

If regulation is only applied to sales made in the home, it would severely penalize those selling in the home, it would severely penalize those selling in the home giving a substantial competitive advantage to retail outlets for the equipment which we also manufacture. Our industry strongly supports equality of opportunity in the market place.

We further suggest that, before these Trade

Commission Regulation Rules have any application, there

should be some evidence of fraud, deception or misleading

acts or practices in connection with the sale.

If, for example, access to the home is gained by fraudulent means then the penalties imposed would be justified.

However, the mere fact that a purchase is consummated or a contract signed in a home is not, in our opinion, sufficient justification for this type of predetermination that a violation of the Federal Trade Commission Act is conclusively presumed to have occurred.

We believe that under any circumstances regardless of where water conditioning equipment is purchased, there should be some penalty imposed on the buyer for cancellation of the contract except where fraud, misrepresentation or deception is involved.

We suggest that such a penalty be the downpayment, but not to exceed 10 percent of the purchase price, if the cancellation option is exercised prior to installation of the equipment. This would have a tendency to discourage a buyer from entering into a series of contracts cancellable with no penalty; simply taking advantage of this cancellation option.

Actually in our industry, this often would impose no penalty on the buyer as there frequently is no downpayment.

We are of the firm conviction that some further obligation should be imposed upon the buyer who does not exercise the cancellation option until after the equipment has been installed with the buyer's knowledge and permission.

Obviously, installation of water softeners cost money. The seller is hardly in a position to refuse to install equipment if the buyer wants it installed.

If the equipment is installed, whether it be purchased from a store or from a salesman who calls at the home, and the buyer subsequently decides to exercise his option to cancel the contract, we strongly recommend

that the buyer should be required to tender payment for the reasonable cost of installing and removing the equipment with his notice of cancellation.

The amount could even be set out in the contract so the buyer would know in advance what this charge would be. If the buyer is not willing to make such a payment, then the contract should not be cancelled and any notes given should be fully negotiable.

Of course, we certainly recommend that this installation charge also be waived and uncollectable in case there is fraud, deception or misrepresentation in connection with the sale. These comments relate to Point 13 of attachment II to Mr. Sherwood's letter to the Commission dated March 4.

We also take exception to the provision referred to as Point 8 in Mr. Sherwood's attachment II, as we do not believe that the right to cancel should be over-promoted.

If the text of the notice is under a sub-heading, is in type no smaller than the rest of the contract, and is in language consistent with the rest of the contract, and is in language consistent with the rest of the contract, we think the objective of protecting the consumer has been adequately accomplished.

Subject to the above comments and reservations, we want to commend Mr. Sherwood's letter, Alternative,

Proposal and analysis which we believe is constructive and forthright in its objective.

If the Commission surmounts the legal questions which have been raised and is disposed to proceed on some basis with a Trade Regulation Rule, we urge that serious consideration be given to the suggestions presented by Mr. Sherwood, and to his reasoning with the amplification and modifications which I have suggested.

I appreciate the opportunity to appear before you today, and thank you for your attention and interest.

If you have any questions, we will be more than happy to try and answer them for you.

HEARING OFFICER DIXON: Thank you.

Mr. Cabell?

EXAMINATION

MR. CABELL: Mr. Betz, we have heard a number of industry members state your thoughts that this proposed rule amounts to an arbitrary and discriminatory action on door-to-door sellers.

My question is this, what is your real objection to this rule. We have a cooling off law in 22 states, we have one in three cities; we have it in the Truth-in-Lending Act. You have a similar provision in the Uniform Commercial Code.

What is your real objection to this rule?

MR. BETZ: The real objection would be that -there are several things in here such as it appears a total
endorsement of the regulation when it is first considered
is one which is about in-home selling and in fact, that
is the best place for the sale of our product. This is
one of our objections.

I think the other one is in the case of a threeday waiting situation where people buy such a unit in most cases they say, "I want it hooked up tomorrow."

Well, if you go ahead and do that and you got this three day cancellation or longer situation, people could go down and shop. They could go to many competitors of ours and they may find one they can buy from for \$20 less and then take this out because he made a deal to me that is more to my liking or something of this sort.

So, you get all of these things that make it restrictive.

MR. CABELL: You also voiced an objection to the provision in the rule that requires the salesman to state the purpose of his call.

At the same time you say most of the salesmen in your industry are invited to the home.

I find it hard to see why if the salesman has been invited to the home, the consumer opens the door and he says, I am so and so a salesman from the so and so water

conditioning company. This is what they do.

MR. BETZ: This is what they do.

MR. CABELL: What is your objection to the provision in the rule that requires you to do that.

MR. BETZ: I don't know. Maybe I don't understand the rule completely. It seems to me if you go to the -- if you are a homeowner and you go to your door and I am there and say, I am Charley Betz from the Lindsay Company. I am here to sell you a water softener, I raise an objection right there.

MR. CABELL: Even if I have called the Lindsay company and said I want to talk to someone about your water softener.

MR. BETZ: If that is the case I would simply be restating the fact I am here at your request and that wouldn't be a problem.

MR. CABELL: I don't think it would be either.

You told us that that is a typical way that your salesmen get into the home.

Now, you repeatedly referred to the expense and risk the seller might have in taking this equipment out after it has been installed.

MR. BETZ: Right.

MR. CABELL: If he is afraid the purchaser is going to cancel why doesn't he wait three days to putlit in?

MR. BETZ: The reason I stated a moment ago, you now have an agreement and you bought this water softener and it is agreat product and during the next three days you call up and shop all over the place and someone makes a deal with you for \$5 less or \$20 less then or someone of this sort, there is no deception whatsoever in this situation yet, this may be the one reason you take the sale out or change your mind.

MR. CABELL: That is one of the basic objections we have on this record. Time and time again the consumer doesn't have an opportunity to shop and compare prices. That is one of the reasons given in support of the three day cooling off period.

MR. BETZ: Well, everyone has a right before signing the contract to say, fine, you just leave it here. I will look around a little bit and come back tomorrow. If they signed the contract then it is a deal.

MR. CABELL: I do not see any real difference if a man signs a contract and you tell him he has three days to think this over.

MR. BETZ: We don't invite it and I do not think you would either if you were in the selling end of it and invite someone to go ahead and shop in the situation you presented. It is equipment that has been recommended. It is designed for a particular case and need and the one he

comparing might be entirely different. It just doesn't measure up to be good, sensible salesmanship.

MR. SNELL: May I make a comment on that.

I think our particular point on that particular issue, Mr. Cabell that you are mentioning is that we think that the sale of this equipment should be treated equally regardless of where it is sold.

If you enter into a contract to buy this equipment in a store, you can't change it later. If you enter into the same contract to buy it in the home you have a period of three business days which could be five or six days to change your mind.

Now, if it is a good idea to give this time to change your mind, we simply say that this idea should be universal and it should not be imposed exclusively on the in-home seller.

That is our position. If it not a good idea then we do not think that it should be imposed on us at all.

If it is applicable to everybody it seems to me that you have more shoppers.

You do not get a chance to change your contract on an automobile sale or any other purchase involved in a contract in any business establishment after you sign the contract. You can shop as much as you want, but when you sign a contract it is our position it should be a

contract. If it can be cancelled it should be cancellable by everybody.

HEARING OFFICER DIXON: In that same line there is one thing that troubles me from the language you yourself use. I take it you don't find any real difference in substance between the situation that exists in direct selling and that which exists when you are selling the same product in the store.

You have described the direct selling involves truly the art of salesmanship. If that situation is true and in your language, why should we regulate in stores sales where a person who takes the order there is in your words, not a salesman but a clerk or an order taker.

MR. BETZ: I think Mr. Dixon that is used as a purpose to sterlize the salesman and so that any salesman whether in the store or in the home would be merely an order taken or clerk or cashier.

Our point is that even those companies who sell units such as this in the store have to go to that home sometime before that unit is installed to make certain the plumbing is as reported to them so they can make a proper installation charge, and also, that it is a proper size unit for the installation.

Another point is that in many cities the municipal water supply may be eight or ten wells providing the water

supply to that city so that the water that may be on your street would be different from the water that is on your street and maybe still in the same neighborhood. One unit would not serve both locations. That is why we feel it is important.

HEARING OFFICER DIXON: What I was trying to get at was not the peculiarities of sales of water conditioners, but the reasons why we should apply the same rule in this regard in stores as to in-home sales where they are not limited to any particular product.

I am thinking of a practice that covers products across the board.

MR. BETZ: I do not see why there should be any discrimination on in-home sale as compared or contrasted to a store. That is my question.

HEARING OFFICER DIXON: I guess my question is, isn't there a difference between the situation where I go to the store looking for a product and the salesman comes to my home and is uninvited.

MR. BETZ: Well, I know you have experienced many different kinds of sales people in the store and out of stores. You go into a store and many times you will be buying a different product because the salesman did a pretty good job of selling you. That can occur in the store as well as in the home.

HEARING OFFICER DIXON: Mr. Lamet.

MR. LAMET: I have only one question somewhat connected to what Mr. Dixon has referred to; do you believe, Mr. Betz, that the fact you are invited or not invited, I don't know if there is a difference -- do you believe there is somewhat a kind of a privilege to be able to consummate that sale within the home itself, within the environs of the buyer's home itself?

Do you think that might be a special privilege that the seller is getting that the store does not have?

MR. BETZ: I do not think it is a special privilege wherever the sale is made. The sale is made when a man makes up his mind he is going to make that purchase, no matter where it is.

MR. LAMET: As to the members of your assocation, do they maintain stores?

Do they actually maintain some display centers that people can come in? Do they all do that?

MR. BETZ: I would say that the biggest percentage do, yes. Probably 90 percent of them have store displays.

MR. LAMET: Why do they then limit, those who do engage in the store activity, why do they engage in the door-to-door solicitation?

Why don't they just send out advertising asking the people to come to their store and view the devices in

the store?

MR. BETZ: For every advertisement that you make the fall-out is very small unless it is directed some way and followed up in some way to be able to measure the value of advertising, it is very difficult as compared to an actual invitation to come into the home.

MR. LAMET: So, there is an advantage to actual get in the home to make the sales pitch?

MR. BETZ: Only -- our product is sold through creating an awareness or creating the knowledge there is such a thing as soft water. This is how you obtain it and these are the benefits to be derived.

Many people in the large retail stores have an opportunity to sell this product in the store and consummate the deal in the store, when really he should go to the home too and do certain things to make certain there is the right application of the unit.

MR. LAMET: Are you saying that the stores are at a disadvantage with regard to selling this particular item?

MR. BETZ: You can close a deal when a man is at his home and he is ready to buy.

MR. LAMET: I am referring to the fact, I think you testified earlier that in order to properly demonstrate the use of this product you really should do it in the home.

Didn't you testify to that?

MR. BETZ: No, not in the use of the product but to make sure it is the right product for the application and the water is tested and they have the right unit for the application.

HEARING OFFICER DIXON: Thank you, gentlemen.

(Witnesses excused.)

HEARING OFFICER DIXON: Next is Mr. Alvin Freidman, Vice-President of the Amalgamated Trust & Savings Bank.

STATEMENT OF ALVIN FREIDMAN, VICE-PRESIDENT, AMALGAMATED TRUST & SAVINGS BANK

MR. FREIDMAN: My name is Alvin Freidman.

Gentlemen, the proposed FTC regulation is designed to provide the consumer with some meaningful and readily available relief. Once he has succumbed to the high pressure sales pitch of a door-to-door salesman, but has subsequently had time to mull over the transaction and realize he has made an unwise and unwanted purchase, paid an unconscionable price or unnecessarily burdened his family with a long-term expenditure.

It should be noted the actual dollar losses to consumers through deception, fraud and misleading practices in door-to-door sales run into millions of dollars annually.

Consumers traditionally have the expense of litigation, loss through over prices and shoddy merchandise,

loss through garnishment, and even the possible loss of a job. These problems are particularly of particular disadvantage to the poor, the uneducated and the aged.

No individual preys upon the elderly, the poor, the ignorant or the gullible or the soft-hearted as much as the unscrupulous door-to-door salesman of products ranging from encylopedias, magazines and kitchen ware to sewing machines, vacuum cleaners, furniture and siding.

A distinct advantage of the proposed Rule is that the remedy is self-executing. It is readily available to all buyers, regardless of their socio-economic status or level of education.

Experience has taught us, especially in the consumer field the remedies are illusory unless it is automatic.

Federal regulation is needed since the States are in no position to enforce the needed regulations.

As of 1968, six states had regulatory provisions similar to those now being proposed by the Federal Trade Commission.

The State of Illinois is one of those six.

During hearings on S-1599, in 1968 before the Consumers Sub-committee of the State Committee on Commerce, William G. Clark, then the Attorney General of Illinois testified the Illinois State Statute regulating door-to-door sales was only moderately effective.

Now, there has been some 50 companies who have been enjoined and prosecuted. Clark noted most of the enjoined companies have since moved from Illinois to states which lack such effective consumer protection laws.

Unless there is uniformity among the laws of all of the States, strict State regulation can no more -- can be a futile gesture.

The door-to-door sales industry is so sizeable and growing rapidly. Something of the magnitude of the business is indicated in a January 1967 New York Times article with the title, "Door-to-Door Sellers move to costlier products," is indicative of the trend.

The article quoted the Executive Director of the National Association of House-to-House installment companies as reporting, "Sales of the house-to-house credit selling industry last year were estimated at \$1 billion."

He predicted an annual increase of 6 percent.

Others have predicted overall sales of this industry both credit and non-credit may exceed \$4 annually.

The vast majority of door-to-door salesmen honestly perform a constructive and useful function by conveniently bringing their products to the doors of millions of house-wives.

The proposed rule achieves the desired result without infringing on the operation of those legitimate

companies. It is not restrictive or punative but merely protective.

Those companies not presently abusing their rights as sellers will not be hurt by the regulations, but those involved in deceptive and fraudulent practices will be deterred.

Moreover, this rule will operate to the advantage of the legitimate companies by instilling great public confidence in door-to-door selling as was recognized by Charles E. Swanson, President of Encyclopedia Brittanica, Incorporated in a statement issued in the Washington Post, January 8, 1970 Swanson said, "If the proposed rule was adopted consumers will have increased confidence of their rights in the home and will have full and adequate protection."

A cooling off period will not eliminate or deter unscrupulous door-to-door selling, but it will offer important additional protection to consumers.

It provides a 72-hour warranty against bad judgement, fraud and high-pressure sales techniques which take advantage of the consumers' lack of sophistication.

It is a check against the unsolicited "sale."

I urge you to adopt the proposed rule.

HEARING OFFICER DIXON: Thank you, Mr. Freidman.

Mr. Cabell.

EXAMINATION

MR. CABELL: Mr. Freidman, the proposed rule has a provision providing that notes or other evidence of indebtedness given by the consumer cannot be negotiated prior to the mid-night of the fifth business day following the date of the sale.

Do you care to comment on that?

MR. FREIDMAN: I make no comment on that.

MR. CABELL: Would you have any objection if the rule were amended to provide that the person to whom it was transferred would take exception to any defenses the consumer might have against the seller?

MR. FREIDMAN: Well, I am going to present Mr.

Cabell a five-page document which I received in the mail

and it bears no signature. We apparently threw away the

envelope before we could find out who sent it to us; however,

it is an excellent piece which I think will even strengthen

to a greater extent the rights of the consumer.

It talks about the definition of door-to-door sales. It talks about the definition of consumer goods and services. It talks about the question you made, cancellation within three business days and is transferred to the Holder in Due Course and it ends on page five.

I think it is a much stronger piece of regulation than is currently being suggested. I think a great deal of

work went into this statement and a great deal of time and a great deal of thought.

I think the consumer, particularly the uneducated consumer, the economically deprived will find this piece of literature and the suggestions incorporated in it even greater protection than what the Federal Trade Commission is currently considering.

If you do not have it in the record now I will leave it and say that it certainly has my blessings, whatever that may be worth.

Thank you, sir.

MR. CABELL: Thank you.

HEARING OFFICER: DIXON: Mr. Lamet.

MR. LAMET: Mr. Freidman, in the banking community itself do you think they would be bothered -- we have asked you with regard to the rule, would they be bothered by the so-called Holder in Due Course Provision?

Would the banks themselves be reluctant to take this kind of paper?

MR. FREIDMAN: I don't know. I am sure I can't speak for the banking community. I could say this to you that for six or seven years the banking community and the sales community and other aspects of the financial industry or institutions fought vigorously and foolishly the acceptance of Truth-in-Lending Legislation. It was supposed to create

all kinds of problems for everybody, including the consumer.

The consumer is not going to take advantage of the provisions.

It would bring tragedy to the financial community, to the sales community.

That is why, time and time again for 67 years this law could never be put on the books. We all know, fortunately, it is on the books today and the tale of woe has not come to pass.

The financial community was not put out of existence, was not discriminated against -- the banks or the small loan companies or any other financial institutions.

It has not put the legitimate retailers out of business. Fortunately it has put the unscrupulous out of business. The hue and cry was there was going to be a tragedy.

We hear the same kind of rhetoric about the Holder in Due Course.

The Amalgamated Bank, and I am a senior officer,
was one of the few banks to testify before the United
States Congress. It was in fact, one of two banks to
testify in the United States Congress on the Truth-in-Lending
Law. There are over 14,000 banks. Unfortunately, that
says something as they stayed silent as far as anything
about Truth-in-Lending.

They were very vociferous as to the ills it would

bring both to the consumer and the lenders.

So, we have directly and indirectly been involved in this State to try to bring more consumer protection to the consumer be it as through the Holder in Due Course or through any of the other points that could be raised, the question of garnishments and all kinds of problems that exist in this State.

So, I think you could see where a feeling that lay in further protection to the consumer. Anything within reason, certainly, but I am sure if you would entertain anything within reason that would help the consumer in its home or elsewhere is something we would certainly endorse and favor.

MR. LAMET: One last question, in your experience do banks make any effort whatsoever to scrutinize the type of paper they are buying from some of these sellers?

Is there any type of a review of the sellers as far as the sale is concerned or do they just deal with them in a direct dollars and cents basis and not look into what might have happened?

Is there any self-regulation?

MR. FREIDMAN: I can only tell you this, our bank does not accept any paper. The run-of-the-mill financial institution does accept paper. We do not accept third party paper, because of the fact we are not a party to it at origin.

We can't get into it and find out how good or how bad it is.

Once you start accepting one piece you have to start taking the good with the bad, otherwise, those who pass it on to you will stop the good from coming, you have got to take the bad. Once you start selecting you are no longer a bank, then they are going to turn off your credit.

We had a practice at the bank I think ever since our inception which goes back to 1922, we con't take any third party paper.

Most other financial institutions do not -- fortunately or not fortunately follow this practice.

I think once they are tied up with the idea the concept, the philosophy, then they are stuck with everything that follows because the arrangement is you just can't take the "good stuff" you got to take everything that comes in.

So, there is very little they can do at that point.

But I would like to see whoever accepts that paper stuck with the same responsibility that the original seller is stuck with. If the original seller made a bad deal, the third party who accepts that paper then in a sense has a legal and social responsibility incumbent upon that transfer to take all the good as well as all the bad, so far as their responsibility to the consumer.

HEARING OFFICER DIXON: Are you aware that we are

1 in May holding hearings on another proposed rule to do 2 exactly that? MR. FREIDMAN: No, but I would be happy if notified 3 4 to come and testify accordingly. 5 HEARING OFFICER DIXON: I will see that you are, 6 sir. 7 MR. FREIDMAN: Very good. 8 MR. LAMET: Thank you. 9 MR. CABELL: Thank you, sir. 10 HEARING OFFICER DIXON: Thank you, Mr. Freidman. 11 (Witness excused.) 12 HEARING OFFICER DIXON: That concludes our schedule 13 for today. 14 These hearings will now adjourn to reconvene here 15 tomorrow morning at 10:00 o'clock a.m. 16 (Whereupon, at 4:38 o'clock p.m., the hearing in 17 the above-entitled matter was adjourned, to reconvene at 18 10:00 o'clock a.m., Wednesday, March 24, 1971, at the same 19 place.) 20 21 22 23

Ed.

24

25

DOCKET NO:

CASE TITLE: Cooling Off Period for Door-to-Door Sales

HEARING DATE: March 23, 1971.

I HEREBY CERTIFY that the proceedings and evidence herein are contained fully and accurately in the notes taken by me at the hearing in the above cause before the Federal Trade Commission and that this is a true and correct transcript of the same.

DATED: 31 March 1971.

(Signature of Reporter)

Edward J. Boris
(Name of Reporter - Typed)

l North LaSalle Street, Chleago, Illinois (Address - Typed)

)