STIKEMAN ELLIOTT

Stikeman Elliott LLP Barristers & Solicitors

5300 Commerce Court West, 199 Bay Street, Toronto, Canada M5L 1B9 Tel: (416)·869-5500 Fax: (416) 947-0866 www.stikeman.com

Direct: (416) 869-5642 Fax: (416) 861-0445

E-mail: jnorthcote@stikeman.com

BY EMAIL

April 1, 2003

British Columbia Securities Commission Alberta Securities Commission Saskatchewan Securities Commission **Manitoba Securities Commission Ontario Securities Commission** Securities Administration Branch, New Brunswick Office of the Attorney General, Prince Edward Island Nova Scotia Securities Commission Securities Commission of Newfoundland and Labrador Registrar of Securities, Department of Justice, Government of the Northwest Territories Registrar of Securities, Government of Yukon Registrar of Securities, Department of Justice, Government of Nunavut c/o John Stevenson, Secretary **Ontario Securities Commission** 20 Queen Street West

- and –

19th Floor, Box 55

Toronto, Ontario M5H 3S8

Email: jstevenson@osc.gov.on.ca

Commission des valeurs mobilières du Québec c/o Denise Brousseau, Secretary 800 Victoria Square, Stock Exchange Tower P. O. Box 246, 22nd Floor Montréal, Québec H4Z 1G3 Email: consultation-en-cours@cvmq.com

Dear Sirs and Mesdames:

TORONTO

MONTREAL

OTTAWA CALGARY

VANCOUVER

NEWYORK

LONDON

SYDNEY

Re: Proposed National Instrument 81-106 - Investment Fund Continuous Disclosure (the "Proposed NI")

I am writing to provide a few further personal comments with respect to the Proposed NI, in addition to the comments set forth in my letter dated December 19, 2002. These comments are not those of the firm.

1. Corporate Law Requirements

The Proposed NI would permit mutual funds to mail annual financial statements to only those beneficial and registered securityholders who request copies¹.

A number of mutual funds are organized as corporations. Pursuant to the provisions of the *Business Corporations Act* (Ontario) (the "**OBCA**") and the *Canada Business Corporations Act* (the "**CBCA**"), annual financial statements are required to be sent to each shareholder, except those shareholders who inform the corporation in writing that they do not wish to receive a copy of the financial statements².

Requiring a securityholder to specifically request copies of annual financial statements is likely to result in many fewer copies of the annual statements being printed and mailed then if securityholders are required to elect in writing not to receive them. Accordingly, corporate mutual funds formed under the OBCA or CBCA could not take the same advantage of the costs savings afforded by the Proposed NI (and the discretionary orders which have recently been granted pursuant thereto) and continue to comply with the requirements of the OBCA or CBCA.

I note that pursuant to the OBCA, the Commission has certain powers and authorities with respect to offering corporations formed under the OBCA. I would encourage the Commission to consider working with the corporate regulators to seek legislative changes to permit corporate mutual funds to take advantage of the same costs savings being afforded to trusts.

2. Subsection 10.1(4) of National Instrument 81-102 ("NI 81-102")

Subsection 10.1(3) of NI 81-102 requires the manager of a mutual fund to provide to security holders at least annually a statement outlining redemption procedures. Subsection 10.1(4) states that a separate statement is not required if the required description of the redemption procedures is

NORTHCOJ\4662189\2

¹ Section 2.2 of the Proposed NI.

² Subsection 154(3) of the OBCA and Subsection 159(1) of the CBCA.

included in "the mutual fund's annual financial statements or annual report, or in a simplified prospectus that is sent to all securityholders in that year".

Presumably, mutual funds can comply with the requirements of subsection 10.1(3) of NI 81-102 by including the required information in the annual financial statements, even if the statements are not sent to all securityholders. Otherwise, the exemptions granted by Section 2.2 of the Proposed Instrument would be significantly less meaningful. Perhaps subsection 10.1(3) or subsection 10.1(4) could be amended to clarify this.

I trust these comments are helpful.

Yours truly,

"Jennifer Northcote"

Jennifer Northcote

/sm