

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

To the Commissioners,

I applaud your efforts to curb the problem of unsolicited bulk email. However, I am concerned about the proposed requirement for merchants to maintain suppression lists.

Suppression lists, as recently created for ordinary mail can be useful only in the context of senders having the right to send unsolicited material into every mailbox.

On internet, context is not so. Internet citizen, and usenet users before them, reprobated so much senders of unsolicited material, because of the easy cascading effect of computer network technology, that only people positively wanting to break the rules send unsolicited material on the net.

So, suppression lists won't do the job. In fact, suppression lists will shutdown many legitimate small businesses and leave the internet to the spammers.

Because on the internet, everything must in a database, so will have to be those suppression lists. Some will crack their access and those lists will get their way to the spammers.

Everything being directly or indirectly under the control of human beings makes a system of suppression lists subject to money corruption. Some spammers do have the means to corrupt almost anybody.

I think that suppression lists for the net will suppress the net. And leave it to a small number of big players. Legitimate and illegitimate.

What I want to explain here, is that those who will be put out of business by this legislation will certainly not be the spammers.

But a very large number of very small legitimate businesses.

The technical problems associated with suppression lists requirements are just too complex to be handled by almost all merchants and will certainly not deter any spammer worthy of his name from spamming even more.

I believe that any legislation about the internet, to work properly, must be much more precisely targeted towards those the legislation is intended to, because of the power and complexity of the technology.

I was quite surprised at the potential problems this ruling could involve, and urge you in the strongest possible terms to reconsider its implementation in light of these problems,

Respectfully,

Mario Taillon
Montreal, Quebec, Canada