

# PUBLIC SUBMISSION

<b>Received:</b> March 06, 2017 <b>Status:</b> Pending_Post <b>Tracking No.</b> 1k1-8v42-wxpm <b>Comments Due:</b> March 17, 2017 <b>Submission Type:</b> Web
---

**Docket:** EBSA-2010-0050

Definition of the Term ‘Fiduciary’; Conflict of Interest Rule—Retirement Investment Advice

**Comment On:** EBSA-2010-0050-3491

Definition of Term Fiduciary; Conflict of Interest Rule-Retirement Investment

**Document:** EBSA-2010-0050-DRAFT-11036

Comment on FR Doc # 2017-04096

---

## Submitter Information

**Name:** sandra grudzen

---

## General Comment

As a person who worked hard for 51 years, I do not think it should be allowed that a financial advisor who agreed to a fiduciary agreement should be allowed by law to erase that agreement and let the adviser suck dry all the investments entrusted to him. I should be able to trust that the person I put in charge of my financial security , and not feel that he is selling me what will make HIM the most money.

There is little evidence that a delay in would benefit the public....This is just wrong. Advisor firms have already reduced conflicts of interest from the original rule. This plan of action is positive,and should not be interrupted.

I am against any delay or changes to the Fiduciary Rule.