

objection. The Commission, therefore, deemed such exemptions necessary "to assure the solvency of the life insurer and performance of its contractual obligations by enabling an insurance regulatory authority or the life insurer to act when certain proposals reasonably could be expected to increase the risks undertaken by the life insurer. In this respect, flexible premium variable life insurance contracts are identical to scheduled premium variable life insurance contracts. Therefore, the corresponding provisions of rule 6e-3(T) under the 1940 Act undoubtedly were adopted in recognition of the same factors.

15. The sale of Fund shares to Qualified Plans, HAA and General Accounts will not have any impact on the relief requested herein. With respect to the Qualified Plans, which are not registered as investment companies under the 1940 Act, there is no requirement to pass through voting rights to Qualified Plan participants. Indeed, to the contrary, applicable law expressly reserves voting rights associated with Qualified Plan assets to certain specified persons. Under section 403(a) of ERISA, shares of a portfolio of a fund sold to a Qualified Plan must be held by the trustees of the Qualified Plan. Section 403(a) also provides that the trustee(s) must have exclusive authority and discretion to manage and control the Qualified Plan with two exceptions: (a) When the Qualified Plan expressly provides that the trustee(s) are subject to the direction of a named fiduciary who is not a trustee, in which case the trustees are subject to proper directions made in accordance with the terms of the Qualified Plan and not contrary to ERISA, and (b) when the authority to manage, acquire, or dispose of assets of the Qualified Plan is delegated to one or more investment managers pursuant to section 402(c)(3) of ERISA. Unless one of the above two exceptions stated in section 403(a) applies, Qualified Plan trustees have the exclusive authority and responsibility for voting proxies.

16. Where a named fiduciary to a Qualified Plan appoints an investment manager, the investment manager has the responsibility to vote the shares held unless the right to vote such shares is reserved to the trustees or the named fiduciary. The Qualified Plans may have their trustee(s) or other fiduciaries exercise voting rights attributable to investment securities held by the Qualified Plans in their discretion. Some of the Qualified Plans, however, may provide for the trustee(s), an investment adviser (or advisers), or another named fiduciary to exercise

voting rights in accordance with instructions from participants. Similarly, HAA and General Accounts are not subject to any pass-through voting requirements. Accordingly, unlike the case with insurance company separate accounts, the issue of resolution of material irreconcilable conflicts with respect to voting is not present with Qualified Plans, HAA or General Accounts.

17. Where a Qualified Plan does not provide participants with the right to give voting instructions, the trustee or named fiduciary has responsibility to vote the shares held by the Qualified Plan. In this circumstance, the trustee has a fiduciary duty to vote the shares in the best interest of the Qualified Plan participants. Accordingly, even if HAA or an affiliate of HAA were to serve in the capacity of trustee or named fiduciary with voting responsibilities, HAA or the affiliates would have a fiduciary duty to vote those shares in the best interest of the Qualified Plan participants.

18. In addition, even if a Qualified Plan were to hold a controlling interest in a Fund, Applicants do not believe that such control would disadvantage other investors in such Fund to any greater extent than is the case when any institutional shareholder holds a majority of the voting securities of any open-end management investment company. In this regard, Applicants submit that investment in a Fund by a Qualified Plan will not create any of the voting complications occasioned by mixed funding or shared funding. Unlike mixed funding or shared funding, Qualified Plan investor voting rights cannot be frustrated by veto rights of insurers or state regulators.

19. Where a Qualified Plan provides participants with the right to give voting instructions, Applicants see no reason to believe that participants in Qualified Plans generally or those in a particular Qualified Plan, either as a single group or in combination with participants in other Qualified Plans, would vote in a manner that would disadvantage Variable Contract holders. The purchase of shares of Funds by Qualified Plans that provide voting rights does not present any complications not otherwise occasioned by mixed or shared funding.

20. The prohibitions on mixed and shared funding might reflect concern regarding possible different investment motivations among investors. When rule 6e-2 under the 1940 Act was adopted, variable annuity separate accounts could invest in mutual funds whose shares also were offered to the general public. Therefore, the Commission staff contemplated underlying funds with

public shareholders, as well as with variable life insurance separate account shareholders. The Commission staff may have been concerned with the potentially different investment motivations of public shareholders and variable life insurance contract owners. There also may have been some concern with respect to the problems of permitting a state insurance regulatory authority to affect the operations of a publicly available mutual fund and to affect the investment decisions of public shareholders.

21. For reasons unrelated to the 1940 Act, however, Internal Revenue Service Revenue Ruling 81-225 (Sept. 25, 1981) effectively deprived variable annuities funded by publicly available mutual funds of their tax-benefited status. The Tax Reform Act of 1984 codified the prohibition against the use of publicly available mutual funds as an investment vehicle for Variable Contracts (including variable life contracts). Section 817(h) of the Code in effect requires that the investments made by variable annuity and variable life insurance separate accounts be "adequately diversified." If a separate account is organized as a UIT that invests in a single fund or series, the diversification test will be applied at the underlying fund level, rather than at the separate account level, but only if "all of the beneficial interests" in the underlying fund "are held by one or more insurance companies (or affiliated companies) in their general account or in segregated asset accounts * * *". Accordingly, a UIT separate account that invests solely in a publicly available mutual fund will not be adequately diversified. In addition, any underlying mutual fund, including any Fund, that sells shares to separate accounts, in effect, would be precluded from also selling its shares to the public. Consequently, there will be no public shareholders of any Fund.

22. Shared funding by unaffiliated insurance companies does not present any issues that do not already exist where a single insurance company is licensed to do business in several or all states. A particular state insurance regulatory body could require action that is inconsistent with the requirements of other states in which the insurance company offers its policies. The fact that different insurers may be domiciled in different states does not create a significantly different or enlarged problem.

23. Shared funding by unaffiliated insurers, in this respect, is no different than the use of the same investment company as the funding vehicle for affiliated insurers, which rules 6e-2(b)(15) and 6e-3(T)(b)(15) under the