

Comment #: 7

May 24 2004

Mr. Dorigen Fried

N/A

Washington

United States

I support the proposed amendment to regulation, 16 C.F.R. Part 310. I support the fee increase because the do-not-call registry is an important service and should be funded by businesses rather than taxpayers. The important question here is who should bear the cost of the public benefit of not being disturbed by telemarketers and the right to privacy. Previously, this cost was born by individuals, who personally had to take the time to request their name be taken off of lists, research companies policies, and write letters to those companies or telemarketing agencies. The cost of that individual action was too high, information on how to do such research was too low, and it resulted in telemarketing agencies having access to almost everyone's phone number. Instead, this regulation makes companies bear the cost of not disturbing individuals who do not wish to be contacted. By providing a list, and requiring companies to pay for their mandatory access to that list, the government is re-distributing the cost of non-disturbance to the companies. Companies are the appropriate parties to bear that cost because they are making money off of the disturbance, have higher profits, and can be more efficient about using such information. The background information makes it clear that the cost of the do-not-call registry over the past year has been higher than the amount that companies have had to pay, and an adjustment of fees is necessary. The \$45 fee does not seem exorbitant and if that is what is required for the do-not-call registry costs to be covered, it is appropriate. Thank you for your consideration of this comment.