The following comment letters were submitted to the OSC and are identical or substantively the same. The names of the commenters that submitted these letters are set out below.

No.	Commenter
1.	Allaway, Patti
2.	Bidaux, Dewaine
3.	Demeria, Jerry
4.	Ens, Art
5.	Guigon, Judy
6.	Hallam, Gerry
7.	Kerr, Gary
8.	Kesler, Susan
9.	Kesler, Tony
10.	Kryzanowski, Brian
11.	Owen, David
12.	Senko, Jason
13.	Weber, Jim
14.	Woodley, David G.

Dear Sirs & Madams:

RE: Proposed Amendments to National Instrument 45-106 relating to the Offering Memorandum Exemption

It is my understanding that the CSA is proposing to limit the ability of otherwise eligible investors to invest in exempt market products by introducing an annual aggregate cap of \$30,000 per investor. I have a number of concerns relating to this ill-advised proposal.

The exempt market is a viable alternative to the public stock markets, which have proven to be volatile and provided little or no return over the past number of years. The proposed cap would limit an individual's ability to diversify within the exempt market, which offers a wide range of products. Furthermore, reinvestment of exempt market proceeds resulting from successful product exits could be severely limited and possibly expose investors to excessive taxation.

I also understand the CSA is proposing a requirement for issuers to provide ongoing annual audited financial statements, with the additional possibility of imposing International Financial Reporting Standards (IFRS). In the vast majority of cases, accounting expenses are ultimately borne by investors. While I applaud the requirement for all issuers to provide annual financial statements, there is no need for the additional expense of either audits or the implementation of IFRS.

In closing, I wish to retain my right to invest my money as I see fit and do not support the proposed changes. If the mandate of the CSA is indeed investor protection, then the CSA should focus on vetting investment products rather than imposing more restrictions on investors.

Yours truly,

Ms. Patti Allaway RR #1, Site 1, Box 8

Carstairs AB TOM 0N0

Tatte allaway

Dear Sirs & Madams:

RE: Proposed Amendments to National Instrument 45-106 relating to the Offering Memorandum Exemption

It is my understanding that the CSA is proposing to limit the ability of otherwise eligible investors to invest in exempt market products by introducing an annual aggregate cap of \$30,000 per investor. I have a number of concerns relating to this ill-advised proposal.

The exempt market is a viable alternative to the public stock markets, which have proven to be volatile and provided little or no return over the past number of years. The proposed cap would limit an individual's ability to diversify within the exempt market, which offers a wide range of products. Furthermore, reinvestment of exempt market proceeds resulting from successful product exits could be severely limited and possibly expose investors to excessive taxation.

I also understand the CSA is proposing a requirement for issuers to provide ongoing annual audited financial statements, with the additional possibility of imposing International Financial Reporting Standards (IFRS). In the vast majority of cases, accounting expenses are ultimately borne by investors. While I applaud the requirement for all issuers to provide annual financial statements, there is no need for the additional expense of either audits or the implementation of IFRS.

In closing, I wish to retain my right to invest my money as I see fit and do not support the proposed changes. If the mandate of the CSA is indeed investor protection, then the CSA should focus on vetting investment products rather than imposing more restrictions on investors.

Yours truly,

Mr. Dewaine Bidaux
12 MacDonald Crescent
Saskatoon SK S7H 3G6

(306) 373-4507

Dear Sirs & Madams:

RE: Proposed Amendments to National Instrument 45-106 relating to the Offering Memorandum Exemption

It is my understanding that the CSA is proposing to limit the ability of otherwise eligible investors to invest in exempt market products by introducing an annual aggregate cap of \$30,000 per investor. I have a number of concerns relating to this ill-advised proposal.

The exempt market is a viable alternative to the public stock markets, which have proven to be volatile and provided little or no return over the past number of years. The proposed cap would limit an individual's ability to diversify within the exempt market, which offers a wide range of products. Furthermore, reinvestment of exempt market proceeds resulting from successful product exits could be severely limited and possibly expose investors to excessive taxation.

I also understand the CSA is proposing a requirement for issuers to provide ongoing annual audited financial statements, with the additional possibility of imposing International Financial Reporting Standards (IFRS). In the vast majority of cases, accounting expenses are ultimately borne by investors. While I applaud the requirement for all issuers to provide annual financial statements, there is no need for the additional expense of either audits or the implementation of IFRS.

In closing, I wish to retain my right to invest my money as I see fit and do not support the proposed changes. If the mandate of the CSA is indeed investor protection, then the CSA should focus on vetting investment products rather than imposing more restrictions on investors.

Yours truly,

Mr. Jerry Demeria 253 Nahanni Drive Saskatoon SK S7K 3Z7

(306) 931-8029

Dear Sirs & Madams:

RE: Proposed Amendments to National Instrument 45-106 relating to the Offering Memorandum Exemption

It is my understanding that the CSA is proposing to limit the ability of otherwise eligible investors to invest in exempt market products by introducing an annual aggregate cap of \$30,000 per investor. I have a number of concerns relating to this ill-advised proposal.

The exempt market is a viable alternative to the public stock markets, which have proven to be volatile and provided little or no return over the past number of years. The proposed cap would limit an individual's ability to diversify within the exempt market, which offers a wide range of products. Furthermore, reinvestment of exempt market proceeds resulting from successful product exits could be severely limited and possibly expose investors to excessive taxation.

I also understand the CSA is proposing a requirement for issuers to provide ongoing annual audited financial statements, with the additional possibility of imposing International Financial Reporting Standards (IFRS). In the vast majority of cases, accounting expenses are ultimately borne by investors. While I applaud the requirement for all issuers to provide annual financial statements, there is no need for the additional expense of either audits or the implementation of IFRS.

In closing, I wish to retain my right to invest my money as I see fit and do not support the proposed changes. If the mandate of the CSA is indeed investor protection, then the CSA should focus on vetting investment products rather than imposing more restrictions on investors.

Yours truly,

Mr. Art Ens P.O. Box 459

Osler SK SOK 3A0

(306) 239-4826

Dear Sirs & Madams:

RE: Proposed Amendments to National Instrument 45-106 relating to the Offering Memorandum Exemption

It is my understanding that the CSA is proposing to limit the ability of otherwise eligible investors to invest in exempt market products by introducing an annual aggregate cap of \$30,000 per investor. I have a number of concerns relating to this ill-advised proposal.

The exempt market is a viable alternative to the public stock markets, which have proven to be volatile and provided little or no return over the past number of years. The proposed cap would limit an individual's ability to diversify within the exempt market, which offers a wide range of products. Furthermore, reinvestment of exempt market proceeds resulting from successful product exits could be severely limited and possibly expose investors to excessive taxation.

I also understand the CSA is proposing a requirement for issuers to provide ongoing annual audited financial statements, with the additional possibility of imposing International Financial Reporting Standards (IFRS). In the vast majority of cases, accounting expenses are ultimately borne by investors. While I applaud the requirement for all issuers to provide annual financial statements, there is no need for the additional expense of either audits or the implementation of IFRS.

In closing, I wish to retain my right to invest my money as I see fit and do not support the proposed changes. If the mandate of the CSA is indeed investor protection, then the CSA should focus on vetting investment products rather than imposing more restrictions on investors.

Yours truly,

Judy Ġuigon

P.O./Box 642

Rosthern SK SOK 3RO

(306) 232-5527

09 June 2014

Canadian Securities Administrators (CSA)
Alberta Securities Commission
Autorité des marchés financiers
Financial and Consumer Affairs Authority of Saskatchewan

Dear Sirs & Madams:

RE: Proposed Amendments to National Instrument 45-106 relating to the Offering Memorandum Exemption

It is my understanding that the CSA is proposing to limit the ability of otherwise eligible investors to invest in exempt market products by introducing an annual aggregate cap of \$30,000 per investor. I have a number of concerns relating to this ill-advised proposal.

The exempt market is a viable alternative to the public stock markets, which have proven to be volatile and provided little or no return over the past number of years. The proposed cap would limit an individual's ability to diversify within the exempt market, which offers a wide range of products. Furthermore, reinvestment of exempt market proceeds resulting from successful product exits could be severely limited and possibly expose investors to excessive taxation.

I also understand the CSA is proposing a requirement for issuers to provide ongoing annual audited financial statements, with the additional possibility of imposing International Financial Reporting Standards (IFRS). In the vast majority of cases, accounting expenses are ultimately borne by investors. While I applaud the requirement for all issuers to provide annual financial statements, there is no need for the additional expense of either audits or the implementation of IFRS.

In closing, I wish to retain my right to invest my money as I see fit and do not support the proposed changes. If the mandate of the CSA is indeed investor protection, then the CSA should focus on vetting investment products rather than imposing more restrictions on investors.

Yours truly,

Mr. Gerry Hallam 2325 Cairns Avenue Saskatoon SK S7J 1T9

(306) 343-6481

Dear Sirs & Madams:

RE: Proposed Amendments to National Instrument 45-106 relating to the Offering Memorandum Exemption

It is my understanding that the CSA is proposing to limit the ability of otherwise eligible investors to invest in exempt market products by introducing an annual aggregate cap of \$30,000 per investor. I have a number of concerns relating to this ill-advised proposal.

The exempt market is a viable alternative to the public stock markets, which have proven to be volatile and provided little or no return over the past number of years. The proposed cap would limit an individual's ability to diversify within the exempt market, which offers a wide range of products. Furthermore, reinvestment of exempt market proceeds resulting from successful product exits could be severely limited and possibly expose investors to excessive taxation.

I also understand the CSA is proposing a requirement for issuers to provide ongoing annual audited financial statements, with the additional possibility of imposing International Financial Reporting Standards (IFRS). In the vast majority of cases, accounting expenses are ultimately borne by investors. While I applaud the requirement for all issuers to provide annual financial statements, there is no need for the additional expense of either audits or the implementation of IFRS.

In closing, I wish to retain my right to invest my money as I see fit and do not support the proposed changes. If the mandate of the CSA is indeed investor protection, then the CSA should focus on vetting investment products rather than imposing more restrictions on investors.

Yours truly,

Mr. Gary Kerr

123 Whiteshore Crescent Saskatoon SK S7J 3W3

(306) 374-6050

04 June 2014

Canadian Securities Administrators (CSA)
Alberta Securities Commission
Autorité des marchés financiers
Financial and Consumer Affairs Authority of Saskatchewan

Dear Sirs & Madams:

RE: Proposed Amendments to National Instrument 45-106 relating to the Offering Memorandum Exemption

It is my understanding that the CSA is proposing to limit the ability of otherwise eligible investors to invest in exempt market products by introducing an annual aggregate cap of \$30,000 per investor. I have a number of concerns relating to this ill-advised proposal.

The exempt market is a viable alternative to the public stock markets, which have proven to be volatile and provided little or no return over the past number of years. The proposed cap would limit an individual's ability to diversify within the exempt market, which offers a wide range of products. Furthermore, reinvestment of exempt market proceeds resulting from successful product exits could be severely limited and possibly expose investors to excessive taxation.

I also understand the CSA is proposing a requirement for issuers to provide ongoing annual audited financial statements, with the additional possibility of imposing International Financial Reporting Standards (IFRS). In the vast majority of cases, accounting expenses are ultimately borne by investors. While I applaud the requirement for all issuers to provide annual financial statements, there is no need for the additional expense of either audits or the implementation of IFRS.

In closing, I wish to retain my right to invest my money as I see fit and do not support the proposed changes. If the mandate of the CSA is indeed investor protection, then the CSA should focus on vetting investment products rather than imposing more restrictions on investors.

Yours truly,

Ms. Susan Keşler 243 Perreault Crescent Saskatoon SK S7K 6B1

(306) 975-2034

Dear Sirs & Madams:

RE: Proposed Amendments to National Instrument 45-106 relating to the Offering Memorandum Exemption

It is my understanding that the CSA is proposing to limit the ability of otherwise eligible investors to invest in exempt market products by introducing an annual aggregate cap of \$30,000 per investor. I have a number of concerns relating to this ill-advised proposal.

The exempt market is a viable alternative to the public stock markets, which have proven to be volatile and provided little or no return over the past number of years. The proposed cap would limit an individual's ability to diversify within the exempt market, which offers a wide range of products. Furthermore, reinvestment of exempt market proceeds resulting from successful product exits could be severely limited and possibly expose investors to excessive taxation.

I also understand the CSA is proposing a requirement for issuers to provide ongoing annual audited financial statements, with the additional possibility of imposing International Financial Reporting Standards (IFRS). In the vast majority of cases, accounting expenses are ultimately borne by investors. While I applaud the requirement for all issuers to provide annual financial statements, there is no need for the additional expense of either audits or the implementation of IFRS.

In closing, I wish to retain my right to invest my money as I see fit and do not support the proposed changes. If the mandate of the CSA is indeed investor protection, then the CSA should focus on vetting investment products rather than imposing more restrictions on investors.

Yours truly,

Mr. Tony Kesler 243 Perreault Crescent Saskatoon SK S7K 6B1

(306) 975-2034

Dear Sirs & Madams:

RE: Proposed Amendments to National Instrument 45-106 relating to the Offering Memorandum Exemption

It is my understanding that the CSA is proposing to limit the ability of otherwise eligible investors to invest in exempt market products by introducing an annual aggregate cap of \$30,000 per investor. I have a number of concerns relating to this ill-advised proposal.

The exempt market is a viable alternative to the public stock markets, which have proven to be volatile and provided little or no return over the past number of years. The proposed cap would limit an individual's ability to diversify within the exempt market, which offers a wide range of products. Furthermore, reinvestment of exempt market proceeds resulting from successful product exits could be severely limited and possibly expose investors to excessive taxation.

I also understand the CSA is proposing a requirement for issuers to provide ongoing annual audited financial statements, with the additional possibility of imposing International Financial Reporting Standards (IFRS). In the vast majority of cases, accounting expenses are ultimately borne by investors. While I applied the requirement for all issuers to provide annual financial statements, there is no need for the additional expense of either audits or the implementation of IFRS.

In closing, I wish to retain my right to invest my money as I see fit and do not support the proposed changes. If the mandate of the CSA is indeed investor protection, then the CSA should focus on vetting investment products rather than imposing more restrictions on investors.

Yours truly

Mr. Brian Kryzanowski

P.O. Box 10,23, Station Main North Battleford SK S9A 3E6

(306) 445-9986

Dear Sirs & Madams:

RE: Proposed Amendments to National Instrument 45-106 relating to the Offering Memorandum Exemption

It is my understanding that the CSA is proposing to limit the ability of otherwise eligible investors to invest in exempt market products by introducing an annual aggregate cap of \$30,000 per investor. I have a number of concerns relating to this ill-advised proposal.

The exempt market is a viable alternative to the public stock markets, which have proven to be volatile and provided little or no return over the past number of years. The proposed cap would limit an individual's ability to diversify within the exempt market, which offers a wide range of products. Furthermore, reinvestment of exempt market proceeds resulting from successful product exits could be severely limited and possibly expose investors to excessive taxation.

I also understand the CSA is proposing a requirement for issuers to provide ongoing annual audited financial statements, with the additional possibility of imposing International Financial Reporting Standards (IFRS). In the vast majority of cases, accounting expenses are ultimately borne by investors. While I appliand the requirement for all issuers to provide annual financial statements, there is no need for the additional expense of either audits or the implementation of IFRS.

In closing, I wish to retain my right to invest my money as I see fit and do not support the proposed changes. If the mandate of the CSA is indeed investor protection, then the CSA should focus on vetting investment products rather than imposing more restrictions on investors.

David L. Quen L.L.B. CFP

Yours truly,

Mr. David Owen P.O. Box 421

Wynyard SK SOA 4TO

(306) 554-3834

- 04 June 2014

Canadian Securities Administrators (CSA)
Alberta Securities Commission
Autorité des marchés financiers
Financial and Consumer Affairs Authority of Saskatchewan

Dear Sirs & Madams:

RE: Proposed Amendments to National Instrument 45-106 relating to the Offering Memorandum Exemption

It is my understanding that the CSA is proposing to limit the ability of otherwise eligible investors to invest in exempt market products by introducing an annual aggregate cap of \$30,000 per investor. I have a number of concerns relating to this ill-advised proposal.

The exempt market is a viable alternative to the public stock markets, which have proven to be volatile and provided little or no return over the past number of years. The proposed cap would limit an individual's ability to diversify within the exempt market, which offers a wide range of products. Furthermore, reinvestment of exempt market proceeds resulting from successful product exits could be severely limited and possibly expose investors to excessive taxation.

I also understand the CSA is proposing a requirement for issuers to provide ongoing annual audited financial statements, with the additional possibility of imposing International Financial Reporting Standards (IFRS). In the vast majority of cases, accounting expenses are ultimately borne by investors. While I applaud the requirement for all issuers to provide annual financial statements, there is no need for the additional expense of either audits or the implementation of IFRS.

In closing, I wish to retain my right to invest my money as I see fit and do not support the proposed changes. If the mandate of the CSA is indeed investor protection, then the CSA should focus on vetting investment products rather than imposing more restrictions on investors.

Yours truly,

Mr. Jason Senko P.O. Box 1420

Warman SK SOK 4SO

(306) 249-3172

Dear Sirs & Madams:

RE: Proposed Amendments to National Instrument 45-106 relating to the Offering Memorandum Exemption

It is my understanding that the CSA is proposing to limit the ability of otherwise eligible investors to invest in exempt market products by introducing an annual aggregate cap of \$30,000 per investor. I have a number of concerns relating to this ill-advised proposal.

The exempt market is a viable alternative to the public stock markets, which have proven to be volatile and provided little or no return over the past number of years. The proposed cap would limit an individual's ability to diversify within the exempt market, which offers a wide range of products. Furthermore, reinvestment of exempt market proceeds resulting from successful product exits could be severely limited and possibly expose investors to excessive taxation.

I also understand the CSA is proposing a requirement for issuers to provide ongoing annual audited financial statements, with the additional possibility of imposing International Financial Reporting Standards (IFRS). In the vast majority of cases, accounting expenses are ultimately borne by investors. While I applaud the requirement for all issuers to provide annual financial statements, there is no need for the additional expense of either audits or the implementation of IFRS.

In closing, I wish to retain my right to invest my money as I see fit and do not support the proposed changes. If the mandate of the CSA is indeed investor protection, then the CSA should focus on vetting investment products rather than imposing more restrictions on investors.

Yours truly,

Mr. Jim Weber 343 Candle Crescent Saskatoon SK S7K 5A5

(306) 242-0306

11 June 2014

Canadian Securities Administrators (CSA)
Alberta Securities Commission
Autorité des marchés financiers
Financial and Consumer Affairs Authority of Saskatchewan

Dear Sirs & Madams:

RE: Proposed Amendments to National Instrument 45-106 relating to the Offering Memorandum Exemption

It is my understanding that the CSA is proposing to limit the ability of otherwise eligible investors to invest in exempt market products by introducing an annual aggregate cap of \$30,000 per investor. I have a number of concerns relating to this ill-advised proposal.

The exempt market is a viable alternative to the public stock markets, which have proven to be volatile and provided little or no return over the past number of years. The proposed cap would limit an individual's ability to diversify within the exempt market, which offers a wide range of products. Furthermore, reinvestment of exempt market proceeds resulting from successful product exits could be severely limited and possibly expose investors to excessive taxation.

I also understand the CSA is proposing a requirement for issuers to provide ongoing annual audited financial statements, with the additional possibility of imposing International Financial Reporting Standards (IFRS). In the vast majority of cases, accounting expenses are ultimately borne by investors. While I applied the requirement for all issuers to provide annual financial statements, there is no need for the additional expense of either audits or the implementation of IFRS.

In closing, I wish to retain my right to invest my money as I see fit and do not support the proposed changes. If the mandate of the CSA is indeed investor protection, then the CSA should focus on vetting investment products rather than imposing more restrictions on investors.

Yours truly,

Mr. David G. Woodley 230 Shepherd Hills Road

Salt Spring Island BC V8K 2H8

(250) 537-1072