

**From:** Cutshaw <dcut@cox.net>  
**Sent:** Thursday, January 21, 2010 7:00 AM  
**To:** secretary <secretary@CFTC.gov>  
**Subject:** 'Regulation of Retail Forex' in the subject line of your message and the identification number RIN 3038-AC61

---

RE: identification number RIN 3038-AC61

The referenced 10:1 leverage consideration is both ridiculous and highly irritating.

Does the CFTC plan to do the same to commodity futures? Or, what about the leverage that stock options possess? Shouldn't we regulate THAT also? And what else can we regulate?

Good grief, stay out of our business and do your job. Was it the retail forex sector that has given the economy so much trouble the past couple years? I have an idea - how about WORKING on the regulation of credit swaps?? Come to think of it, why don't you LEAVE the private citizens and their trading ALONE and FOCUS on the larger institutions that can present FAR more problems for everyone concerned than the solitary independent American trading on his home PC.

Or could it be that the CFTC and those who lead it are far too influenced by the institutional investors than to ever muck about with the way THEY trade?

If you think you're 'protecting' the retail investor by this kind of regulation -- thanks but no thanks. Protect me from the institutional mega-investors, and any illegal practices in the marketplace, but don't you DARE attempt to protect me from myself. There may be a host of featherheads who crave this type of 'protection' from their government, but there are FAR MORE of us who will, and do, take responsibility for our own actions. Again, just stay out of our way.

You so much as even ACT like you're serious about passing this drivel, and that "giant sucking sound" will be the noise that all that money makes as it leaves CFTC-controlled US forex accounts on its way to overseas brokerages.

Darrell Cutshaw  
850-501-5088