

# Hudson Amendments Intended to Improve Failed Door-To-Door Solicitation Bill

**FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE:**

**Contact:**

**July 8, 2010**

Stephanie Mantegna  
House of Representatives  
302-577-8515

[Stephanie.Mantegna@state.de.us](mailto:Stephanie.Mantegna@state.de.us)

In an attempt to address serious flaws with legislation that was defeated in the final days of the General Assembly's legislative session last month, several amendments were introduced to House Bill 317.

The legislation would have required door-to-door solicitors to prominently display an identification card. A number of lawmakers voted against the bill when it came up for a second vote in the House (June 24) after being amended by the Senate and the bill was defeated.

Rep. Hudson, a sponsor of four amendments, said, "Too many questions were raised, with the most important one being how to ensure consumer safety if we were to make this bill law. Without these amendments I think we would have given people a false sense of security and, to an extent, a false sense that the state is sanctioning these door to door solicitors. The bill, in its current form, would not have gone far enough to protect residents from door to door scams, which, in my understanding, has always been the purpose of the bill. These amendments try to address some of the unintended consequences of this flawed bill.

Saying that she will add her proposed amendments if the same bill is submitted next year, Rep. Hudson also stated, "I believe the bill had enough votes for passage in the House with these amendments. Unfortunately, the lead sponsor did not pursue the bill in the final days of the session, so we will have to wait until at least next year to work similar legislation. I am disappointed because I thought the sponsor would have worked the bill with these amendments, which, I believe, would have made it a stronger bill."

Rep. Hudson's amendments included the following provisions:

- **House Amendment 7** would have required the Department of Finance to contact the State Bureau of Identification (SBI) to ensure that the door-to-door salesperson applicant doesn't have a criminal record, and the Better Business Bureau (BBB) to determine if the salesperson or the salesperson's business or employer is accredited. The amendment gave the Finance Department the ability to indicate on the identification card that both SBI and the BBB have been contacted.

- **House Amendment 8** would have given DeIDOT the authority to keep in place a “No Solicitation” sign if a community desires to have one.
- **House Amendment 9** would have required the Department of Finance to include a watermark or another feature which proves that the card is an original, and not a reproduction.
- **House Amendment 10** would have required the Department of Finance to provide on its website a list of door-to-door salesperson identification cards that the department has issued. The website information would have to be updated quarterly.

State Representative William A. Oberle, Jr. (R-Beechers Lot) also introduced an amendment (House Amendment 6) that would have required the Department of Finance to educate the public that the new law existed, and what people could do if they believed a door-to-door salesperson was not complying with the law.

Rep. Hudson stated, “I think we all wanted to make sure this bill does what it’s supposed to do without giving people a false sense of security. Otherwise, we would, without a doubt, be doing more harm than good.”

###