Concurring Statement of Commissioner Orson Swindle
in *Telemarketing Sales Rule*, File No. R411001

I wholeheartedly support the amendments to the Telemarketing Sales Rule ("TSR"), because I believe that they will help protect consumers from deceptive and abusive telemarketing practices. In particular, these amendments will give consumers the ability to avoid the sheer volume of unwanted telemarketing calls that many consider to be a nuisance. I write separately to explain my views on two issues – how the Commission determines whether an act or practice is "abusive" for purposes of the TSR, and the national do-not-call registry.

Abusive Telemarketing Acts or Practices

The Telemarketing and Consumer Fraud and Abuse Prevention Act ("Telemarketing Act") directs the Commission to promulgate rules that prohibit "deceptive telemarketing acts or practices and other abusive telemarketing acts or practices." 15 U.S.C. 6102 (a)(1). To determine what constitutes an abusive telemarketing practice, the Commission for the most part has used the examples of abusive practices that Congress provided in the Telemarketing Act and principles drawn from these examples. I agree that this is an appropriate analysis, and in light of the rulemaking record as a whole, I fully support the TSR amendments that fall within these parameters. These amendments include, among other things, the provisions involving the national do-not-call registry, transmission of caller identification information, and abandoned calls and predictive dialers.

When the Commission seeks to identify practices as abusive that are less distinctly within the parameters of the Act's examples and their emphasis on privacy protection, the Commission employs its traditional unfairness analysis.[1] I understand the Commission's intention to narrow the potentially expansive scope of the term "abusive" by using its unfairness analysis. However, given the broad ordinary meaning of the term "abusive," I believe that the standard for determining what constitutes an abusive telemarketing practice likely is broader than the stringent definition of the term "unfair." Therefore, I would have preferred it had the Commission looked to the plain meaning of the term "abusive" and then formulated a separate standard to identify abusive telemarketing practices for

---

[1] Given that nothing in the language of the Telemarketing Act or its legislative history indicates that Congress intended the Commission to use its unfairness standard to determine which practices are abusive, I previously raised concerns about this analysis and requested comment on this issue. *Concurring Statement of Commissioner Orson Swindle in Telemarketing Sales Rule Review*, File No. R411001, available at <www.ftc.gov/os/2002/01/swindletsrstatment. htm>. Although some comments agreed with this concern, they did not offer an alternative analysis of abusive practices beyond suggesting that the Commission's authority is limited to the examples of abusive practices included in the Telemarketing Act and its legislative history. *See Statement of Basis and Purpose* at 100, n. 428. However, because the Act does not limit the Commission's authority to identify abusive practices to the examples in the Act, the Commission may prohibit other practices that it identifies as abusive.

purposes of the Telemarketing Act and the TSR.

Nevertheless, I agree with the Commission's conclusion that a telemarketing practice that meets the strict unfairness standard will constitute an abusive practice for purposes of the Act and the TSR. In light of the rulemaking record, I therefore support the TSR amendments that are analyzed under this standard. This includes the requirement that telemarketers obtain consumers' or donors' express informed consent before causing their information to be submitted for payment. The rulemaking record evidences the harm that results from unauthorized billing, the need for the consent requirement, and the need to mandate specific steps that telemarketers must take to obtain consumers' consent in transactions involving preacquired account information.

In addition, the record supports the prohibition on the disclosure or receipt, for consideration, of unencrypted account numbers for use in telemarketing (except to process a payment for goods or services or a charitable contribution pursuant to a transaction). I do not believe that the mere disclosure of personal financial information, without more, causes or is likely to cause substantial consumer injury. In this situation, however, the rulemaking record provides a basis for concluding that trafficking in unencrypted account numbers is likely to cause substantial consumer injury in the form of unauthorized billing. Industry comments state that there is no legitimate reason to purchase unencrypted lists of credit card numbers. Therefore, there is a strong likelihood that telemarketers who do engage in this practice will misuse the information in a manner that results in unauthorized charges to consumers' accounts. The Commission's law enforcement experience corroborates this conclusion.[2] As a result, I conclude that this practice is abusive for purposes of the Telemarketing Act.

The National Do-Not-Call Registry

The Telemarketing Act and the TSR recognize consumers' "right to be let alone." *See, e.g.*, *Olmstead v. U.S.*, 277 U.S. 438, 478 (1928) (Brandeis, J., dissenting) (stating that the "right to be let alone" is the "most comprehensive of rights and the right most valued by civilized men"). In the context of telemarketing, there is an inherent tension between this right and the First Amendment's right to free speech. With this in mind, and in light of the rulemaking record as a whole, the Commission has determined to establish a national do-not-call registry. This will enable consumers to stop certain telemarketing calls – calls to induce the purchase of goods and services from companies within the FTC's jurisdiction (except where the consumer has an "established business relationship" with the seller).

---

[2] *See Statement of Basis and Purpose* at 97-98. In addition, given the evidence that the use of encrypted account information in telemarketing can result in unauthorized charges, there is an even greater likelihood that injury will occur when a telemarketer has obtained, for consideration, consumers' actual credit card numbers.

Although the USA PATRIOT Act of 2001 gave the Commission authority to regulate for-profit companies that make telephone calls seeking charitable donations on behalf of charities, the Commission has determined to exempt these entities from the national do-not-call registry requirements. Instead, the Commission requires these telemarketers to comply with the "entity-specific" do-not-call provision, which prohibits them from calling consumers who have said they do not want to be called by or on behalf of a particular entity. This more narrowly tailored approach seeks to protect consumers from unwanted telemarketing calls seeking charitable donations, while minimizing the impact of the TSR on charities' First Amendment rights. I do not object to taking this approach at the outset; but if there is evidence that suggests that this approach is not effective in protecting consumers from unsolicited telemarketing calls, the Commission should revisit this decision and require for-profit telemarketers seeking charitable donations to comply with the national do-not-call registry.

While I believe that the amended TSR and the national do-not-call registry will go a long way to help consumers prevent unwanted intrusions into their homes, a number of entities are not subject to the TSR's requirements. Under the Telemarketing Act and the TSR, the Commission does not have jurisdiction in whole or in part over the calls of entities such as banks, telephone companies, airlines, insurance companies, credit unions, charities, political campaigns, and political fund-raisers. From the perspective of consumers, the right to be let alone is invaded just as much by unwanted calls from exempt entities (*e.g.*, banks, telephone companies, or political fund-raisers) as it is by such calls from covered entities.[3] Therefore, I believe that the entire spectrum of entities that make telemarketing calls to consumers should be subject to do-not-call requirements.

[3] The Federal Communications Commission, however, has requested comment on whether to establish a national do-not-call registry that would address telemarketing calls by at least some of the entities that are exempt from the FTC's jurisdiction. *Notice of Proposed Rulemaking*, Rules and Regulations Implementing the Telephone Consumer Protection Act of 1991, 67 FR 62667 (Oct. 8, 2002).