

April 1, 2007

Dear Mesdames---I have been practicing securities law for 21 years. In my view the requirement for "substantial beneficiary" to sign a prospectus certificate in Part 5 makes some sense in the case of non-arms length transactions but it makes no sense at all in the case of arms length transactions. Quite clearly, it will put public companies at a relative disadvantage to private purchasers in acquiring assets for cash consideration. As such, it will inflate the prices that a public company will be required to pay for assets to the detriment of current and future shareholders, including those persons purchasing securities under the prospectus.

Jay Sujir

Anfield Sujir Kennedy & Durno
PO Box 10068, Pacific Centre
Suite 1600, 609 Granville Street
Vancouver, BC, V7Y 1C3
Phone: 604.669.1322
Fax: 604.669.3877