In response to the proposed business opportunity rule (16 CFR Part 437), I must make my feelings known.

I have been a Quixtar business owner for just over a year and have been able to achieve the exact level of success I was led to believe was possible. Very quickly now based upon the action I am taking I will grow my business to a large level. Quixtar has provided me with a very unique and honest way to supplement my family's income and assist others to do the same. Aside from income though, the greater benefit is the opportunity to reach my hand out to a stranger and affect their life for the positive.

I must say that I absolutely agree with the spirit of the rule in question, but that I cannot agree with the specific methods it proposes. I can tell you from my experience and what I've in turn provided to others, when I registered, I was given a very clear and thorough understanding of the opportunity over a **series** of meetings before ever making a free and personal decision to register my own business. From the initial contact I make very clear, by telling people directly, that I cannot promise them anything, nor am I offering a get rich quick scheme. I can only offer a vehicle and my continued support to help them achieve what they want for their own life, if they are willing to do the work to get it.

I will outline my disagreements below:

I disagree with the blanket 7-day waiting period proposal. For those opportunities that provide 100% money back guarantees on all of their start up costs, (which are always less than $180 in my business, an admittedly small investment) I feel a 7-day or any other waiting period only serves to waste time and inhibit positive action. I have had 5 cases of personally sponsored business owners deciding they no longer want to be a part of my team. In every case they have promptly received all of their start up costs back from the corporation with my guidance and good wishes. For another opportunity this may make sense, but you need to legally differentiate between those that provide money back and those that don't.

I disagree with all aspects that require myself or others to give away my personal information to a prospective business owner, whether for reference or substantiation. In my organization, prospective owners meet, interact with, and hear examples from no less than 15 other business owners and are provided full disclosure of "average monthly gross income", in addition to being shown specific cases of what is possible. They are clearly informed what it takes to achieve those levels of success, as well as what can be expected if they choose not to take the steps that were taken in those cases. When asked, I have never been anything but transparent as to what my income has been and what it took me to get there. That level of integrity is openly taught and practiced throughout my organization. Requiring me to give additional personal information, without proper demonstration of legal need only violates my privacy.

As for disclosure of past and present litigation, some serious clarification needs to be made. To require that we provide information on ALL litigation, whether it had any merit or not, and regardless of who the actual defendant and prosecutor were, would be like requiring every McDonalds to hand out a list at the door of all the lawsuits filed against the corporation or any of their franchises! It is absurd! In a country that allows widespread abuse of the legal system, if a prospective owner wishes to investigate legal accusations against a company, they have ample resources to do so. In my opinion, the

vast majority of information out there is either painfully biased or outright false, so this rule has me dumbfounded.

As I said previously, I agree in spirit with the proposed rules, but there are many aspects and practices that I cannot see affecting my community of business owners or prospects in any positive way. I ask for far more differentiation between different business opportunities, based upon their individual practices. My business has always been fully compliant with regulations and I see this proposal as a broad act to cripple my business for the shortcomings of another. Please…change this proposal or strike it.

Joshua Lawson