9-6-15

CATHERINE A. POZAR
801 LOWER BEN LOMOND DRIVE, S.E. • SALEM, OREGON 97302

Regards the issue before the U.S. Dept of Labor - The Proposed Fiduciary Rule Change

Please Extend Fiduciary Duty to anyone advising people on Retirement Accounts That includes Rollovers to IRA, trans-actions that aren't currently governed by a fiduciary-care Rule.

I agree with this statement + my take!
Catherine A. Pozar

am enclosing part of the article that brought it to my attention Oregonian 9-6-15

Advisers should play by same rules

When you go to a car lot, you don't necessarily expect a salesman to put your financial interests first.

What about when you want help rolling over your 401(k)? Or deciding to take your pension as an annuity or lump sum? Should your financial adviser be held to a higher legal standard than your car salesman?

That's the crux of the issue before the U.S. Department of Labor. Should an adviser helping you decide what to do with your retirement savings be required to put your financial interests before her own? Or can she sell you something and leave it to you to make the best choice?

The Obama administration wants the former. It's pushing to extend fiduciary duty to anyone advising people on retirement accounts. That includes rollovers to IRAs, transactions that aren't currently governed by a fiduciary-care rule.

The department also wants to level the playing field. Thousands of registered investment advisers already abide by a fiduciary standard when giving advice under the federal Investment Advisers Act. But brokers and insurance agents aren't held to this standard, even though they might use "investment advisor" on their business cards. They only need to offer choices that are "suitable" for clients, and that doesn't necessarily mean the least expensive option, regulators have said.

This difference isn't well understood by consumers, studies suggest. And it appears to cost them.

One study in Oregon compared the returns in retirement accounts of state university workers who relied on brokers to pick their investments versus those who picked their own. Broker-advised workers

See Money, C6

Continued from C1

fared worse than do-it-yourself investors. And they did far worse than if they'd put their money in a target-date fund, researchers found.

Broker-dealers and insurance companies have been battling a proposed rule change since 2010. A lot of their claims suggest they're not acting in your best interest

My take: The department already has made a big concession with this proposal. It will allow brokers to receive commissions while advising on retirement assets, so long as they enter into contracts with clients detailing their fiduciary duty and fees. The Labor Department isn't doing what the United Kingdom and Australia have done: banned commissioned sales of financial products entirely.

A lot has changed since the 1970s, when the Department of Labor began regulating retirement plans. Once the norm, traditional pensions have given way to portable 401(k)-type plans that put workers in charge of their retirements. Yet the law hasn't evolved to protect them along the way.

It's time to bring these rules into the 21st century. You can help. The department is still taking comments on the proposal (See box). Tell 'em you'll haggle over a Chevy, but not over your retirement.

•

Brent Hunsberger is an investment adviser representative and certified financial planner in Portland. For important disclosures and information about Hunsberger, visit ORne.ws/aboutbrent. Reach him at 503-683-3098 or itsonlymoneyblog@gmail.com.

Thank You
Catherine A. Pozar