

While I applaud your effort to put the "CAN SPAM" Act into practice, I'm disturbed by the overall effect of the act in and of itself. In particular, it still places the burden on the recipient to deal with the huge deluge of junk email downloading to his or her computer. This burden to the user takes many forms:

1. Use of network bandwidth: This is not free for recipients of such junk mail (including but not limited to sexually oriented email) – it takes computer cycles, time, and network bandwidth to just download junk mail in order to send said mail through the user's email filtering software.
2. Burden is placed on recipient to purchase, install, and keep updated filtering software. This costs the recipient of unwanted email money and time.
3. There is no recourse for a recipient of these emails to penalize spammers. In fact, this Act encourages spamming as long as it is labeled correctly.
4. The "labeling" junk email itself is flawed as there is really no way to enforce it. Plenty of junk email comes from outside the USA. This Act does not and cannot apply to such entities unless international agreements are made and enforced as well. While the "good" companies of junk email may comply, there isn't really any motivation for the real spamming entities to comply. There's a saying I'm reminded of: "A lock keeps the gentleman out."

So, while this labeling idea seems to be good on the surface, all you're doing is opening the floodgates for my bandwidth to get used up by downloading magnitudes larger volumes of "correctly labeled" spam.

Thanks for your time and efforts, but it isn't going to work – it really surprises me that no one in any government body seems to see this simple fact. I hope someday I can say I was wrong, but I doubt it.

Jeff Reynolds
WA