

ORIGINAL



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.

It does appear that they are far too stringent. Indeed, in my view, there are so many problems and costs associated with this idea, and so much damage done to consumers and businesses alike, that I feel I must request that you urgently consider this matter most carefully.

If the law requires the use of suppression lists, it will definitely seriously damage many of the legitimate publications available on the internet. In particular, I am especially worried about the very severe harm that will definitely be done to publishers who require permission from the consumer prior to adding them to any list.

Legitimate internet businesses and publishers are **not** who CAN-SPAM was designed to put out of business. However, it is almost certain that this requirement will have precisely that effect.

In addition to all of this, there's also the potential for significant harm to consumers. Why? Because of the problem of properly knowing their intent when they unsubscribe from a list. Moreover, these suppression lists could very easily fall into the hands of spammers. This would then have the opposite effect to that intended, i.e. it would actually lead to **more** spam instead of less.

I have to say that I am astonished and very disturbed at the **many** potential problems this ruling could involve. Moreover, given what I said in the last paragraph, there is also the possibility that it would **add** to the problem, and not reduce it. Hence, I urge you in the strongest possible terms to reconsider its implementation in light of these problems,

Respectfully Yours,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "A.K. Shwartz".

Gauteng, South Africa

for M.I. RESOURCES INC.