To Whom It May Concern:

No aspect of the DOL'S clarification should be amended:

. The fact that this is even being debated is an example of the Financial Services Industry's influence over Congress and Regulators through campaign contributions.

. Trust law is instructional to ERISA of 1974 whereby a fiduciary, in prudence & loyalty, must provide visible evidence of behaviors and methodologies that increase the likelihood that the beneficiary of the assets reach their objective. Should a client expect anything less from their Investment Adviser?

. If the Financial Services Industry and the Congressman that they pay off to protect themselves are against this rule, what exactly is their defense....they don't want to act in the best interest of their clients?.. they want to protect their commission and revenue spreads?...they want to limit their potential litigation costs and outcomes?...so who are ERISA, the DOL, and the regulators supposed to be protecting? The Financial Services Industry or the sovereign (public)?

. The Financial Services Industry claims that "this" rule will hurt the middle class's access to advice. Which has hurt access to advice more? This rule or not compensating Investment Advisers for any household under $150,000-$250,000?

. Are the Class Actions against Employer Sponsor Plans frivolous or has the Legal Profession been incompetent for filing the cases incorrectly? It seems as if the Outcome/Contract "cultured" legal industry doesn't know how to file pleadings involving Fiduciary Breaches where imprudent and disloyal behaviors and methodologies must be evidenced.

My point is that there is real opportunity to adhere to the oath of office and protect the sovereign. Enforce the regulation/law. The law should not be for sale.

Regards,

Neal Shikes
The "Trusted & Willing" Fiduciary
http://www.trustedfiduciary.com/
http://willingfiduciary.com/