From: Pecsbailey@aol.com
Sent: Thursday, April 8, 2010 4:26 PM
To: secretary <secretary@CFTC.gov>
Subject: Industry Filings: Comments on Industry Submissions

This is a comment specifically on Gary Gensler lack of protecting the American consumer.

I represent over 3500 tractors-trailer OTR drivers that are getting gouged each time they pull up to a pump fuel. In the last two months, their fuel cost have gone up over $750.00 monthly. This is money that should be going home not into the pockets of some blind trader that's in it only for the money, they don't give a flip about the hard working people on the road. Unlike you Mr. Gensler, they're from the real world where you do your job right the first time or get fired, they have something that you apparently lack and that's integrity and pride for doing a job well...

Mr. Gensler,

I can appreciate how difficult your job is but after 10-years and 4-months of unregulated trades and loopholes that have benefited (that's not a big enough description) your former employer this is getting pretty ridiculous and as we say in the South, a true Good Ole Boy back room deal. Now they're flaunting these manipulated prices at the recovery

Correct me if I'm wrong but I believe your primary job is to protect the American consumer so I respectfully ask, *"When do you plan on getting around to that?"*

I have worked in the trucking industry since 1973, I was actively involved in hedging for JB Hunt Transport from 1983 to 1992 and continued doing this for my customers up until Phil Gram rammed through the Enron Loophole that changed a law that was in effect for 67-years. When this happened the small hedger was forced out of the markets - Why? We could not compete (risk) with the uncertainty from Goldman Sach and the rest the crooks on Wall Street.

I don't know who said this but you might want to think about this as rule of thumb concerning the commodity markets. Regarding energy, a life source and necessity to generate revenues - If you can't touch, see it, smell it or need it to pull or transport an asset for revenues then you can't buy

I strongly believe you need to step down from your position due solely on "conflicts of interest" - there's NO way you can relate to front line trucking companies that have to work their tails off to make a 5 to 7% profit. In my opinion, your still have too close to Goldman Sachs and Wall street or this crap would already to slowed down or stopped completely.

Back in June 2008, Michael Greenberger testified that YOUR agency has the power to stop manipulation then and if you would the price of crude would drop 50%. If this was not true then why didn't you at least get more vocal towards supporting Mr. Greenberger's statements? Obama said during the small month that he would "close the Enron loophole and limit the number of trades and make it more transparent" great line of BS but here we are coming up on 24-month later and your agency is STILL allow this to happen to the American consumer...

I know you know your lack of action is hurting the American consumer and this is the sole reason why I believe your still too closely connected to Goldman Sach and Wall street. You don't give a damn what happens to middle American is what your lack of actions is saying. Each time you fools give the commodity traders the 90-day grace period they simply step up the prices. December 2009 you did it again, they added $.32 to diesel, and during the last three weeks, they've added $.40 to diesel. What did you do have a Wall Street Good Ole Boy wink and a nod? This is BS and you know it...So from middle American I have a message for you and your staff - Grow a pair and stop this before American is thrown back into a deep depression or step down - at some point in your life you need become a man with ethics and morale - Prove me wrong and do the right thing.

Long but worth the read......

What seems to be common sense to most folks in survival mode these days is ***unheard of*** *by the well insulated crooks on Wall Street. We need representation, we need folks that are going to protect the interest of us aimlessly walking the (Main) streets NOW.*

Fundamentally speaking, for upwards of 18-months supplies and demand has steady gone bearish. During this period, *the very same crooks were buying actual physical products to hoard off shore with OUR tax dollars* **then** *they proceeded (successfully) to run up prices in the crude, heating oil and gas in commodity markets.* ***Fact: energy prices went up 208%***

To me, this is dead wrong, this is collusion, this is fixing prices, this is **NOT** *speculating - speculation bares a "risk" - if you close the doors to the "free" market investor by intentionally raising the cost of buying into the commodity markets then you're controlling the market. This is what OPEC does, they lower production to raise prices, they hoard product to make the markets appear bullish. EVEN OPEC, repeat, EVER OPEC has exposed Wall Street to pricing fixing...*

You've heard me repeatedly grip about Phil Gram and the reason for this is Phil Gram is the Alpha crook behind the deregulation of the banking system, and he pushed through the clause that allows hidden transactions for Goldman Sach, Stanley Morgan and the rest of the crooks. They DON'T want a "free market" if they did they would have NO problems with going back to pre-2000 commodity trading rules...

This is what Goldman Sach and Morgan Stanley did prior to the bail out so they could continue stealing from the American consumer - They were about to go down but they did NOT meet the requirements for TARP money...No problem, **both companies changed their previous status of investment banks overnight to holding banks in order to qualify for the government bailouts.**

Their official press release is they don't want government to interfere with the "free markets" BULL! First, its not a free market it's THEIR Candy Store to do whatever they choose to do but they'll sure knock you down to get at the free money...

FOUR-WEEK GASOLINE DEMAND LOWEST IN NEARLY SIX YEARS
Gasoline demand as measured by the Energy Information Administration for last week (ending Friday, Jan. 22) hit a low number not witnessed since Feb. 20, 2004. What is particularly frightening to gasoline marketers is that demand typically bottoms out in the final week of January or the first week of February, so still lower numbers could be in the cards.

Four-week demand as calculated by EIA was 8.676 million b/d last week. The lowest number for the entire 2009 winter malaise was the 8.766 million b/d registered for the week ending Jan. 30. For some perspective, gasoline demand's winter bottom in the "go go" years of 2007 and 2008 was 9.129 million b/d and 9.081 million b/d, respectively.

The last time gasoline demand was as low over a four-week stretch was the winter of 2004, when some particularly harsh conditions pushed motor fuel demand down to 8.66 million b/d in the period ending Feb. 20. But gasoline demand eventually spent most of the spring and summer in the 9.1-million b/d to 9.4-million b/d area, a "lift" that most analysts don't think is possible in 2010.

BANKS CONCERNED ABOUT PRESIDENT OBAMA'S TRADING RESTRICTION PROPOSALS
Some banks with large exposures to commodities trading businesses are already expressing concerns about the new trading restrictions and size of liabilities of financial firms and banks proposed by President Barack Obama last week, some banking sources told OPIS on Wednesday. None of these proposed restrictions are in effect as the president would need to work with Congress to write an appropriate financial reform legislation for deliberation and approval.

This could take a while if it does get through the legislative reform process. The idea of new restrictions and limiting liabilities **goes against the current trend of banks ramping up their energy and commodities trading operations.** OPIS reported last September that banks are aggressively hiring energy traders again, offering hefty bonuses in some cases. The banks are optimistic on the market outlook as commodities prices have somewhat recovered from the lows seen in the second half of 2008.

So far, the responses from some bankers on the proposed new restrictions are mixed. "I believe some restrictions are probably necessary," a bank source said. "Companies should have reserve capital to back up the trading they do." It could cause some banks to scale back their commodities trading operations, he added.

However, some others are against the idea of the government interfering with the concept of the free market. If the legislation on proposed restrictions were passed, the banks that would be most affected would be **JP Morgan Chase and Citigroup, as both companies have traditionally large banking assets.**

The restrictions would also affect the **two largest commodity traders in the banking sector** -- **Goldman Sachs and Morgan Stanley**, but the potential impact would be to a lesser extent despite their **huge exposure to the commodities markets.**

PROPOSALS
Last week, President Obama proposed no bank or financial firm that owns a bank would be allowed to own, invest in or sponsor a hedge fund or private equity or engage in proprietary trading operations unrelated to serving customers.

Also, the growth of the largest financial firms would be limited through an imposition of a cap on the market share of their liabilities. The aim of these proposals is to restrict the ability of financial companies that own a bank to invest in, and even sponsor, a private equity fund or a hedge fund.

Sources said that the banks are concerned about these proposals, but most top bank officials do not have any meaningful details of the President's proposals and could not predict the possible impact or outcome. However, they maintained that the new measures could turn out to be a blessing in disguise for Goldman Sachs and Morgan Stanley. Goldman Sachs and Morgan Stanley are not traditional commercial banks. **Both companies could and would prefer to sell off its banking segment, and become full-fledged hedge funds with no commercial banking liabilities. In 2008, both companies changed their previous status of investment banks overnight to holding banks in order to qualify for the government bailouts.** As for JP Morgan and Citigroup, both banks have substantial commercial bank liabilities and assets.

The new proposed restrictions may not go well with JP Morgan's $4 billion plan to buy Sempra Energy. JP Morgan is in the process of building its physical trading portfolio from the ground up, aiming to establish a dominant presence in the oil market that would rival Morgan Stanley and Goldman Sachs.

It is unclear if the talks of the new restrictions would give JP Morgan second thoughts on going ahead with the Sempra transaction. As for Citigroup, it continues to grow its commodities division despite selling its commodities trading division, Phibro LLC, to Occidental Petroleum Corporation for $250 million late last year.

Have a great day,

Loren R. Bailey,

Fuel Manager Services, Inc.
"Serving the trucking industry since 1992"

Office/Fuel Desk: 479-756-5927
Cellular: 479-790-5581
eFax: 832-426-0220

Proud Supporter of
ARKANSAS LADY TITANS
www.ArkansasLadyTitans.com
" Developing Today's Youth to be Tomorrow's Leaders Since 2003"

www.FuelManagerServices.com