# Electronic Faxes should be treated exactly like paper faxes (as per my earlier comments). The harms are similar and concrete (trespass, seizing the recipient’s resources (fax count against payments, disk space, time, invasion of privacy, etc.). But the reason for this second comment is the claim that these abusive faxes should be handled under the CAN SPAM Act. The main point is that the CAN SPAM ACT PROVIDES NO PROTECTION OR RECOURSE FOR CONSUMERS OR BUSINESSES. So, basically, petitioners want remove any recourse for businesses or consumers to reduce or eliminate these harmful junk faxes. It would have the effect of eviscerating the junk fax protections in the TCPA. The bad guys could then send unlimited efaxes with no possibility of being stopped. Do a Google search for cases involving the CAN SPAM act. Cornell law answers the question, “Do I have ANY recourse under the CAN-SPAM Act?” With the following, “As a private citizen, unfortunately the answer is no: you don't have any recourse under the CAN-SPAM Act”. This is why petitioners want to move enforcement under CAN SPAM—because they know that means there will never be any enforcement.