Mike A. Jacques-O'Gorman
10 February 2013

The Federal Trade Commission (FTC) has determined that the "Cooling Off" rule, 16 CFR part 429, remains a valuable tool against unfair and deceptive door to door sales. The "Cooling Off" rule makes it an unfair and deceptive act or practice for a seller engaged in a door-to-door sale of consumer goods or services, with a purchase price of $25 or more, to fail to provide the buyer with certain oral and written disclosures regarding the buyer's right to cancel the contract within three business days from the date of the sales transaction. This rule was properly and fairly enacted in accordance with The Federal Trade Commission Act, 15 U.S.C. 41, and the provisions of Subpart B. Part 1 of the Commission's procedures and rules of practice, 16 CFR 1.11.

The FTC have requested comments on several topics relating to this rule, this comment will focus on two specific topics: (1) the necessity of the "Cooling Off" rule going forward and (2) the appropriateness of the $25 threshold given inflation since its implementation in 1973.

(1) In regard to the necessity to the "Cooling Off" rule going forward I am in complete agreement with the assessment of the FTC that there is a need for this rule to continue. I base my reasoning on many of the same factors as the five expressed by FTC, that these door-to-door sales techniques are high pressure situations with a high likelihood of deception in quality or value. The only point that I would like to add to the record that was not mentioned in the FTC's five and which I believe now has now become more important given technological developments and that is the likelihood of targeted deceptive sales towards vulnerable members of society, particularly the elderly. Given the wide availability of the internet in both stationary and mobile devices the likelihood

of someone being scammed over a product's value becomes less likely if the mark has the ability to instantly check other potential sources to compare price, quality and availability. I believe that this fact is not lost on those individuals that would seek to perpetrate these deceptive practices. These scam artists would target marks that they believed would be less likely to be savvy enough to recognize the deception. Technology, economic reasons and other factors would likely lead to the elderly being targeted as easy marks for this type of deception.

I believe that the elimination of this rule would be to the detriment of the general public because some fraud and deception is very difficult to immediately detect in a high pressure sales situation, despite available technology and other safeguards. Also the elimination of this rule will leave the elderly and others not in sound mind particularly vulnerable to these tactics.

(2) As to the $25 threshold contained in the Act, I believe the amount does not need to be altered due to inflation as has been suggested. Despite the fact that inflation has occurred at a rather steady pace since the Act was first implemented in the 1970s I believe it is now more important to keep the figure low than it was at the time of the original implementation. This is due once again to the potential for deception in these types of transactions. When the potential of deception is as high as it is here I believe it is imperative to keep the threshold low as to allow a scam to be discovered before it can become widespread and allow the scam artists to amass significant funds. If kept at $25 dollars then surely scam artists will price their fraudulent products at $24.99 as not to have to allow a 'cool down' where they could be discovered. The scam artist will then attempt to make as many sales as possible to profit as much as possible, but it will

become more likely that the scam will be exposed with each sale made. Therefore the fraud and deceit that is anticipated in the rule is more likely to be curtailed before major profits can be made by scam artists if the threshold remains low.