

000552

Lloyd H. Whitting [REDACTED] Dickson, TN [REDACTED]

To: Federal Trade Commission
CAN-SPAM Act
P. O. Box 1030
Merrifield, VA 22116-1030

E-Mail: [REDACTED]

Re: CAN-SPAM Act Rulemaking, Project No. R411008

To the Commissioners,

I applaud your efforts to curb the problem of unsolicited bulk email. I get a lot of it I did not ask for, and that is my main concern. Opting out of such lists seems to be an action that verifies to them the fact you are alive and receiving such messages, and a deluge starts. However, I am concerned about the proposed requirement for merchants to maintain suppression lists, which may pose risky conditions for the few I do want to continue hearing from, and who do seem to be making an effort to maintain a forthright, businesslike image to preserve a decent reputation.

There are so many problems and costs associated with this idea, and so much damage done to consumers and businesses alike that, as a picky recipient, I feel I must urge you to consider this matter most carefully.


Requirement of the use of suppression lists may seriously damage many of the legitimate publications available on the net. My specific concern is for harm to publishers who require permission from the consumer prior to adding them to any list -- the ones I WANT to hear from.

They're not who CAN-SPAM was designed to put out of business, but this requirement will very likely have that effect and take away a source of information I have found to be valuable, and that is unavailable to me in no other way.

There's also the potential for significant harm to consumers, because of the problem of properly knowing their intent when they unsubscribe from a list. On top of that, these suppression lists could easily fall into the hands of spammers, again leading to more spam instead of less.

The "Do Not Call" list, as it was established by state law in Tennessee, at least quadrupled my telemarketer calls shortly after I signed up for it, as telemarketers realized it provided a handy database of people who potentially find saying "No" hard to do. The facelessness of eMail makes that easier, of course, but I was quite surprised at the potential problems this ruling could involve when I learned how things would have to work, and urge you in the strongest possible terms to reconsider its implementation in light of these problems.

Respectfully,



Lloyd Harrison Whitting
Dickson, Tennessee, USA