

February 26, 2007

Securities and Exchange Commission
450 5th Street, NW
Washington, DC 20549

Ref: File No. S7-24-06

To whom it may concern:

I consider myself a strong supporter of the Sarbanes Oxley Act and the many areas of financial reporting that it seeks to improve. The collapse of companies such as Enron and Arthur Anderson are an embarrassment not only to corporate America but to other professionals in the business world. Agreeing with the motives and the need for the implementation of the Act does not mean that I believe the Act has achieved perfection or is anywhere near being perfect. There is room for improvement and modification in Sarbanes Oxley and it is time for the SEC to take a look at making some modifications in particular areas of the act.

Section 404 of the Sarbanes Oxley Act requires that management issue an annual report giving an evaluation of the effectiveness and quality of their internal control over financial reporting. This is supposed to make the financial statements more reliable for investors and the general public. The SEC states that a reliable financial statement must be materially accurate and that the central purpose of section 404 is to assess whether there is a possibility of a misstatement within the financial statements that is not being prevented by the internal controls set in place by management. This raises an important issue of responsibilities for stock exchange companies. I have a very hard time believing that the Chief Executive Officer of a nationwide corporation knows exactly how his/her internal controls are doing at **every** location. I doubt that most CEO's even maintain frequent communication with so called "management".

When the CEO of a corporation puts a signature on the bottom of an annual report they are telling the general public that they have verified the information on the report and have complied with the rules set forth by the SEC. I have trouble believing that they can verify with absolute certainty that at every location nationwide all of the internal controls are working one hundred percent.

Why not include managements input on the annual report also?

Section 302 of the Sarbanes Oxley Act deals with signing officers of a corporation and the responsibilities they are given as far as verifying the accuracy of the financial statements. I have researched annual 10-K reports of many publicly held corporations and have noticed that typed names are often taking the place of actual signatures at the bottom of the annual report.

A signature holds someone personally reliable and represents a promise to investors that all measures have been taken to avoid any material misstatements on the annual report.

A signature is what congress was pushing for and it is what investors want to see. Why is it that some of the largest corporations in our country are choosing to ignore the importance of a signed document? The entire mission of Sarbanes Oxley is to improve investor confidence by promoting accurate and reliable financial statements. Corporations that type names in the place of a genuine signature are potentially jeopardizing the trust that the Act wanted corporate management to convey to investors who were not present when the certifications were signed.

Section 404 of the Sarbanes Oxley Act puts the same amount of burden on small or mid cap companies as it does the biggest corporations in America. Some of these smaller corporations simply do not have the management to create the necessary control environment to comply with standards and regulations set forth by the SEC.

The cost of the external auditing and the documentation hits the pockets of small cap corporations much harder than it does the biggest corporations in our country.

Could there be a different approach for smaller cap companies? The lack of guidance from the PCAOB (public company accounting oversight board) regarding the documentation required by these smaller corporations results in enormous amounts of documentation and extremely high costs that are necessary for the company to comply.

I would like to again stress the fact that I do support the goals and objectives of the Securities and Exchange Commission with the creation of the Sarbanes Oxley Act. I ask that the SEC be aware of the aforementioned areas within Sarbanes Oxley and provide improvements within these areas.

Sincerely,

Benjamin J. Hauser
2008 Accounting Graduate
University of Wisconsin La Crosse