

DNCOURT FILE NO.: 2301-16982

COURT COURT OF KING'S BENCH OF ALBERTA

JUDICIAL CENTRE CALGARY

IN THE MATTER OF THE COMPANIES' CREDITORS ARRANGEMENT
ACT, RSC 1985, c. C-36, AS AMENDED

AND IN THE MATTER OF A PLAN OF COMPROMISE OR
ARRANGEMENT OF CANDESTO ENTERPRISES CORP., D3
INFRASTRUCTURE SERVICES INC. and SAFE ROADS ALBERTA
LTD.

APPLICANTS CANDESTO ENTERPRISES CORP., D3 INFRASTRUCTURE
SERVICES INC. and SAFE ROADS ALBERTA LTD.

DOCUMENT **BOOK OF AUTHORITIES OF THE APPLICANTS, CANDESTO
ENTERPRISES CORP., D3 INFRASTRUCTURE SERVICES INC. and
SAFE ROADS ALBERTA LTD.**

ADDRESS FOR
SERVICE AND
CONTACT
INFORMATION
OF PARTY
FILING THIS
DOCUMENT

Cassels Brock & Blackwell LLP
Suite 3810, Bankers Hall West
888 3rd Street SW
Calgary, Alberta, T2P 5C5

Telephone: 403 351 2920

Facsimile: 403 648 1151

Email: joliver@cassels.com / nthompson@cassels.com

File No.: 58965-1

Attention: Jeffrey Oliver / Natalie Thompson



LIST OF AUTHORITIES

STATUTES

Tab	Authority

1.	<i>Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act</i>, RSC 1985, c B-3
2.	<i>Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act</i>, RSC 1985, c C-36

JURISPRUDENCE

Tab	Authority

3.	<i>9354-9186 Québec Inc. v Callidus Capital Corp.</i>, 2020 SCC 10
4.	<i>Canwest Global Communications Corp., Re</i>, [2009] OJ No 4286
5.	<i>Canwest Publishing Inc.</i>, 2010 ONSC 222
6.	<i>Century Services Inc v Canada (Attorney General)</i>, 2010 SCC 60
7.	<i>Cinram International Inc. (Re)</i>, 2012 ONSC 3767
8.	<i>Cline Mining Corporation, Re</i> 2014 ONSC 6998
9.	<i>Free Rein Enterprises Ltd. (Re)</i> (8 December 2023), Calgary-2301-16260
10.	<i>iMarketing Solutions Group Inc., Re</i>, 2013 ONSC 2223
11.	<i>Industrial Properties Regina Limited v Cooper Sands Lands Corp</i>, 2018 SKCA 36
12.	<i>Jaguar Mining Inc., Re</i>, 2014 ONSC 494
13.	<i>Laurentian University of Sudbury</i>, 2021 ONSC 659
14.	<i>Lydian International Limited, Re</i>, 2019 ONSC 7473
15.	<i>Northstar Aerospace, Inc. (Re)</i>, 2012 ONSC 4546
16.	<i>Port Capital Development (EV) Inc. v. 1296371 B.C. Ltd.</i>, 2021 BCCA 382
17.	<i>Priszm Income Fund, Re</i>, 2011 ONSC 2061
18.	<i>PT Holdco, Inc., (Re)</i>, 2016 ONSC 495
19.	<i>Re Canada North Group Inc.</i>, 2017 ABQB 508
20.	<i>Re Stelco Inc.</i>, 48 CBR (4th) 299
21.	<i>Re Wayland group Corp. et al.</i> (2 December 2019), Toronto CV–19–00632079-00CL
22.	<i>SkyLink Aviation Inc., Re</i>, 2013 ONSC 1500

23. [Victorian Order of Nurses for Canada \(Re\) 2015 ONSC 7371](#)

TAB 1

Canada Federal Statutes
Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act

R.S.C. 1985, c. B-3

Currency

An Act respecting Bankruptcy and Insolvency

R.S.C. 1985, c. B-3, as am. R.S.C. 1985, c. 27 (1st Supp.), s. 203; R.S.C. 1985, c. 31 (1st Supp.), ss. 3, 28, 69-77; R.S.C. 1985, c. 3 (2nd Supp.), s. 28; R.S.C. 1985, c. 27 (2nd Supp.), s. 10 (Sched., item 2); S.C. 1990, c. 17, s. 3; 1991, c. 46, s. 584; 1992, c. 1, ss. 12-20, 143 (Sched. VI, item 2), 145, 161; 1992, c. 27, ss. 1-90; 1993, c. 28, s. 78 (Sched. III, items 6, 7) [Amended 1999, c. 3, s. 12 (Sched., item 3).]; 1993, c. 34, s. 10; 1994, c. 26, ss. 6-9, 46; 1995, c. 1, s. 62(1)(a); 1996, c. 6, s. 167(1)(b), (2); 1996, c. 23, s. 168; 1997, c. 12, ss. 1-119; 1998, c. 19, s. 250; 1998, c. 21, s. 103; 1998, c. 30, s. 14(a); 1999, c. 3, s. 15; 1999, c. 28, ss. 146, 147; 1999, c. 31, ss. 17-26; 2000, c. 12, ss. 8-21; 2000, c. 30, ss. 143-148; 2001, c. 4, ss. 25-27, 28 (Fr.), 29-32, 33(1) (Fr.), (2), (3); 2001, c. 9, ss. 572-574; 2002, c. 7, ss. 83-85; 2002, c. 8, s. 182(1) (b); 2004, c. 25, ss. 7(1), (2) (Fr.), (3)-(8), (9) (Fr.), (10), 8, 9 (Fr.), 10(1) (Fr.), (2), (3) (Fr.), 11 (Fr.), 12-16, 17 (Fr.), 18, 19 (Fr.), 20-23, 24 (Fr.), 25(1), (2) (Fr.), 26, 27(1)-(3), (4) (Fr.), (5), 28-31, 32(1), (2), (3) (Fr.), 33-35 (Fr.), 36-48, 49(1) (Fr.), (2), (3), 50(1), (2) (Fr.), (3), 51 (Fr.), 52(1) (Fr.), (2), 53-64, 65 (Fr.), 66, 67-69 (Fr.), 70-74, 75 (Fr.), 76 (Fr.), 77, 78 (Fr.), 79 (Fr.), 80-83, 84 (Fr.), 85 (Fr.), 86, 87, 88(1), (2) (Fr.), 89, 90 (Fr.), 91 (Fr.), 92, 93, 94 (Fr.), 95-99, 100(1) (Fr.), (2), 101 (Fr.), 102(1), (2) (Fr.), 103; 2005, c. 3, ss. 11-14; 2005, c. 47, ss. 2(1), (2) (Fr.), (3)-(5), (6) (Fr.), 3-52, 53 (Fr.), 54-100, 101(1), (2) (Fr.), (3), 102-123 [ss. 20(3), 30(2), 31(3), 37, 104(3), 106, 116, 120(2) repealed 2007, c. 36, ss. 95-98, 101-104; ss. 39(2), 103 amended 2007, c. 36, ss. 99, 100.]; 2007, c. 29, ss. 91-102; 2007, c. 36, ss. 1-3, 4 (Fr.), 5-7, 8 (Fr.), 9(1) (Fr.), (2), (3), 10, 11 (Fr.), 12-32, 33(1), (2), (3) (Fr.), (4), (5), 34, 35, 36 (Fr.), 37-52, 53(1) (Fr.), (2), 54-60, 112(4), (10)(b), (13), (14) [ss. 25, 31, 40 repealed 2007, c. 36, s. 112(2), (7), (10)(a).]; 2009, c. 2, ss. 355 (Fr.), 356 (Fr.); 2009, c. 31, ss. 63-65; 2009, c. 33, ss. 21-26; 2012, c. 16, ss. 79-81; 2012, c. 31, ss. 414-418; 2014, c. 20, s. 484; 2015, c. 3, ss. 6 (Fr.), 7 (Fr.), 8, 9, 10 (Fr.); 2017, c. 6, s. 122; 2017, c. 26, ss. 5-10; 2018, c. 10, s. 82; 2018, c. 27, ss. 265 (Fr.), 266-268; 2019, c. 29, ss. 133-135, 160, 161; 2022, c. 5, s. 12; 2022, c. 10, ss. 137, 173(2); 2023, c. 6, ss. 2-4.

Currency

Federal English Statutes reflect amendments current to October 26, 2023

Federal English Regulations Current to Gazette Vol. 157:20 (September 27, 2023)

("fiducie de revenu")

"insolvent person" means a person who is not bankrupt and who resides, carries on business or has property in Canada, whose liabilities to creditors provable as claims under this Act amount to one thousand dollars, and

(a) who is for any reason unable to meet his obligations as they generally become due,

(b) who has ceased paying his current obligations in the ordinary course of business as they generally become due, or

(c) the aggregate of whose property is not, at a fair valuation, sufficient, or, if disposed of at a fairly conducted sale under legal process, would not be sufficient to enable payment of all his obligations, due and accruing due;

("personne insolvable")

"legal counsel" means any person qualified, in accordance with the laws of a province, to give legal advice; (*"conseiller juridique"*)

"locality of a debtor" means the principal place

(a) where the debtor has carried on business during the year immediately preceding the date of the initial bankruptcy event,

(b) where the debtor has resided during the year immediately preceding the date of the initial bankruptcy event, or

(c) in cases not coming within paragraph (a) or (b), where the greater portion of the property of the debtor is situated;

("localité")

"Minister" means the Minister of Industry; (*"ministre"*)

"net termination value" means the net amount obtained after netting or setting off or compensating the mutual obligations between the parties to an eligible financial contract in accordance with its provisions; (*"valeurs nettes dues à la date de résiliation"*)

"official receiver" means an officer appointed under [subsection 12\(2\)](#); (*"séquestre officiel"*)

"person" includes a partnership, an unincorporated association, a corporation, a cooperative society or a cooperative organization, the successors of a partnership, of an association, of a corporation, of a society or of an organization and the heirs, executors, liquidators of the succession, administrators or other legal representatives of a person; (*"personne"*)

"prescribed"

(a) in the case of the form of a document that is by this Act to be prescribed and the information to be given therein, means prescribed by directive issued by the Superintendent under [paragraph 5\(4\)\(e\)](#), and

(b) in any other case, means prescribed by the General Rules;

("prescrit")

"property" means any type of property, whether situated in Canada or elsewhere, and includes money, goods, things in action, land and every description of property, whether real or personal, legal or equitable, as well as obligations, easements and every description of estate, interest and profit, present or future, vested or contingent, in, arising out of or incident to property; (*"bien"*)

"proposal" means

(a) in any provision of Division I of Part III, a proposal made under that Division, and

TAB 2

Canada Federal Statutes
Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act

R.S.C. 1985, c. C-36

Currency

An Act to facilitate compromises and arrangements between companies and their creditors

R.S.C. 1985, c. C-36, as am. R.S.C. 1985, c. 27 (2nd Supp.), ss. 10 (Sched., item 3), 11; S.C. 1990, c. 17, s. 4; 1992, c. 27, s. 90(1)(f); 1993, c. 28, s. 78 (Sched. III, item 20) [Repealed 1999, c. 3, s. 12 (Sched., item 4).]; 1993, c. 34, s. 52; 1996, c. 6, s. 167(1)(d), (2); 1997, c. 12, ss. 120-127; 1998, c. 19, s. 260; 1998, c. 30, s. 14(c); 1999, c. 3, s. 22; 1999, c. 28, s. 154; 2000, c. 30, ss. 156-158; 2001, c. 9, ss. 575-577; 2001, c. 34, s. 33; 2002, c. 7, ss. 133-135; 2004, c. 25, ss. 193-195; 2005, c. 3, ss. 15, 16; 2005, c. 47, ss. 124-131 [ss. 124, 126 amended 2007, c. 36, ss. 105, 106.]; 2007, c. 29, ss. 104-109; 2007, c. 36, ss. 61(1), (2), (3) (Fr.), (4), 62 (Fr.), 63-73, 74(1), (2) (Fr.), 75-82, 112(17), (20), (23) [s. 63 repealed 2007, c. 36, s. 112(15).]; 2009, c. 33, ss. 27-29; 2012, c. 16, s. 82; 2012, c. 31, ss. 419-421; 2015, c. 3, s. 37; 2017, c. 26, s. 14; 2018, c. 10, s. 89; 2018, c. 27, s. 269; 2019, c. 29, ss. 136-140; 2023, c. 6, s. 5.

Currency

Federal English Statutes reflect amendments current to October 26, 2023

Federal English Regulations Current to Gazette Vol. 157:20 (September 27, 2023)

End of Document

Copyright © Thomson Reuters Canada Limited or its licensors (excluding individual court documents). All rights reserved.

Canada Federal Statutes
Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act
Interpretation

R.S.C. 1985, c. C-36, s. 2

s 2.

Currency

2.

2(1) Definitions

In this Act,

"aircraft objects" [Repealed 2012, c. 31, s. 419.]

"bargaining agent" means any trade union that has entered into a collective agreement on behalf of the employees of a company; (*"agent négociateur"*)

"bond" includes a debenture, debenture stock or other evidences of indebtedness; (*"obligation"*)

"cash-flow statement", in respect of a company, means the statement referred to in [paragraph 10\(2\)\(a\)](#) indicating the company's projected cash flow; (*"état de l'évolution de l'encaisse"*)

"claim" means any indebtedness, liability or obligation of any kind that would be a claim provable within the meaning of [section 2 of the Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act](#); (*"réclamation"*)

"collective agreement", in relation to a debtor company, means a collective agreement within the meaning of the jurisdiction governing collective bargaining between the debtor company and a bargaining agent; (*"convention collective"*)

"company" means any company, corporation or legal person incorporated by or under an Act of Parliament or of the legislature of a province, any incorporated company having assets or doing business in Canada, wherever incorporated, and any income trust, but does not include banks, authorized foreign banks within the meaning of [section 2 of the Bank Act](#), telegraph companies, insurance companies and companies to which the *Trust and Loan Companies Act* applies; (*"compagnie"*)

"court" means

(a) in Nova Scotia, British Columbia and Prince Edward Island, the Supreme Court,

(a.1) in Ontario, the Superior Court of Justice,

(b) in Quebec, the Superior Court,

(c) in New Brunswick, Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta, the Court of Queen's Bench, and

(c.1) in Newfoundland and Labrador, the Trial Division of the Supreme Court, and

(d) in Yukon and the Northwest Territories, the Supreme Court, and in Nunavut, the Nunavut Court of Justice;

(*"tribunal"*)

"debtor company" means any company that

- (a) is bankrupt or insolvent,
- (b) has committed an act of bankruptcy within the meaning of the *Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act* or is deemed insolvent within the meaning of the *Winding-up and Restructuring Act*, whether or not proceedings in respect of the company have been taken under either of those Acts,
- (c) has made an authorized assignment or against which a bankruptcy order has been made under the *Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act*, or
- (d) is in the course of being wound up under the *Winding-up and Restructuring Act* because the company is insolvent;

("compagnie débitrice")

"director" means, in the case of a company other than an income trust, a person occupying the position of director by whatever name called and, in the case of an income trust, a person occupying the position of trustee by whatever name called; *("administrateur")*

"eligible financial contract" means an agreement of a prescribed kind; *("contrat financier admissible")*

"equity claim" means a claim that is in respect of an equity interest, including a claim for, among others,

- (a) a dividend or similar payment,
- (b) a return of capital,
- (c) a redemption or retraction obligation,
- (d) a monetary loss resulting from the ownership, purchase or sale of an equity interest or from the rescission, or, in Quebec, the annulment, of a purchase or sale of an equity interest, or
- (e) contribution or indemnity in respect of a claim referred to in any of paragraphs (a) to (d);

("réclamation relative à des capitaux propres")

"equity interest" means

- (a) in the case of a company other than an income trust, a share in the company — or a warrant or option or another right to acquire a share in the company — other than one that is derived from a convertible debt, and
- (b) in the case of an income trust, a unit in the income trust — or a warrant or option or another right to acquire a unit in the income trust — other than one that is derived from a convertible debt;

("intérêt relatif à des capitaux propres")

"financial collateral" means any of the following that is subject to an interest, or in the Province of Quebec a right, that secures payment or performance of an obligation in respect of an eligible financial contract or that is subject to a title transfer credit support agreement:

- (a) cash or cash equivalents, including negotiable instruments and demand deposits,
- (b) securities, a securities account, a securities entitlement or a right to acquire securities, or
- (c) a futures agreement or a futures account;

Canada Federal Statutes
Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act
Interpretation

R.S.C. 1985, c. C-36, s. 3

s 3.

Currency

3.

3(1)Application

This Act applies in respect of a debtor company or affiliated debtor companies if the total of claims against the debtor company or affiliated debtor companies, determined in accordance with [section 20](#), is more than \$5,000,000 or any other amount that is prescribed.

3(2)Affiliated companies

For the purposes of this Act,

(a) companies are affiliated companies if one of them is the subsidiary of the other or both are subsidiaries of the same company or each of them is controlled by the same person; and

(b) two companies affiliated with the same company at the same time are deemed to be affiliated with each other.

3(3)Company controlled

For the purposes of this Act, a company is controlled by a person or by two or more companies if

(a) securities of the company to which are attached more than fifty per cent of the votes that may be cast to elect directors of the company are held, other than by way of security only, by or for the benefit of that person or by or for the benefit of those companies; and

(b) the votes attached to those securities are sufficient, if exercised, to elect a majority of the directors of the company.

3(4)Subsidiary

For the purposes of this Act, a company is a subsidiary of another company if

(a) it is controlled by

(i) that other company,

(ii) that other company and one or more companies each of which is controlled by that other company, or

(iii) two or more companies each of which is controlled by that other company; or

(b) it is a subsidiary of a company that is a subsidiary of that other company.

Amendment History

1997, c. 12, s. 121; 2005, c. 47, s. 125

Currency

Federal English Statutes reflect amendments current to October 26, 2023

Federal English Regulations Current to Gazette Vol. 157:20 (September 27, 2023)

End of Document

Copyright © Thomson Reuters Canada Limited or its licensors (excluding individual court documents). All rights reserved.

Canada Federal Statutes
Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act
Part II — Jurisdiction of Courts (ss. 9-18.5)

R.S.C. 1985, c. C-36, s. 11.02

s 11.02

Currency

11.02

11.02(1) Stays, etc. — initial application

A court may, on an initial application in respect of a debtor company, make an order on any terms that it may impose, effective for the period that the court considers necessary, which period may not be more than 10 days,

- (a) staying, until otherwise ordered by the court, all proceedings taken or that might be taken in respect of the company under the *Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act* or the *Winding-up and Restructuring Act*;
- (b) restraining, until otherwise ordered by the court, further proceedings in any action, suit or proceeding against the company; and
- (c) prohibiting, until otherwise ordered by the court, the commencement of any action, suit or proceeding against the company.

11.02(2) Stays, etc. — other than initial application

A court may, on an application in respect of a debtor company other than an initial application, make an order, on any terms that it may impose,

- (a) staying, until otherwise ordered by the court, for any period that the court considers necessary, all proceedings taken or that might be taken in respect of the company under an Act referred to in paragraph (1)(a);
- (b) restraining, until otherwise ordered by the court, further proceedings in any action, suit or proceeding against the company; and
- (c) prohibiting, until otherwise ordered by the court, the commencement of any action, suit or proceeding against the company.

11.02(3) Burden of proof on application

The court shall not make the order unless

- (a) the applicant satisfies the court that circumstances exist that make the order appropriate; and
- (b) in the case of an order under subsection (2), the applicant also satisfies the court that the applicant has acted, and is acting, in good faith and with due diligence.

11.02(4) Restriction

Orders doing anything referred to in subsection (1) or (2) may only be made under this section.

Amendment History

2005, c. 47, s. 128; 2019, c. 29, s. 137

Currency

Federal English Statutes reflect amendments current to October 26, 2023

Federal English Regulations Current to Gazette Vol. 157:20 (September 27, 2023)

End of Document

Copyright © Thomson Reuters Canada Limited or its licensors (excluding individual court documents). All rights reserved.

Canada Federal Statutes
Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act
Part II — Jurisdiction of Courts (ss. 9-18.5)

R.S.C. 1985, c. C-36, s. 11.2

s 11.2

Currency

11.2

11.2(1) Interim financing

On application by a debtor company and on notice to the secured creditors who are likely to be affected by the security or charge, a court may make an order declaring that all or part of the company's property is subject to a security or charge — in an amount that the court considers appropriate — in favour of a person specified in the order who agrees to lend to the company an amount approved by the court as being required by the company, having regard to its cash-flow statement. The security or charge may not secure an obligation that exists before the order is made.

11.2(2) Priority — secured creditors

The court may order that the security or charge rank in priority over the claim of any secured creditor of the company.

11.2(3) Priority — other orders

The court may order that the security or charge rank in priority over any security or charge arising from a previous order made under subsection (1) only with the consent of the person in whose favour the previous order was made.

11.2(4) Factors to be considered

In deciding whether to make an order, the court is to consider, among other things,

- (a) the period during which the company is expected to be subject to proceedings under this Act;
- (b) how the company's business and financial affairs are to be managed during the proceedings;
- (c) whether the company's management has the confidence of its major creditors;
- (d) whether the loan would enhance the prospects of a viable compromise or arrangement being made in respect of the company;
- (e) the nature and value of the company's property;
- (f) whether any creditor would be materially prejudiced as a result of the security or charge; and
- (g) the monitor's report referred to in paragraph 23(1)(b), if any.

11.2(5) Additional factor — initial application

When an application is made under subsection (1) at the same time as an initial application referred to in subsection 11.02(1) or during the period referred to in an order made under that subsection, no order shall be made under subsection (1) unless the court is also satisfied that the terms of the loan are limited to what is reasonably necessary for the continued operations of the debtor company in the ordinary course of business during that period.

Amendment History

1997, c. 12, s. 124; 2005, c. 47, s. 128; 2007, c. 36, s. 65; 2019, c. 29, s. 138

Currency

Federal English Statutes reflect amendments current to October 26, 2023

Federal English Regulations Current to Gazette Vol. 157:20 (September 27, 2023)

End of Document

Copyright © Thomson Reuters Canada Limited or its licensors (excluding individual court documents). All rights reserved.

Canada Federal Statutes
Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act
Part II — Jurisdiction of Courts (ss. 9-18.5)

R.S.C. 1985, c. C-36, s. 11.4

s 11.4

Currency

11.4

11.4(1)Critical supplier

On application by a debtor company and on notice to the secured creditors who are likely to be affected by the security or charge, the court may make an order declaring a person to be a critical supplier to the company if the court is satisfied that the person is a supplier of goods or services to the company and that the goods or services that are supplied are critical to the company's continued operation.

11.4(2)Obligation to supply

If the court declares a person to be a critical supplier, the court may make an order requiring the person to supply any goods or services specified by the court to the company on any terms and conditions that are consistent with the supply relationship or that the court considers appropriate.

11.4(3)Security or charge in favour of critical supplier

If the court makes an order under subsection (2), the court shall, in the order, declare that all or part of the property of the company is subject to a security or charge in favour of the person declared to be a critical supplier, in an amount equal to the value of the goods or services supplied under the terms of the order.

11.4(4)Priority

The court may order that the security or charge rank in priority over the claim of any secured creditor of the company.

[Editor's Note: S.C. 2000, c. 30, s. 156(2) provides as follows:

(2) Subsection (1) [which repealed and replaced s. 11.4 of the Act] applies to proceedings commenced under the Act after September 29, 1997.]

[Editor's Note: S.C. 2001, c. 34, s. 33(2) provides as follows:

(2) Subsection (1) [which repealed and replaced the portion of [paragraph 11.4\(3\)\(c\)](#) before subparagraph (i) of the Act] applies to proceedings commenced under the Act after September 29, 1997.]

Amendment History

1997, c. 12, s. 124; 2000, c. 30, s. 156(1); 2001, c. 34, s. 33; 2005, c. 47, s. 128; 2007, c. 36, s. 65

Currency

Federal English Statutes reflect amendments current to October 26, 2023

Federal English Regulations Current to Gazette Vol. 157:20 (September 27, 2023)

Canada Federal Statutes
Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act
Part II — Jurisdiction of Courts (ss. 9-18.5)

R.S.C. 1985, c. C-36, s. 11.7

s 11.7

Currency

11.7

11.7(1) Court to appoint monitor

When an order is made on the initial application in respect of a debtor company, the court shall at the same time appoint a person to monitor the business and financial affairs of the company. The person so appointed must be a trustee, within the meaning of subsection 2(1) of the *Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act*.

11.7(2) Restrictions on who may be monitor

Except with the permission of the court and on any conditions that the court may impose, no trustee may be appointed as monitor in relation to a company

(a) if the trustee is or, at any time during the two preceding years, was

(i) a director, an officer or an employee of the company,

(ii) related to the company or to any director or officer of the company, or

(iii) the auditor, accountant or legal counsel, or a partner or an employee of the auditor, accountant or legal counsel, of the company; or

(b) if the trustee is

(i) the trustee under a trust indenture issued by the company or any person related to the company, or the holder of a power of attorney under an act constituting a hypothec within the meaning of the *Civil Code of Quebec* that is granted by the company or any person related to the company, or

(ii) related to the trustee, or the holder of a power of attorney, referred to in subparagraph (i).

11.7(3) Court may replace monitor

On application by a creditor of the company, the court may, if it considers it appropriate in the circumstances, replace the monitor by appointing another trustee, within the meaning of [subsection 2\(1\) of the *Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act*](#), to monitor the business and financial affairs of the company.

11.7(4) [Repealed 2005, c. 47, s. 129.]

11.7(5) [Repealed 2005, c. 47, s. 129.]

Amendment History

1997, c. 12, s. 124; 2005, c. 47, s. 129

Currency

Federal English Statutes reflect amendments current to October 26, 2023

Federal English Regulations Current to Gazette Vol. 157:20 (September 27, 2023)

End of Document

Copyright © Thomson Reuters Canada Limited or its licensors (excluding individual court documents). All rights reserved.

Canada Federal Statutes
Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act
Part II — Jurisdiction of Courts (ss. 9-18.5)

R.S.C. 1985, c. C-36, s. 11.51

s 11.51

Currency

11.51

11.51(1) Security or charge relating to director's indemnification

On application by a debtor company and on notice to the secured creditors who are likely to be affected by the security or charge, the court may make an order declaring that all or part of the property of the company is subject to a security or charge — in an amount that the court considers appropriate — in favour of any director or officer of the company to indemnify the director or officer against obligations and liabilities that they may incur as a director or officer of the company after the commencement of proceedings under this Act.

11.51(2) Priority

The court may order that the security or charge rank in priority over the claim of any secured creditor of the company.

11.51(3) Restriction — indemnification insurance

The court may not make the order if in its opinion the company could obtain adequate indemnification insurance for the director or officer at a reasonable cost.

11.51(4) Negligence, misconduct or fault

The court shall make an order declaring that the security or charge does not apply in respect of a specific obligation or liability incurred by a director or officer if in its opinion the obligation or liability was incurred as a result of the director's or officer's gross negligence or wilful misconduct or, in Quebec, the director's or officer's gross or intentional fault.

Amendment History

2005, c. 47, s. 128; 2007, c. 36, s. 66

Currency

Federal English Statutes reflect amendments current to October 26, 2023

Federal English Regulations Current to Gazette Vol. 157:20 (September 27, 2023)

Canada Federal Statutes
Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act
Part II — Jurisdiction of Courts (ss. 9-18.5)

R.S.C. 1985, c. C-36, s. 11.52

s 11.52

Currency

11.52

11.52(1) Court may order security or charge to cover certain costs

On notice to the secured creditors who are likely to be affected by the security or charge, the court may make an order declaring that all or part of the property of a debtor company is subject to a security or charge — in an amount that the court considers appropriate — in respect of the fees and expenses of

- (a) the monitor, including the fees and expenses of any financial, legal or other experts engaged by the monitor in the performance of the monitor's duties;
- (b) any financial, legal or other experts engaged by the company for the purpose of proceedings under this Act; and
- (c) any financial, legal or other experts engaged by any other interested person if the court is satisfied that the security or charge is necessary for their effective participation in proceedings under this Act.

11.52(2) Priority

The court may order that the security or charge rank in priority over the claim of any secured creditor of the company.

Amendment History

2005, c. 47, s. 128; 2007, c. 36, s. 66

Currency

Federal English Statutes reflect amendments current to October 26, 2023

Federal English Regulations Current to Gazette Vol. 157:20 (September 27, 2023)

TAB 3

**9354-9186 Québec inc. and
9354-9178 Québec inc. *Appellants***

v.

**Callidus Capital Corporation,
International Game Technology,
Deloitte LLP, Luc Carignan,
François Vigneault, Philippe Millette,
Francis Proulx and François Pelletier
*Respondents***

and

**Ernst & Young Inc.,
IMF Bentham Limited (now known as
Omni Bridgeway Limited),
Bentham IMF Capital Limited (now known
as Omni Bridgeway Capital (Canada)
Limited), Insolvency Institute of Canada and
Canadian Association of Insolvency and
Restructuring Professionals *Interveners***

- and -

**IMF Bentham Limited (now known as Omni
Bridgeway Limited) and
Bentham IMF Capital Limited (now known
as Omni Bridgeway Capital (Canada)
Limited) *Appellants***

v.

**Callidus Capital Corporation,
International Game Technology,
Deloitte LLP, Luc Carignan,
François Vigneault, Philippe Millette,
Francis Proulx and François Pelletier
*Respondents***

and

**9354-9186 Québec inc. et
9354-9178 Québec inc. *Appelantes***

c.

**Callidus Capital Corporation,
International Game Technology,
Deloitte S.E.N.C.R.L., Luc Carignan,
François Vigneault, Philippe Millette,
Francis Proulx et François Pelletier *Intimés***

et

**Ernst & Young Inc.,
IMF Bentham Limited (maintenant
connue sous le nom d’Omni Bridgeway
Limited), Corporation Bentham IMF
Capital (maintenant connue sous le nom de
Corporation Omni Bridgeway Capital
(Canada)), Institut d’insolvabilité du Canada
et Association canadienne des professionnels
de l’insolvabilité et de la réorganisation
*Intervenants***

- et -

**IMF Bentham Limited (maintenant
connue sous le nom d’Omni Bridgeway
Limited) et Corporation Bentham IMF
Capital (maintenant connue sous le nom de
Corporation Omni Bridgeway Capital
(Canada)) *Appelantes***

c.

**Callidus Capital Corporation,
International Game Technology,
Deloitte S.E.N.C.R.L., Luc Carignan,
François Vigneault, Philippe Millette,
Francis Proulx et François Pelletier *Intimés***

et

**Ernst & Young Inc.,
9354-9186 Québec inc.,
9354-9178 Québec inc.,
Insolvency Institute of Canada and
Canadian Association of Insolvency
and Restructuring Professionals** *Interveniers*

**INDEXED AS: 9354-9186 QUÉBEC INC. v.
CALLIDUS CAPITAL CORP.**

2020 SCC 10

File No.: 38594.

Hearing and judgment: January 23, 2020.

Reasons delivered: May 8, 2020.

Present: Wagner C.J. and Abella, Moldaver,
Karakatsanis, Côté, Rowe and Kasirer JJ.

**ON APPEAL FROM THE COURT OF APPEAL
FOR QUEBEC**

Bankruptcy and insolvency — Discretionary authority of supervising judge in proceedings under Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act — Appellate review of decisions of supervising judge — Whether supervising judge has discretion to bar creditor from voting on plan of arrangement where creditor is acting for improper purpose — Whether supervising judge can approve third party litigation funding as interim financing — Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act, R.S.C. 1985, c. C-36, ss. 11, 11.2.

The debtor companies filed a petition for the issuance of an initial order under the *Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act* ("CCAA") in November 2015. The petition succeeded, and the initial order was issued by a supervising judge, who became responsible for overseeing the proceedings. Since then, substantially all of the assets of the debtor companies have been liquidated, with the notable exception of retained claims for damages against the companies' only secured creditor. In September 2017, the secured creditor proposed a plan of arrangement, which later failed to receive sufficient creditor support. In February 2018, the secured creditor proposed another, virtually identical, plan of arrangement. It also sought the supervising judge's permission to vote on this new plan in the same class as the debtor companies' unsecured creditors, on the basis that its security was worth nil. Around the

**Ernst & Young Inc.,
9354-9186 Québec inc.,
9354-9178 Québec inc.,
Institut d'insolvabilité du Canada et
Association canadienne des professionnels
de l'insolvabilité et de la réorganisation** *Intervenants*

**RÉPERTORIÉ : 9354-9186 QUÉBEC INC. c.
CALLIDUS CAPITAL CORP.**

2020 CSC 10

N° du greffe : 38594.

Audition et jugement : 23 janvier 2020.

Motifs déposés : 8 mai 2020.

Présents : Le juge en chef Wagner et les juges Abella,
Moldaver, Karakatsanis, Côté, Rowe et Kasirer.

EN APPEL DE LA COUR D'APPEL DU QUÉBEC

Faillite et insolvabilité — Pouvoir discrétionnaire du juge surveillant dans une instance introduite sous le régime de la Loi sur les arrangements avec les créanciers des compagnies — Contrôle en appel des décisions du juge surveillant — Le juge surveillant a-t-il le pouvoir discrétionnaire d'empêcher un créancier de voter sur un plan d'arrangement si ce créancier agit dans un but illégitime? — Le juge surveillant peut-il approuver le financement de litige par un tiers à titre de financement temporaire? — Loi sur les arrangements avec les créanciers des compagnies, L.R.C. 1985, c. C-36, art. 11, 11.2.

En novembre 2015, les compagnies débitrices déposent une requête en délivrance d'une ordonnance initiale sous le régime de la *Loi sur les arrangements avec les créanciers des compagnies* (« LACC »). La requête est accueillie, et l'ordonnance initiale est rendue par un juge surveillant, qui est chargé de surveiller le déroulement de l'instance. Depuis, la quasi-totalité des éléments d'actif de la compagnie débitrice ont été liquidés, à l'exception notable des réclamations réservées en dommages-intérêts contre le seul créancier garanti des compagnies. En septembre 2017, le créancier garanti propose un plan d'arrangement, qui n'obtient pas subséquemment l'appui nécessaire des créanciers. En février 2018, le créancier garanti propose un autre plan d'arrangement, presque identique au premier. Il demande aussi au juge surveillant la permission de voter sur ce nouveau plan dans la même catégorie que

same time, the debtor companies sought interim financing in the form of a proposed third party litigation funding agreement, which would permit them to pursue litigation of the retained claims. They also sought the approval of a related super-priority litigation financing charge.

The supervising judge determined that the secured creditor should not be permitted to vote on the new plan because it was acting with an improper purpose. As a result, the new plan had no reasonable prospect of success and was not put to a creditors' vote. The supervising judge allowed the debtor companies' application, authorizing them to enter into a third party litigation funding agreement. On appeal by the secured creditor and certain of the unsecured creditors, the Court of Appeal set aside the supervising judge's order, holding that he had erred in reaching the foregoing conclusions.

Held: The appeal should be allowed and the supervising judge's order reinstated.

The supervising judge made no error in barring the secured creditor from voting or in authorizing the third party litigating funding agreement. A supervising judge has the discretion to bar a creditor from voting on a plan of arrangement where they determine that the creditor is acting for an improper purpose. A supervising judge can also approve third party litigation funding as interim financing, pursuant to s. 11.2 of the CCAA. The Court of Appeal was not justified in interfering with the supervising judge's discretionary decisions in this regard, having failed to treat them with the appropriate degree of deference.

The CCAA is one of three principal insolvency statutes in Canada. It pursues an array of overarching remedial objectives that reflect the wide ranging and potentially catastrophic impacts insolvency can have. These objectives include: providing for timely, efficient and impartial resolution of a debtor's insolvency; preserving and maximizing the value of a debtor's assets; ensuring fair and equitable treatment of the claims against a debtor; protecting the public interest; and, in the context of a commercial insolvency, balancing the costs and benefits of restructuring or liquidating the company. The architecture of the CCAA leaves the case-specific assessment and balancing of these objectives to the supervising judge.

les créanciers non garantis des compagnies débitrices, au motif que sa sûreté ne vaut rien. À peu près au même moment, les compagnies débitrices demandent un financement temporaire sous forme d'un accord de financement de litige par un tiers qui leur permettrait de poursuivre l'instruction des réclamations réservées. Elles sollicitent également l'approbation d'une charge super-prioritaire pour financer le litige.

Le juge surveillant décide que le créancier garanti ne peut voter sur le nouveau plan parce qu'il agit dans un but illégitime. En conséquence, le nouveau plan n'a aucune possibilité raisonnable d'être avalisé et il n'est pas soumis au vote des créanciers. Le juge surveillant accueille la demande des compagnies débitrices et les autorise à conclure un accord de financement de litige par un tiers. À l'issue d'un appel formé par le créancier garanti et certains des créanciers non garantis, la Cour d'appel annule l'ordonnance du juge surveillant, estimant qu'il est parvenu à tort aux conclusions qui précèdent.

Arrêt : Le pourvoi est accueilli et l'ordonnance du juge surveillant est rétablie.

Le juge surveillant n'a commis aucune erreur en empêchant le créancier garanti de voter ou en approuvant l'accord de financement de litige par un tiers. Un juge surveillant a le pouvoir discrétionnaire d'empêcher un créancier de voter sur un plan d'arrangement s'il décide que le créancier agit dans un but illégitime. Un juge surveillant peut aussi approuver le financement de litige par un tiers à titre de financement temporaire, en vertu de l'art. 11.2 de la LACC. La Cour d'appel n'était pas justifiée de modifier les décisions discrétionnaires du juge surveillant à cet égard et n'a pas fait preuve de la déférence à laquelle elle était tenue par rapport à ces décisions.

La LACC est l'une des trois principales lois canadiennes en matière d'insolvabilité. Elle poursuit un grand nombre d'objectifs réparateurs généraux qui témoignent de la vaste gamme des conséquences potentiellement catastrophiques qui peuvent découler de l'insolvabilité. Ces objectifs incluent les suivants : régler de façon rapide, efficace et impartiale l'insolvabilité d'un débiteur; préserver et maximiser la valeur des actifs d'un débiteur; assurer un traitement juste et équitable des réclamations déposées contre un débiteur; protéger l'intérêt public; et, dans le contexte d'une insolvabilité commerciale, établir un équilibre entre les coûts et les bénéfices découlant de la restructuration ou de la liquidation d'une compagnie. La structure de la LACC laisse au juge surveillant le soin de procéder à un examen et à une mise en balance au cas par cas de ces objectifs.

From beginning to end, each proceeding under the CCAA is overseen by a single supervising judge, who has broad discretion to make a variety of orders that respond to the circumstances of each case. The anchor of this discretionary authority is s. 11 of the CCAA, which empowers a judge to make any order that they consider appropriate in the circumstances. This discretionary authority is broad, but not boundless. It must be exercised in furtherance of the remedial objectives of the CCAA and with three baseline considerations in mind: (1) that the order sought is appropriate in the circumstances, and (2) that the applicant has been acting in good faith and (3) with due diligence. The due diligence consideration discourages parties from sitting on their rights and ensures that creditors do not strategically manoeuvre or position themselves to gain an advantage. A high degree of deference is owed to discretionary decisions made by judges supervising CCAA proceedings and, as such, appellate intervention will only be justified if the supervising judge erred in principle or exercised their discretion unreasonably.

A creditor can generally vote on a plan of arrangement or compromise that affects its rights, subject to any specific provisions of the CCAA that may restrict its voting rights, or a proper exercise of discretion by the supervising judge to constrain or bar the creditor's right to vote. Given that the CCAA regime contemplates creditor participation in decision-making as an integral facet of the workout regime, the discretion to bar a creditor from voting should only be exercised where the circumstances demand such an outcome. Where a creditor is seeking to exercise its voting rights in a manner that frustrates, undermines, or runs counter to the remedial objectives of the CCAA — that is, acting for an improper purpose — s. 11 of the CCAA supplies the supervising judge with the discretion to bar that creditor from voting. This discretion parallels the similar discretion that exists under the *Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act* and advances the basic fairness that permeates Canadian insolvency law and practice. Whether this discretion ought to be exercised in a particular case is a circumstance-specific inquiry that the supervising judge is best-positioned to undertake.

In the instant case, the supervising judge's decision to bar the secured creditor from voting on the new plan discloses no error justifying appellate intervention. When he made this decision, the supervising judge was intimately

Chaque procédure fondée sur la LACC est supervisée du début à la fin par un seul juge surveillant, qui a le vaste pouvoir discrétionnaire de rendre toute une gamme d'ordonnances susceptibles de répondre aux circonstances de chaque cas. Le point d'ancrage de ce pouvoir discrétionnaire est l'art. 11 de la LACC, lequel confère au juge le pouvoir de rendre toute ordonnance qu'il estime indiquée. Quoique vaste, ce pouvoir discrétionnaire n'est pas sans limites. Son exercice doit tendre à la réalisation des objectifs réparateurs de la LACC et tenir compte de trois considérations de base : (1) que l'ordonnance demandée est indiquée, et (2) que le demandeur a agi de bonne foi et (3) avec la diligence voulue. La considération de diligence décourage les parties de rester sur leurs positions et fait en sorte que les créanciers n'usent pas stratégiquement de ruse ou ne se placent pas eux-mêmes dans une position pour obtenir un avantage. Les décisions discrétionnaires des juges chargés de la supervision des procédures intentées sous le régime de la LACC commandent un degré élevé de déférence. En conséquence, les cours d'appel ne seront justifiées d'intervenir que si le juge surveillant a commis une erreur de principe ou exercé son pouvoir discrétionnaire de manière déraisonnable.

En général, un créancier peut voter sur un plan d'arrangement ou une transaction qui a une incidence sur ses droits, sous réserve des dispositions de la LACC qui peuvent limiter son droit de voter, ou de l'exercice justifié par le juge surveillant de son pouvoir discrétionnaire de limiter ou de supprimer ce droit. Étant donné que le régime de la LACC, dont l'un des aspects essentiels tient à la participation du créancier au processus décisionnel, les créanciers ne devraient être empêchés de voter que si les circonstances l'exigent. Lorsqu'un créancier cherche à exercer ses droits de vote de manière à contrecarrer ou à miner les objectifs réparateurs de la LACC ou à aller à l'encontre de ceux-ci — c'est-à-dire à agir dans un but illégitime — l'art. 11 de la LACC confère au juge surveillant le pouvoir discrétionnaire d'empêcher le créancier de voter. Ce pouvoir discrétionnaire s'apparente au pouvoir discrétionnaire semblable qui existe en vertu de la *Loi sur la faillite et l'insolvabilité* et favorise l'équité fondamentale qui imprègne le droit et la pratique en matière d'insolvabilité au Canada. La question de savoir s'il y a lieu d'exercer le pouvoir discrétionnaire dans une situation donnée appelle une analyse fondée sur les circonstances propres à chaque situation que le juge surveillant est le mieux placé pour effectuer.

En l'espèce, la décision du juge surveillant d'empêcher le créancier garanti de voter sur le nouveau plan ne révèle aucune erreur justifiant l'intervention d'une cour d'appel. Lorsqu'il a rendu sa décision, le juge surveillant

familiar with these proceedings, having presided over them for over 2 years, received 15 reports from the monitor, and issued approximately 25 orders. He considered the whole of the circumstances and concluded that the secured creditor's vote would serve an improper purpose. He was aware that the secured creditor had chosen not to value any of its claim as unsecured prior to the vote on the first plan and did not attempt to vote on that plan, which ultimately failed to receive the other creditors' approval. Between the failure of the first plan and the proposal of the (essentially identical) new plan, none of the factual circumstances relating to the debtor companies' financial or business affairs had materially changed. However, the secured creditor sought to value the entirety of its security at nil and, on that basis, sought leave to vote on the new plan as an unsecured creditor. If the secured creditor were permitted to vote in this way, the new plan would certainly have met the double majority threshold for approval under s. 6(1) of the CCAA. The inescapable inference was that the secured creditor was attempting to strategically value its security to acquire control over the outcome of the vote and thereby circumvent the creditor democracy the CCAA protects. The secured creditor's course of action was also plainly contrary to the expectation that parties act with due diligence in an insolvency proceeding, which includes acting with due diligence in valuing their claims and security. The secured creditor was therefore properly barred from voting on the new plan.

Whether third party litigation funding should be approved as interim financing is a case-specific inquiry that should have regard to the text of s. 11.2 of the CCAA and the remedial objectives of the CCAA more generally. Interim financing is a flexible tool that may take on a range of forms. This is apparent from the wording of s. 11.2(1), which is broad and does not mandate any standard form or terms. At its core, interim financing enables the preservation and realization of the value of a debtor's assets. In some circumstances, like the instant case, litigation funding furthers this basic purpose. Third party litigation funding agreements may therefore be approved as interim financing in CCAA proceedings when the supervising judge determines that doing so would be fair and appropriate, having regard to all the circumstances and the objectives of the Act. This requires consideration of the specific factors set out in s. 11.2(4) of the CCAA. These factors need not be mechanically applied or individually reviewed by the supervising judge, as not all of them will be significant in every case, nor are they exhaustive.

connaissait très bien les procédures en cause, car il les avait présidées pendant plus de 2 ans, avait reçu 15 rapports du contrôleur et avait délivré environ 25 ordonnances. Il a tenu compte de l'ensemble des circonstances et a conclu que le vote du créancier garanti viserait un but illégitime. Il savait qu'avant le vote sur le premier plan, le créancier garanti avait choisi de n'évaluer aucune partie de sa réclamation à titre de créancier non garanti et n'avait pas tenté de voter sur ce plan, qui n'a finalement pas reçu l'aval des autres créanciers. Entre l'insuccès du premier plan et la proposition du nouveau plan (identique pour l'essentiel au premier plan), les circonstances factuelles se rapportant aux affaires financières ou commerciales des compagnies débitrices n'avaient pas réellement changé. Pourtant, le créancier garanti a tenté d'évaluer la totalité de sa sûreté à zéro et, sur cette base, a demandé l'autorisation de voter sur le nouveau plan à titre de créancier non garanti. Si le créancier garanti avait été autorisé à voter de cette façon, le nouveau plan aurait certainement satisfait au critère d'approbation à double majorité prévu par le par. 6(1) de la LACC. La seule conclusion possible était que le créancier garanti tentait d'évaluer stratégiquement la valeur de sa sûreté afin de prendre le contrôle du vote et ainsi contourner la démocratie entre les créanciers que défend la LACC. La façon d'agir du créancier garanti était manifestement contraire à l'attente selon laquelle les parties agissent avec diligence dans une procédure d'insolvabilité, ce qui comprend le fait de faire preuve de diligence raisonnable dans l'évaluation de leurs réclamations et sûretés. Le créancier garanti a donc été empêché à bon droit de voter sur le nouveau plan.

La question de savoir s'il y a lieu d'approuver le financement d'un litige par un tiers à titre de financement temporaire commande une analyse fondée sur les faits de l'espèce qui doit tenir compte du libellé de l'art. 11.2 de la LACC et des objectifs réparateurs de la LACC de façon plus générale. Le financement temporaire est un outil souple qui peut revêtir différentes formes. Cela ressort du libellé du par. 11.2(1), qui est large et ne prescrit aucune forme ou condition type. Le financement temporaire permet essentiellement de préserver et de réaliser la valeur des éléments d'actif du débiteur. Dans certaines circonstances, comme en l'espèce, le financement de litige favorise la réalisation de cet objectif fondamental. Les accords de financement de litige par un tiers peuvent être approuvés à titre de financement temporaire dans le cadre des procédures fondées sur la LACC lorsque le juge surveillant estime qu'il serait juste et approprié de le faire, compte tenu de l'ensemble des circonstances et des objectifs de la Loi. Cela implique la prise en considération des facteurs précis énoncés au par. 11.2(4) de la LACC. Ces facteurs

Additionally, in order for a third party litigation funding agreement to be approved as interim financing, the agreement must not contain terms that effectively convert it into a plan of arrangement.

In the instant case, there is no basis upon which to interfere with the supervising judge's exercise of his discretion to approve the litigation funding agreement as interim financing. A review of the supervising judge's reasons as a whole, combined with a recognition of his manifest experience with the debtor companies' CCAA proceedings, leads to the conclusion that the factors listed in s. 11.2(4) concern matters that could not have escaped his attention and due consideration. It is apparent that he was focussed on the fairness at stake to all parties, the specific objectives of the CCAA, and the particular circumstances of this case when he approved the litigation funding agreement as interim financing. Further, the litigation funding agreement is not a plan of arrangement because it does not propose any compromise of the creditors' rights. The fact that the creditors may walk away with more or less money at the end of the day does not change the nature or existence of their rights to access the funds generated from the debtor companies' assets, nor can it be said to compromise those rights. Finally, the litigation financing charge does not convert the litigation funding agreement into a plan of arrangement. Holding otherwise would effectively extinguish the supervising judge's authority to approve these charges without a creditors' vote, which is expressly provided for in s. 11.2 of the CCAA.

Cases Cited

By Wagner C.J. and Moldaver J.

Applied: *Century Services Inc. v. Canada (Attorney General)*, 2010 SCC 60, [2010] 3 S.C.R. 379; **considered:** *Re Crystallex*, 2012 ONCA 404, 293 O.A.C. 102; *Laserworks Computer Services Inc. (Bankruptcy)*, *Re*, 1998 NSCA 42, 165 N.S.R. (2d) 296; **referred to:** *Bayens v. Kinross Gold Corporation*, 2013 ONSC 4974, 117 O.R. (3d) 150; *Hayes v. The City of Saint John*, 2016 NBQB 125; *Schenk v. Valeant Pharmaceuticals International Inc.*, 2015 ONSC 3215, 74 C.P.C. (7th) 332; *Re Blackburn*, 2011 BCSC 1671, 27 B.C.L.R. (5th) 199; *Sun Indalex Finance, LLC v. United Steelworkers*, 2013 SCC 6, [2013] 1 S.C.R. 271; *Ernst & Young Inc. v. Essar Global Fund*

ne doivent pas être appliqués machinalement ou examinés individuellement par le juge surveillant, car ils ne seront pas tous importants dans tous les cas, et ils ne sont pas non plus exhaustifs. En outre, pour qu'un accord de financement de litige par un tiers soit approuvé à titre de financement temporaire, il ne doit pas comporter des conditions qui le convertissent effectivement en plan d'arrangement.

En l'espèce, il n'y a aucune raison d'intervenir dans l'exercice par le juge surveillant de son pouvoir discrétionnaire d'approuver l'accord de financement de litige à titre de financement temporaire. L'examen des motifs du juge surveillant dans leur ensemble, conjugué à la reconnaissance de son expérience évidente des procédures intentées par les compagnies débitrices sous le régime de la LACC, mène à la conclusion que les facteurs énumérés au par. 11.2(4) concernent des questions qui n'auraient pu échapper à son attention et à son examen adéquat. Il est manifeste que le juge surveillant a mis l'accent sur l'équité envers toutes les parties, les objectifs précis de la LACC et les circonstances particulières de la présente affaire lorsqu'il a approuvé l'accord de financement de litige à titre de financement temporaire. De plus, l'accord de financement de litige ne constitue pas un plan d'arrangement parce qu'il ne propose aucune transaction visant les droits des créanciers. Le fait que les créanciers puissent en fin de compte remporter plus ou moins d'argent ne modifie en rien la nature ou l'existence de leurs droits d'avoir accès aux fonds provenant des actifs des compagnies débitrices, pas plus qu'on ne saurait dire qu'il s'agit d'une transaction à l'égard de leurs droits. Enfin, la charge relative au financement de litige ne convertit pas l'accord de financement de litige en plan d'arrangement. Une conclusion contraire aurait pour effet d'annihiler le pouvoir du juge surveillant d'approuver ces charges sans un vote des créanciers, un résultat qui est expressément prévu par l'art. 11.2 de la LACC.

Jurisprudence

Citée par le juge en chef Wagner et le juge Moldaver

Arrêt appliqué : *Century Services Inc. c. Canada (Procureur général)*, 2010 CSC 60, [2010] 3 R.C.S. 379; **arrêts examinés :** *Re Crystallex*, 2012 ONCA 404, 293 O.A.C. 102; *Laserworks Computer Services Inc. (Bankruptcy)*, *Re*, 1998 NSCA 42, 165 N.S.R. (2d) 296; **arrêts mentionnés :** *Bayens c. Kinross Gold Corporation*, 2013 ONSC 4974, 117 O.R. (3d) 150; *Hayes c. The City of Saint John*, 2016 NBQB 125; *Schenk c. Valeant Pharmaceuticals International Inc.*, 2015 ONSC 3215, 74 C.P.C. (7th) 332; *Re Blackburn*, 2011 BCSC 1671, 27 B.C.L.R. (5th) 199; *Sun Indalex Finance, LLC c. Syndicat des Métallos*, 2013 CSC 6, [2013] 1 R.C.S. 271; *Ernst*

Ltd., 2017 ONCA 1014, 139 O.R. (3d) 1; *Third Eye Capital Corporation v. Ressources Dianor Inc./Dianor Resources Inc.*, 2019 ONCA 508, 435 D.L.R. (4th) 416; *Re Canadian Red Cross Society* (1998), 5 C.B.R. (4th) 299; *Re Target Canada Co.*, 2015 ONSC 303, 22 C.B.R. (6th) 323; *Uti Energy Corp. v. Fracmaster Ltd.*, 1999 ABCA 178, 244 A.R. 93, aff'd 1999 ABQB 379, 11 C.B.R. (4th) 204; *Orphan Well Association v. Grant Thornton Ltd.*, 2019 SCC 5, [2019] 1 S.C.R. 150; *Stelco Inc. (Re)* (2005), 253 D.L.R. (4th) 109; *Lehndorff General Partner Ltd., Re* (1993), 17 C.B.R. (3d) 24; *North American Tungsten Corp. v. Global Tungsten and Powders Corp.*, 2015 BCCA 390, 377 B.C.A.C. 6; *Re BA Energy Inc.*, 2010 ABQB 507, 70 C.B.R. (5th) 24; *HSBC Bank Canada v. Bear Mountain Master Partnership*, 2010 BCSC 1563, 72 C.B.R. (5th) 276; *Caterpillar Financial Services Ltd. v. 360networks Corp.*, 2007 BCCA 14, 279 D.L.R. (4th) 701; *Grant Forest Products Inc. v. Toronto-Dominion Bank*, 2015 ONCA 570, 387 D.L.R. (4th) 426; *Bridging Finance Inc. v. Béton Brunet 2001 inc.*, 2017 QCCA 138, 44 C.B.R. (6th) 175; *New Skeena Forest Products Inc., Re*, 2005 BCCA 192, 39 B.C.L.R. (4th) 338; *Canadian Metropolitan Properties Corp. v. Libin Holdings Ltd.*, 2009 BCCA 40, 308 D.L.R. (4th) 339; *Metcalf & Mansfield Alternative Investments II Corp. (Re)*, 2008 ONCA 587, 296 D.L.R. (4th) 135; *Canada Trustco Mortgage Co. v. Canada*, 2005 SCC 54, [2005] 2 S.C.R. 601; *Re 1078385 Ontario Ltd.* (2004), 206 O.A.C. 17; *ATCO Gas and Pipelines Ltd. v. Alberta (Energy and Utilities Board)*, 2006 SCC 4, [2006] 1 S.C.R. 140; *Nortel Networks Corp., Re*, 2015 ONCA 681, 391 D.L.R. (4th) 283; *Kitchener Frame Ltd.*, 2012 ONSC 234, 86 C.B.R. (5th) 274; *Royal Oak Mines Inc., Re* (1999), 6 C.B.R. (4th) 314; *Boutiques San Francisco Inc. v. Richter & Associés Inc.*, 2003 CanLII 36955; *Dugal v. Manulife Financial Corp.*, 2011 ONSC 1785, 105 O.R. (3d) 364; *Montgrain v. Banque nationale du Canada*, 2006 QCCA 557, [2006] R.J.Q. 1009; *Langtry v. Dumoulin* (1884), 7 O.R. 644; *McIntyre Estate v. Ontario (Attorney General)* (2002), 218 D.L.R. (4th) 193; *Marcotte v. Banque de Montréal*, 2015 QCCS 1915; *Houle v. St. Jude Medical Inc.*, 2017 ONSC 5129, 9 C.P.C. (8th) 321, aff'd 2018 ONSC 6352, 429 D.L.R. (4th) 739; *Stanway v. Wyeth*, 2013 BCSC 1585, 56 B.C.L.R. (5th) 192; *Re Crystallex International Corporation*, 2012 ONSC 2125, 91 C.B.R. (5th) 169; *Cliffs Over Maple Bay Investments Ltd. v. Fisgard Capital Corp.*, 2008 BCCA 327, 296 D.L.R. (4th) 577.

& Young Inc. c. Essar Global Fund Ltd., 2017 ONCA 1014, 139 O.R. (3d) 1; *Third Eye Capital Corporation c. Ressources Dianor Inc./Dianor Resources Inc.*, 2019 ONCA 508, 435 D.L.R. (4th) 416; *Re Canadian Red Cross Society* (1998), 5 C.B.R. (4th) 299; *Re Target Canada Co.*, 2015 ONSC 303, 22 C.B.R. (6th) 323; *Uti Energy Corp. c. Fracmaster Ltd.*, 1999 ABCA 178, 244 A.R. 93, conf. 1999 ABQB 379, 11 C.B.R. (4th) 204; *Orphan Well Association c. Grant Thornton Ltd.*, 2019 CSC 5, [2019] 1 R.C.S. 150; *Stelco Inc. (Re)* (2005), 253 D.L.R. (4th) 109; *Lehndorff General Partner Ltd., Re* (1993), 17 C.B.R. (3d) 24; *North American Tungsten Corp. c. Global Tungsten and Powders Corp.*, 2015 BCCA 390, 377 B.C.A.C. 6; *Re BA Energy Inc.*, 2010 ABQB 507, 70 C.B.R. (5th) 24; *HSBC Bank Canada c. Bear Mountain Master Partnership*, 2010 BCSC 1563, 72 C.B.R. (5th) 276; *Caterpillar Financial Services Ltd. c. 360networks Corp.*, 2007 BCCA 14, 279 D.L.R. (4th) 701; *Grant Forest Products Inc. c. Toronto-Dominion Bank*, 2015 ONCA 570, 387 D.L.R. (4th) 426; *Bridging Finance Inc. c. Béton Brunet 2001 inc.*, 2017 QCCA 138, 44 C.B.R. (6th) 175; *New Skeena Forest Products Inc., Re*, 2005 BCCA 192, 39 B.C.L.R. (4th) 338; *Canadian Metropolitan Properties Corp. c. Libin Holdings Ltd.*, 2009 BCCA 40, 308 D.L.R. (4th) 339; *Metcalf & Mansfield Alternative Investments II Corp. (Re)*, 2008 ONCA 587, 296 D.L.R. (4th) 135; *Hypothèques Trustco Canada c. Canada*, 2005 CSC 54, [2005] 2 R.C.S. 601; *Re 1078385 Ontario Ltd.* (2004), 206 O.A.C. 17; *ATCO Gas and Pipelines Ltd. c. Alberta (Energy and Utilities Board)*, 2006 CSC 4, [2006] 1 R.C.S. 140; *Nortel Networks Corp., Re*, 2015 ONCA 681, 391 D.L.R. (4th) 283; *Kitchener Frame Ltd.*, 2012 ONSC 234, 86 C.B.R. (5th) 274; *Royal Oak Mines Inc., Re* (1999), 6 C.B.R. (4th) 314; *Boutiques San Francisco Inc. c. Richter & Associés Inc.*, 2003 CanLII 36955; *Dugal c. Manulife Financial Corp.*, 2011 ONSC 1785, 105 O.R. (3d) 364; *Montgrain c. Banque nationale du Canada*, 2006 QCCA 557, [2006] R.J.Q. 1009; *Langtry c. Dumoulin* (1884), 7 O.R. 644; *McIntyre Estate c. Ontario (Attorney General)* (2002), 218 D.L.R. (4th) 193; *Marcotte c. Banque de Montréal*, 2015 QCCS 1915; *Houle c. St. Jude Medical Inc.*, 2017 ONSC 5129, 9 C.P.C. (8th) 321, conf. par 2018 ONSC 6352, 429 D.L.R. (4th) 739; *Stanway c. Wyeth*, 2013 BCSC 1585, 56 B.C.L.R. (5th) 192; *Re Crystallex International Corporation*, 2012 ONSC 2125, 91 C.B.R. (5th) 169; *Cliffs Over Maple Bay Investments Ltd. c. Fisgard Capital Corp.*, 2008 BCCA 327, 296 D.L.R. (4th) 577.

Statutes and Regulations Cited

An Act respecting Champerty, R.S.O. 1897, c. 327.
Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act, R.S.C. 1985, c. B-3, ss. 4.2, 43(7), 50(1), 54(3), 108(3), 187(9).
Budget Implementation Act, 2019, No. 1, S.C. 2019, c. 29, ss. 133, 138, 140.
Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act, R.S.C. 1985, c. C-36, ss. 2(1), 3(1), 4, 5, 6(1), 7, 11, 11.2(1), (2), (4), (a), (b), (c), (d), (e), (f), (g), (5), 11.7, 11.8, 18.6, 22(1), (2), (3), 23(1)(d), (i), 23 to 25, 36.
Winding-up and Restructuring Act, R.S.C. 1985, c. W-11, s. 6(1).

Authors Cited

Agarwal, Ranjan K., and Doug Fenton. "Beyond Access to Justice: Litigation Funding Agreements Outside the Class Actions Context" (2017), 59 *Can. Bus. L.J.* 65.
 Canada. Innovation, Science and Economic Development Canada. *Archived — Bill C-55: clause by clause analysis*, last updated December 29, 2016 (online: <https://www.ic.gc.ca/eic/site/cilp-pdci.nsf/eng/cl00908.html#bill128e>; archived version: https://www.scc-csc.ca/cso-dce/2020SCC-CSC10_1_eng.pdf).
 Canada. Office of the Superintendent of Bankruptcy Canada. *Bill C-12: Clause by Clause Analysis*, developed by Industry Canada, last updated March 24, 2015 (online: <https://www.ic.gc.ca/eic/site/bsf-osb.nsf/eng/br01986.html#a79>; archived version: https://www.scc-csc.ca/cso-dce/2020SCC-CSC10_2_eng.pdf).
 Canada. Senate. Standing Senate Committee on Banking, Trade and Commerce. *Debtors and Creditors Sharing the Burden: A Review of the Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act and the Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act*. Ottawa, 2003.
 Houlden, Lloyd W., Geoffrey B. Morawetz and Janis P. Sarra. *Bankruptcy and Insolvency Law of Canada*, vol. 4, 4th ed. Toronto: Thomson Reuters, 2009 (loose-leaf updated 2020, release 3).
 Kaplan, Bill. "Liquidating CCAAs: Discretion Gone Awry?", in Janis P. Sarra, ed., *Annual Review of Insolvency Law*. Toronto: Carswell, 2008, 79.
 Klar, Lewis N., et al. *Remedies in Tort*, vol. 1, by Leanne Berry, ed. Toronto: Thomson Reuters, 1987 (loose-leaf updated 2019, release 12).
 McElcheran, Kevin P. *Commercial Insolvency in Canada*, 4th ed. Toronto: LexisNexis, 2019.
 Michaud, Guillaume. "New Frontier: The Emergence of Litigation Funding in the Canadian Insolvency Landscape", in Janis P. Sarra et al., eds., *Annual Review of Insolvency Law 2018*. Toronto: Thomson Reuters, 2019, 221.

Lois et règlements cités

An Act respecting Champerty, R.S.O. 1897, c. 327.
Loi n° 1 d'exécution du budget de 2019, L.C. 2019, c. 29, art. 133, 138, 140.
Loi sur la faillite et l'insolvabilité, L.R.C. 1985, c. B-3, art. 4.2, 43(7), 50(1), 54(3), 108(3), 187(9).
Loi sur les arrangements avec les créanciers des compagnies, L.R.C. 1985, c. C-36, art. 2(1), 3(1), 4, 5, 6(1), 7, 11, 11.2(1), (2), (4), a), b), c), d), e), f), g), (5), 11.7, 11.8, 18.6, 22(1), (2), (3), 23(1)d), i), 23 à 25, 36.
Loi sur les liquidations et les restructurations, L.R.C. 1985, c. W-11, art. 6(1).

Doctrine et autres documents cités

Agarwal, Ranjan K., and Doug Fenton. « Beyond Access to Justice : Litigation Funding Agreements Outside the Class Actions Context » (2017), 59 *Rev. can. dr. comm.* 65.
 Canada. Bureau du surintendant des faillites Canada. *Projet de loi C-12 : analyse article par article*, élaboré par Industrie Canada, dernière mise à jour 24 mars 2015 (en ligne : <https://www.ic.gc.ca/eic/site/bsf-osb.nsf/fra/br01986.html#a77f>; version archivée : https://www.scc-csc.ca/cso-dce/2020SCC-CSC10_2_fra.pdf).
 Canada. Innovation, Sciences et Développement économique Canada. *Archivé — Projet de Loi C-55 : analyse article par article*, dernière mise à jour 29 décembre 2016 (en ligne : <https://www.ic.gc.ca/eic/site/cilp-pdci.nsf/fra/cl00908.html#lacc11-2>; version archivée : https://www.scc-csc.ca/cso-dce/2020SCC-CSC10_1_fra.pdf).
 Canada. Sénat. Comité sénatorial permanent des banques et du commerce. *Les débiteurs et les créanciers doivent se partager le fardeau : Examen de la Loi sur la faillite et l'insolvabilité et de la Loi sur les arrangements avec les créanciers des compagnies*, Ottawa, 2003.
 Houlden, Lloyd W., Geoffrey B. Morawetz and Janis P. Sarra. *Bankruptcy and Insolvency Law of Canada*, vol. 4, 4th ed., Toronto, Thomson Reuters, 2009 (loose-leaf updated 2020, release 3).
 Kaplan, Bill. « Liquidating CCAAs : Discretion Gone Awry? », in Janis P. Sarra, ed., *Annual Review of Insolvency Law*, Toronto, Carswell, 2008, 79.
 Klar, Lewis N., et al. *Remedies in Tort*, vol. 1, by Leanne Berry, ed., Toronto, Thomson Reuters, 1987 (loose-leaf updated 2019, release 12).
 McElcheran, Kevin P. *Commercial Insolvency in Canada*, 4th ed., Toronto, LexisNexis, 2019.
 Michaud, Guillaume. « New Frontier : The Emergence of Litigation Funding in the Canadian Insolvency Landscape », in Janis P. Sarra et al., eds., *Annual*

Nocilla, Alfonso. “Asset Sales Under the Companies’ Creditors Arrangement Act and the Failure of Section 36” (2012), 52 *Can. Bus. L.J.* 226.

Nocilla, Alfonso. “The History of the Companies’ Creditors Arrangement Act and the Future of Re-Structuring Law in Canada” (2014), 56 *Can. Bus. L.J.* 73.

Rotsztain, Michael B., and Alexandra Dostal. “Debtor-In-Possession Financing”, in Stephanie Ben-Ishai and Anthony Duggan, eds., *Canadian Bankruptcy and Insolvency Law: Bill C-55, Statute c. 47 and Beyond*. Markham, Ont.: LexisNexis, 2007, 227.

Sarra, Janis P. *Rescue! The Companies’ Creditors Arrangement Act*, 2nd ed. Toronto: Carswell, 2013.

Sarra, Janis P. “The Oscillating Pendulum: Canada’s Sesquicentennial and Finding the Equilibrium for Insolvency Law”, in Janis P. Sarra and Barbara Romaine, eds., *Annual Review of Insolvency Law 2016*. Toronto: Thomson Reuters, 2017, 9.

Wood, Roderick J. *Bankruptcy and Insolvency Law*, 2nd ed. Toronto: Irwin Law, 2015.

APPEALS from a judgment of the Quebec Court of Appeal (Dutil, Schrager and Dumas J.J.A.), 2019 QCCA 171, [2019] AZ-51566416, [2019] Q.J. No. 670 (QL), 2019 CarswellQue 94 (WL Can.), setting aside a decision of Michaud J., 2018 QCCS 1040, [2018] AZ-51477967, [2018] Q.J. No. 1986 (QL), 2018 CarswellQue 1923 (WL Can.). Appeals allowed.

Jean-Philippe Groleau, Christian Lachance, Gabriel Lavery Lepage and Hannah Toledano, for the appellants/intervenors 9354-9186 Québec inc. and 9354-9178 Québec inc.

Neil A. Peden, for the appellants/intervenors IMF Bentham Limited (now known as Omni Bridgeway Limited) and Bentham IMF Capital Limited (now known as Omni Bridgeway Capital (Canada) Limited).

Geneviève Cloutier and Clifton P. Prophet, for the respondent Callidus Capital Corporation.

Jocelyn Perreault, Noah Zucker and François Alexandre Toupin, for the respondents International

Review of Insolvency Law 2018, Toronto, Thomson Reuters, 2019, 221.

Nocilla, Alfonso. « Asset Sales Under the Companies’ Creditors Arrangement Act and the Failure of Section 36 » (2012), 52 *Rev. can. dr. comm.* 226.

Nocilla, Alfonso. « The History of the Companies’ Creditors Arrangement Act and the Future of Re-Structuring Law in Canada » (2014), 56 *Rev. can. dr. comm.* 73.

Rotsztain, Michael B., and Alexandra Dostal. « Debtor-In-Possession Financing », in Stephanie Ben-Ishai and Anthony Duggan, eds., *Canadian Bankruptcy and Insolvency Law : Bill C-55, Statute c. 47 and Beyond*, Markham (Ont.), LexisNexis, 2007, 227.

Sarra, Janis P. *Rescue! The Companies’ Creditors Arrangement Act*, 2nd ed., Toronto, Carswell, 2013.

Sarra, Janis P. « The Oscillating Pendulum : Canada’s Sesquicentennial and Finding the Equilibrium for Insolvency Law », in Janis P. Sarra and Barbara Romaine, eds., *Annual Review of Insolvency Law 2016*, Toronto, Thomson Reuters, 2017, 9.

Wood, Roderick J. *Bankruptcy and Insolvency Law*, 2nd ed., Toronto, Irwin Law, 2015.

POURVOIS contre un arrêt de la Cour d’appel du Québec (les juges Dutil, Schrager et Dumas), 2019 QCCA 171, [2019] AZ-51566416, [2019] Q.J. No. 670 (QL), 2019 CarswellQue 94 (WL Can.), qui a infirmé une décision du juge Michaud, 2018 QCCS 1040, [2018] AZ-51477967, [2018] Q.J. No. 1986 (QL), 2018 CarswellQue 1923 (WL Can.). Pourvois accueillis.

Jean-Philippe Groleau, Christian Lachance, Gabriel Lavery Lepage et Hannah Toledano, pour les appelantes/intervenantes 9354-9186 Québec inc. et 9354-9178 Québec inc.

Neil A. Peden, pour les appelantes/intervenantes IMF Bentham Limited (maintenant connue sous le nom d’Omni Bridgeway Limited) et Corporation Bentham IMF Capital (maintenant connue sous le nom de Corporation Omni Bridgeway Capital (Canada)).

Geneviève Cloutier et Clifton P. Prophet, pour l’intimée Callidus Capital Corporation.

Jocelyn Perreault, Noah Zucker et François Alexandre Toupin, pour les intimés International

Game Technology, Deloitte LLP, Luc Carignan, François Vigneault, Philippe Millette, Francis Proulx and François Pelletier.

Joseph Reynaud and Nathalie Nouvet, for the interveners Ernst & Young Inc.

Sylvain Rigaud, Arad Mojtahedi and Saam Pousht-Mashhad, for the interveners the Insolvency Institute of Canada and the Canadian Association of Insolvency and Restructuring Professionals.

The reasons for judgment of the Court were delivered by

THE CHIEF JUSTICE AND MOLDAVER J.—

I. Overview

[1] These appeals arise in the context of an ongoing proceeding instituted under the *Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act*, R.S.C. 1985, c. C-36 ("CCAA"), in which substantially all of the assets of the debtor companies have been liquidated. The proceeding was commenced well over four years ago. Since then, a single supervising judge has been responsible for its oversight. In this capacity, he has made numerous discretionary decisions.

[2] Two of the supervising judge's decisions are in issue before us. Each raises a question requiring this Court to clarify the nature and scope of judicial discretion in CCAA proceedings. The first is whether a supervising judge has the discretion to bar a creditor from voting on a plan of arrangement where they determine that the creditor is acting for an improper purpose. The second is whether a supervising judge can approve third party litigation funding as interim financing, pursuant to s. 11.2 of the CCAA.

[3] For the reasons that follow, we would answer both questions in the affirmative, as did the supervising judge. To the extent the Court of Appeal disagreed

Game Technology, Deloitte S.E.N.C.R.L., Luc Carignan, François Vigneault, Philippe Millette, Francis Proulx et François Pelletier.

Joseph Reynaud et Nathalie Nouvet, pour l'intervenante Ernst & Young Inc.

Sylvain Rigaud, Arad Mojtahedi et Saam Pousht-Mashhad, pour les intervenants l'Institut d'insolvabilité du Canada et l'Association canadienne des professionnels de l'insolvabilité et de la réorganisation.

Version française des motifs de jugement de la Cour rendus par

LE JUGE EN CHEF ET LE JUGE MOLDAVER —

I. Aperçu

[1] Ces pourvois s'inscrivent dans le contexte d'une instance toujours en cours introduite sous le régime de la *Loi sur les arrangements avec les créanciers de compagnies*, L.R.C. 1985, c. C-36 (« LACC »), dans le cadre de laquelle la quasi-totalité des éléments d'actif des compagnies débitrices ont été liquidés. L'instance a été introduite il y a plus de quatre ans. Depuis, un seul juge surveillant a été chargé de sa supervision. À ce titre, il a rendu de nombreuses décisions discrétionnaires.

[2] Deux de ces décisions du juge surveillant font l'objet du présent pourvoi. Chacune d'elles soulève une question exigeant de notre Cour qu'elle précise la nature et la portée du pouvoir discrétionnaire exercé par les tribunaux dans les instances relevant de la LACC. La première est de savoir si le juge surveillant dispose du pouvoir discrétionnaire d'interdire à un créancier de voter sur un plan d'arrangement s'il estime que ce créancier agit dans un but illégitime. La deuxième porte sur le pouvoir du juge surveillant d'approuver le financement du litige par un tiers à titre de financement temporaire, en vertu de l'art. 11.2 de la LACC.

[3] Pour les motifs qui suivent, nous sommes d'avis de répondre à ces deux questions par l'affirmative, à l'instar du juge surveillant. Dans la mesure où la

and went on to interfere with the supervising judge’s discretionary decisions, we conclude that it was not justified in doing so. In our respectful view, the Court of Appeal failed to treat the supervising judge’s decisions with the appropriate degree of deference. In the result, as we ordered at the conclusion of the hearing, these appeals are allowed and the supervising judge’s order reinstated.

II. Facts

[4] In 1994, Mr. Gérald Duhamel founded Bluberi Gaming Technologies Inc., which is now one of the appellants, 9354-9186 Québec inc. The corporation manufactured, distributed, installed, and serviced electronic casino gaming machines. It also provided management systems for gambling operations. Its sole shareholder has at all material times been Bluberi Group Inc., which is now another of the appellants, 9354-9178 Québec inc. Through a family trust, Mr. Duhamel controls Bluberi Group Inc. and, as a result, Bluberi Gaming (collectively, “Bluberi”).

[5] In 2012, Bluberi sought financing from the respondent, Callidus Capital Corporation (“Callidus”), which describes itself as an “asset-based or distressed lender” (R.F., at para. 26). Callidus extended a credit facility of approximately \$24 million to Bluberi. This debt was secured in part by a share pledge agreement.

[6] Over the next three years, Bluberi lost significant amounts of money, and Callidus continued to extend credit. By 2015, Bluberi owed approximately \$86 million to Callidus — close to half of which Bluberi asserts is comprised of interest and fees.

A. *Bluberi’s Institution of CCAA Proceedings and Initial Sale of Assets*

[7] On November 11, 2015, Bluberi filed a petition for the issuance of an initial order under the CCAA. In its petition, Bluberi alleged that its liquidity issues

Cour d’appel s’est dite d’avis contraire et a modifié les décisions discrétionnaires du juge surveillant, nous concluons qu’elle n’était pas justifiée de le faire. Avec égards, la Cour d’appel n’a pas fait preuve de la déférence à laquelle elle était tenue par rapport aux décisions du juge surveillant. C’est pourquoi, comme nous l’avons ordonné à l’issue de l’audience, les pourvois sont accueillis et l’ordonnance du juge surveillant est rétablie.

II. Les faits

[4] En 1994, M. Gérald Duhamel fonde Bluberi Gaming Technologies Inc., qui est devenue l’une des appelantes, 9354-9186 Québec inc. L’entreprise fabriquait, distribuait, installait et entretenait des appareils de jeux électroniques pour casino. Elle offrait aussi des systèmes de gestion dans le domaine des jeux d’argent. Pendant toute la période pertinente, son unique actionnaire était Bluberi Group Inc., qui est devenue une autre des appelantes, 9354-9178 Québec inc. Par l’entremise d’une fiducie familiale, M. Duhamel contrôlait Bluberi Group inc. et, de ce fait, Bluberi Gaming (collectivement, « Bluberi »).

[5] En 2012, Bluberi demande du financement à l’intimée Callidus Capital Corporation (« Callidus »), qui se décrit comme un [TRADUCTION] « prêteur offrant du financement garanti par des actifs ou du financement à des entreprises en difficulté financière » (m.i., par. 26). Callidus lui consent une facilité de crédit d’environ 24 millions de dollars, que Bluberi garantit partiellement en signant une entente par laquelle elle met en gage ses actions.

[6] Au cours des trois années suivantes, Bluberi perd d’importantes sommes d’argent et Callidus continue de lui consentir du crédit. En 2015, Bluberi doit environ 86 millions de dollars à Callidus — Bluberi affirme que près de la moitié de cette somme est composée d’intérêts et de frais.

A. *L’introduction des procédures sous le régime de la LACC par Bluberi et la vente initiale d’actifs*

[7] Le 11 novembre 2015, Bluberi dépose une requête en délivrance d’une ordonnance initiale sous le régime de la LACC. Dans sa requête, Bluberi allègue

were the result of Callidus taking *de facto* control of the corporation and dictating a number of purposefully detrimental business decisions. Bluberi alleged that Callidus engaged in this conduct in order to deplete the corporation's equity value with a view to owning Bluberi and, ultimately, selling it.

[8] Over Callidus's objection, Bluberi's petition succeeded. The supervising judge, Michaud J., issued an initial order under the CCAA. Among other things, the initial order confirmed that Bluberi was a "debtor company" within the meaning of s. 2(1) of the Act; stayed any proceedings against Bluberi or any director or officer of Bluberi; and appointed Ernst & Young Inc. as monitor ("Monitor").

[9] Working with the Monitor, Bluberi determined that a sale of its assets was necessary. On January 28, 2016, it proposed a sale solicitation process, which the supervising judge approved. That process led to Bluberi entering into an asset purchase agreement with Callidus. The agreement contemplated that Callidus would obtain all of Bluberi's assets in exchange for extinguishing almost the entirety of its secured claim against Bluberi, which had ballooned to approximately \$135.7 million. Callidus would maintain an undischarged secured claim of \$3 million against Bluberi. The agreement would also permit Bluberi to retain claims for damages against Callidus arising from its alleged involvement in Bluberi's financial difficulties ("Retained Claims").¹ Throughout these proceedings, Bluberi has asserted that the Retained Claims should amount to over \$200 million in damages.

[10] The supervising judge approved the asset purchase agreement, and the sale of Bluberi's assets to Callidus closed in February 2017. As a result, Callidus effectively acquired Bluberi's business, and has continued to operate it as a going concern.

que ses problèmes de liquidité découlent du fait que Callidus exerce un contrôle de facto à l'égard de son entreprise et lui dicte un certain nombre de décisions d'affaires dans l'intention de lui nuire. Bluberi prétend que Callidus agit ainsi afin de réduire la valeur des actions dans le but de devenir propriétaire de Bluberi et ultimement de la vendre.

[8] Malgré l'objection de Callidus, la requête de Bluberi est accueillie. Le juge surveillant, le juge Michaud, rend une ordonnance initiale sous le régime de la LACC. Celle-ci confirme entre autres que Bluberi est une « compagnie débitrice » au sens du par. 2(1) de la Loi, suspend toute procédure introduite à l'encontre de Bluberi, de ses administrateurs ou dirigeants, et désigne Ernst & Young Inc. pour agir à titre de contrôleur (« contrôleur »).

[9] Travaillant en collaboration avec le contrôleur, Bluberi décide que la vente de ses actifs est nécessaire. Le 28 janvier 2016, elle propose un processus de mise en vente que le juge surveillant approuve. Ce processus débouche sur la conclusion d'une convention d'achat d'actifs entre Bluberi et Callidus. Cette convention prévoit que Callidus obtient l'ensemble des actifs de Bluberi en échange de l'extinction de la presque totalité de la créance garantie qu'elle détient à l'encontre de Bluberi, qui s'élevait à environ 135,7 millions de dollars. Callidus conserve une créance garantie non libérée de 3 millions de dollars contre Bluberi. La convention prévoit aussi que Bluberi se réserve le droit de réclamer des dommages-intérêts à Callidus en raison de l'implication alléguée de celle-ci dans ses difficultés financières (les « réclamations réservées »)¹. Tout au long de ces procédures, Bluberi affirme que la valeur des réclamations ainsi réservées représente plus de 200 millions de dollars en dommages-intérêts.

[10] Le juge surveillant approuve la convention d'achat d'actifs, et la vente des actifs de Bluberi à Callidus est conclue en février 2017. En conséquence, Callidus acquiert l'entreprise de Bluberi et en poursuit l'exploitation.

¹ Bluberi does not appear to have filed this claim yet (see 2018 QCCS 1040, at para. 10 (CanLII)).

¹ Bluberi semble ne pas avoir encore déposé cette action (voir 2018 QCCS 1040, par. 10 (CanLII)).

[11] Since the sale, the Retained Claims have been Bluberi's sole remaining asset and thus the sole security for Callidus's \$3 million claim.

B. The Initial Competing Plans of Arrangement

[12] On September 11, 2017, Bluberi filed an application seeking the approval of a \$2 million interim financing credit facility to fund the litigation of the Retained Claims and other related relief. The lender was a joint venture numbered company incorporated as 9364-9739 Québec inc. This interim financing application was set to be heard on September 19, 2017.

[13] However, one day before the hearing, Callidus proposed a plan of arrangement ("First Plan") and applied for an order convening a creditors' meeting to vote on that plan. The First Plan proposed that Callidus would fund a \$2.5 million (later increased to \$2.63 million) distribution to Bluberi's creditors, except itself, in exchange for a release from the Retained Claims. This would have fully satisfied the claims of Bluberi's former employees and those creditors with claims worth less than \$3000; creditors with larger claims were to receive, on average, 31 percent of their respective claims.

[14] The supervising judge adjourned the hearing of both applications to October 5, 2017. In the meantime, Bluberi filed its own plan of arrangement. Among other things, the plan proposed that half of any proceeds resulting from the Retained Claims, after payment of expenses and Bluberi's creditors' claims, would be distributed to the unsecured creditors, as long as the net proceeds exceeded \$20 million.

[15] On October 5, 2017, the supervising judge ordered that the parties' plans of arrangement could be put to a creditors' vote. He ordered that both parties share the fees and expenses related to the

[11] Depuis la vente, les réclamations réservées sont le seul élément d'actif de Bluberi et représentent donc la seule garantie que possède Callidus pour sa créance de 3 millions de dollars.

B. Les premiers plans d'arrangement concurrents

[12] Le 11 septembre 2017, Bluberi dépose une demande par laquelle elle sollicite l'approbation d'un financement provisoire de 2 millions de dollars sous forme de facilité de crédit afin de financer le coût des procédures liées aux réclamations réservées ainsi que d'autres mesures de réparation accessoires. Le prêteur est une coentreprise constituée sous le numéro 9364-9739 Québec inc. Cette demande de financement provisoire devait être instruite le 19 septembre 2017.

[13] Toutefois, la veille de l'audience, Callidus propose un plan d'arrangement (« premier plan ») et demande une ordonnance pour convoquer les créanciers à une assemblée afin qu'ils votent sur ce plan. Le premier plan proposait que Callidus avance la somme de 2,5 millions de dollars (puis plus tard 2,63 millions de dollars) aux fins de distribution aux créanciers de Bluberi, sauf elle-même, en échange de quoi elle serait libérée des réclamations réservées. Cette somme aurait permis d'acquitter entièrement les créances des anciens employés de Bluberi et toutes celles de moins de 3 000 \$; les créanciers dont la créance était plus élevée devaient recevoir chacun en moyenne 31 pour 100 du montant de leur réclamation.

[14] Le juge surveillant ajourne donc l'audition des deux demandes au 5 octobre 2017. Entre-temps, Bluberi dépose son propre plan d'arrangement dans lequel elle propose notamment que la moitié de toute somme provenant des réclamations réservées, après paiement des dépenses et acquittement des réclamations des créanciers de Bluberi, soit distribuée aux créanciers non garantis, pourvu que la somme nette ainsi obtenue soit supérieure à 20 millions de dollars.

[15] Le 5 octobre 2017, le juge surveillant ordonne que les plans d'arrangement des parties soient soumis au vote des créanciers. Il ordonne que les honoraires et dépenses découlant de la présentation des

presentation of the plans of arrangement at a creditors' meeting, and that a party's failure to deposit those funds with the Monitor would bar the presentation of that party's plan of arrangement. Bluberi elected not to deposit the necessary funds, and, as a result, only Callidus's First Plan was put to the creditors.

C. Creditors' Vote on Callidus's First Plan

[16] On December 15, 2017, Callidus submitted its First Plan to a creditors' vote. The plan failed to receive sufficient support. Section 6(1) of the CCAA provides that, to be approved, a plan must receive a "double majority" vote in each class of creditors — that is, a majority in *number* of class members, which also represents two-thirds in *value* of the class members' claims. All of Bluberi's creditors, besides Callidus, formed a single voting class of unsecured creditors. Of the 100 voting unsecured creditors, 92 creditors (representing \$3,450,882 of debt) voted in favour, and 8 voted against (representing \$2,375,913 of debt). The First Plan failed because the creditors voting in favour only held 59.22 percent of the total value being voted, which did not meet the s. 6(1) threshold. Most notably, SMT Hautes Technologies ("SMT"), which held 36.7 percent of Bluberi's debt, voted against the plan.

[17] Callidus did not vote on the First Plan — despite the Monitor explicitly stating that Callidus could have "vote[d] . . . the portion of its claim, assessed by Callidus, to be an unsecured claim" (Joint R.R., vol. III, at p.188).

D. Bluberi's Interim Financing Application and Callidus's New Plan

[18] On February 6, 2018, Bluberi filed one of the applications underlying these appeals, seeking authorization of a proposed third party litigation funding agreement ("LFA") with a publicly traded

plans d'arrangement à l'assemblée des créanciers soient partagés entre les parties et qu'il soit interdit à toute partie qui ne dépose pas les fonds nécessaires auprès du contrôleur de présenter son plan d'arrangement. Bluberi choisit de ne pas déposer les fonds nécessaires et, en conséquence, seul le premier plan de Callidus est présenté aux créanciers.

C. Le vote des créanciers sur le premier plan de Callidus

[16] Le 15 décembre 2017, Callidus soumet son premier plan au vote des créanciers. Le plan n'obtient pas l'appui nécessaire. Le paragraphe 6(1) de la LACC prévoit que, pour être approuvé, le plan doit obtenir la « double majorité » de chaque catégorie de créanciers — c'est-à-dire, la majorité en *nombre* d'une catégorie de créanciers, qui représente aussi les deux tiers en *valeur* des réclamations de cette catégorie de créanciers. Tous les créanciers de Bluberi, hormis Callidus, forment une seule catégorie de créanciers non garantis ayant droit de vote. Des 100 créanciers non garantis, 92 (qui ont ensemble une créance de 3 450 882 \$) votent en faveur du plan, et 8 votent contre (qui ont ensemble une créance de 2 375 913 \$). Le premier plan échoue parce que les réclamations des créanciers ayant voté en sa faveur ne détiennent que 59,22 p. 100 en valeur des réclamations de ceux ayant voté, ce qui ne respectait pas le seuil établi au par. 6(1). Plus particulièrement, SMT Hautes Technologies (« SMT »), qui détient 36,7 p. 100 de la dette de Bluberi, vote contre le plan.

[17] Callidus ne vote pas sur le premier plan — malgré les propos explicites du contrôleur, selon qui Callidus pouvait [TRADUCTION] « voter [. . .] selon le pourcentage de sa créance qui, de l'avis de Callidus, était non garantie » (dossier conjoint des intimés, vol. III, p. 188).

D. La demande de financement provisoire de Bluberi et le nouveau plan de Callidus

[18] Le 6 février 2018, Bluberi dépose une des demandes à l'origine des présents pourvois. Elle demande au tribunal l'autorisation de conclure un accord de financement du litige par un tiers (« AFL »)

litigation funder, IMF Bentham Limited or its Canadian subsidiary, Bentham IMF Capital Limited (collectively, “Bentham”). Bluberi’s application also sought the placement of a \$20 million super-priority charge in favour of Bentham on Bluberi’s assets (“Litigation Financing Charge”).

[19] The LFA contemplated that Bentham would fund Bluberi’s litigation of the Retained Claims in exchange for receiving a portion of any settlement or award after trial. However, were Bluberi’s litigation to fail, Bentham would lose all of its invested funds. The LFA also provided that Bentham could terminate the litigation of the Retained Claims if, acting reasonably, it were no longer satisfied of the merits or commercial viability of the litigation.

[20] Callidus and certain unsecured creditors who voted in favour of its plan (who are now respondents and style themselves the “Creditors’ Group”) contested Bluberi’s application on the ground that the LFA was a plan of arrangement and, as such, had to be submitted to a creditors’ vote.²

[21] On February 12, 2018, Callidus filed the other application underlying these appeals, seeking to put another plan of arrangement to a creditors’ vote (“New Plan”). The New Plan was essentially identical to the First Plan, except that Callidus increased the proposed distribution by \$250,000 (from \$2.63 million to \$2.88 million). Further, Callidus filed an amended proof of claim, which purported to value the security attached to its \$3 million claim at *nil*. Callidus was of the view that this valuation was proper because Bluberi had no assets other than the Retained Claims. On this basis, Callidus asserted that it stood in the position of an unsecured creditor, and sought the supervising judge’s permission to vote on the New Plan with the other unsecured creditors.

avec un bailleur de fonds de litiges coté en bourse, IMF Bentham Limited ou sa filiale canadienne, Corporation Bentham IMF Capital (collectivement, « Bentham »). Bluberi demande également l’autorisation de grever son actif d’une charge super-prioritaire de 20 millions de dollars en faveur de Bentham (« charge liée au financement du litige »).

[19] L’AFL prévoit que Bentham financera le litige relatif aux réclamations réservées de Bluberi et qu’en retour elle recevra un pourcentage de toute somme convenue par règlement ou accordée à l’issue d’un procès. Toutefois, dans l’éventualité où Bluberi serait déboutée, Bentham perdra la totalité des fonds investis. L’AFL prévoit aussi que Bentham peut mettre fin au recours si, agissant de façon raisonnable, elle n’est plus convaincue du bien-fondé du litige ou de sa viabilité commerciale.

[20] Callidus et certains créanciers non garantis qui ont voté en faveur de son plan (qui sont maintenant intimés au présent pourvoi et se font appeler le « groupe de créanciers ») contestent la demande de Bluberi au motif que l’AFL est un plan d’arrangement et qu’à ce titre, il doit être soumis au vote des créanciers².

[21] Le 12 février 2018, Callidus dépose l’autre demande qui est à l’origine des présents pourvois, laquelle vise à soumettre un autre plan d’arrangement au vote des créanciers (« nouveau plan »). Le nouveau plan est pour l’essentiel identique au premier plan, sauf que Callidus propose que la somme à distribuer soit augmentée de 250 000 \$ (passant de 2,63 millions à 2,88 millions de dollars). Callidus a en outre déposé une preuve de réclamation modifiée qui ramène à *zéro* la valeur de la garantie liée à sa créance de 3 millions de dollars. Callidus considère que cette évaluation est juste parce que Bluberi n’a aucun autre élément d’actif que les revendications réservées. Sur cette base, elle fait valoir qu’elle se trouve dans la situation d’un créancier non garanti et

² Notably, the Creditors’ Group advised Callidus that it would lend its support to the New Plan. It also asked Callidus to reimburse any legal fees incurred in association with that support. At the same time, the Creditors’ Group did not undertake to vote in any particular way, and confirmed that each of its members would assess all available alternatives individually.

² Fait à remarquer, le groupe de créanciers a informé Callidus qu’il appuierait le nouveau plan. Il lui a aussi demandé de rembourser tous les frais juridiques découlant de cet appui. Par ailleurs, le groupe de créanciers ne s’est pas engagé à voter d’une certaine façon, et a confirmé que chacun de ses membres évaluerait toutes les possibilités qui s’offraient à lui.

Given the size of its claim, if Callidus were permitted to vote on the New Plan, the plan would necessarily pass a creditors' vote. Bluberi opposed Callidus's application.

[22] The supervising judge heard Bluberi's interim financing application and Callidus's application regarding its New Plan together. Notably, the Monitor supported Bluberi's position.

III. Decisions Below

A. *Quebec Superior Court, 2018 QCCS 1040 (Michaud J.)*

[23] The supervising judge dismissed Callidus's application, declining to submit the New Plan to a creditors' vote. He granted Bluberi's application, authorizing Bluberi to enter into a litigation funding agreement with Bentham on the terms set forth in the LFA and imposing the Litigation Financing Charge on Bluberi's assets.

[24] With respect to Callidus's application, the supervising judge determined Callidus should not be permitted to vote on the New Plan because it was acting with an "improper purpose" (para. 48 (CanLII)). He acknowledged that creditors are generally entitled to vote in their own self-interest. However, given that the First Plan — which was almost identical to the New Plan — had been defeated by a creditors' vote, the supervising judge concluded that Callidus's attempt to vote on the New Plan was an attempt to override the result of the first vote. In particular, he wrote:

Taking into consideration the creditors' interest, the Court accepted, in the fall of 2017, that Callidus' Plan be submitted to their vote with the understanding that, as a secured creditor, Callidus would not cast a vote. However, under the present circumstances, it would serve an improper purpose if Callidus was allowed to vote on its own plan, especially when its vote would very likely result in

demande au juge surveillant la permission de voter sur le nouveau plan avec les autres créanciers non garantis. Vu l'importance de sa réclamation, le plan serait nécessairement adopté par les créanciers si Callidus était autorisée à voter. Bluberi s'oppose à la demande de Callidus.

[22] Le juge surveillant instruit ensemble la demande de financement provisoire de Bluberi ainsi que la demande présentée par Callidus concernant son nouveau plan. Il est à souligner que le contrôleur appuie la position de Bluberi.

III. Historique judiciaire

A. *Cour supérieure du Québec, 2018 QCCS 1040 (le juge Michaud)*

[23] Le juge surveillant rejette la demande de Callidus et refuse de soumettre le nouveau plan au vote des créanciers. Il accueille la demande de Bluberi, l'autorisant ainsi à conclure un accord de financement du litige avec Bentham aux conditions énoncées dans l'AFL et ordonne que les actifs de Bluberi soient grevés de la charge liée au financement du litige.

[24] En ce qui a trait à la demande de Callidus, le juge surveillant décide que cette dernière ne peut voter sur le nouveau plan parce qu'elle agit dans un [TRADUCTION] « but illégitime » (par. 48 (CanLII)). Il reconnaît que les créanciers ont habituellement le droit de voter dans leur propre intérêt. Or, étant donné que le premier plan — qui était presque identique au nouveau plan — a été rejeté par les créanciers, le juge surveillant conclut qu'en demandant à voter sur le nouveau plan, Callidus tentait de contourner le résultat du premier vote. Il écrit notamment :

[TRADUCTION] Tenant compte de leur intérêt, la Cour a accepté à l'automne 2017 que le plan de Callidus soit soumis au vote des créanciers, étant entendu que, en tant que créancière garantie, celle-ci ne voterait pas. Toutefois, si, dans les circonstances actuelles, Callidus était autorisée à voter sur son propre plan, elle le ferait dans un but illégitime d'autant plus qu'il est probable que son vote

the New Plan meeting the two thirds threshold for approval under the CCAA.

As pointed out by SMT, the main unsecured creditor, Callidus' attempt to vote aims only at cancelling SMT's vote which prevented Callidus' Plan from being approved at the creditors' meeting.

It is one thing to let the creditors vote on a plan submitted by a secured creditor, it is another to allow this secured creditor to vote on its own plan in order to exert control over the vote for the sole purpose of obtaining releases. [paras. 45-47]

[25] The supervising judge concluded that, in these circumstances, allowing Callidus to vote would be both "unfair and unreasonable" (para. 47). He also observed that Callidus's conduct throughout the CCAA proceedings "lacked transparency" (at para. 41) and that Callidus was "solely motivated by the [pending] litigation" (para. 44). In sum, he found that Callidus's conduct was contrary to the "requirements of appropriateness, good faith, and due diligence", and ordered that Callidus would not be permitted to vote on the New Plan (para. 48, citing *Century Services Inc. v. Canada (Attorney General)*, 2010 SCC 60, [2010] 3 S.C.R. 379, at para. 70).

[26] Because Callidus was not permitted to vote on the New Plan and SMT had unequivocally stated its intention to vote against it, the supervising judge concluded that the plan had no reasonable prospect of success. He therefore declined to submit it to a creditors' vote.

[27] With respect to Bluberi's application, the supervising judge considered three issues relevant to these appeals: (1) whether the LFA should be submitted to a creditors' vote; (2) if not, whether the LFA ought to be approved by the court; and (3) if so, whether the \$20 million Litigation Financing Charge should be imposed on Bluberi's assets.

[28] The supervising judge determined that the LFA did not need to be submitted to a creditors' vote because it was not a plan of arrangement. He considered a plan of arrangement to involve "an arrangement

permettrait d'atteindre le seuil de deux tiers nécessaire pour que le nouveau plan soit approuvé en vertu de la LACC.

Comme l'a souligné SMT, la principale créancière non garantie, Callidus souhaite voter afin d'annuler le vote de SMT, qui a empêché que son plan soit approuvé lors de l'assemblée des créanciers.

C'est une chose de laisser les créanciers voter sur un plan présenté par un créancier garanti, c'en est une autre de laisser ce créancier garanti voter sur son propre plan et exercer ainsi un contrôle sur le vote à seule fin d'être libéré de toute responsabilité. [par. 45-47]

[25] Le juge surveillant conclut que, dans les circonstances, permettre à Callidus de voter serait à la fois [TRADUCTION] « injuste et déraisonnable » (par. 47). Il note aussi que, tout au long de la procédure introduite en vertu de la LACC, Callidus a « manqué de transparence » (par. 41) et qu'elle « n'est motivée que par le litige [en cours] » (par. 44). En somme, il conclut que la conduite de Callidus est contraire à « l'opportunité, [à] la bonne foi et [à] la diligence » requises, et il ordonne que Callidus ne puisse pas voter sur le nouveau plan (par. 48, citant *Century Services Inc. c. Canada (Procureur général)*, 2010 CSC 60, [2010] 3 R.C.S. 379, par. 70).

[26] Puisque Callidus n'a pas été autorisée à voter sur le nouveau plan et que SMT a manifesté sans équivoque son intention de voter contre celui-ci, le juge surveillant conclut que le plan n'a aucune possibilité raisonnable de recevoir l'aval des créanciers. Il refuse donc de le soumettre au vote des créanciers.

[27] Pour ce qui est de la demande de Bluberi, le juge surveillant examine trois questions qui sont pertinentes pour les présents pourvois : (1) si l'AFL devait être soumis au vote des créanciers; (2) dans la négative, si l'AFL devait être approuvé par le tribunal; et (3) le cas échéant, s'il devait ordonner que la charge liée au financement du litige de 20 millions de dollars grève les actifs de Bluberi.

[28] Le juge surveillant décide qu'il n'est pas nécessaire de soumettre l'AFL au vote des créanciers parce qu'il ne s'agit pas d'un plan d'arrangement. Il considère qu'un tel plan suppose [TRADUCTION] « un

or compromise between a debtor and its creditors” (para. 71, citing *Re Crystallex*, 2012 ONCA 404, 293 O.A.C. 102, at para. 92 (“*Crystallex*”). In his view, the LFA lacked this essential feature. He also concluded that the LFA did not need to be accompanied by a plan, as Bluberi had stated its intention to file a plan in the future.

[29] After reviewing the terms of the LFA, the supervising judge found it met the criteria for approval of third party litigation funding set out in *Bayens v. Kinross Gold Corporation*, 2013 ONSC 4974, 117 O.R. (3d) 150, at para. 41, and *Hayes v. The City of Saint John*, 2016 NBQB 125, at para. 4 (CanLII). In particular, he considered Bentham’s percentage of return to be reasonable in light of its level of investment and risk. Further, the supervising judge rejected Callidus and the Creditors’ Group’s argument that the LFA gave too much discretion to Bentham. He found that the LFA did not allow Bentham to exert undue influence on the litigation of the Retained Claims, noting similarly broad clauses had been approved in the CCAA context (para. 82, citing *Schenk v. Valeant Pharmaceuticals International Inc.*, 2015 ONSC 3215, 74 C.P.C. (7th) 332, at para. 23).

[30] Finally, the supervising judge imposed the Litigation Financing Charge on Bluberi’s assets. While significant, the supervising judge considered the amount to be reasonable given: the amount of damages that would be claimed from Callidus; Bentham’s financial commitment to the litigation; and the fact that Bentham was not charging any interim fees or interest (i.e., it would only profit in the event of successful litigation or settlement). Put simply, Bentham was taking substantial risks, and it was reasonable that it obtain certain guarantees in exchange.

[31] Callidus, again supported by the Creditors’ Group, appealed the supervising judge’s order, impleading Bentham in the process.

arrangement ou une transaction entre un débiteur et ses créanciers » (par. 71, citant *Re Crystallex*, 2012 ONCA 404, 293 O.A.C. 102, par. 92 (« *Crystallex* »)). À son avis, l’AFL est dépourvu de cette caractéristique essentielle. Il conclut aussi qu’il n’est pas nécessaire que l’AFL soit assorti d’un plan étant donné que Bluberi a exprimé l’intention d’en déposer un plus tard.

[29] Après en avoir examiné les modalités, le juge surveillant conclut que l’AFL respecte le critère d’approbation applicable en matière de financement d’un litige par un tiers qui est établi dans les décisions *Bayens c. Kinross Gold Corporation*, 2013 ONSC 4974, 117 O.R. (3d) 150, par. 41, et *Hayes c. The City of Saint John*, 2016 NBQB 125, par. 4 (CanLII). Plus particulièrement, il considère que le taux de retour de Bentham est raisonnable eu égard à son niveau d’investissement et de risque. Il rejette en outre l’argument avancé par Callidus et le groupe de créanciers, qui soutenaient que l’AFL donne trop de latitude à Bentham. Il conclut que l’AFL ne permet pas à Bentham d’exercer une influence indue sur le déroulement du litige lié aux réclamations réservées et souligne que des clauses générales semblables à celles qu’il contient ont déjà été approuvées dans le contexte de la LACC (par. 82, citant *Schenk c. Valeant Pharmaceuticals International Inc.*, 2015 ONSC 3215, 74 C.P.C. (7th) 332, par. 23).

[30] Enfin, le juge surveillant ordonne que les actifs de Bluberi soient grevés de la charge liée au financement du litige. Il juge que, même s’il est élevé, le montant en question est raisonnable étant donné : le montant des dommages-intérêts qui sont réclamés à Callidus; l’engagement financier de Bentham dans le litige; et le fait que Bentham n’exige aucune provision pour frais ou intérêts (c.-à-d. qu’elle ne tirera profit de l’accord que si le procès ou le règlement est couronné de succès). En termes simples, Bentham prend des risques importants et il est raisonnable qu’elle obtienne certaines garanties en échange.

[31] Callidus, de nouveau appuyée par le groupe de créanciers, interjette appel de l’ordonnance du juge surveillant et met en cause Bentham.

B. *Quebec Court of Appeal, 2019 QCCA 171 (Dutil and Schrager J.J.A. and Dumas J. (ad hoc))*

[32] The Court of Appeal allowed the appeal, finding that “[t]he exercise of the judge’s discretion [was] not founded in law nor on a proper treatment of the facts so that irrespective of the standard of review applied, appellate intervention [was] justified” (para. 48 (CanLII)). In particular, the court identified two errors of relevance to these appeals.

[33] First, the court was of the view that the supervising judge erred in finding that Callidus had an improper purpose in seeking to vote on its New Plan. In its view, Callidus should have been permitted to vote. The court relied heavily on the notion that creditors have a right to vote in their own self-interest. It held that any judicial discretion to preclude voting due to improper purpose should be reserved for the “clearest of cases” (para. 62, referring to *Re Blackburn*, 2011 BCSC 1671, 27 B.C.L.R. (5th) 199, at para. 45). The court was of the view that Callidus’s transparent attempt to obtain a release from Bluberi’s claims against it did not amount to an improper purpose. The court also considered Callidus’s conduct prior to and during the CCAA proceedings to be incapable of justifying a finding of improper purpose.

[34] Second, the court concluded that the supervising judge erred in approving the LFA as interim financing because, in its view, the LFA was not connected to Bluberi’s commercial operations. The court concluded that the supervising judge had both “misconstrued in law the notion of interim financing and misapplied that notion to the factual circumstances of the case” (para. 78).

[35] In light of this perceived error, the court substituted its view that the LFA was a plan of arrangement and, as a result, should have been submitted

B. *Cour d’appel du Québec, 2019 QCCA 171 (les juges Dutil et Schrager et le juge Dumas (ad hoc))*

[32] La Cour d’appel accueille l’appel et conclut que [TRADUCTION] « [l]’exercice par le juge de son pouvoir discrétionnaire [n’était] pas fondé en droit, non plus qu’il ne reposait sur un traitement approprié des faits, de sorte que, peu importe la norme de contrôle appliquée, il [était] justifié d’intervenir en appel » (par. 48 (CanLII)). En particulier, la cour relève deux erreurs qui sont pertinentes pour les présents pourvois.

[33] D’une part, la cour conclut que le juge surveillant a commis une erreur en concluant que Callidus a agi dans un but illégitime en demandant l’autorisation de voter sur son nouveau plan. À son avis, Callidus aurait dû être autorisée à voter. La cour s’appuie grandement sur l’idée que les créanciers ont le droit de voter en fonction de leur propre intérêt. Elle juge que l’exercice du pouvoir discrétionnaire qui consiste à empêcher un créancier de voter dans un but illégitime devrait être [TRADUCTION] « réservé aux cas les plus évidents » (par. 62, renvoyant à *Re Blackburn*, 2011 BCSC 1671, 27 B.C.L.R. (5th) 199, par. 45). Selon elle, en tentant de façon transparente d’être libérée des réclamations de Bluberi à son égard, Callidus ne pouvait être considérée comme ayant agi dans un but illégitime. La cour conclut également que la conduite de Callidus, avant et pendant la procédure introduite en vertu de la LACC, ne pouvait justifier la conclusion qu’il existe un but illégitime.

[34] D’autre part, la cour conclut que le juge surveillant a eu tort d’approuver l’AFL en tant qu’accord de financement provisoire parce qu’à son avis, il n’est pas lié aux opérations commerciales de Bluberi. Elle conclut que le juge surveillant a [TRADUCTION] « donné à la notion de financement provisoire une interprétation non fondée en droit et qu’il a mal appliqué cette notion aux circonstances factuelles de l’affaire » (par. 78).

[35] À la lumière de ce qu’elle percevait comme une erreur, la cour substitue son opinion selon laquelle l’AFL est un plan d’arrangement et que pour

to a creditors' vote. It held that "[a]n arrangement or proposal can encompass both a compromise of creditors' claims as well as the process undertaken to satisfy them" (para. 85). The court considered the LFA to be a plan of arrangement because it affected the creditors' share in any eventual litigation proceeds, would cause them to wait for the outcome of any litigation, and could potentially leave them with nothing at all. Moreover, the court held that Bluberi's scheme "as a whole", being the prosecution of the Retained Claims and the LFA, should be submitted as a plan to the creditors for their approval (para. 89).

[36] Bluberi and Bentham (collectively, "appellants"), again supported by the Monitor, now appeal to this Court.

IV. Issues

[37] These appeals raise two issues:

- (1) Did the supervising judge err in barring Callidus from voting on its New Plan on the basis that it was acting for an improper purpose?
- (2) Did the supervising judge err in approving the LFA as interim financing, pursuant to s. 11.2 of the CCAA?

V. Analysis

A. *Preliminary Considerations*

[38] Addressing the above issues requires situating them within the contemporary Canadian insolvency landscape and, more specifically, the CCAA regime. Accordingly, before turning to those issues, we review (1) the evolving nature of CCAA proceedings; (2) the role of the supervising judge in those proceedings; and (3) the proper scope of appellate review of a supervising judge's exercise of discretion.

cette raison, il aurait dû être soumis au vote des créanciers. Elle conclut [TRADUCTION] « [qu']un arrangement ou une proposition peut englober une transaction visant les réclamations des créanciers ainsi que le processus suivi pour y donner suite » (par. 85). La cour juge que l'AFL est un plan d'arrangement parce qu'il a une incidence sur la participation des créanciers à l'indemnité susceptible d'être accordée à la suite d'un litige, qu'il oblige ceux-ci à attendre l'issue de tout litige, et qu'il est possible que les créanciers se retrouvent les mains vides. De plus, la cour conclut que le projet de Bluberi « dans son entièreté », soit la poursuite des réclamations réservées et l'AFL, doit être soumis à l'approbation des créanciers (par. 89).

[36] Bluberi et Bentham (collectivement, les « appelantes »), encore une fois appuyées par le contrôleur, se pourvoient maintenant devant notre Cour.

IV. Questions en litige

[37] Les pourvois soulèvent deux questions :

- (1) Le juge surveillant a-t-il commis une erreur en empêchant Callidus de voter sur son nouveau plan au motif qu'elle agissait dans un but illégitime?
- (2) Le juge surveillant a-t-il commis une erreur en approuvant l'AFL en tant que plan de financement provisoire, selon les termes de l'art. 11.2 de la LACC?

V. Analyse

A. *Considérations préliminaires*

[38] Pour répondre aux questions ci-dessus, nous devons les situer dans le contexte contemporain de l'insolvabilité au Canada, et plus précisément du régime de la LACC. Ainsi, avant de passer à ces questions, nous examinons (1) la nature évolutive des procédures intentées sous le régime de la LACC; (2) le rôle que joue le juge surveillant dans ces procédures; et (3) la portée du contrôle, en appel, de l'exercice du pouvoir discrétionnaire du juge surveillant.

(1) The Evolving Nature of CCAA Proceedings

[39] The CCAA is one of three principal insolvency statutes in Canada. The others are the *Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act*, R.S.C. 1985, c. B-3 (“BIA”), which covers insolvencies of both individuals and companies, and the *Winding-up and Restructuring Act*, R.S.C. 1985, c. W-11 (“WURA”), which covers insolvencies of financial institutions and certain other corporations, such as insurance companies (WURA, s. 6(1)). While both the CCAA and the BIA enable reorganizations of insolvent companies, access to the CCAA is restricted to debtor companies facing total claims in excess of \$5 million (CCAA, s. 3(1)).

[40] Together, Canada’s insolvency statutes pursue an array of overarching remedial objectives that reflect the wide ranging and potentially “catastrophic” impacts insolvency can have (*Sun Indalex Finance, LLC v. United Steelworkers*, 2013 SCC 6, [2013] 1 S.C.R. 271, at para. 1). These objectives include: providing for timely, efficient and impartial resolution of a debtor’s insolvency; preserving and maximizing the value of a debtor’s assets; ensuring fair and equitable treatment of the claims against a debtor; protecting the public interest; and, in the context of a commercial insolvency, balancing the costs and benefits of restructuring or liquidating the company (J. P. Sarra, “The Oscillating Pendulum: Canada’s Sesquicentennial and Finding the Equilibrium for Insolvency Law”, in J. P. Sarra and B. Romaine, eds., *Annual Review of Insolvency Law 2016* (2017), 9, at pp. 9-10; J. P. Sarra, *Rescue! The Companies’ Creditors Arrangement Act* (2nd ed. 2013), at pp. 4-5 and 14; Standing Senate Committee on Banking, Trade and Commerce, *Debtors and Creditors Sharing the Burden: A Review of the Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act and the Companies’ Creditors Arrangement Act* (2003), at pp. 9-10; R. J. Wood, *Bankruptcy and Insolvency Law* (2nd ed. 2015), at pp. 4-5).

(1) La nature évolutive des procédures intentées sous le régime de la LACC

[39] La LACC est l’une des trois principales lois canadiennes en matière d’insolvabilité. Les autres sont la *Loi sur la faillite et l’insolvabilité*, L.R.C. 1985 c. B-3 (« LFI »), qui traite de l’insolvabilité des personnes physiques et des sociétés, et la *Loi sur les liquidations et les restructurations*, L.R.C. 1985 c. W-11 (« LLR »), qui traite de l’insolvabilité des institutions financières et de certaines autres personnes morales, telles que les compagnies d’assurance (LLR, par. 6(1)). Bien que la LACC et la LFI permettent toutes deux la restructuration de compagnies insolubles, l’accès à la LACC est limité aux sociétés débitrices qui sont aux prises avec des réclamations dont le montant total est supérieur à 5 millions de dollars (LACC, par. 3(1)).

[40] Ensemble, les lois canadiennes sur l’insolvabilité poursuivent un grand nombre d’objectifs réparateurs généraux qui témoignent de la vaste gamme des conséquences potentiellement « catastrophiques » qui peuvent découler de l’insolvabilité (*Sun Indalex Finance, LLC c. Syndicat des Métallus*, 2013 CSC 6, [2013] 1 R.C.S. 271, par. 1). Ces objectifs incluent les suivants : régler de façon rapide, efficace et impartiale l’insolvabilité d’un débiteur; préserver et maximiser la valeur des actifs d’un débiteur; assurer un traitement juste et équitable des réclamations déposées contre un débiteur; protéger l’intérêt public; et, dans le contexte d’une insolvabilité commerciale, établir un équilibre entre les coûts et les bénéfices découlant de la restructuration ou de la liquidation d’une compagnie (J. P. Sarra, « The Oscillating Pendulum : Canada’s Sesquicentennial and Finding the Equilibrium for Insolvency Law », dans J. P. Sarra et B. Romaine, dir., *Annual Review of Insolvency Law 2016* (2017), 9, p. 9-10; J. P. Sarra, *Rescue! The Companies’ Creditors Arrangement Act* (2^e éd. 2013), p. 4-5 et 14; Comité sénatorial permanent des banques et du commerce, *Les débiteurs et les créanciers doivent se partager le fardeau : Examen de la Loi sur la faillite et l’insolvabilité et de la Loi sur les arrangements avec les créanciers des compagnies* (2003), p. 13-14; R. J. Wood, *Bankruptcy and Insolvency Law* (2^e éd. 2015), p. 4-5).

[41] Among these objectives, the CCAA generally prioritizes “avoiding the social and economic losses resulting from liquidation of an insolvent company” (*Century Services*, at para. 70). As a result, the typical CCAA case has historically involved an attempt to facilitate the reorganization and survival of the pre-filing debtor company in an operational state — that is, as a going concern. Where such a reorganization was not possible, the alternative course of action was seen as a liquidation through either a receivership or under the BIA regime. This is precisely the outcome that was sought in *Century Services* (see para. 14).

[42] That said, the CCAA is fundamentally insolvency legislation, and thus it also “has the simultaneous objectives of maximizing creditor recovery, preservation of going-concern value where possible, preservation of jobs and communities affected by the firm’s financial distress . . . and enhancement of the credit system generally” (Sarra, *Rescue! The Companies’ Creditors Arrangement Act*, at p. 14; see also *Ernst & Young Inc. v. Essar Global Fund Ltd.*, 2017 ONCA 1014, 139 O.R. (3d) 1 (“*Essar*”), at para. 103). In pursuit of those objectives, CCAA proceedings have evolved to permit outcomes that do not result in the emergence of the pre-filing debtor company in a restructured state, but rather involve some form of liquidation of the debtor’s assets under the auspices of the Act itself (Sarra, “The Oscillating Pendulum: Canada’s Sesquicentennial and Finding the Equilibrium for Insolvency Law”, at pp. 19-21). Such scenarios are referred to as “liquidating CCAAs”, and they are now commonplace in the CCAA landscape (see *Third Eye Capital Corporation v. Ressources Dianor Inc./Dianor Resources Inc.*, 2019 ONCA 508, 435 D.L.R. (4th) 416, at para. 70).

[41] Parmi ces objectifs, la LACC priorise en général le fait d’« éviter les pertes sociales et économiques résultant de la liquidation d’une compagnie insolvable » (*Century Services*, par. 70). C’est pourquoi les affaires types qui relèvent de cette loi ont historiquement facilité la restructuration de l’entreprise débitrice qui n’a pas encore déposé de proposition en la maintenant dans un état opérationnel, c’est-à-dire en permettant qu’elle poursuive ses activités. Lorsqu’une telle restructuration n’était pas possible, on considérait qu’il fallait alors procéder à la liquidation par voie de mise sous séquestre ou sous le régime de la LFI. C’est précisément le résultat qui était recherché dans l’affaire *Century Services* (voir par. 14).

[42] Cela dit, la LACC est fondamentalement une loi sur l’insolvabilité, et à ce titre, elle a aussi [TRADUCTION] « comme objectifs simultanés de maximiser le recouvrement au profit des créanciers, de préserver la valeur d’exploitation dans la mesure du possible, de protéger les emplois et les collectivités touchées par les difficultés financières de l’entreprise [. . .] et d’améliorer le système de crédit de manière générale » (Sarra, *Rescue! The Companies’ Creditors Arrangement Act*, p. 14; voir aussi *Ernst & Young Inc. c. Essar Global Fund Ltd.*, 2017 ONCA 1014, 139 O.R. (3d) 1 (« *Essar* »), par. 103). Afin d’atteindre ces objectifs, les procédures intentées sous le régime de la LACC ont évolué de telle sorte qu’elles permettent des solutions qui évitent l’émergence, sous une forme restructurée, de la société débitrice qui existait avant le début des procédures, mais qui impliquent plutôt une certaine forme de liquidation des actifs du débiteur sous le régime même de la Loi (Sarra, « The Oscillating Pendulum : Canada’s Sesquicentennial and Finding the Equilibrium for Insolvency Law », p. 19-21). Ces cas, qualifiés de [TRADUCTION] « procédures de liquidation sous le régime de la LACC », sont maintenant courants dans le contexte de la LACC (voir *Third Eye Capital Corporation c. Ressources Dianor Inc./Dianor Resources Inc.*, 2019 ONCA 508, 435 D.L.R. (4th) 416, par. 70).

[43] Liquidating CCAAs take diverse forms and may involve, among other things: the sale of the debtor company as a going concern; an “en bloc” sale of assets that are capable of being operationalized by a buyer; a partial liquidation or downsizing of business operations; or a piecemeal sale of assets (B. Kaplan, “Liquidating CCAAs: Discretion Gone Awry?”, in J. P. Sarra, ed., *Annual Review of Insolvency Law* (2008), 79, at pp. 87-89). The ultimate commercial outcomes facilitated by liquidating CCAAs are similarly diverse. Some may result in the continued operation of the business of the debtor under a different going concern entity (e.g., the liquidations in *Indalex* and *Re Canadian Red Cross Society* (1998), 5 C.B.R. (4th) 299 (Ont. C.J. (Gen. Div.)), while others may result in a sale of assets and inventory with no such entity emerging (e.g., the proceedings in *Re Target Canada Co.*, 2015 ONSC 303, 22 C.B.R. (6th) 323, at paras. 7 and 31). Others still, like the case at bar, may involve a going concern sale of most of the assets of the debtor, leaving residual assets to be dealt with by the debtor and its stakeholders.

[44] CCAA courts first began approving these forms of liquidation pursuant to the broad discretion conferred by the Act. The emergence of this practice was not without criticism, largely on the basis that it appeared to be inconsistent with the CCAA being a “restructuring statute” (see, e.g., *Uti Energy Corp. v. Fracmaster Ltd.*, 1999 ABCA 178, 244 A.R. 93, at paras. 15-16, aff’g 1999 ABQB 379, 11 C.B.R. (4th) 204, at paras. 40-43; A. Nocilla, “The History of the Companies’ Creditors Arrangement Act and the Future of Re-Structuring Law in Canada” (2014), 56 *Can. Bus. L.J.* 73, at pp. 88-92).

[45] However, since s. 36 of the CCAA came into force in 2009, courts have been using it to effect liquidating CCAAs. Section 36 empowers courts to authorize the sale or disposition of a debtor

[43] Les procédures de liquidation sous le régime de la LACC revêtent différentes formes et peuvent, entre autres, inclure la vente de la société débitrice à titre d’entreprise en activité; la vente « en bloc » des éléments d’actif susceptibles d’être exploités par un acquéreur; une liquidation partielle de l’entreprise ou une réduction de ses activités; ou encore une vente de ses actifs élément par élément (B. Kaplan, « Liquidating CCAAs : Discretion Gone Awry? » dans J. P. Sarra, dir., *Annual Review of Insolvency Law* (2008), 79, p. 87-89). Les résultats commerciaux ultimement obtenus à l’issue des procédures de liquidation introduites sous le régime de la LACC sont eux aussi variés. Certaines procédures peuvent avoir pour résultat la continuité des activités de la débitrice sous la forme d’une autre entité viable (p. ex., les sociétés liquidées dans *Indalex* et *Re Canadian Red Cross Society* (1998), 5 C.B.R. (4th) 299 (C.J. Ont., Div. gén.)), alors que d’autres peuvent simplement aboutir à la vente des actifs et de l’inventaire sans donner naissance à une nouvelle entité (p. ex., la procédure en cause dans *Re Target Canada Co.*, 2015 ONSC 303, 22 C.B.R. (6th) 323, par. 7 et 31). D’autres encore, comme dans le dossier qui nous occupe, peuvent donner lieu à la vente de la plupart des actifs de la débitrice en vue de la poursuite de son activité, laissant à la débitrice et aux parties intéressées le soin de s’occuper des actifs résiduels.

[44] Les tribunaux chargés de l’application de la LACC ont d’abord commencé à approuver ces formes de liquidation en exerçant le vaste pouvoir discrétionnaire que leur confère la Loi. L’émergence de cette pratique a fait l’objet de critiques, essentiellement parce qu’elle semblait incompatible avec l’objectif de « restructuration » de la LACC (voir, p. ex., *Uti Energy Corp. c. Fracmaster Ltd.*, 1999 ABCA 178, 244 A.R. 93, par. 15-16, conf. 1999 ABQB 379, 11 C.B.R. (4th) 204, par. 40-43; A. Nocilla, « The History of the Companies’ Creditors Arrangement Act and the Future of Re-Structuring Law in Canada » (2014), 56 *Rev. can. dr. comm.* 73, p. 88-92).

[45] Toutefois, depuis que l’art. 36 de la LACC est entré en vigueur en 2009, les tribunaux l’utilisent pour consentir à une liquidation sous le régime de la LACC. L’article 36 confère aux tribunaux le pouvoir

company's assets outside the ordinary course of business.³ Significantly, when the Standing Senate Committee on Banking, Trade and Commerce recommended the adoption of s. 36, it observed that liquidation is not necessarily inconsistent with the remedial objectives of the CCAA, and that it may be a means to "raise capital [to facilitate a restructuring], eliminate further loss for creditors or focus on the solvent operations of the business" (p. 147). Other commentators have observed that liquidation can be a "vehicle to restructure a business" by allowing the business to survive, albeit under a different corporate form or ownership (Sarra, *Rescue! The Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act*, at p. 169; see also K. P. McElcheran, *Commercial Insolvency in Canada* (4th ed. 2019), at p. 311). Indeed, in *Indalex*, the company sold its assets under the CCAA in order to preserve the jobs of its employees, despite being unable to survive as their employer (see para. 51).

d'autoriser la vente ou la disposition des actifs d'une compagnie débitrice hors du cours ordinaire de ses affaires³. Fait important, lorsque le Comité sénatorial permanent des banques et du commerce a recommandé l'adoption de l'art. 36, il a fait observer que la liquidation n'est pas nécessairement incompatible avec les objectifs réparateurs de la LACC et qu'il pourrait s'agir d'un moyen « soit pour obtenir des capitaux [et faciliter la restructuration] ou éviter des pertes plus graves aux créanciers, soit pour se concentrer sur ses activités solvables » (p. 163). D'autres auteurs ont observé que la liquidation peut [TRADUCTION] « être un moyen de restructurer une entreprise » en lui permettant de survivre, quoique sous une forme corporative différente ou sous la gouverne de propriétaires différents (Sarra, *Rescue! The Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act*, p. 169; voir aussi K. P. McElcheran, *Commercial Insolvency in Canada* (4^e éd. 2019), p. 311). D'ailleurs, dans l'arrêt *Indalex*, la compagnie a vendu ses actifs sous le régime de la LACC afin de protéger les emplois de son personnel, même si elle ne pouvait demeurer leur employeur (voir par. 51).

[46] Ultimately, the relative weight that the different objectives of the CCAA take on in a particular case may vary based on the factual circumstances, the stage of the proceedings, or the proposed solutions that are presented to the court for approval. Here, a parallel may be drawn with the BIA context. In *Orphan Well Association v. Grant Thornton Ltd.*, 2019 SCC 5, [2019] 1 S.C.R. 150, at para. 67, this Court explained that, as a general matter, the BIA serves two purposes: (1) the bankrupt's financial rehabilitation and (2) the equitable distribution of the bankrupt's assets among creditors. However,

[46] En définitive, le poids relatif attribué aux différents objectifs de la LACC dans une affaire donnée peut varier en fonction des circonstances factuelles, de l'étape des procédures ou des solutions qui sont présentées à la cour pour approbation. En l'espèce, il est possible d'établir un parallèle avec le contexte de la LFI. Dans l'arrêt *Orphan Well Association c. Grant Thornton Ltd.*, 2019 CSC 5, [2019] 1 R.C.S. 150, par. 67, notre Cour a expliqué que, de façon générale, la LFI vise deux objectifs : (1) la réhabilitation financière du failli, et (2) le partage équitable des actifs du failli entre les créanciers. Or, dans les cas où

³ We note that while s. 36 now codifies the jurisdiction of a supervising court to grant a sale and vesting order, and enumerates factors to guide the court's discretion to grant such an order, it is silent on when courts ought to approve a liquidation under the CCAA as opposed to requiring the parties to proceed to liquidation under a receivership or the BIA regime (see Sarra, *Rescue! The Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act*, at pp. 167-68; A. Nocilla, "Asset Sales Under the Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act and the Failure of Section 36" (2012) 52 *Can. Bus. L.J.* 226, at pp. 243-44 and 247). This issue remains an open question and was not put to this Court in either *Indalex* or these appeals.

³ Mentionnons que, bien que l'art. 36 codifie désormais le pouvoir du juge surveillant de rendre une ordonnance de vente et de dévolution, et qu'il énonce les facteurs devant orienter l'exercice de son pouvoir discrétionnaire d'accorder une telle ordonnance, il est muet quant aux circonstances dans lesquelles les tribunaux doivent approuver une liquidation sous le régime de la LACC plutôt que d'exiger des parties qu'elles procèdent à la liquidation par voie de mise sous séquestre ou sous le régime de la LFI (voir Sarra, *Rescue! The Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act*, p. 167-168; A. Nocilla, « Asset Sales Under the Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act and the Failure of Section 36 » (2012) 52 *Rev. can. dr. comm.* 226, p. 243-244 et 247). Cette question demeure ouverte et n'a pas été soumise à la Cour dans *Indalex* non plus que dans les présents pourvois.

in circumstances where a debtor corporation will never emerge from bankruptcy, only the latter purpose is relevant (see para. 67). Similarly, under the CCAA, when a reorganization of the pre-filing debtor company is not a possibility, a liquidation that preserves going-concern value and the ongoing business operations of the pre-filing company may become the predominant remedial focus. Moreover, where a reorganization or liquidation is complete and the court is dealing with residual assets, the objective of maximizing creditor recovery from those assets may take centre stage. As we will explain, the architecture of the CCAA leaves the case-specific assessment and balancing of these remedial objectives to the supervising judge.

(2) The Role of a Supervising Judge in CCAA Proceedings

[47] One of the principal means through which the CCAA achieves its objectives is by carving out a unique supervisory role for judges (see Sarra, *Rescue! The Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act*, at pp. 18-19). From beginning to end, each CCAA proceeding is overseen by a single supervising judge. The supervising judge acquires extensive knowledge and insight into the stakeholder dynamics and the business realities of the proceedings from their ongoing dealings with the parties.

[48] The CCAA capitalizes on this positional advantage by supplying supervising judges with broad discretion to make a variety of orders that respond to the circumstances of each case and “meet contemporary business and social needs” (*Century Services*, at para. 58) in “real-time” (para. 58, citing R. B. Jones, “The Evolution of Canadian Restructuring: Challenges for the Rule of Law”, in J. P. Sarra, ed., *Annual Review of Insolvency Law 2005* (2006), 481, at p. 484). The anchor of this discretionary authority is s. 11, which empowers a judge “to make any order that [the judge] considers appropriate in the circumstances”. This section has been described as “the engine” driving the statutory scheme (*Stelco*

la société débitrice ne s’extirpera jamais de la faillite, seul le dernier objectif est pertinent (voir par. 67). Dans la même veine, sous le régime de la LACC, lorsque la restructuration d’une société débitrice qui n’a pas déposé de proposition est impossible, une liquidation visant à protéger sa valeur d’exploitation et à maintenir ses activités courantes peut devenir l’objectif réparateur principal. En outre, lorsque la restructuration ou la liquidation est terminée et que le tribunal doit décider du sort des actifs résiduels, l’objectif de maximiser le recouvrement des créanciers à partir de ces actifs peut passer au premier plan. Comme nous l’expliquerons, la structure de la LACC laisse au juge surveillant le soin de procéder à un examen et à une mise en balance au cas par cas de ces objectifs réparateurs.

(2) Le rôle du juge surveillant dans les procédures intentées sous le régime de la LACC

[47] Un des principaux moyens par lesquels la LACC atteint ses objectifs réside dans le rôle particulier de surveillance qu’elle réserve aux juges (voir Sarra, *Rescue! The Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act*, p. 18-19). Chaque procédure fondée sur la LACC est supervisée du début à la fin par un seul juge surveillant. En raison de ses rapports continus avec les parties, ce dernier acquiert une connaissance approfondie de la dynamique entre les intéressés et des réalités commerciales entourant la procédure.

[48] La LACC mise sur la position avantageuse qu’occupe le juge surveillant en lui accordant le vaste pouvoir discrétionnaire de rendre toute une gamme d’ordonnances susceptibles de répondre aux circonstances de chaque cas et de « [s’adapter] aux besoins commerciaux et sociaux contemporains » (*Century Services*, par. 58) en « temps réel » (par. 58, citant R. B. Jones, « The Evolution of Canadian Restructuring : Challenges for the Rule of Law », dans J. P. Sarra, dir., *Annual Review of Insolvency Law 2005* (2006), 481, p. 484). Le point d’ancrage de ce pouvoir discrétionnaire est l’art. 11, qui confère au juge le pouvoir de « rendre toute ordonnance qu’il estime indiquée ». Cette disposition a été décrite

Inc. (Re) (2005), 253 D.L.R. (4th) 109 (Ont. C.A.), at para. 36).

[49] The discretionary authority conferred by the CCAA, while broad in nature, is not boundless. This authority must be exercised in furtherance of the remedial objectives of the CCAA, which we have explained above (see *Century Services*, at para. 59). Additionally, the court must keep in mind three “baseline considerations” (at para. 70), which the applicant bears the burden of demonstrating: (1) that the order sought is appropriate in the circumstances, and (2) that the applicant has been acting in good faith and (3) with due diligence (para. 69).

[50] The first two considerations of appropriateness and good faith are widely understood in the CCAA context. Appropriateness “is assessed by inquiring whether the order sought advances the policy objectives underlying the CCAA” (para. 70). Further, the well-established requirement that parties must act in good faith in insolvency proceedings has recently been made express in s. 18.6 of the CCAA, which provides:

Good faith

18.6 (1) Any interested person in any proceedings under this Act shall act in good faith with respect to those proceedings.

Good faith — powers of court

(2) If the court is satisfied that an interested person fails to act in good faith, on application by an interested person, the court may make any order that it considers appropriate in the circumstances.

(See also *BIA*, s. 4.2; *Budget Implementation Act, 2019, No. 1*, S.C. 2019, c. 29, ss. 133 and 140.)

[51] The third consideration of due diligence requires some elaboration. Consistent with the CCAA regime generally, the due diligence consideration discourages parties from sitting on their rights and ensures that creditors do not strategically manoeuvre or

comme étant le « moteur » du régime législatif (*Stelco Inc. (Re)* (2005), 253 D.L.R. (4th) 109 (C.A. Ont.), par. 36).

[49] Quoique vaste, le pouvoir discrétionnaire conféré par la LACC n’est pas sans limites. Son exercice doit tendre à la réalisation des objectifs réparateurs de la LACC, que nous avons expliqués ci-dessus (voir *Century Services*, par. 59). En outre, la cour doit garder à l’esprit les trois « considérations de base » (par. 70) qu’il incombe au demandeur de démontrer : (1) que l’ordonnance demandée est indiquée, et (2) qu’il a agi de bonne foi et (3) avec la diligence voulue (par. 69).

[50] Les deux premières considérations, l’opportunité et la bonne foi, sont largement connues dans le contexte de la LACC. Le tribunal « évalue l’opportunité de l’ordonnance demandée en déterminant si elle favorisera la réalisation des objectifs de politique générale qui sous-tendent la Loi » (par. 70). Par ailleurs, l’exigence bien établie selon laquelle les parties doivent agir de bonne foi dans les procédures d’insolvabilité est depuis peu mentionnée de façon expresse à l’art. 18.6 de la LACC, qui dispose :

Bonne foi

18.6 (1) Tout intéressé est tenu d’agir de bonne foi dans le cadre d’une procédure intentée au titre de la présente loi.

Bonne foi — pouvoirs du tribunal

(2) S’il est convaincu que l’intéressé n’agit pas de bonne foi, le tribunal peut, à la demande de tout intéressé, rendre toute ordonnance qu’il estime indiquée.

(Voir aussi *LFI*, art. 4.2; *Loi n° 1 d’exécution du budget de 2019*, L.C. 2019, c. 29, art. 133 et 140.)

[51] La troisième considération, celle de la diligence, requiert qu’on s’y attarde. Conformément au régime de la LACC en général, la considération de diligence décourage les parties de rester sur leurs positions et fait en sorte que les créanciers n’usent

position themselves to gain an advantage (*Lehndorff General Partner Ltd., Re* (1993), 17 C.B.R. (3d) 24 (Ont. C.J. (Gen. Div.)), at p. 31). The procedures set out in the CCAA rely on negotiations and compromise between the debtor and its stakeholders, as overseen by the supervising judge and the monitor. This necessarily requires that, to the extent possible, those involved in the proceedings be on equal footing and have a clear understanding of their respective rights (see McElcheran, at p. 262). A party's failure to participate in CCAA proceedings in a diligent and timely fashion can undermine these procedures and, more generally, the effective functioning of the CCAA regime (see, e.g., *North American Tungsten Corp. v. Global Tungsten and Powders Corp.*, 2015 BCCA 390, 377 B.C.A.C. 6, at paras. 21-23; *Re BA Energy Inc.*, 2010 ABQB 507, 70 C.B.R. (5th) 24; *HSBC Bank Canada v. Bear Mountain Master Partnership*, 2010 BCSC 1563, 72 C.B.R. (5th) 276, at para. 11; *Caterpillar Financial Services Ltd. v. 360networks Corp.*, 2007 BCCA 14, 279 D.L.R. (4th) 701, at paras. 51-52, in which the courts seized on a party's failure to act diligently).

[52] We pause to note that supervising judges are assisted in their oversight role by a court appointed monitor whose qualifications and duties are set out in the CCAA (see ss. 11.7, 11.8 and 23 to 25). The monitor is an independent and impartial expert, acting as “the eyes and the ears of the court” throughout the proceedings (*Essar*, at para. 109). The core of the monitor's role includes providing an advisory opinion to the court as to the fairness of any proposed plan of arrangement and on orders sought by parties, including the sale of assets and requests for interim financing (see CCAA, s. 23(1)(d) and (i); *Sarra, Rescue! The Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act*, at pp. 566 and 569).

pas stratégiquement de ruse ou ne se placent pas eux-mêmes dans une position pour obtenir un avantage (*Lehndorff General Partner Ltd., Re* (1993), 17 C.B.R. (3d) 24 (C.J. Ont. (Div. gén.)), p. 31). La procédure prévue par la LACC se fonde sur les négociations et les transactions entre le débiteur et les intéressés, le tout étant supervisé par le juge surveillant et le contrôleur. Il faut donc nécessairement que, dans la mesure du possible, ceux qui participent au processus soient sur un pied d'égalité et aient une compréhension claire de leurs droits respectifs (voir McElcheran, p. 262). La partie qui, dans le cadre d'une procédure fondée sur la LACC, n'agit pas avec diligence et en temps utile risque de compromettre le processus et, de façon plus générale, de nuire à l'efficacité du régime de la Loi (voir, p. ex., *North American Tungsten Corp. c. Global Tungsten and Powders Corp.*, 2015 BCCA 390, 377 B.C.A.C. 6 par. 21-23; *Re BA Energy Inc.*, 2010 ABQB 507, 70 C.B.R. (5th) 24; *HSBC Bank Canada c. Bear Mountain Master Partnership*, 2010 BCSC 1563, 72 C.B.R. (5th) 276 par. 11; *Caterpillar Financial Services Ltd. c. 360networks Corp.*, 2007 BCCA 14, 279 D.L.R. (4th) 701, par. 51-52, où les tribunaux se sont penchés sur le manque de diligence d'une partie).

[52] Nous soulignons que les juges surveillants s'acquittent de leur rôle de supervision avec l'aide d'un contrôleur qui est nommé par le tribunal et dont les compétences et les attributions sont énoncées dans la LACC (voir art. 11.7, 11.8 et 23 à 25). Le contrôleur est un expert indépendant et impartial qui agit comme [TRADUCTION] « les yeux et les oreilles du tribunal » tout au long de la procédure (*Essar*, par. 109). Il a essentiellement pour rôle de donner au tribunal des avis consultatifs sur le caractère équitable de tout plan d'arrangement proposé et sur les ordonnances demandées par les parties, y compris celles portant sur la vente d'actifs et le financement provisoire (voir LACC, al. 23(1)d) et i); *Sarra, Rescue! The Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act*, p. 566 et 569).

(3) Appellate Review of Exercises of Discretion by a Supervising Judge

[53] A high degree of deference is owed to discretionary decisions made by judges supervising CCAA proceedings. As such, appellate intervention will only be justified if the supervising judge erred in principle or exercised their discretion unreasonably (see *Grant Forest Products Inc. v. Toronto-Dominion Bank*, 2015 ONCA 570, 387 D.L.R. (4th) 426, at para. 98; *Bridging Finance Inc. v. Béton Brunet 2001 inc.*, 2017 QCCA 138, 44 C.B.R. (6th) 175, at para. 23). Appellate courts must be careful not to substitute their own discretion in place of the supervising judge's (*New Skeena Forest Products Inc., Re*, 2005 BCCA 192, 39 B.C.L.R. (4th) 338, at para. 20).

[54] This deferential standard of review accounts for the fact that supervising judges are steeped in the intricacies of the CCAA proceedings they oversee. In this respect, the comments of Tysoe J.A. in *Canadian Metropolitan Properties Corp. v. Libin Holdings Ltd.*, 2009 BCCA 40, 308 D.L.R. (4th) 339 (*“Re Edgewater Casino Inc.”*), at para. 20, are apt:

... one of the principal functions of the judge supervising the CCAA proceeding is to attempt to balance the interests of the various stakeholders during the reorganization process, and it will often be inappropriate to consider an exercise of discretion by the supervising judge in isolation of other exercises of discretion by the judge in endeavoring to balance the various interests. ... CCAA proceedings are dynamic in nature and the supervising judge has intimate knowledge of the reorganization process. The nature of the proceedings often requires the supervising judge to make quick decisions in complicated circumstances.

[55] With the foregoing in mind, we turn to the issues on appeal.

(3) Le contrôle en appel de l'exercice du pouvoir discrétionnaire du juge surveillant

[53] Les décisions discrétionnaires des juges chargés de la supervision des procédures intentées sous le régime de la LACC commandent un degré élevé de déférence. Ainsi, les cours d'appel ne seront justifiées d'intervenir que si le juge surveillant a commis une erreur de principe ou exercé son pouvoir discrétionnaire de manière déraisonnable (voir *Grant Forest Products Inc. c. Toronto-Dominion Bank*, 2015 ONCA 570, 387 D.L.R. (4th) 426, par. 98; *Bridging Finance Inc. c. Béton Brunet 2001 inc.*, 2017 QCCA 138, 44 C.B.R. (6th) 175, par. 23). Elles doivent prendre garde de ne pas substituer leur propre pouvoir discrétionnaire à celui du juge surveillant (*New Skeena Forest Products Inc., Re*, 2005 BCCA 192, 39 B.C.L.R. (4th) 338, par. 20).

[54] Cette norme déférente de contrôle tient compte du fait que le juge surveillant possède une connaissance intime des procédures intentées sous le régime de la LACC dont il assure la supervision. À cet égard, les observations formulées par le juge Tysoe dans *Canadian Metropolitan Properties Corp. c. Libin Holdings Ltd.*, 2009 BCCA 40, 308 D.L.R. (4th) 339 (« *Re Edgewater Casino Inc.* »), par. 20, sont pertinentes :

[TRADUCTION] ... une des fonctions principales du juge chargé de la supervision de la procédure fondée sur la LACC est d'essayer d'établir un équilibre entre les intérêts des différents intéressés durant le processus de restructuration, et il sera bien souvent inopportun d'examiner une des décisions qu'il aura rendues à cet égard isolément des autres. [...] Les procédures intentées sous le régime de la LACC sont de nature dynamique et le juge surveillant a une connaissance intime du processus de restructuration. La nature du processus l'oblige souvent à prendre des décisions rapides dans des situations complexes.

[55] En gardant ce qui précède à l'esprit, nous passons maintenant aux questions soulevées par le présent pourvoi.

B. *Callidus Should Not Be Permitted to Vote on Its New Plan*

[56] A creditor can generally vote on a plan of arrangement or compromise that affects its rights, subject to any specific provisions of the *CCAA* that may restrict its voting rights (e.g., s. 22(3)), or a proper exercise of discretion by the supervising judge to constrain or bar the creditor's right to vote. We conclude that one such constraint arises from s. 11 of the *CCAA*, which provides supervising judges with the discretion to bar a creditor from voting where the creditor is acting for an improper purpose. Supervising judges are best-placed to determine whether this discretion should be exercised in a particular case. In our view, the supervising judge here made no error in exercising his discretion to bar Callidus from voting on the New Plan.

(1) Parameters of Creditors' Right to Vote on Plans of Arrangement

[57] Creditor approval of any plan of arrangement or compromise is a key feature of the *CCAA*, as is the supervising judge's oversight of that process. Where a plan is proposed, an application may be made to the supervising judge to order a creditors' meeting to vote on the proposed plan (*CCAA*, ss. 4 and 5). The supervising judge has the discretion to determine whether to order the meeting. For the purposes of voting at a creditors' meeting, the debtor company may divide the creditors into classes, subject to court approval (*CCAA*, s. 22(1)). Creditors may be included in the same class if "their interests or rights are sufficiently similar to give them a commonality of interest" (*CCAA*, s. 22(2); see also L. W. Houlden, G. B. Morawetz and J. P. Sarra, *Bankruptcy and Insolvency Law of Canada* (4th ed. (loose-leaf)), vol. 4, at §149). If the requisite "double majority" in each class of creditors — again, a majority in *number* of class members, which also represents two-thirds in *value* of the class members' claims — vote in favour of the plan, the supervising judge may sanction the plan (*Metcalf & Mansfield Alternative Investments II Corp. (Re)*, 2008 ONCA 587, 296 D.L.R. (4th) 135, at para. 34; see *CCAA*, s. 6). The supervising judge will conduct what is

B. *Callidus ne devrait pas être autorisée à voter sur son nouveau plan*

[56] En général, un créancier peut voter sur un plan d'arrangement ou une transaction qui a une incidence sur ses droits, sous réserve des dispositions de la *LACC* qui peuvent limiter son droit de voter (p. ex., par. 22(3)), ou de l'exercice justifié par le juge surveillant de son pouvoir discrétionnaire de limiter ou de supprimer ce droit. Nous concluons qu'une telle limite découle de l'art. 11 de la *LACC*, qui confère au juge surveillant le pouvoir discrétionnaire d'empêcher le créancier de voter lorsqu'il agit dans un but illégitime. Le juge surveillant est mieux placé que quiconque pour déterminer s'il doit exercer ce pouvoir dans un cas donné. À notre avis, le juge surveillant n'a, en l'espèce, commis aucune erreur en exerçant son pouvoir discrétionnaire pour empêcher Callidus de voter sur le nouveau plan.

(1) Les paramètres du droit d'un créancier de voter sur un plan d'arrangement

[57] L'approbation par les créanciers d'un plan d'arrangement ou d'une transaction est l'une des principales caractéristiques de la *LACC*, tout comme la supervision du processus assurée par le juge surveillant. Lorsqu'un plan est proposé, le juge surveillant peut, sur demande, ordonner que soit convoquée une assemblée des créanciers pour que ceux-ci puissent voter sur le plan proposé (*LACC*, art. 4 et 5). Le juge surveillant a le pouvoir discrétionnaire de décider ou non d'ordonner qu'une assemblée soit convoquée. Pour les besoins du vote à l'assemblée des créanciers, la compagnie débitrice peut établir des catégories de créanciers, sous réserve de l'approbation du tribunal (*LACC*, par. 22(1)). Peuvent faire partie de la même catégorie les créanciers « ayant des droits ou intérêts à ce point semblables [...] qu'on peut en conclure qu'ils ont un intérêt commun » (*LACC*, par. 22(2); voir aussi L. W. Houlden, G. B. Morawetz, et J. P. Sarra, *Bankruptcy and Insolvency Law of Canada* (4^e éd. (feuilles mobiles)), vol. 4, §149). Si la « double majorité » requise dans chaque catégorie de créanciers — rappelons qu'il s'agit de la majorité en *nombre* d'une catégorie, qui représente aussi les deux-tiers en *valeur* des réclamations de cette catégorie — vote

commonly referred to as a “fairness hearing” to determine, among other things, whether the plan is fair and reasonable (Wood, at pp. 490-92; see also Sarra, *Rescue! The Companies’ Creditors Arrangement Act*, at p. 529; Houlden, Morawetz and Sarra at §45). Once sanctioned by the supervising judge, the plan is binding on each class of creditors that participated in the vote (CCAA, s. 6(1)).

[58] Creditors with a provable claim against the debtor whose interests are affected by a proposed plan are usually entitled to vote on plans of arrangement (Wood, at p. 470). Indeed, there is no express provision in the CCAA barring such a creditor from voting on a plan of arrangement, including a plan it sponsors.

[59] Notwithstanding the foregoing, the appellants submit that a purposive interpretation of s. 22(3) of the CCAA reveals that, as a general matter, a creditor should be precluded from voting on its own plan. Section 22(3) provides:

Related creditors

(3) A creditor who is related to the company may vote against, but not for, a compromise or arrangement relating to the company.

The appellants note that s. 22(3) was meant to harmonize the CCAA scheme with s. 54(3) of the BIA, which provides that “[a] creditor who is related to the debtor may vote against but not for the acceptance of the proposal.” The appellants point out that, under s. 50(1) of the BIA, only debtors can sponsor plans; as a result, the reference to “debtor” in s. 54(3) captures *all* plan sponsors. They submit that if s. 54(3) captures all plan sponsors, s. 22(3) of the CCAA must do the same. On this basis, the appellants ask us to extend the voting restriction in s. 22(3) to apply not only to creditors who are “related to the company”, as the provision states, but to any

en faveur du plan, le juge surveillant peut homologuer celui-ci (*Metcalfe & Mansfield Alternative Investments II Corp. (Re)*, 2008 ONCA 587, 296 D.L.R. (4th) 135, par. 34; voir la LACC, art. 6). Le juge surveillant tiendra ce qu’on appelle communément une [TRADUCTION] « audience d’équité » pour décider, entre autres choses, si le plan est juste et raisonnable (Wood, p. 490-492; Sarra, *Rescue! The Companies’ Creditors Arrangement Act*, p. 529; Houlden, Morawetz et Sarra, §45). Une fois homologué par le juge surveillant, le plan lie chaque catégorie de créanciers qui a participé au vote (LACC, par. 6(1)).

[58] Les créanciers qui ont une réclamation prouvable contre le débiteur et dont les intérêts sont touchés par un plan d’arrangement proposé ont habituellement le droit de voter sur un tel plan (Wood, p. 470). En fait, aucune disposition expresse de la LACC n’interdit à un créancier de voter sur un plan d’arrangement, y compris sur un plan dont il fait la promotion.

[59] Nonobstant ce qui précède, les appelantes soutiennent qu’une interprétation téléologique du par. 22(3) de la LACC révèle que, de façon générale, un créancier ne devrait pas pouvoir voter sur son propre plan. Le paragraphe 22(3) prévoit :

Créancier lié

(3) Le créancier lié à la compagnie peut voter contre, mais non pour, l’acceptation de la transaction ou de l’arrangement.

Les appelantes font remarquer que le par. 22(3) devait permettre d’harmoniser le régime de la LACC avec le par. 54(3) de la LFI, qui dispose que « [u]n créancier qui est lié au débiteur peut voter contre, mais non pour, l’acceptation de la proposition. » Elles soulignent que, en vertu du par. 50(1) de la LFI, seuls les débiteurs peuvent faire la promotion d’un plan; ainsi, le « débiteur » auquel renvoie le par. 54(3) s’entend de *tous* les promoteurs de plan. Elles soutiennent que, si le par. 54(3) vise tous les promoteurs de plan, le par. 22(3) de la LACC doit également les viser. Pour cette raison, les appelantes nous demandent d’étendre la restriction au droit de

creditor who sponsors a plan. They submit that this interpretation gives effect to the underlying intention of both provisions, which they say is to ensure that a creditor who has a conflict of interest cannot “dilute” or overtake the votes of other creditors.

[60] We would not accept this strained interpretation of s. 22(3). Section 22(3) makes no mention of conflicts of interest between creditors and plan sponsors generally. The wording of s. 22(3) only places voting restrictions on creditors who are “related to the [debtor] company”. These words are “precise and unequivocal” and, as such, must “play a dominant role in the interpretive process” (*Canada Trustco Mortgage Co. v. Canada*, 2005 SCC 54, [2005] 2 S.C.R. 601, at para. 10). In our view, the appellants’ analogy to the *BIA* is not sufficient to overcome the plain wording of this provision.

[61] While the appellants are correct that s. 22(3) was enacted to harmonize the treatment of related parties in the *CCAA* and *BIA*, its history demonstrates that it is not a general conflict of interest provision. Prior to the amendments incorporating s. 22(3) into the *CCAA*, the *CCAA* clearly allowed creditors to put forward a plan of arrangement (see Houlden, Morawetz and Sarra, at §33, *Red Cross; Re 1078385 Ontario Inc.* (2004), 206 O.A.C. 17). In contrast, under the *BIA*, only debtors could make proposals. Parliament is presumed to have been aware of this obvious difference between the two statutes (see *ATCO Gas and Pipelines Ltd. v. Alberta (Energy and Utilities Board)*, 2006 SCC 4, [2006] 1 S.C.R. 140, at para. 59; see also *Third Eye*, at para. 57). Despite this difference, Parliament imported, with necessary modification, the wording of the *BIA* related creditor provision into the *CCAA*. Going beyond this language entails accepting that Parliament failed to choose the right words to give effect to its intention, which we do not.

voter imposée par le par. 22(3) de manière à ce qu’elle s’applique non seulement aux créanciers « lié[s] à la compagnie », comme le prévoit la disposition, mais aussi à tous les créanciers qui font la promotion d’un plan. Elles soutiennent que cette interprétation donne effet à l’intention sous-jacente aux deux dispositions, intention qui, de dire les appelantes, est de faire en sorte qu’un créancier qui est en conflit d’intérêts ne puisse pas « diluer » ou supplanter le vote des autres créanciers.

[60] Nous n’acceptons pas cette interprétation forcée du par. 22(3). Il n’est nullement question dans cette disposition de conflit d’intérêts entre les créanciers et les promoteurs d’un plan en général. Les restrictions au droit de voter imposées par le par. 22(3) ne s’appliquent qu’aux créanciers qui sont « lié[s] à la compagnie [débitrice] ». Ce libellé est « précis et non équivoque », et il doit ainsi « jouer un rôle primordial dans le processus d’interprétation » (*Hypothèques Trustco Canada c. Canada*, 2005 CSC 54, [2005] 2 R.C.S. 601, par. 10). À notre avis, l’analogie que les appelantes font avec la *LFI* ne suffit pas à écarter le libellé clair de cette disposition.

[61] Bien que les appelantes aient raison de dire que l’adoption du par. 22(3) visait à harmoniser le traitement réservé aux parties liées par la *LACC* et la *LFI*, son historique montre qu’il ne s’agit pas d’une disposition générale relative aux conflits d’intérêts. Avant qu’elle soit modifiée et qu’on y incorpore le par. 22(3), la *LACC* permettait clairement aux créanciers de présenter un plan d’arrangement (voir Houlden, Morawetz et Sarra, §33, *Red Cross; Re 1078385 Ontario Inc.* (2004), 206 O.A.C. 17). À l’opposé, en vertu de la *LFI*, seuls les débiteurs pouvaient déposer une proposition. Il faut présumer que le législateur était au fait de cette différence évidente entre les deux lois (voir *ATCO Gas and Pipelines Ltd. c. Alberta (Energy and Utilities Board)*, 2006 CSC 4, [2006] 1 R.C.S. 140, par. 59; voir aussi *Third Eye*, par. 57). Le législateur a malgré tout importé dans la *LACC*, avec les adaptations nécessaires, le texte de la disposition de la *LFI* portant sur les créanciers liés. Aller au-delà de ce libellé suppose d’accepter que le législateur n’a pas choisi les bons mots pour donner effet à son intention, ce que nous ne ferons pas.

[62] Indeed, Parliament did not mindlessly reproduce s. 54(3) of the *BIA* in s. 22(3) of the *CCAA*. Rather, it made two modifications to the language of s. 54(3) to bring it into conformity with the language of the *CCAA*. First, it changed “proposal” (a defined term in the *BIA*) to “compromise or arrangement” (a term used throughout the *CCAA*). Second, it changed “debtor” to “company”, recognizing that companies are the only kind of debtor that exists in the *CCAA* context.

[63] Our view is further supported by Industry Canada’s explanation of the rationale for s. 22(3) as being to “reduce the ability of debtor companies to organize a restructuring plan that confers additional benefits to related parties” (Office of the Superintendent of Bankruptcy Canada, *Bill C-12: Clause by Clause Analysis* (online), cl. 71, s. 22 (emphasis added); see also Standing Senate Committee on Banking, Trade and Commerce, at p. 151).

[64] Finally, we note that the *CCAA* contains other mechanisms that attenuate the concern that a creditor with conflicting legal interests with respect to a plan it proposes may distort the creditors’ vote. Although we reject the appellants’ interpretation of s. 22(3), that section still bars creditors who are related to the debtor company from voting in favour of *any* plan. Additionally, creditors who do not share a sufficient commonality of interest may be forced to vote in separate classes (s. 22(1) and (2)), and, as we will explain, a supervising judge may bar a creditor from voting where the creditor is acting for an improper purpose.

(2) Discretion to Bar a Creditor From Voting in Furtherance of an Improper Purpose

[65] There is no dispute that the *CCAA* is silent on when a creditor who is otherwise entitled to vote on a plan can be barred from voting. However, *CCAA* supervising judges are often called upon “to sanction measures for which there is no explicit authority in the *CCAA*” (*Century Services*, at para. 61; see also para. 62). In *Century Services*, this Court endorsed

[62] En fait, le législateur n’a pas reproduit de façon irréfléchie, au par. 22(3) de la *LACC*, le texte du par. 54(3) de la *LFI*. Au contraire, il a apporté deux modifications au libellé du par. 54(3) pour l’adapter à celui employé dans la *LACC*. Premièrement, il a remplacé le terme « proposition » (défini dans la *LFI*) par les mots « transaction ou arrangement » (employés tout au long dans la *LACC*). Deuxièmement, il a remplacé « débiteur » par « compagnie », reconnaissant ainsi que les compagnies sont les seuls débiteurs qui existent dans le contexte de la *LACC*.

[63] Notre opinion est en outre appuyée par Industrie Canada, selon qui l’adoption du par. 22(3) se justifie par la volonté de « réduire la capacité des compagnies débitrices d’établir un plan de restructuration apportant des avantages supplémentaires à des personnes qui leur sont liées » (Bureau du surintendant des faillites Canada, *Projet de loi C-12 : analyse article par article* (en ligne), cl. 71, art. 22 (nous soulignons); voir aussi Comité sénatorial permanent des banques et du commerce, p. 166).

[64] Enfin, nous soulignons que la *LACC* prévoit d’autres mécanismes qui réduisent le risque qu’un créancier en situation de conflit d’intérêts par rapport au plan qu’il propose puisse biaiser le vote des créanciers. Bien que nous rejetions l’interprétation donnée par les appelantes au par. 22(3), ce paragraphe interdit tout de même aux créanciers liés à la compagnie débitrice de voter en faveur de *tout* plan. De plus, les créanciers qui n’ont pas suffisamment d’intérêts en commun pourraient être contraints de voter dans des catégories distinctes (par. 22(1) et (2)); et, comme nous l’expliquerons, le juge surveillant peut empêcher un créancier de voter si ce dernier agit dans un but illégitime.

(2) Le pouvoir discrétionnaire d’interdire à un créancier de voter dans un but illégitime

[65] Il est acquis aux débats que la *LACC* ne contient aucune disposition énonçant les circonstances dans lesquelles un créancier, autrement admissible à voter sur un plan, peut être empêché de le faire. Toutefois, les juges chargés d’appliquer la *LACC* sont souvent appelés à « sanctionner des mesures non expressément prévues par la *LACC* »

a “hierarchical” approach to determining whether jurisdiction exists to sanction a proposed measure: “. . . courts [must] rely first on an interpretation of the provisions of the CCAA text before turning to inherent or equitable jurisdiction to anchor measures taken in a CCAA proceeding” (para. 65). In most circumstances, a purposive and liberal interpretation of the provisions of the CCAA will be sufficient “to ground measures necessary to achieve its objectives” (para. 65).

[66] Applying this approach, we conclude that jurisdiction exists under s. 11 of the CCAA to bar a creditor from voting on a plan of arrangement or compromise where the creditor is acting for an improper purpose.

[67] Courts have long recognized that s. 11 of the CCAA signals legislative endorsement of the “broad reading of CCAA authority developed by the jurisprudence” (*Century Services*, at para. 68). Section 11 states:

General power of court

11 Despite anything in the *Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act* or the *Winding-up and Restructuring Act*, if an application is made under this Act in respect of a debtor company, the court, on the application of any person interested in the matter, may, subject to the restrictions set out in this Act, on notice to any other person or without notice as it may see fit, make any order that it considers appropriate in the circumstances.

On the plain wording of the provision, the jurisdiction granted by s. 11 is constrained only by restrictions set out in the CCAA itself, and the requirement that the order made be “appropriate in the circumstances”.

[68] Where a party seeks an order relating to a matter that falls within the supervising judge’s purview, and for which there is no CCAA provision conferring more specific jurisdiction, s. 11 necessarily is the

(*Century Services*, par. 61; voir aussi par. 62). Dans l’arrêt *Century Services*, notre Cour a souscrit à l’approche « hiérarchisée » qui vise à déterminer si le tribunal a compétence pour sanctionner une mesure proposée : « . . . les tribunaux procéderaient d’abord à une interprétation des dispositions de la LACC avant d’invoquer leur compétence inhérente ou leur compétence en equity pour justifier des mesures prises dans le cadre d’une procédure fondée sur la LACC » (par. 65). Dans la plupart des cas, une interprétation téléologique et large des dispositions de la LACC suffira à « justifier les mesures nécessaires à la réalisation de ses objectifs » (par. 65).

[66] Après avoir appliqué cette approche, nous concluons que l’art. 11 de la LACC confère au tribunal le pouvoir d’interdire à un créancier de voter sur un plan d’arrangement ou une transaction s’il agit dans un but illégitime.

[67] Les tribunaux reconnaissent depuis longtemps que le libellé de l’art. 11 de la LACC indique que le législateur a sanctionné « l’interprétation large du pouvoir conféré par la LACC qui a été élaborée par la jurisprudence » (*Century Services*, par. 68). L’article 11 est ainsi libellé :

Pouvoir général du tribunal

11 Malgré toute disposition de la *Loi sur la faillite et l’insolvabilité* ou de la *Loi sur les liquidations et les restructurations*, le tribunal peut, dans le cas de toute demande sous le régime de la présente loi à l’égard d’une compagnie débitrice, rendre, sur demande d’un intéressé, mais sous réserve des restrictions prévues par la présente loi et avec ou sans avis, toute ordonnance qu’il estime indiquée.

Selon le libellé clair de la disposition, le pouvoir conféré par l’art. 11 n’est limité que par les restrictions imposées par la LACC elle-même, ainsi que par l’exigence que l’ordonnance soit « indiquée » dans les circonstances.

[68] Lorsqu’une partie sollicite une ordonnance relativement à une question qui entre dans le champ de compétence du juge surveillant, mais pour laquelle aucune disposition de la LACC ne confère plus

provision of first resort in anchoring jurisdiction. As Blair J.A. put it in *Stelco*, s. 11 “for the most part supplants the need to resort to inherent jurisdiction” in the CCAA context (para. 36).

[69] Oversight of the plan negotiation, voting, and approval process falls squarely within the supervising judge’s purview. As indicated, there are no specific provisions in the CCAA which govern when a creditor who is otherwise eligible to vote on a plan may nonetheless be barred from voting. Nor is there any provision in the CCAA which suggests that a creditor has an absolute right to vote on a plan that cannot be displaced by a proper exercise of judicial discretion. However, given that the CCAA regime contemplates creditor participation in decision-making as an integral facet of the workout regime, creditors should only be barred from voting where the circumstances demand such an outcome. In other words, it is necessarily a discretionary, circumstance-specific inquiry.

[70] Thus, it is apparent that s. 11 serves as the source of the supervising judge’s jurisdiction to issue a discretionary order barring a creditor from voting on a plan of arrangement. The exercise of this discretion must further the remedial objectives of the CCAA and be guided by the baseline considerations of appropriateness, good faith, and due diligence. This means that, where a creditor is seeking to exercise its voting rights in a manner that frustrates, undermines, or runs counter to those objectives — that is, acting for an “improper purpose” — the supervising judge has the discretion to bar that creditor from voting.

[71] The discretion to bar a creditor from voting in furtherance of an improper purpose under the CCAA parallels the similar discretion that exists under the BIA, which was recognized in *Laserworks Computer Services Inc. (Bankruptcy), Re*, 1998 NSCA 42, 165 N.S.R. (2d) 296. In *Laserworks*, the Nova Scotia

précisément compétence, l’art. 11 est nécessairement la disposition à laquelle on peut recourir d’emblée pour fonder la compétence du tribunal. Comme l’a dit le juge Blair dans l’arrêt *Stelco*, l’art. 11 [TRA-DUCTION] « fait en sorte que la plupart du temps, il est inutile de recourir à la compétence inhérente » dans le contexte de la LACC (par. 36).

[69] La supervision des négociations entourant le plan, tout comme le vote et le processus d’approbation, relève nettement de la compétence du juge surveillant. Comme nous l’avons dit, aucune disposition de la LACC ne vise le cas où un créancier par ailleurs admissible à voter sur un plan peut néanmoins être empêché de le faire. Il n’existe non plus aucune disposition de la LACC selon laquelle le droit que possède un créancier de voter sur un plan est absolu et que ce droit ne peut pas être écarté par l’exercice légitime du pouvoir discrétionnaire du tribunal. Toutefois, étant donné le régime de la LACC, dont l’un des aspects essentiels tient à la participation du créancier au processus décisionnel, les créanciers ne devraient être empêchés de voter que si les circonstances l’exigent. Autrement dit, il faut nécessairement procéder à un examen discrétionnaire axé sur les circonstances propres à chaque situation.

[70] L’article 11 constitue donc manifestement la source de la compétence du juge surveillant pour rendre une ordonnance discrétionnaire empêchant un créancier de voter sur un plan d’arrangement. L’exercice du pouvoir discrétionnaire doit favoriser la réalisation des objets réparateurs de la LACC et être fondé sur les considérations de base que sont l’opportunité, la bonne foi et la diligence. Cela signifie que, lorsqu’un créancier cherche à exercer ses droits de vote de manière à contrecarrer, à miner ces objectifs ou à aller à l’encontre de ceux-ci — c’est-à-dire à agir dans un « but illégitime » — le juge surveillant a le pouvoir discrétionnaire d’empêcher le créancier de voter.

[71] Le pouvoir discrétionnaire d’empêcher un créancier de voter dans un but illégitime au sens de la LACC s’apparente au pouvoir discrétionnaire semblable qui existe en vertu de la LFI, lequel a été reconnu dans l’arrêt *Laserworks Computer Services Inc. (Bankruptcy), Re*, 1998 NSCA 42, 165 N.S.R.

Court of Appeal concluded that the discretion to bar a creditor from voting in this way stemmed from the court's power, inherent in the scheme of the *BIA*, to supervise “[e]ach step in the bankruptcy process” (at para. 41), as reflected in ss. 43(7), 108(3), and 187(9) of the Act. The court explained that s. 187(9) specifically grants the power to remedy a “substantial injustice”, which arises “when the *BIA* is used for an improper purpose” (para. 54). The court held that “[a]n improper purpose is any purpose collateral to the purpose for which the bankruptcy and insolvency legislation was enacted by Parliament” (para. 54).

[72] While not determinative, the existence of this discretion under the *BIA* lends support to the existence of similar discretion under the *CCAA* for two reasons.

[73] First, this conclusion would be consistent with this Court's recognition that the *CCAA* “offers a more flexible mechanism with greater judicial discretion” than the *BIA* (*Century Services*, at para. 14 (emphasis added)).

[74] Second, this Court has recognized the benefits of harmonizing the two statutes to the extent possible. For example, in *Indalex*, the Court observed that “in order to avoid a race to liquidation under the *BIA*, courts will favour an interpretation of the *CCAA* that affords creditors analogous entitlements” to those received under the *BIA* (para. 51; see also *Century Services*, at para. 24; *Nortel Networks Corp., Re*, 2015 ONCA 681, 391 D.L.R. (4th) 283, at paras. 34-46). Thus, where the statutes are capable of bearing a harmonious interpretation, that interpretation ought to be preferred “to avoid the ills that can arise from [insolvency] ‘statute-shopping’” (*Kitchener Frame Ltd.*, 2012 ONSC 234, 86 C.B.R. (5th) 274, at para. 78; see also para. 73). In our view, the articulation of “improper purpose” set out in *Laserworks* — that is, any purpose collateral to the purpose of insolvency legislation — is entirely harmonious with the nature and scope of judicial discretion afforded by the *CCAA*. Indeed, as we have explained, this

(2d) 296. Dans *Laserworks*, la Cour d'appel de la Nouvelle-Écosse a conclu que le pouvoir discrétionnaire d'empêcher un créancier de voter de cette façon découlait du pouvoir du tribunal, inhérent au régime établi par la *LFI*, de superviser [TRADUCTION] « [c]haque étape du processus de faillite » (par. 41), comme l'indiquent les par. 43(7), 108(3) et 187(9) de la Loi. La cour a expliqué que le par. 187(9) confère expressément le pouvoir de remédier à une « injustice grave », laquelle se produit « lorsque la *LFI* est utilisée dans un but illégitime » (par. 54). La cour a statué que « [l]e but illégitime est un but qui est accessoire à l'objet pour lequel la loi en matière de faillite et d'insolvabilité a été adoptée par le législateur » (par. 54).

[72] Bien qu'elle ne soit pas déterminante, l'existence de ce pouvoir discrétionnaire en vertu de la *LFI* étaye l'existence d'un pouvoir discrétionnaire semblable en vertu de la *LACC* pour deux raisons.

[73] D'abord, cette conclusion serait compatible avec le fait que la Cour a reconnu que la *LACC* « établit un mécanisme plus souple, dans lequel les tribunaux disposent d'un plus grand pouvoir discrétionnaire » que sous le régime de la *LFI* (*Century Services*, par. 14 (nous soulignons)).

[74] Ensuite, la Cour a reconnu les bienfaits de l'harmonisation, dans la mesure du possible, des deux lois. À titre d'exemple, dans l'arrêt *Indalex*, la Cour a souligné que « pour éviter de précipiter une liquidation sous le régime de la *LFI*, les tribunaux privilégieront une interprétation de la *LACC* qui confère [. . .] aux créanciers [des droits analogues] » à ceux dont ils jouissent en vertu de la *LFI* (par. 51; voir également *Century Services*, par. 24; *Nortel Networks Corp., Re*, 2015 ONCA 681, 391 D.L.R. (4th) 283, par. 34-46). Ainsi, lorsque les lois permettent une interprétation harmonieuse, il y a lieu de retenir cette interprétation [TRADUCTION] « afin d'écarter les embûches pouvant découler du choix des créanciers de “recourir à la loi la plus favorable” [en matière d'insolvabilité] » (*Kitchener Frame Ltd.*, 2012 ONSC 234, 86 C.B.R. (5th) 274, par. 78; voir aussi par. 73). À notre avis, la manière dont a été formulé le « but illégitime » dans l'arrêt *Laserworks* — c'est-à-dire un but accessoire à l'objet de la loi en

discretion is to be exercised in accordance with the CCAA's objectives as an insolvency statute.

[75] We also observe that the recognition of this discretion under the CCAA advances the basic fairness that “permeates Canadian insolvency law and practice” (Sarra, “The Oscillating Pendulum: Canada’s Sesquicentennial and Finding the Equilibrium for Insolvency Law”, at p. 27; see also *Century Services*, at paras. 70 and 77). As Professor Sarra observes, fairness demands that supervising judges be in a position to recognize and meaningfully address circumstances in which parties are working against the goals of the statute:

The Canadian insolvency regime is based on the assumption that creditors and the debtor share a common goal of maximizing recoveries. The substantive aspect of fairness in the insolvency regime is based on the assumption that all involved parties face real economic risks. Unfairness resides where only some face these risks, while others actually benefit from the situation . . . If the CCAA is to be interpreted in a purposive way, the courts must be able to recognize when people have conflicting interests and are working actively against the goals of the statute. [Emphasis added.]

(“The Oscillating Pendulum: Canada’s Sesquicentennial and Finding the Equilibrium for Insolvency Law”, at p. 30)

In this vein, the supervising judge’s oversight of the CCAA voting regime must not only ensure strict compliance with the Act, but should further its goals as well. We are of the view that the policy objectives of the CCAA necessitate the recognition of the discretion to bar a creditor from voting where the creditor is acting for an improper purpose.

matière d’insolvabilité — s’harmonise parfaitement avec la nature et la portée du pouvoir discrétionnaire judiciaire que confère la LACC. En effet, comme nous l’avons expliqué, ce pouvoir discrétionnaire doit être exercé conformément aux objets de la LACC en tant que loi en matière d’insolvabilité.

[75] Nous soulignons également que la reconnaissance de l’existence de ce pouvoir discrétionnaire sous le régime de la LACC favorise l’équité fondamentale qui [TRADUCTION] « imprègne le droit et la pratique en matière d’insolvabilité au Canada » (Sarra, « The Oscillating Pendulum : Canada’s Sesquicentennial and Finding the Equilibrium for Insolvency Law », p. 27; voir également *Century Services*, par. 70 et 77). Comme le fait observer la professeure Sarra, l’équité commande que les juges surveillants soient en mesure de reconnaître les situations où les parties empêchent la réalisation des objectifs de la loi et de prendre des mesures utiles à leur égard :

[TRADUCTION] Le régime d’insolvabilité canadien repose sur la présomption que les créanciers et le débiteur ont pour objectif commun de maximiser les recouvrements. L’aspect substantiel de la justice dans le régime d’insolvabilité repose sur la présomption que toutes les parties concernées sont exposées à de réels risques économiques. L’injustice réside dans les situations où seules certaines personnes sont exposées aux risques, tandis que d’autres tirent en fait avantage de la situation. [. . .] Si l’on veut que la LACC reçoive une interprétation téléologique, les tribunaux doivent être en mesure de reconnaître les situations où les gens ont des intérêts opposés et s’emploient activement à contrecarrer les objectifs de la loi. [Nous soulignons.]

(« The Oscillating Pendulum : Canada’s Sesquicentennial and Finding the Equilibrium for Insolvency Law », p. 30)

Dans le même ordre d’idées, la surveillance du régime de droit de vote prévu par la LACC qu’exerce le juge surveillant ne doit pas seulement assurer une application stricte de la Loi, mais doit aussi favoriser la réalisation de ses objectifs. Nous estimons que la réalisation des objectifs de politique de la LACC nécessite la reconnaissance du pouvoir discrétionnaire d’empêcher un créancier de voter s’il agit dans un but illégitime.

[76] Whether this discretion ought to be exercised in a particular case is a circumstance-specific inquiry that must balance the various objectives of the CCAA. As this case demonstrates, the supervising judge is best-positioned to undertake this inquiry.

(3) The Supervising Judge Did Not Err in Prohibiting Callidus From Voting

[77] In our view, the supervising judge's decision to bar Callidus from voting on the New Plan discloses no error justifying appellate intervention. As we have explained, discretionary decisions like this one must be approached from the appropriate posture of deference. It bears mentioning that, when he made this decision, the supervising judge was intimately familiar with Bluberi's CCAA proceedings. He had presided over them for over 2 years, received 15 reports from the Monitor, and issued approximately 25 orders.

[78] The supervising judge considered the whole of the circumstances and concluded that Callidus's vote would serve an improper purpose (paras. 45 and 48). We agree with his determination. He was aware that, prior to the vote on the First Plan, Callidus had chosen not to value *any* of its claim as unsecured and later declined to vote at all — despite the Monitor explicitly inviting it to do so.⁴ The supervising judge was also aware that Callidus's First Plan had failed to receive the other creditors' approval at the creditors' meeting of December 15, 2017, and that Callidus had chosen not to take the opportunity to amend or increase the value of its plan at that time, which it was entitled to do (see CCAA, ss. 6 and 7; Monitor, I.F., at para. 17). Between the failure of the First Plan and the proposal of the New Plan — which was identical to the First Plan, save for a modest increase of \$250,000 — none of the factual circumstances relating to Bluberi's financial or business

⁴ It bears noting that the Monitor's statement in this regard did not decide whether Callidus would ultimately have been entitled to vote on the First Plan. Because Callidus did not even attempt to vote on the First Plan, this question was never put to the supervising judge.

[76] La question de savoir s'il y a lieu d'exercer le pouvoir discrétionnaire dans une situation donnée appelle une analyse fondée sur les circonstances propres à chaque situation qui doit mettre en balance les divers objectifs de la LACC. Comme le démontre le présent dossier, le juge surveillant est le mieux placé pour procéder à cette analyse.

(3) Le juge surveillant n'a pas commis d'erreur en interdisant à Callidus de voter

[77] À notre avis, la décision du juge surveillant d'empêcher Callidus de voter sur le nouveau plan ne révèle aucune erreur justifiant l'intervention d'une cour d'appel. Comme nous l'avons expliqué, il faut adopter l'attitude de déférence appropriée à l'égard des décisions discrétionnaires de ce genre. Il convient de mentionner que, lorsqu'il a rendu sa décision, le juge surveillant connaissait très bien les procédures fondées sur la LACC relatives à Bluberi. Il les avait présidées pendant plus de 2 ans, avait reçu 15 rapports du contrôleur et avait délivré environ 25 ordonnances.

[78] Le juge surveillant a tenu compte de l'ensemble des circonstances et a conclu que le vote de Callidus viserait un but illégitime (par. 45 et 48). Nous sommes d'accord avec cette conclusion. Il savait qu'avant le vote sur le premier plan, Callidus avait choisi de n'évaluer *aucune partie* de sa réclamation à titre de créancier non garanti et s'était par la suite abstenue de voter — bien que le contrôleur l'ait expressément invité à le faire⁴. Le juge surveillant savait aussi que le premier plan de Callidus n'avait pas reçu l'aval des autres créanciers à l'assemblée des créanciers tenue le 15 décembre 2017, et que Callidus avait choisi de ne pas profiter de l'occasion pour modifier ou augmenter la valeur de son plan à ce moment-là, ce qu'elle était en droit de faire (voir LACC, art. 6 et 7; contrôleur, m.i., par. 17). Entre l'insuccès du premier plan et la proposition du nouveau plan — qui était identique au premier plan, hormis la modeste augmentation de 250 000 \$ — les

⁴ Il convient de souligner que la déclaration du contrôleur à cet égard ne permettait pas de décider si Callidus aurait finalement eu le droit de voter sur le premier plan. Comme Callidus n'a même pas essayé de voter sur le premier plan, cette question n'a jamais été soumise au juge surveillant.

affairs had materially changed. However, Callidus sought to value the *entirety* of its security at *nil* and, on that basis, sought leave to vote on the New Plan as an unsecured creditor. If Callidus were permitted to vote in this way, the New Plan would certainly have met the s. 6(1) threshold for approval. In these circumstances, the inescapable inference was that Callidus was attempting to strategically value its security to acquire control over the outcome of the vote and thereby circumvent the creditor democracy the CCAA protects. Put simply, Callidus was seeking to take a “second kick at the can” and manipulate the vote on the New Plan. The supervising judge made no error in exercising his discretion to prevent Callidus from doing so.

[79] Indeed, as the Monitor observes, “[o]nce a plan of arrangement or proposal has been submitted to the creditors of a debtor for voting purposes, to order a second creditors’ meeting to vote on a substantially similar plan would not advance the policy objectives of the CCAA, nor would it serve and enhance the public’s confidence in the process or otherwise serve the ends of justice” (I.F., at para. 18). This is particularly the case given that the cost of having another meeting to vote on the New Plan would have been upwards of \$200,000 (see supervising judge’s reasons, at para. 72).

[80] We add that Callidus’s course of action was plainly contrary to the expectation that parties act with due diligence in an insolvency proceeding — which, in our view, includes acting with due diligence in valuing their claims and security. At all material times, Bluberi’s Retained Claims have been the sole asset securing Callidus’s claim. Callidus has pointed to nothing in the record that indicates that the value of the Retained Claims has changed. Had Callidus been of the view that the Retained Claims had no value, one would have expected Callidus to have valued its security accordingly prior to the vote on the First Plan, if not earlier. Parenthetically, we note that, irrespective of the timing, an attempt at

circonstances factuelles se rapportant aux affaires financières ou commerciales de Bluberi n’avaient pas réellement changé. Pourtant, Callidus a tenté d’évaluer la *totalité* de sa sûreté à *zéro* et, sur cette base, a demandé l’autorisation de voter sur le nouveau plan à titre de créancier non garanti. Si Callidus avait été autorisée à voter de cette façon, le nouveau plan aurait certainement satisfait au critère d’approbation prévu par le par. 6(1). Dans ces circonstances, la seule conclusion possible était que Callidus tentait d’évaluer stratégiquement la valeur de sa sûreté afin de prendre le contrôle du vote et ainsi contourner la démocratie entre les créanciers que défend la LACC. En termes simples, Callidus cherchait à « se donner une seconde chance » et à manipuler le vote sur le nouveau plan. Le juge surveillant n’a pas commis d’erreur en exerçant son pouvoir discrétionnaire pour empêcher Callidus de le faire.

[79] En effet, comme le fait observer le contrôleur, [TRADUCTION] « [u]ne fois que le plan d’arrangement ou la proposition ont été présentés aux créanciers du débiteur aux fins d’un vote, le fait d’ordonner la tenue d’une seconde assemblée des créanciers pour voter sur un plan à peu près semblable ne favoriserait pas la réalisation des objectifs de politique de la LACC, pas plus qu’il ne servirait ou n’accroîtrait la confiance du public dans le processus ou ne servirait par ailleurs les fins de la justice » (m.i., par. 18). C’est particulièrement le cas en l’espèce étant donné que la tenue d’une autre assemblée pour voter sur le nouveau plan aurait coûté plus de 200 000 \$ (voir les motifs du juge surveillant, par. 72).

[80] Ajoutons que la façon d’agir de Callidus était manifestement contraire à l’attente selon laquelle les parties agissent avec diligence dans les procédures d’insolvabilité — ce qui, à notre avis, comprend le fait de faire preuve de diligence raisonnable dans l’évaluation de leurs réclamations et sûretés. Pendant toute la période pertinente, les réclamations retenues de Bluberi ont constitué les seuls éléments d’actif garantissant la réclamation de Callidus. Cette dernière n’a rien relevé dans le dossier qui indique que la valeur des réclamations retenues a changé. Si Callidus estimait que les réclamations retenues n’avaient aucune valeur, on se serait attendu à ce qu’elle ait évalué sa sûreté en conséquence avant

such a valuation may well have failed. This would have prevented Callidus from voting as an unsecured creditor, even in the absence of Callidus's improper purpose.

[81] As we have indicated, discretionary decisions attract a highly deferential standard of review. Deference demands that review of a discretionary decision begin with a proper characterization of the basis for the decision. Respectfully, the Court of Appeal failed in this regard. The Court of Appeal seized on the supervising judge's somewhat critical comments relating to Callidus's goal of being released from the Retained Claims and its conduct throughout the proceedings as being incapable of grounding a finding of improper purpose. However, as we have explained, these considerations did not drive the supervising judge's conclusion. His conclusion was squarely based on Callidus' attempt to manipulate the creditors' vote to ensure that its New Plan would succeed where its First Plan had failed (see supervising judge's reasons, at paras. 45-48). We see nothing in the Court of Appeal's reasons that grapples with this decisive impropriety, which goes far beyond a creditor merely acting in its own self-interest.

[82] In sum, we see nothing in the supervising judge's reasons on this point that would justify appellate intervention. Callidus was properly barred from voting on the New Plan.

[83] Before moving on, we note that the Court of Appeal addressed two further issues: whether Callidus is "related" to Bluberi within the meaning of s. 22(3) of the *CCAA*; and whether, if permitted to vote, Callidus should be ordered to vote in a separate class from Bluberi's other creditors (see *CCAA*, s. 22(1) and (2)). Given our conclusion that the supervising judge did not err in barring Callidus from voting on the New Plan on the basis that Callidus was acting for an improper purpose, it is unnecessary to

le vote sur le premier plan, voire même plus tôt. Nous ouvrons une parenthèse pour souligner que, peu importe le moment, la tentative d'évaluer ainsi la sûreté aurait pu fort bien échouer. Cela aurait empêché Callidus de voter à titre de créancier non garanti même si elle ne poursuivait pas de but illégitime.

[81] Comme nous l'avons indiqué, les décisions discrétionnaires appellent une norme de contrôle empreinte d'une grande déférence. La déférence commande que l'examen d'une décision discrétionnaire commence par la qualification appropriée du fondement de la décision. Soit dit en tout respect, la Cour d'appel a échoué à cet égard. La Cour d'appel s'est saisie des commentaires quelque peu critiques formulés par le juge surveillant à l'égard de l'objectif de Callidus d'être libérée des réclamations retenues et de la conduite de celle-ci tout au long des procédures pour affirmer qu'il ne s'agissait pas de considérations pouvant donner lieu à une conclusion de but illégitime. Toutefois, comme nous l'avons expliqué, ce ne sont pas ces considérations qui ont amené le juge surveillant à tirer sa conclusion. Sa conclusion reposait nettement sur la tentative de Callidus de manipuler le vote des créanciers pour faire en sorte que son nouveau plan soit retenu alors que son premier plan ne l'avait pas été (voir les motifs du juge surveillant, par. 45-48). Nous ne voyons rien dans les motifs de la Cour d'appel qui s'attaque à cette irrégularité déterminante, qui va beaucoup plus loin que le simple fait pour un créancier d'agir dans son propre intérêt.

[82] En résumé, nous ne voyons rien dans les motifs du juge surveillant sur ce point qui justifie l'intervention d'une cour d'appel. Callidus a été à juste titre empêchée de voter sur le nouveau plan.

[83] Avant de passer au prochain point, soulignons que la Cour d'appel a abordé deux questions supplémentaires : Callidus est-elle « liée » à Bluberi au sens du par. 22(3) de la *LACC*? Si Callidus est autorisée à voter, convient-il de lui ordonner de voter dans une catégorie distincte des autres créanciers de Bluberi (voir la *LACC*, par. 22(1) et (2))? Vu notre conclusion que le juge surveillant n'a pas commis d'erreur en interdisant à Callidus de voter sur le nouveau plan au motif qu'elle avait agi dans un but illégitime, il n'est

address either of these issues. However, nothing in our reasons should be read as endorsing the Court of Appeal’s analysis of them.

C. Bluberi’s LFA Should Be Approved as Interim Financing

[84] In our view, the supervising judge made no error in approving the LFA as interim financing pursuant to s. 11.2 of the *CCAA*. Interim financing is a flexible tool that may take on a range of forms. As we will explain, third party litigation funding may be one such form. Whether third party litigation funding should be approved as interim financing is a case-specific inquiry that should have regard to the text of s. 11.2 and the remedial objectives of the *CCAA* more generally.

(1) Interim Financing and Section 11.2 of the *CCAA*

[85] Interim financing, despite being expressly provided for in s. 11.2 of the *CCAA*, is not defined in the Act. Professor Sarra has described it as “refer[ring] primarily to the working capital that the debtor corporation requires in order to keep operating during restructuring proceedings, as well as to the financing to pay the costs of the workout process” (*Rescue! The Companies’ Creditors Arrangement Act*, at p. 197). Interim financing used in this way — sometimes referred to as “debtor-in-possession” financing — protects the going-concern value of the debtor company while it develops a workable solution to its insolvency issues (p. 197; *Royal Oak Mines Inc., Re* (1999), 6 C.B.R. (4th) 314 (Ont. C.J. (Gen. Div.)), at paras. 7, 9 and 24; *Boutiques San Francisco Inc. v. Richter & Associés Inc.*, 2003 CanLII 36955 (Que. Sup. Ct.), at para. 32). That said, interim financing is not limited to providing debtor companies with immediate operating capital. Consistent with the remedial objectives of the *CCAA*, interim financing

pas nécessaire de se prononcer sur l’une ou l’autre de ces questions. Cependant, rien dans les présents motifs ne doit être interprété comme souscrivant à l’analyse que la Cour d’appel a faite de ces questions.

C. L’AFL de Bluberi devrait être approuvé à titre de financement temporaire

[84] À notre avis, le juge surveillant n’a commis aucune erreur en approuvant l’AFL à titre de financement temporaire en vertu de l’art. 11.2 de la *LACC*. Le financement temporaire est un outil souple qui peut revêtir différentes formes. Comme nous l’expliquerons, le financement d’un litige par un tiers peut constituer l’une de ces formes. La question de savoir s’il y a lieu d’approuver le financement d’un litige par un tiers à titre de financement temporaire commande une analyse fondée sur les faits de l’espèce qui doit tenir compte du libellé de l’art. 11.2 et des objectifs réparateurs de la *LACC* de façon plus générale.

(1) Le financement temporaire et l’art. 11.2 de la *LACC*

[85] Bien qu’il soit expressément prévu par l’art. 11.2 de la *LACC*, le financement temporaire n’est pas défini dans la Loi. La professeure Sarra l’a décrit comme [TRADUCTION] « vis[ant] principalement le fonds de roulement dont a besoin la société débitrice pour continuer de fonctionner pendant la restructuration ainsi que les fonds nécessaires pour payer les frais liés au processus de sauvetage » (*Rescue! The Companies’ Creditors Arrangement Act*, p. 197). Utilisé de cette façon, le financement temporaire — parfois appelé financement de [TRADUCTION] « débiteur-exploitant » — protège la valeur d’exploitation de la compagnie débitrice pendant qu’elle met au point une solution viable à ses problèmes d’insolvabilité (p. 197; *Royal Oak Mines Inc., Re* (1999), 6 C.B.R. (4th) 314 (C.J. Ont. (Div. gén.)), par. 7, 9 et 24; *Boutiques San Francisco Inc. c. Richter & Associés Inc.*, 2003 CanLII 36955 (C.S. Qc), par. 32). Cela dit, le financement temporaire ne se limite pas à fournir un fonds de roulement

at its core enables the preservation and realization of the value of a debtor's assets.

[86] Since 2009, s. 11.2(1) of the CCAA has codified a supervising judge's discretion to approve interim financing, and to grant a corresponding security or charge in favour of the lender in the amount the judge considers appropriate:

Interim financing

11.2 (1) On application by a debtor company and on notice to the secured creditors who are likely to be affected by the security or charge, a court may make an order declaring that all or part of the company's property is subject to a security or charge — in an amount that the court considers appropriate — in favour of a person specified in the order who agrees to lend to the company an amount approved by the court as being required by the company, having regard to its cash-flow statement. The security or charge may not secure an obligation that exists before the order is made.

[87] The breadth of a supervising judge's discretion to approve interim financing is apparent from the wording of s. 11.2(1). Aside from the protections regarding notice and pre-filing security, s. 11.2(1) does not mandate any standard form or terms.⁵ It simply provides that the financing must be in an amount that is "appropriate" and "required by the company, having regard to its cash-flow statement".

⁵ A further exception has been codified in the 2019 amendments to the CCAA, which create s. 11.2(5) (see *Budget Implementation Act, 2019, No. 1*, s. 138). This section provides that at the time an initial order is sought, "no order shall be made under subsection [11.2](1) unless the court is also satisfied that the terms of the loan are limited to what is reasonably necessary for the continued operations of the debtor company in the ordinary course of business during that period". This provision does not apply in this case, and the parties have not relied on it. However, it may be that it restricts the ability of supervising judges to approve LFAs as interim financing at the time of granting an Initial Order.

immédiat aux compagnies débitrices. Conformément aux objectifs réparateurs de la LACC, le financement temporaire permet essentiellement de préserver et de réaliser la valeur des éléments d'actif du débiteur.

[86] Depuis 2009, le par. 11.2(1) de la LACC a codifié le pouvoir discrétionnaire du juge surveillant d'approuver le financement temporaire et d'accorder une charge ou une sûreté correspondante, d'un montant qu'il estime indiqué, en faveur du prêteur :

Financement temporaire

11.2 (1) Sur demande de la compagnie débitrice, le tribunal peut par ordonnance, sur préavis de la demande aux créanciers garantis qui seront vraisemblablement touchés par la charge ou sûreté, déclarer que tout ou partie des biens de la compagnie sont grevés d'une charge ou sûreté — d'un montant qu'il estime indiqué — en faveur de la personne nommée dans l'ordonnance qui accepte de prêter à la compagnie la somme qu'il approuve compte tenu de l'état de l'évolution de l'encaisse et des besoins de celle-ci. La charge ou sûreté ne peut garantir qu'une obligation postérieure au prononcé de l'ordonnance.

[87] L'étendue du pouvoir discrétionnaire du juge surveillant d'approuver le financement temporaire ressort du libellé du par. 11.2(1). Abstraction faite des protections concernant le préavis et les sûretés constituées avant le dépôt des procédures, le par. 11.2(1) ne prescrit aucune forme ou condition type⁵. Il prévoit simplement que le financement doit être d'un montant qui est « indiqué » et qui tient compte de « l'état de l'évolution de l'encaisse et des besoins de [la compagnie] ».

⁵ Une autre exception a été codifiée dans les modifications apportées en 2019 à la LACC qui créent le par. 11.2(5) (voir *Loi n° 1 d'exécution du budget de 2019*, art. 138). Cet article prévoit que, lorsqu'une ordonnance relative à la demande initiale a été demandée, « le tribunal ne rend l'ordonnance visée au paragraphe [11.2](1) que s'il est également convaincu que les modalités du financement temporaire demandé sont limitées à ce qui est normalement nécessaire à la continuation de l'exploitation de la compagnie débitrice dans le cours ordinaire de ses affaires durant cette période ». Cette disposition ne s'applique pas en l'espèce, et les parties ne l'ont pas invoquée. Toutefois, il se peut qu'elle ait pour effet d'empêcher les juges surveillants d'approuver des AFL à titre de financement temporaire au moment où l'ordonnance relative à la demande initiale est rendue.

[88] The supervising judge may also grant the lender a “super-priority charge” that will rank in priority over the claims of any secured creditors, pursuant to s. 11.2(2):

Priority — secured creditors

(2) The court may order that the security or charge rank in priority over the claim of any secured creditor of the company.

[89] Such charges, also known as “priming liens”, reduce lenders’ risks, thereby incentivizing them to assist insolvent companies (Innovation, Science and Economic Development Canada, *Archived — Bill C-55: clause by clause analysis*, last updated December 29, 2016 (online), cl. 128, s. 11.2; Wood, at p. 387). As a practical matter, these charges are often the only way to encourage this lending. Normally, a lender protects itself against lending risk by taking a security interest in the borrower’s assets. However, debtor companies under CCAA protection will often have pledged all or substantially all of their assets to other creditors. Accordingly, without the benefit of a super-priority charge, an interim financing lender would rank behind those other creditors (McElcheran, at pp. 298-99). Although super-priority charges do subordinate secured creditors’ security positions to the interim financing lender’s — a result that was controversial at common law — Parliament has indicated its general acceptance of the trade-offs associated with these charges by enacting s. 11.2(2) (see M. B. Rotsztain and A. Dostal, “Debtor-In-Possession Financing”, in S. Ben-Ishai and A. Duggan, eds., *Canadian Bankruptcy and Insolvency Law: Bill C-55, Statute c. 47 and Beyond* (2007), 227, at pp. 228-29 and 240-50). Indeed, this balance was expressly considered by the Standing Senate Committee on Banking, Trade and Commerce that recommended codifying interim financing in the CCAA (pp. 100-104).

[90] Ultimately, whether proposed interim financing should be approved is a question that the supervising judge is best-placed to answer. The CCAA

[88] Le juge surveillant peut également accorder au prêteur une « charge super prioritaire » qui aura priorité sur toute réclamation des créanciers garantis, en vertu du par. 11.2(2) :

Priorité — créanciers garantis

(2) Le tribunal peut préciser, dans l’ordonnance, que la charge ou sûreté a priorité sur toute réclamation des créanciers garantis de la compagnie.

[89] Ces charges, également appelées « superprivilèges », réduisent les risques des prêteurs, les incitant ainsi à aider les compagnies insolvable (Innovation, Sciences et Développement économique Canada, *Archivé — Projet de loi C-55 : analyse article par article*, dernière mise à jour le 29 décembre 2016 (en ligne), cl. 128, art. 11.2; Wood, p. 387). Sur le plan pratique, ces charges constituent souvent le seul moyen d’encourager ce type de prêt. Généralement, le prêteur se protège contre le risque de crédit en prenant une sûreté sur les éléments d’actifs de l’emprunteur. Or, les compagnies débitrices qui sont sous la protection de la LACC ont souvent donné en gage la totalité ou la presque totalité de leurs actifs à d’autres créanciers. En l’absence d’une charge super prioritaire, le prêteur qui accepte d’apporter un financement temporaire prendrait rang derrière les autres créanciers (McElcheran, p. 298-299). Bien que la charge super prioritaire subordonne les sûretés des créanciers garantis à celle du prêteur qui apporte un financement temporaire — un résultat qui a suscité la controverse en common law — le législateur a signifié son acceptation générale des transactions allant de pair avec ces charges en adoptant le par. 11.2(2) (voir M. B. Rotsztain et A. Dostal, « Debtor-In-Possession Financing », dans S. Ben-Ishai et A. Duggan, dir., *Canadian Bankruptcy and Insolvency Law : Bill C-55, Statute c. 47 and Beyond* (2007), 227, p. 228-229 et 240-250). En effet, cet équilibre a été expressément pris en considération par le Comité sénatorial permanent des banques et du commerce, qui a recommandé la codification du financement temporaire dans la LACC (p. 111-115).

[90] Au bout du compte, la question de savoir s’il y a lieu d’approuver le financement temporaire projeté est une question à laquelle le juge surveillant est le

sets out a number of factors that help guide the exercise of this discretion. The inclusion of these factors in s. 11.2 was informed by the Standing Senate Committee on Banking, Trade and Commerce's view that they would help meet the "fundamental principles" that have guided the development of Canadian insolvency law, including "fairness, predictability and efficiency" (p. 103; see also Innovation, Science and Economic Development Canada, cl. 128, s. 11.2). In deciding whether to grant interim financing, the supervising judge is to consider the following non-exhaustive list of factors:

Factors to be considered

(4) In deciding whether to make an order, the court is to consider, among other things,

- (a) the period during which the company is expected to be subject to proceedings under this Act;
- (b) how the company's business and financial affairs are to be managed during the proceedings;
- (c) whether the company's management has the confidence of its major creditors;
- (d) whether the loan would enhance the prospects of a viable compromise or arrangement being made in respect of the company;
- (e) the nature and value of the company's property;
- (f) whether any creditor would be materially prejudiced as a result of the security or charge; and
- (g) the monitor's report referred to in paragraph 23(1)(b), if any.

(CCAA, s. 11.2(4))

[91] Prior to the coming into force of the above provisions in 2009, courts had been using the general discretion conferred by s. 11 to authorize interim financing and associated super-priority charges

mieux placé pour répondre. La LACC énonce un certain nombre de facteurs qui encadrent l'exercice de ce pouvoir discrétionnaire. L'inclusion de ces facteurs dans le par. 11.2 reposait sur le point de vue du Comité sénatorial permanent des banques et du commerce selon lequel ils permettraient de respecter les « principes fondamentaux » ayant guidé la conception des lois en matière d'insolvabilité au Canada, notamment « l'équité, la prévisibilité et l'efficience » (p. 115; voir également Innovation, Sciences et Développement économique Canada, cl. 128, art. 11.2). Pour décider s'il y a lieu d'accorder le financement temporaire, le juge surveillant doit prendre en considération les facteurs non exhaustifs suivants :

Facteurs à prendre en considération

(4) Pour décider s'il rend l'ordonnance, le tribunal prend en considération, entre autres, les facteurs suivants :

- a) la durée prévue des procédures intentées à l'égard de la compagnie sous le régime de la présente loi;
- b) la façon dont les affaires financières et autres de la compagnie seront gérées au cours de ces procédures;
- c) la question de savoir si ses dirigeants ont la confiance de ses créanciers les plus importants;
- d) la question de savoir si le prêt favorisera la conclusion d'une transaction ou d'un arrangement viable à l'égard de la compagnie;
- e) la nature et la valeur des biens de la compagnie;
- f) la question de savoir si la charge ou sûreté causera un préjudice sérieux à l'un ou l'autre des créanciers de la compagnie;
- g) le rapport du contrôleur visé à l'alinéa 23(1)b).

(LACC, par. 11.2(4))

[91] Avant l'entrée en vigueur en 2009 des dispositions susmentionnées, les tribunaux utilisaient le pouvoir discrétionnaire général que confère l'art. 11 pour autoriser le financement temporaire

(*Century Services*, at para. 62). Section 11.2 largely codifies the approaches those courts have taken (Wood, at p. 388; McElcheran, at p. 301). As a result, where appropriate, guidance may be drawn from the pre-codification interim financing jurisprudence.

[92] As with other measures available under the CCAA, interim financing is a flexible tool that may take different forms or attract different considerations in each case. Below, we explain that third party litigation funding may, in appropriate cases, be one such form.

(2) Supervising Judges May Approve Third Party Litigation Funding as Interim Financing

[93] Third party litigation funding generally involves “a third party, otherwise unconnected to the litigation, agree[ing] to pay some or all of a party’s litigation costs, in exchange for a portion of that party’s recovery in damages or costs” (R. K. Agarwal and D. Fenton, “Beyond Access to Justice: Litigation Funding Agreements Outside the Class Actions Context” (2017), 59 *Can. Bus. L.J.* 65, at p. 65). Third party litigation funding can take various forms. A common model involves the litigation funder agreeing to pay a plaintiff’s disbursements and indemnify the plaintiff in the event of an adverse cost award in exchange for a share of the proceeds of any successful litigation or settlement (see *Dugal v. Manulife Financial Corp.*, 2011 ONSC 1785, 105 O.R. (3d) 364; *Bayens*).

[94] Outside of the CCAA context, the approval of third party litigation funding agreements has been somewhat controversial. Part of that controversy arises from the potential of these agreements to offend the common law doctrines of champerty and

et la constitution des charges super prioritaires s’y rattachant (*Century Services*, par. 62). L’article 11.2 codifie en grande partie les approches adoptées par ces tribunaux (Wood, p. 388; McElcheran, p. 301). En conséquence, il est possible, le cas échéant, de s’inspirer de la jurisprudence relative au financement temporaire antérieure à la codification.

[92] Comme c’est le cas pour les autres mesures susceptibles d’être prises sous le régime de la LACC, le financement temporaire est un outil souple qui peut revêtir différentes formes ou faire intervenir différentes considérations dans chaque cas. Comme nous l’expliquerons plus loin, le financement d’un litige par un tiers peut, dans les cas qui s’y prêtent, constituer l’une de ces formes.

(2) Les juges surveillants peuvent approuver le financement d’un litige par un tiers à titre de financement temporaire

[93] Le financement d’un litige par un tiers met généralement en cause [TRANSLATION] « un tiers, n’ayant par ailleurs aucun lien avec le litige, [qui] accepte de payer une partie ou la totalité des frais de litige d’une partie, en échange d’une portion de la somme recouvrée par cette partie au titre des dommages-intérêts ou des dépens » (R. K. Agarwal et D. Fenton, « Beyond Access to Justice : Litigation Funding Agreements Outside the Class Actions Context » (2017), 59 *Rev. can. dr. comm.* 65, p. 65). Le financement d’un litige par un tiers peut revêtir diverses formes. Un modèle courant met en cause un bailleur de fonds de litiges qui s’engage à payer les débours du demandeur et à indemniser ce dernier dans l’éventualité d’une adjudication des dépens défavorable, en échange d’une partie de la somme obtenue dans le cadre d’un procès ou d’un règlement couronné de succès (voir *Dugal c. Manulife Financial Corp.*, 2011 ONSC 1785, 105 O.R. (3d) 364; *Bayens*).

[94] En dehors du cadre de la LACC, l’approbation des accords de financement d’un litige par un tiers a été quelque peu controversée. Une partie de cette controverse découle de la possibilité que ces accords portent atteinte aux doctrines de common

maintenance.⁶ The tort of maintenance prohibits “officious intermeddling with a lawsuit which in no way belongs to one” (L. N. Klar et al., *Remedies in Tort* (loose-leaf), vol. 1, by L. Berry, ed., at p. 14-11, citing *Langtry v. Dumoulin* (1884), 7 O.R. 644 (Ch. Div.), at p. 661). Champerty is a species of maintenance that involves an agreement to share in the proceeds or otherwise profit from a successful suit (*McIntyre Estate v. Ontario (Attorney General)* (2002), 218 D.L.R. (4th) 193 (Ont. C.A.), at para. 26).

[95] Building on jurisprudence holding that *contingency fee* arrangements are not champertous where they are not motivated by an improper purpose (e.g., *McIntyre Estate*), lower courts have increasingly come to recognize that *litigation funding* agreements are also not *per se* champertous. This development has been focussed within class action proceedings, where it arose as a response to barriers like adverse cost awards, which were stymieing litigants’ access to justice (see *Dugal*, at para. 33; *Marcotte v. Banque de Montréal*, 2015 QCCS 1915, at paras. 43-44 (CanLII); *Houle v. St. Jude Medical Inc.*, 2017 ONSC 5129, 9 C.P.C. (8th) 321, at para. 52, aff’d 2018 ONSC 6352, 429 D.L.R. (4th) 739 (Div. Ct.); see also *Stanway v. Wyeth*, 2013 BCSC 1585, 56 B.C.L.R. (5th) 192, at para. 13). The jurisprudence on the approval of third party litigation funding agreements in the class action context — and indeed, the parameters of their legality generally — is still evolving, and no party before this Court has invited us to evaluate it.

⁶ The extent of this controversy varies by province. In Ontario, champertous agreements are forbidden by statute (see *An Act respecting Champerty*, R.S.O. 1897, c. 327). In Quebec, concerns associated with champerty and maintenance do not arise as acutely because champerty and maintenance are not part of the law as such (see *Montgrain v. Banque nationale du Canada*, 2006 QCCA 557, [2006] R.J.Q. 1009; G. Michaud, “New Frontier: The Emergence of Litigation Funding in the Canadian Insolvency Landscape” in J. P. Sarra et al., eds., *Annual Review of Insolvency Law 2018* (2019), 221, at p. 231).

law concernant la champartie (*champerty*) et le soutien abusif (*maintenance*)⁶. Le délit de soutien abusif interdit [TRADUCTION] « l’immixtion trop empressée dans une action avec laquelle on n’a rien à voir » (L. N. Klar et autres, *Remedies in Tort* (feuilles mobiles), vol. 1, par L. Berry, dir., p. 14-11, citant *Langtry c. Dumoulin* (1884), 7 O.R. 644 (Ch. Div.), p. 661). La champartie est une sorte de soutien abusif qui comporte un accord prévoyant le partage de la somme obtenue ou de tout autre profit réalisé dans le cadre d’une action réussie (*McIntyre Estate c. Ontario (Attorney General)* (2002), 218 D.L.R. (4th) 193 (C.A. Ont.), par. 26).

[95] S’appuyant sur la jurisprudence voulant que les conventions d’honoraires conditionnels ne constituent pas de la champartie lorsqu’elles ne sont pas motivées par un but illégitime (p. ex., *McIntyre Estate*), les tribunaux d’instance inférieure en sont venus progressivement à reconnaître que les accords de *financement d’un litige* ne constituent pas non plus de la champartie *en soi*. Cette évolution s’est opérée surtout dans le contexte des recours collectifs, en réaction aux obstacles, comme les adjudications de dépens défavorables, qui entravaient l’accès des parties à la justice (voir *Dugal*, par. 33; *Marcotte c. Banque de Montréal*, 2015 QCCS 1915, par. 43-44 (CanLII); *Houle c. St. Jude Medical Inc.*, 2017 ONSC 5129, 9 C.P.C. (8th) 321, par. 52, conf. par 2018 ONSC 6352, 429 D.L.R. (4th) 739 (C. div.); voir également *Stanway c. Wyeth*, 2013 BCSC 1585, 56 B.C.L.R. (5th) 192, par. 13). La jurisprudence relative à l’approbation des accords de financement de litige par un tiers dans le contexte des recours collectifs — et même les paramètres de leur légalité en général — continue d’évoluer, et aucune des parties au présent pourvoi ne nous a invités à l’analyser.

⁶ L’ampleur de la controverse varie selon les provinces. En Ontario, les accords de champartie sont interdits par la loi (voir *An Act respecting Champerty*, R.S.O. 1897, c. 327). Au Québec, les questions relatives à la champartie et au soutien abusif ne se posent pas de façon aussi aiguë parce que la champartie et le soutien abusif ne font pas partie du droit comme tel (voir *Montgrain c. Banque nationale du Canada*, 2006 QCCA 557, [2006] R.J.Q. 1009; G. Michaud, « New Frontier : The Emergence of Litigation Funding in the Canadian Insolvabilité Landscape » dans J. P. Sarra et autres, dir., *Annual Review of Insolvency Law 2018* (2019), 221, p. 231).

[96] That said, insofar as third party litigation funding agreements are not *per se* illegal, there is no principled basis upon which to restrict supervising judges from approving such agreements as interim financing in appropriate cases. We acknowledge that this funding differs from more common forms of interim financing that are simply designed to help the debtor “keep the lights on” (see *Royal Oak*, at paras. 7 and 24). However, in circumstances like the case at bar, where there is a single litigation asset that could be monetized for the benefit of creditors, the objective of maximizing creditor recovery has taken centre stage. In those circumstances, litigation funding furthers the basic purpose of interim financing: allowing the debtor to realize on the value of its assets.

[97] We conclude that third party litigation funding agreements may be approved as interim financing in CCAA proceedings when the supervising judge determines that doing so would be fair and appropriate, having regard to all the circumstances and the objectives of the Act. This requires consideration of the specific factors set out in s. 11.2(4) of the CCAA. That said, these factors need not be mechanically applied or individually reviewed by the supervising judge. Indeed, not all of them will be significant in every case, nor are they exhaustive. Further guidance may be drawn from other areas in which third party litigation funding agreements have been approved.

[98] The foregoing is consistent with the practice that is already occurring in lower courts. Most notably, in *Crystallex*, the Ontario Court of Appeal approved a third party litigation funding agreement in circumstances substantially similar to the case at bar. *Crystallex* involved a mining company that had the right to develop a large gold deposit in Venezuela. *Crystallex* eventually became insolvent and (similar to *Bluberi*) was left with only a single significant asset: a US\$3.4 billion arbitration claim against Venezuela. After entering CCAA protection,

[96] Cela dit, dans la mesure où les accords de financement de litige par un tiers ne sont pas illégaux *en soi*, il n’y a aucune raison de principe qui permet d’empêcher les juges surveillants d’approuver ce type d’accord à titre de financement temporaire dans les cas qui s’y prêtent. Nous reconnaissons que cette forme de financement diffère des formes plus courantes de financement temporaire qui visent simplement à aider le débiteur à [TRADUCTION] « payer les frais courants » (voir *Royal Oak*, par. 7 et 24). Toutefois, dans des circonstances semblables à celles en l’espèce, lorsqu’il existait un seul élément d’actif susceptible de monétisation au bénéfice des créanciers, l’objectif visant à maximiser le recouvrement des créanciers a occupé le devant de la scène. En pareilles circonstances, le financement de litige favorise la réalisation de l’objectif fondamental du financement temporaire : permettre au débiteur de réaliser la valeur de ses éléments d’actif.

[97] Nous concluons que les accords de financement de litige par un tiers peuvent être approuvés à titre de financement temporaire dans le cadre des procédures fondées sur la LACC lorsque le juge surveillant estime qu’il serait juste et approprié de le faire, compte tenu de l’ensemble des circonstances et des objectifs de la Loi. Cela implique la prise en considération des facteurs précis énoncés au par. 11.2(4) de la LACC. Cela dit, ces facteurs ne doivent pas être appliqués machinalement ou examinés individuellement par le juge surveillant. En effet, ils ne seront pas tous importants dans tous les cas, et ils ne sont pas non plus exhaustifs. Des enseignements supplémentaires peuvent être tirés d’autres domaines où des accords de financement de litige par un tiers ont été approuvés.

[98] Ce qui précède est compatible avec la pratique qui a déjà cours devant les tribunaux d’instance inférieure. Plus particulièrement, dans *Crystallex*, la Cour d’appel de l’Ontario a approuvé un accord de financement de litige par un tiers dans des circonstances très semblables à celles en l’espèce. Cette affaire mettait en cause une société minière ayant le droit d’exploiter un grand gisement d’or au Venezuela. *Crystallex* est finalement devenue insolvable, et (comme *Bluberi*) il ne lui restait plus qu’un seul élément d’actif important : une réclamation

Crystallex sought the approval of a third party litigation funding agreement. The agreement contemplated that the lender would advance substantial funds to finance the arbitration in exchange for, among other things, a percentage of the net proceeds of any award or settlement. The supervising judge approved the agreement as interim financing pursuant to s. 11.2. The Court of Appeal unanimously found no error in the supervising judge's exercise of discretion. It concluded that s. 11.2 "does not restrict the ability of the supervising judge, where appropriate, to approve the grant of a charge securing financing before a plan is approved that may continue after the company emerges from CCAA protection" (para. 68).

[99] A key argument raised by the creditors in *Crystallex* — and one that Callidus and the Creditors' Group have put before us now — was that the litigation funding agreement at issue was a plan of arrangement and not interim financing. This was significant because, if the agreement was in fact a plan, it would have had to be put to a creditors' vote pursuant to ss. 4 and 5 of the CCAA prior to receiving court approval. The court in *Crystallex* rejected this argument, as do we.

[100] There is no definition of plan of arrangement in the CCAA. In fact, the CCAA does not refer to plans at all — it only refers to an "arrangement" or "compromise" (see ss. 4 and 5). The authors of *Bankruptcy and Insolvency Law of Canada* offer the following general definition of these terms, relying on early English case law:

A "compromise" presupposes some dispute about the rights compromised and a settling of that dispute on terms that are satisfactory to the debtor and the creditor. An agreement to accept less than 100¢ on the dollar would be a compromise where the debtor disputes the debt or lacks the means to pay it. "Arrangement" is a broader word

d'arbitrage de 3,4 milliards de dollars américains contre le Venezuela. Après s'être placée sous la protection de la LACC, Crystallex a demandé l'approbation d'un accord de financement de litige par un tiers. L'accord prévoyait que le prêteur avancerait des fonds importants pour financer l'arbitrage en échange, notamment, d'un pourcentage de la somme nette obtenue à la suite d'une sentence ou d'un règlement. Le juge surveillant a approuvé l'accord à titre de financement temporaire en vertu de l'art. 11.2. La Cour d'appel a conclu à l'unanimité que le juge surveillant n'avait commis aucune erreur dans l'exercice de son pouvoir discrétionnaire. Elle a conclu que l'art. 11.2 [TRADUCTION] « n'empêche pas le juge surveillant d'approuver, s'il y a lieu, avant qu'un plan soit approuvé, l'octroi d'une charge garantissant un financement qui pourra continuer après que la compagnie aura émergé de la protection de la LACC » (par. 68).

[99] Dans *Crystallex*, l'un des principaux arguments soulevés par les créanciers — et l'un de ceux qu'ont soulevés Callidus et le groupe de créanciers dans le présent pourvoi — était que l'accord de financement de litige en cause était un plan d'arrangement et non pas un financement temporaire. Il s'agissait d'un argument important car, si l'accord était en fait un plan, il aurait dû être soumis à un vote des créanciers conformément aux art. 4 et 5 de la LACC avant de recevoir l'aval du tribunal. La cour, dans *Crystallex*, a rejeté cet argument, et nous en faisons autant.

[100] La LACC ne définit pas le plan d'arrangement. En fait, la LACC ne fait aucunement allusion aux plans — elle fait uniquement état d'un « arrangement » ou d'une « transaction » (voir art. 4 et 5). S'appuyant sur l'ancienne jurisprudence anglaise, les auteurs de *Bankruptcy and Insolvency Law of Canada* proposent la définition générale suivante de ces termes :

[TRADUCTION] La « transaction » suppose d'emblée l'existence d'un différend au sujet des droits visés par la transaction et d'un règlement de ce différend selon des conditions jugées satisfaisantes par le débiteur et le créancier. L'accord visant à accepter une somme inférieure à 100 ¢ par dollar constituerait une transaction lorsque

than “compromise” and is not limited to something analogous to a compromise. It would include any scheme for reorganizing the affairs of the debtor: *Re Guardian Assur. Co.*, [1917] 1 Ch. 431, 61 Sol. Jo 232, [1917] H.B.R. 113 (C.A.); *Re Refund of Dues under Timber Regulations*, [1935] A.C. 185 (P.C.).

(Houlden, Morawetz and Sarra, at §33)

[101] The apparent breadth of these terms notwithstanding, they do have some limits. More recent jurisprudence suggests that they require, at minimum, some compromise of creditors’ rights. For example, in *Crystallex* the litigation funding agreement at issue (known as the Tenor DIP facility) was held not to be a plan of arrangement because it did not “compromise the terms of [the creditors’] indebtedness or take away . . . their legal rights” (para. 93). The Court of Appeal adopted the following reasoning from the lower court’s decision, with which we substantially agree:

A “plan of arrangement” or a “compromise” is not defined in the CCAA. It is, however, to be an arrangement or compromise between a debtor and its creditors. The Tenor DIP facility is not on its face such an arrangement or compromise between *Crystallex* and its creditors. Importantly the rights of the noteholders are not taken away from them by the Tenor DIP facility. The noteholders are unsecured creditors. Their rights are to sue to judgment and enforce the judgment. If not paid, they have a right to apply for a bankruptcy order under the BIA. Under the CCAA, they have the right to vote on a plan of arrangement or compromise. None of these rights are taken away by the Tenor DIP.

(*Re Crystallex International Corporation*, 2012 ONSC 2125, 91 C.B.R. (5th) 169, at para. 50)

[102] Setting out an exhaustive definition of plan of arrangement or compromise is unnecessary to resolve these appeals. For our purposes, it is sufficient to conclude that plans of arrangement require at least

le débiteur conteste la dette ou n’a pas les moyens de la payer. Le mot « arrangement » a un sens plus large que le mot « transaction » et ne se limite pas à quelque chose qui ressemble à une transaction. Il viserait tout plan de réorganisation des affaires du débiteur : *Re Guardian Assur. Co.*, [1917] 1 Ch. 431, 61 Sol. Jo 232, [1917] H.B.R. 113 (C.A.); *Re Refund of Dues under Timber Regulations*, [1935] A.C. 185 (C.P.).

(Houlden, Morawetz et Sarra, §33)

[101] Malgré leur vaste portée apparente, ces termes connaissent quand même certaines limites. Selon une jurisprudence plus récente, ils exigeraient, à tout le moins, une certaine transaction à l’égard des droits des créanciers. Dans *Crystallex*, par exemple, on a conclu que l’accord de financement de litige en cause (également appelé [TRADUCTION] « facilité de DE Tenor ») ne constituait pas un plan d’arrangement parce qu’il ne comportait pas [TRADUCTION] « une transaction visant les conditions [des] dettes envers [des créanciers] ni ne [. . .] privait [ceux-ci] de [. . .] leurs droits reconnus par la loi » (par. 93). La Cour d’appel a fait sien le raisonnement suivant du tribunal de première instance, auquel nous souscrivons pour l’essentiel :

[TRADUCTION] Le « plan d’arrangement » et la « transaction » ne sont pas définis dans la LACC. Il doit toutefois s’agir d’un arrangement ou d’une transaction entre un débiteur et ses créanciers. La facilité de DE Tenor ne constitue pas, à première vue, un arrangement ou une transaction entre *Crystallex* et ses créanciers. Fait important, les détenteurs de billets ne sont pas privés de leurs droits par la facilité de DE Tenor. Les détenteurs de billets sont des créanciers non garantis. Leurs droits se résument à poursuivre en vue d’obtenir un jugement et à faire exécuter ce jugement. S’ils ne sont pas payés, ils ont le droit de demander une ordonnance de faillite en vertu de la LFI. Sous le régime de la LACC, ils ont le droit de voter sur un plan d’arrangement ou une transaction. La facilité de DE Tenor ne les prive d’aucun de ces droits.

(*Re Crystallex International Corporation*, 2012 ONSC 2125, 91 C.B.R. (5th) 169, par. 50)

[102] Il n’est pas nécessaire de définir exhaustivement les notions de plan d’arrangement ou de transaction pour trancher les présents pourvois. Il suffit de conclure que les plans d’arrangement doivent au

some compromise of creditors' rights. It follows that a third party litigation funding agreement aimed at extending financing to a debtor company to realize on the value of a litigation asset does not necessarily constitute a plan of arrangement. We would leave it to supervising judges to determine whether, in the particular circumstances of the case before them, a particular third party litigation funding agreement contains terms that effectively convert it into a plan of arrangement. So long as the agreement does not contain such terms, it may be approved as interim financing pursuant to s. 11.2 of the CCAA.

[103] We add that there may be circumstances in which a third party litigation funding agreement may contain or incorporate a plan of arrangement (e.g., if it contemplates a plan for distribution of litigation proceeds among creditors). Alternatively, a supervising judge may determine that, despite an agreement itself not being a plan of arrangement, it should be packaged with a plan and submitted to a creditors' vote. That said, we repeat that third party litigation funding agreements are not necessarily, or even generally, plans of arrangement.

[104] None of the foregoing is seriously contested before us. The parties essentially agree that third party litigation funding agreements *can* be approved as interim financing. The dispute between them focusses on whether the supervising judge erred in exercising his discretion to approve the LFA in the absence of a vote of the creditors, either because it was a plan of arrangement or because it should have been accompanied by a plan of arrangement. We turn to these issues now.

(3) The Supervising Judge Did Not Err in Approving the LFA

[105] In our view, there is no basis upon which to interfere with the supervising judge's exercise of his discretion to approve the LFA as interim financing.

moins comporter une certaine transaction à l'égard des droits des créanciers. Il s'ensuit que l'accord de financement de litige par un tiers visant à apporter un financement à la compagnie débitrice pour réaliser la valeur d'un élément d'actif ne constitue pas nécessairement un plan d'arrangement. Nous sommes d'avis de laisser aux juges surveillants le soin de déterminer si, compte tenu des circonstances particulières de l'affaire dont ils sont saisis, l'accord de financement de litige par un tiers comporte des conditions qui le convertissent effectivement en plan d'arrangement. Si l'accord ne comporte pas de telles conditions, il peut être approuvé à titre de financement temporaire en vertu de l'art. 11.2 de la LACC.

[103] Ajoutons que, dans certaines circonstances, l'accord de financement de litige par un tiers peut contenir ou incorporer un plan d'arrangement (p. ex., s'il contient un plan prévoyant la distribution aux créanciers des sommes obtenues dans le cadre du litige). Subsidiairement, le juge surveillant peut décider que, bien que l'accord lui-même ne constitue pas un plan d'arrangement, il y a lieu de l'accompagner d'un plan et de le soumettre à un vote des créanciers. Cela dit, nous le répétons, les accords de financement de litige par un tiers ne constituent pas nécessairement, ni même généralement, des plans d'arrangement.

[104] Rien de ce qui précède n'est sérieusement contesté en l'espèce. Les parties s'entendent essentiellement pour dire que les accords de financement de litige par un tiers *peuvent* être approuvés à titre de financement temporaire. Le différend qui les oppose porte sur la question de savoir si le juge surveillant a commis une erreur en exerçant son pouvoir discrétionnaire d'approuver l'AFL en l'absence d'un vote des créanciers, soit parce qu'il constituait un plan d'arrangement, soit parce qu'il aurait dû être accompagné d'un plan d'arrangement. Nous abordons maintenant cette question.

(3) Le juge surveillant n'a pas commis d'erreur en approuvant l'AFL

[105] À notre avis, il n'y a aucune raison d'intervenir dans l'exercice par le juge surveillant de son pouvoir discrétionnaire d'approuver l'AFL à titre de

The supervising judge considered the LFA to be fair and reasonable, drawing guidance from the principles relevant to approving similar agreements in the class action context (para. 74, citing *Bayens*, at para. 41; *Hayes*, at para. 4). In particular, he canvassed the terms upon which Bentham and Bluberi's lawyers would be paid in the event the litigation was successful, the risks they were taking by investing in the litigation, and the extent of Bentham's control over the litigation going forward (paras. 79 and 81). The supervising judge also considered the unique objectives of CCAA proceedings in distinguishing the LFA from ostensibly similar agreements that had not received approval in the class action context (paras. 81-82, distinguishing *Houle*). His consideration of those objectives is also apparent from his reliance on *Crystallex*, which, as we have explained, involved the approval of interim financing in circumstances substantially similar to the case at bar (see paras. 67 and 71). We see no error in principle or unreasonableness to this approach.

[106] While the supervising judge did not canvass each of the factors set out in s. 11.2(4) of the CCAA individually before reaching his conclusion, this was not itself an error. A review of the supervising judge's reasons as a whole, combined with a recognition of his manifest experience with Bluberi's CCAA proceedings, leads us to conclude that the factors listed in s. 11.2(4) concern matters that could not have escaped his attention and due consideration. It bears repeating that, at the time of his decision, the supervising judge had been seized of these proceedings for well over two years and had the benefit of the Monitor's assistance. With respect to each of the s. 11.2(4) factors, we note that:

- the judge's supervisory role would have made him aware of the potential length of Bluberi's CCAA proceedings and the extent of creditor support for Bluberi's management (s. 11.2(4)(a) and (c)), though we observe that these factors

financement temporaire. Se fondant sur les principes applicables à l'approbation d'accords semblables dans le contexte des recours collectifs (par. 74, citant *Bayens*, par. 41; *Hayes*, par. 4), le juge surveillant a estimé que l'AFL était juste et raisonnable. Plus particulièrement, il a examiné soigneusement les conditions selon lesquelles les avocats de Bentham et de Bluberi seraient payés si le litige était couronné de succès, les risques qu'ils prenaient en investissant dans le litige et l'étendue du contrôle qu'exercerait désormais Bentham sur le litige (par. 79 et 81). Le juge surveillant a également pris en compte les objectifs uniques des procédures fondées sur la LACC en établissant une distinction entre l'AFL et des accords apparemment semblables qui n'avaient pas été approuvés dans le contexte des recours collectifs (par. 81-82, établissant une distinction avec l'affaire *Houle*). Sa prise en compte de ces objectifs ressort également du fait qu'il s'est fondé sur *Crystallex*, qui, comme nous l'avons expliqué, portait sur l'approbation d'un financement temporaire dans des circonstances très semblables à celles en l'espèce (voir par. 67 et 71). Nous ne voyons aucune erreur de principe ni rien de déraisonnable dans cette approche.

[106] Certes, le juge surveillant n'a pas examiné à fond chacun des facteurs énoncés au par. 11.2(4) de la LACC de façon individuelle avant de tirer sa conclusion, mais cela ne constituait pas une erreur en soi. L'examen des motifs du juge surveillant dans leur ensemble, conjugué à la reconnaissance de son expérience évidente des procédures intentées par Bluberi sous le régime de la LACC, nous mène à conclure que les facteurs énumérés au par. 11.2(4) concernent des questions qui n'auraient pu échapper à son attention et à son examen adéquat. Il convient de rappeler qu'au moment où il a rendu sa décision, le juge surveillant était saisi des procédures en question depuis plus de deux ans et avait pu bénéficier de l'aide du contrôleur. En ce qui a trait à chacun des facteurs énoncés au par. 11.2(4), nous soulignons ce qui suit :

- le rôle de surveillance du juge lui aurait permis de connaître la durée prévue des procédures intentées par Bluberi sous le régime de la LACC ainsi que la mesure dans laquelle les dirigeants de Bluberi bénéficiaient du soutien des créanciers

appear to be less significant than the others in the context of this particular case (see para. 96);

- the LFA itself explains “how the company’s business and financial affairs are to be managed during the proceedings” (s. 11.2(4)(b));
- the supervising judge was of the view that the LFA would enhance the prospect of a viable plan, as he accepted (1) that Bluberi intended to submit a plan and (2) Bluberi’s submission that approval of the LFA would assist it in finalizing a plan “with a view towards achieving maximum realization” of its assets (para. 68, citing 9354-9186 Québec inc. and 9354-9178 Québec inc.’s application, at para. 99; s. 11.2(4)(d));
- the supervising judge was apprised of the “nature and value” of Bluberi’s property, which was clearly limited to the Retained Claims (s. 11.2(4)(e));
- the supervising judge implicitly concluded that the creditors would not be materially prejudiced by the Litigation Financing Charge, as he stated that “[c]onsidering the results of the vote [on the First Plan], and given the particular circumstances of this matter, the only potential recovery lies with the lawsuit that the Debtors will launch” (para. 91 (emphasis added); s. 11.2(4)(f)); and
- the supervising judge was also well aware of the Monitor’s reports, and drew from the most recent report at various points in his reasons (see, e.g., paras. 64-65 and fn. 1; s. 11.2(4)(g)). It is worth noting that the Monitor supported approving the LFA as interim financing.

[107] In our view, it is apparent that the supervising judge was focussed on the fairness at stake to all parties, the specific objectives of the CCAA, and the particular circumstances of this case when he approved the LFA as interim financing. We cannot say that he erred in the exercise of his discretion.

(al. 11.2(4)a) et c)), mais nous constatons que ces facteurs semblent revêtir beaucoup moins d’importance que les autres dans le contexte de la présente affaire (voir par. 96);

- l’AFL lui-même indique « la façon dont les affaires financières et autres de la compagnie seront gérées au cours de ces procédures » (al. 11.2(4)b));
- le juge surveillant était d’avis que l’AFL favoriserait la conclusion d’un plan viable, car il a accepté (1) le fait que Bluberi avait l’intention de présenter un plan et (2) l’argument de Bluberi selon lequel l’approbation de l’AFL l’aiderait à conclure un plan [TRADUCTION] « visant à atteindre une réalisation maximale » de ses éléments d’actif (par. 68, citant la demande de 9354-9186 Québec inc. et de 9354-9178 Québec inc., par. 99; al. 11.2(4)d));
- le juge surveillant était au courant de la « nature et [de] la valeur » des biens de Bluberi, qui se limitaient clairement aux réclamations retenues (al. 11.2(4)e));
- le juge surveillant a conclu implicitement que la charge relative au financement de litige ne causerait pas un préjudice sérieux aux créanciers, car il a affirmé que [TRADUCTION] « [c]ompte tenu du résultat du vote [sur le premier plan] et des circonstances particulières de la présente affaire, la seule possibilité de recouvrement réside dans l’action que vont tenter les débiteurs » (par. 91 (nous soulignons); al. 11.2(4)f));
- le juge surveillant était aussi bien au fait des rapports du contrôleur, et s’est appuyé sur le plus récent d’entre eux à divers endroits dans ses motifs (voir, p. ex., par. 64-65 et note 1; al. 11.2(4)g)). Il convient de souligner que le contrôleur appuyait l’approbation de l’AFL à titre de financement temporaire.

[107] À notre avis, il est manifeste que le juge surveillant a mis l’accent sur l’équité envers toutes les parties, les objectifs précis de la LACC et les circonstances particulières de la présente affaire lorsqu’il a approuvé l’AFL à titre de financement temporaire. Nous ne pouvons affirmer qu’il a commis une erreur

Although we are unsure whether the LFA was as favourable to Bluberi’s creditors as it might have been — to some extent, it does prioritize Bentham’s recovery over theirs — we nonetheless defer to the supervising judge’s exercise of discretion.

[108] To the extent the Court of Appeal held otherwise, we respectfully do not agree. Generally speaking, our view is that the Court of Appeal again failed to afford the supervising judge the necessary deference. More specifically, we wish to comment on three of the purported errors in the supervising judge’s decision that the Court of Appeal identified.

[109] First, it follows from our conclusion that LFAs can constitute interim financing that the Court of Appeal was incorrect to hold that approving the LFA as interim financing “transcended the nature of such financing” (para. 78).

[110] Second, in our view, the Court of Appeal was wrong to conclude that the LFA was a plan of arrangement, and that *Crystallex* was distinguishable on its facts. The Court of Appeal held that the LFA and associated super-priority Litigation Financing Charge formed a plan because they subordinated the rights of Bluberi’s creditors to those of Bentham.

[111] We agree with the supervising judge that the LFA is not a plan of arrangement because it does not propose any compromise of the creditors’ rights. To borrow from the Court of Appeal in *Crystallex*, Bluberi’s litigation claim is akin to a “pot of gold” (para. 4). Plans of arrangement determine how to distribute that pot. They do not generally determine what a debtor company should do to fill it. The fact that the creditors may walk away with more or less money at the end of the day does not change the nature or existence of their rights to access the pot once it is filled, nor can it be said to “compromise” those rights. When the “pot of gold” is secure — that

dans l’exercice de son pouvoir discrétionnaire. Nous ne savons pas avec certitude si l’AFL était aussi favorable aux créanciers de Bluberi qu’il aurait pu l’être — dans une certaine mesure, il donne priorité au recouvrement de Bentham sur le leur — mais nous nous en remettons néanmoins à l’exercice par le juge surveillant de son pouvoir discrétionnaire.

[108] Dans la mesure où la Cour d’appel a conclu le contraire, en toute déférence, nous ne sommes pas d’accord. De façon générale, nous estimons que la Cour d’appel a encore une fois omis de faire preuve de la déférence nécessaire à l’égard du juge surveillant. Plus particulièrement, nous souhaitons faire des observations sur trois des erreurs qu’aurait décelées la Cour d’appel dans la décision du juge surveillant.

[109] Premièrement, il découle de notre conclusion selon laquelle les AFL peuvent constituer un financement temporaire que la Cour d’appel a eu tort de conclure que l’approbation de l’AFL à titre de financement temporaire [TRADUCTION] « transcendait la nature de ce type de financement » (par. 78).

[110] Deuxièmement, à notre avis, la Cour d’appel a eu tort de conclure que l’AFL était un plan d’arrangement, et qu’il était possible d’établir une distinction entre l’espèce et les faits de l’affaire *Crystallex*. La Cour d’appel a conclu que l’AFL et la charge relative au financement de litige super prioritaire s’y rattachant constituaient un plan parce qu’ils subordonnaient les droits des créanciers de Bluberi à ceux de Bentham.

[111] Nous souscrivons à l’opinion du juge surveillant selon laquelle l’AFL ne constitue pas un plan d’arrangement parce qu’il ne propose aucune transaction visant les droits des créanciers. Pour reprendre la formule qu’a employée la Cour d’appel dans *Crystallex*, la réclamation de Bluberi s’apparente à une [TRADUCTION] « marmite d’or » (par. 4). Les plans d’arrangement établissent la façon dont le contenu de cette marmite sera distribué. Ils n’indiquent généralement pas ce que la compagnie débitrice devra faire pour la remplir. Le fait que les créanciers puissent en fin de compte remporter plus ou moins d’argent ne modifie en rien la nature ou

is, in the event of any litigation or settlement — the net funds will be distributed to the creditors. Here, if the Retained Claims generate funds in excess of Bluberi’s total liabilities, the creditors will be paid in full; if there is a shortfall, a plan of arrangement or compromise will determine how the funds are distributed. Bluberi has committed to proposing such a plan (see supervising judge’s reasons, at para. 68, distinguishing *Cliffs Over Maple Bay Investments Ltd. v. Fisgard Capital Corp.*, 2008 BCCA 327, 296 D.L.R. (4th) 577).

[112] This is the very same conclusion that was reached in *Crystallex* in similar circumstances:

The facts of this case are unusual: there is a single “pot of gold” asset which, if realized, will provide significantly more than required to repay the creditors. The supervising judge was in the best position to balance the interests of all stakeholders. I am of the view that the supervising judge’s exercise of discretion in approving the Tenor DIP Loan was reasonable and appropriate, despite having the effect of constraining the negotiating position of the creditors.

...

... While the approval of the Tenor DIP Loan affected the Noteholders’ leverage in negotiating a plan, and has made the negotiation of a plan more complex, it did not compromise the terms of their indebtedness or take away any of their legal rights. It is accordingly not an arrangement, and a creditor vote was not required. [paras. 82 and 93]

[113] We disagree with the Court of Appeal that *Crystallex* should be distinguished on the basis that it involved a single option for creditor recovery (i.e., the arbitration) while this case involves two (i.e., litigation of the Retained Claims and Callidus’s New

l’existence de leurs droits d’avoir accès à la marmite une fois qu’elle est remplie, pas plus qu’on ne saurait dire qu’il s’agit d’une « transaction » à l’égard de leurs droits. Lorsque la « marmite d’or » aura été obtenue — c’est-à-dire dans l’éventualité d’une action ou d’un règlement — les sommes nettes seront distribuées aux créanciers. En l’espèce, si les réclamations retenues permettent de recouvrer des sommes qui dépassent le total des dettes de Bluberi, les créanciers seront payés en entier; si les sommes sont insuffisantes, un plan d’arrangement ou une transaction établira la façon dont les sommes seront distribuées. Bluberi s’est engagée à proposer un tel plan (voir les motifs du juge surveillant, par. 68, établissant une distinction avec *Cliffs Over Maple Bay Investments Ltd. v. Fisgard Capital Corp.*, 2008 BCCA 327, 296 D.L.R. (4th) 577).

[112] C’est exactement la même conclusion qui a été tirée dans *Crystallex* dans des circonstances semblables :

[TRADUCTION] Les faits de l’espèce sont inhabituels : la « marmite d’or » ne contient qu’un seul élément d’actif qui, s’il est réalisé, rapportera beaucoup plus que ce qui est nécessaire pour rembourser les créanciers. Le juge surveillant était le mieux placé pour établir un équilibre entre les intérêts de toutes les parties intéressées. J’estime que l’exercice par le juge surveillant de son pouvoir discrétionnaire d’approuver le prêt de DE Tenor était raisonnable et approprié, bien qu’il ait eu pour effet de limiter la position de négociation des créanciers.

...

... L’approbation du prêt de DE Tenor a certes amoindri l’influence que pouvaient exercer les détenteurs de billets lors de la négociation d’un plan, et rendu plus complexe la négociation d’un plan, mais ce prêt ne constituait pas une transaction visant les conditions de leurs dettes ni ne les privait de l’un de leurs droits reconnus par la loi. Il ne s’agit donc pas d’un arrangement, et un vote des créanciers n’était pas nécessaire. [par. 82 et 93]

[113] Nous ne souscrivons pas à l’opinion de la Cour d’appel selon laquelle il y a lieu d’établir une distinction avec *Crystallex* parce que, dans cette affaire, les créanciers disposaient d’un seul moyen de recouvrement (c.-à-d. l’arbitrage) tandis que, dans la

Plan). Given the supervising judge's conclusion that Callidus could not vote on the New Plan, that plan was not a viable alternative to the LFA. This left the LFA and litigation of the Retained Claims as the "only potential recovery" for Bluberi's creditors (supervising judge's reasons, at para. 91). Perhaps more significantly, even if there were multiple options for creditor recovery in either *Crystallex* or this case, the mere presence of those options would not necessarily have changed the character of the third party litigation funding agreements at issue or converted them into plans of arrangement. The question for the supervising judge in each case is whether the agreement before them ought to be approved as interim financing. While other options for creditor recovery may be relevant to that discretionary decision, they are not determinative.

[114] We add that the Litigation Financing Charge does not convert the LFA into a plan of arrangement by "subordinat[ing]" creditors' rights (C.A. reasons, at para. 90). We accept that this charge would have the effect of placing secured creditors like Callidus behind in priority to Bentham. However, this result is expressly provided for in s. 11.2 of the *CCAA*. This "subordination" does not convert statutorily authorized interim financing into a plan of arrangement. Accepting this interpretation would effectively extinguish the supervising judge's authority to approve these charges without a creditors' vote pursuant to s. 11.2(2).

[115] Third, we are of the view that the Court of Appeal was wrong to decide that the supervising judge should have submitted the LFA together with a plan to the creditors for their approval (para. 89). As we have indicated, whether to insist that a debtor package their third party litigation funding agreement

présente affaire, il y en a deux (c.-à-d. l'introduction d'une action à l'égard des réclamations retenues et le nouveau plan de Callidus). Étant donné que le juge surveillant avait conclu que Callidus ne pouvait pas voter sur le nouveau plan, ce plan ne constituait pas une solution de rechange viable à l'AFL. La [TRADUCTION] « seule possibilité de recouvrement » qui s'offrait aux créanciers de Bluberi résidait donc dans l'AFL et l'introduction d'une action à l'égard des réclamations retenues (motifs du juge surveillant, par. 91). Fait peut-être plus important, même si les créanciers avaient disposé de plusieurs moyens de recouvrement, tant dans l'affaire *Crystallex* que dans la présente affaire, la simple existence de ces moyens n'aurait pas nécessairement modifié la nature des accords de financement de litige par un tiers en cause ni n'aurait eu pour effet de les convertir en plans d'arrangement. La question que doit se poser le juge surveillant dans chaque affaire est de savoir si l'accord qui lui est soumis doit être approuvé à titre de financement temporaire. Certes, les autres moyens de recouvrement dont disposent les créanciers peuvent entrer en ligne de compte dans la prise de cette décision discrétionnaire, mais ils ne sont pas déterminants.

[114] Ajoutons que la charge relative au financement de litige ne convertit pas l'AFL en plan d'arrangement en [TRADUCTION] « subordonn[ant] » les droits des créanciers (motifs de la Cour d'appel, par. 90). Nous reconnaissons que cette charge aurait pour effet de placer les créanciers garantis comme Callidus derrière Bentham dans l'ordre de priorité, mais ce résultat est expressément prévu par l'art. 11.2 de la *LACC*. Cette « subordination » ne convertit pas le financement temporaire autorisé par la loi en plan d'arrangement. Retenir cette interprétation aurait pour effet d'annihiler le pouvoir du juge surveillant d'approuver ces charges sans un vote des créanciers en vertu du par. 11.2(2).

[115] Troisièmement, nous estimons que la Cour d'appel a eu tort de conclure que le juge surveillant aurait dû soumettre l'AFL accompagné d'un plan à l'approbation des créanciers (par. 89). Comme nous l'avons indiqué, la décision d'exiger que le débiteur accompagne d'un plan son accord de financement

with a plan is a discretionary decision for the supervising judge to make.

[116] Finally, at the appellants' insistence, we point out that the Court of Appeal's suggestion that the LFA is somehow "akin to an equity investment" was unhelpful and potentially confusing (para. 90). That said, this characterization was clearly *obiter dictum*. To the extent that the Court of Appeal relied on it as support for the conclusion that the LFA was a plan of arrangement, we have already explained why we believe the Court of Appeal was mistaken on this point.

VI. Conclusion

[117] For these reasons, at the conclusion of the hearing we allowed these appeals and reinstated the supervising judge's order. Costs were awarded to the appellants in this Court and the Court of Appeal.

Appeals allowed with costs in the Court and in the Court of Appeal.

Solicitors for the appellants/interveners 9354-9186 Québec inc. and 9354-9178 Québec inc.: Davies Ward Phillips & Vineberg, Montréal.

Solicitors for the appellants/interveners IMF Bentham Limited (now known as Omni Bridgeway Limited) and Bentham IMF Capital Limited (now known as Omni Bridgeway Capital (Canada) Limited): Woods, Montréal.

Solicitors for the respondent Callidus Capital Corporation: Gowling WLG (Canada), Montréal.

Solicitors for the respondents International Game Technology, Deloitte LLP, Luc Carignan, François Vigneault, Philippe Millette, Francis Proulx and François Pelletier: McCarthy Tétrault, Montréal.

Solicitors for the intervenor Ernst & Young Inc.: Stikeman Elliott, Montréal.

de litige par un tiers est une décision discrétionnaire qui appartient au juge surveillant.

[116] Enfin, sur les instances des appelantes, nous soulignons que l'affirmation de la Cour d'appel selon laquelle l'AFL [TRADUCTION] « s'apparente [en quelque sorte] à un placement à échéance non déterminée » était inutile et pouvait prêter à confusion (par. 90). Cela dit, il s'agissait manifestement d'une remarque incidente. Dans la mesure où la Cour d'appel s'est fondée sur cette qualification pour conclure que l'AFL constituait un plan d'arrangement, nous avons déjà expliqué pourquoi nous croyons que la Cour d'appel a fait erreur sur ce point.

VI. Conclusion

[117] Pour ces motifs, à l'issue de l'audience, nous avons accueilli les pourvois et rétabli l'ordonnance du juge surveillant. Les dépens devant notre Cour et la Cour d'appel ont été adjugés aux appelantes.

Pourvois accueillis avec dépens devant la Cour et la Cour d'appel.

Procureurs des appelantes/intervenantes 9354-9186 Québec inc. et 9354-9178 Québec inc. : Davies Ward Phillips & Vineberg, Montréal.

Procureurs des appelantes/intervenantes IMF Bentham Limited (maintenant connue sous le nom d'Omni Bridgeway Limited) et Corporation Bentham IMF Capital (maintenant connue sous le nom de Corporation Omni Bridgeway Capital (Canada)) : Woods, Montréal.

Procureurs de l'intimée Callidus Capital Corporation : Gowling WLG (Canada), Montréal.

Procureurs des intimés International Game Technology, Deloitte S.E.N.C.R.L., Luc Carignan, François Vigneault, Philippe Millette, Francis Proulx et François Pelletier : McCarthy Tétrault, Montréal.

Procureurs de l'intervenante Ernst & Young Inc. : Stikeman Elliott, Montréal.

Solicitors for the interveners the Insolvency Institute of Canada and the Canadian Association of Insolvency and Restructuring Professionals: Norton Rose Fulbright Canada, Montréal.

Procureurs des intervenants l'Institut d'insolvabilité du Canada et l'Association canadienne des professionnels de l'insolvabilité et de la réorganisation : Norton Rose Fulbright Canada, Montréal.

TAB 4

COURT FILE NO.: CV-09-8241-OOCL

DATE: 20091013

ONTARIO
SUPERIOR COURT OF JUSTICE
COMMERCIAL LIST

IN THE MATTER OF THE COMPANIES' CREDITORS ARRANGEMENT ACT,

R.S.C. 1985, C-36. AS AMENDED

AND IN THE MATTER OF A PROPOSED PLAN OF COMPROMISE OR
ARRANGEMENT OF CANWEST GLOBAL COMMUNICATIONS CORP. AND THE
OTHER APPLICANTS LISTED ON SCHEDULE "A"

BEFORE: PEPALL J.

COUNSEL: *Lyndon Barnes, Edward Sellers and Jeremy Dacks* for the Applicants
Alan Merskey for the Special Committee of the Board of Directors
David Byers and Maria Konyukhova for the Proposed Monitor, FTI Consulting
Canada Inc.
Benjamin Zarnett and Robert Chadwick for Ad Hoc Committee of Noteholders
Edmond Lamek for the Asper Family
Peter H. Griffin and Peter J. Osborne for the Management Directors and Royal
Bank of Canada
Hilary Clarke for Bank of Nova Scotia,
Steve Weisz for CIT Business Credit Canada Inc.

REASONS FOR DECISION

Relief Requested

[1] Canwest Global Communications Corp. ("Canwest Global"), its principal operating subsidiary, Canwest Media Inc. ("CMI"), and the other applicants listed on Schedule "A" of the Notice of Application apply for relief pursuant to the *Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act*.¹ The applicants also seek to have the stay of proceedings and other provisions extend to the following partnerships: Canwest Television Limited Partnership ("CTLP"), Fox Sports World Canada Partnership and The National Post Company/La Publication National Post ("The National Post Company"). The businesses operated by

¹ R.S.C. 1985, c. C. 36, as amended

the applicants and the aforementioned partnerships include (i) Canwest's free-to-air television broadcast business (ie. the Global Television Network stations); (ii) certain subscription-based specialty television channels that are wholly owned and operated by CTLP; and (iii) the National Post.

- [2] The Canwest Global enterprise as a whole includes the applicants, the partnerships and Canwest Global's other subsidiaries that are not applicants. The term Canwest will be used to refer to the entire enterprise. The term CMI Entities will be used to refer to the applicants and the three aforementioned partnerships. The following entities are not applicants nor is a stay sought in respect of any of them: the entities in Canwest's newspaper publishing and digital media business in Canada (other than the National Post Company) namely the Canwest Limited Partnership, Canwest Publishing Inc./Publications Canwest Inc., Canwest Books Inc., and Canwest (Canada) Inc.; the Canadian subscription based specialty television channels acquired from Alliance Atlantis Communications Inc. in August, 2007 which are held jointly with Goldman Sachs Capital Partners and operated by CW Investments Co. and its subsidiaries; and subscription-based specialty television channels which are not wholly owned by CTLP.

- [3] No one appearing opposed the relief requested.

Background Facts

- [4] Canwest is a leading Canadian media company with interests in twelve free-to-air television stations comprising the Global Television Network, subscription-based specialty television channels and newspaper publishing and digital media operations.
- [5] As of October 1, 2009, Canwest employed the full time equivalent of approximately 7,400 employees around the world. Of that number, the full time equivalent of approximately 1,700 are employed by the CMI Entities, the vast majority of whom work in Canada and 850 of whom work in Ontario.

- [6] Canwest Global owns 100% of CMI. CMI has direct or indirect ownership interests in all of the other CMI Entities. Ontario is the chief place of business of the CMI Entities.
- [7] Canwest Global is a public company continued under the *Canada Business Corporations Act*². It has authorized capital consisting of an unlimited number of preference shares, multiple voting shares, subordinate voting shares, and non-voting shares. It is a “constrained-share company” which means that at least 66 2/3% of its voting shares must be beneficially owned by Canadians. The Asper family built the Canwest enterprise and family members hold various classes of shares. In April and May, 2009, corporate decision making was consolidated and streamlined.
- [8] The CMI Entities generate the majority of their revenue from the sale of advertising (approximately 77% on a consolidated basis). Fuelled by a deteriorating economic environment in Canada and elsewhere, in 2008 and 2009, they experienced a decline in their advertising revenues. This caused problems with cash flow and circumstances were exacerbated by their high fixed operating costs. In response to these conditions, the CMI Entities took steps to improve cash flow and to strengthen their balance sheets. They commenced workforce reductions and cost saving measures, sold certain interests and assets, and engaged in discussions with the CRTC and the Federal government on issues of concern.
- [9] Economic conditions did not improve nor did the financial circumstances of the CMI Entities. They experienced significant tightening of credit from critical suppliers and trade creditors, a further reduction of advertising commitments, demands for reduced credit terms by newsprint and printing suppliers, and restrictions on or cancellation of credit cards for certain employees.
- [10] In February, 2009, CMI breached certain of the financial covenants in its secured credit facility. It subsequently received waivers of the borrowing conditions on six

² R.S.C. 1985, c.C.44.

occasions. On March 15, 2009, it failed to make an interest payment of US\$30.4 million due on 8% senior subordinated notes. CMI entered into negotiations with an ad hoc committee of the 8% senior subordinated noteholders holding approximately 72% of the notes (the “Ad Hoc Committee”). An agreement was reached wherein CMI and its subsidiary CTLP agreed to issue US\$105 million in 12% secured notes to members of the Ad Hoc Committee. At the same time, CMI entered into an agreement with CIT Business Credit Canada Inc. (“CIT”) in which CIT agreed to provide a senior secured revolving asset based loan facility of up to \$75 million. CMI used the funds generated for operations and to repay amounts owing on the senior credit facility with a syndicate of lenders of which the Bank of Nova Scotia was the administrative agent. These funds were also used to settle related swap obligations.

[11] Canwest Global reports its financial results on a consolidated basis. As at May 31, 2009, it had total consolidated assets with a net book value of \$4.855 billion and total consolidated liabilities of \$5.846 billion. The subsidiaries of Canwest Global that are not applicants or partnerships in this proceeding had short and long term debt totalling \$2.742 billion as at May 31, 2009 and the CMI Entities had indebtedness of approximately \$954 million. For the 9 months ended May 31, 2009, Canwest Global’s consolidated revenues decreased by \$272 million or 11% compared to the same period in 2008. In addition, operating income before amortization decreased by \$253 million or 47%. It reported a consolidated net loss of \$1.578 billion compared to \$22 million for the same period in 2008. CMI reported that revenues for the Canadian television operations decreased by \$8 million or 4% in the third quarter of 2009 and operating profit was \$21 million compared to \$39 million in the same period in 2008.

[12] The board of directors of Canwest Global struck a special committee of the board (“the Special Committee”) with a mandate to explore and consider strategic alternatives in order to maximize value. That committee appointed Thomas Strike, who is the President, Corporate Development and Strategy Implementation of Canwest Global, as Recapitalization Officer and retained Hap Stephen, who is the Chairman and CEO of Stonecrest Capital Inc., as a Restructuring Advisor (“CRA”).

- [13] On September 15, 2009, CMI failed to pay US\$30.4 million in interest payments due on the 8% senior subordinated notes.
- [14] On September 22, 2009, the board of directors of Canwest Global authorized the sale of all of the shares of Ten Network Holdings Limited (Australia) (“Ten Holdings”) held by its subsidiary, Canwest Mediaworks Ireland Holdings (“CMIH”). Prior to the sale, the CMI Entities had consolidated indebtedness totalling US\$939.9 million pursuant to three facilities. CMI had issued 8% unsecured notes in an aggregate principal amount of US\$761,054,211. They were guaranteed by all of the CMI Entities except Canwest Global, and 30109, LLC. CMI had also issued 12% secured notes in an aggregate principal amount of US\$94 million. They were guaranteed by the CMI Entities. Amongst others, Canwest’s subsidiary, CMIH, was a guarantor of both of these facilities. The 12% notes were secured by first ranking charges against all of the property of CMI, CTLP and the guarantors. In addition, pursuant to a credit agreement dated May 22, 2009 and subsequently amended, CMI has a senior secured revolving asset-based loan facility in the maximum amount of \$75 million with CIT Business Credit Canada Inc. (“CIT”). Prior to the sale, the debt amounted to \$23.4 million not including certain letters of credit. The facility is guaranteed by CTLP, CMIH and others and secured by first ranking charges against all of the property of CMI, CTLP, CMIH and other guarantors. Significant terms of the credit agreement are described in paragraph 37 of the proposed Monitor’s report. Upon a CCAA filing by CMI and commencement of proceedings under Chapter 15 of the Bankruptcy Code, the CIT facility converts into a DIP financing arrangement and increases to a maximum of \$100 million.
- [15] Consents from a majority of the 8% senior subordinated noteholders were necessary to allow the sale of the Ten Holdings shares. A Use of Cash Collateral and Consent Agreement was entered into by CMI, CMIH, certain consenting noteholders and others wherein CMIH was allowed to lend the proceeds of sale to CMI.
- [16] The sale of CMIH’s interest in Ten Holdings was settled on October 1, 2009. Gross proceeds of approximately \$634 million were realized. The proceeds were applied to

fund general liquidity and operating costs of CMI, pay all amounts owing under the 12% secured notes and all amounts outstanding under the CIT facility except for certain letters of credit in an aggregate face amount of \$10.7 million. In addition, a portion of the proceeds was used to reduce the amount outstanding with respect to the 8% senior subordinated notes leaving an outstanding indebtedness thereunder of US\$393.25 million.

[17] In consideration for the loan provided by CMIH to CMI, CMI issued a secured intercompany note in favour of CMIH in the principal amount of \$187.3 million and an unsecured promissory note in the principal amount of \$430.6 million. The secured note is subordinated to the CIT facility and is secured by a first ranking charge on the property of CMI and the guarantors. The payment of all amounts owing under the unsecured promissory note are subordinated and postponed in favour of amounts owing under the CIT facility. Canwest Global, CTLP and others have guaranteed the notes. It is contemplated that the debt that is the subject matter of the unsecured note will be compromised.

[18] Without the funds advanced under the intercompany notes, the CMI Entities would be unable to meet their liabilities as they come due. The consent of the noteholders to the use of the Ten Holdings proceeds was predicated on the CMI Entities making this application for an Initial Order under the CCAA. Failure to do so and to take certain other steps constitute an event of default under the Use of Cash Collateral and Consent Agreement, the CIT facility and other agreements. The CMI Entities have insufficient funds to satisfy their obligations including those under the intercompany notes and the 8% senior subordinated notes.

[19] The stay of proceedings under the CCAA is sought so as to allow the CMI Entities to proceed to develop a plan of arrangement or compromise to implement a consensual “pre-packaged” recapitalization transaction. The CMI Entities and the Ad Hoc Committee of noteholders have agreed on the terms of a going concern recapitalization transaction which is intended to form the basis of the plan. The terms are reflected in a

support agreement and term sheet. The recapitalization transaction contemplates amongst other things, a significant reduction of debt and a debt for equity restructuring. The applicants anticipate that a substantial number of the businesses operated by the CMI Entities will continue as going concerns thereby preserving enterprise value for stakeholders and maintaining employment for as many as possible. As mentioned, certain steps designed to implement the recapitalization transaction have already been taken prior to the commencement of these proceedings.

[20] CMI has agreed to maintain not more than \$2.5 million as cash collateral in a deposit account with the Bank of Nova Scotia to secure cash management obligations owed to BNS. BNS holds first ranking security against those funds and no court ordered charge attaches to the funds in the account.

[21] The CMI Entities maintain eleven defined benefit pension plans and four defined contribution pension plans. There is an aggregate solvency deficiency of \$13.3 million as at the last valuation date and a wind up deficiency of \$32.8 million. There are twelve television collective agreements eleven of which are negotiated with the Communications, Energy and Paperworkers Union of Canada. The Canadian Union of Public Employees negotiated the twelfth television collective agreement. It expires on December 31, 2010. The other collective agreements are in expired status. None of the approximately 250 employees of the National Post Company are unionized. The CMI Entities propose to honour their payroll obligations to their employees, including all pre-filing wages and employee benefits outstanding as at the date of the commencement of the CCAA proceedings and payments in connection with their pension obligations.

Proposed Monitor

[22] The applicants propose that FTI Consulting Canada Inc. serve as the Monitor in these proceedings. It is clearly qualified to act and has provided the Court with its consent to act. Neither FTI nor any of its representatives have served in any of the capacities prohibited by section of the amendments to the CCAA.

Proposed Order

[23] I have reviewed in some detail the history that preceded this application. It culminated in the presentation of the within application and proposed order. Having

reviewed the materials and heard submissions, I was satisfied that the relief requested should be granted.

[24] This case involves a consideration of the amendments to the CCAA that were proclaimed in force on September 18, 2009. While these were long awaited, in many instances they reflect practices and principles that have been adopted by insolvency practitioners and developed in the jurisprudence and academic writings on the subject of the CCAA. In no way do the amendments change or detract from the underlying purpose of the CCAA, namely to provide debtor companies with the opportunity to extract themselves from financial difficulties notwithstanding insolvency and to reorganize their affairs for the benefit of stakeholders. In my view, the amendments should be interpreted and applied with that objective in mind.

(a) Threshold Issues

[25] Firstly, the applicants qualify as debtor companies under the CCAA. Their chief place of business is in Ontario. The applicants are affiliated debtor companies with total claims against them exceeding \$5 million. The CMI Entities are in default of their obligations. CMI does not have the necessary liquidity to make an interest payment in the amount of US\$30.4 million that was due on September 15, 2009 and none of the other CMI Entities who are all guarantors are able to make such a payment either. The assets of the CMI Entities are insufficient to discharge all of the liabilities. The CMI Entities are unable to satisfy their debts as they come due and they are insolvent. They are insolvent both under the *Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act*³ definition and under the more expansive definition of insolvency used in *Re Stelco*⁴. Absent these CCAA proceedings, the applicants would lack liquidity and would be unable to continue as going concerns. The CMI Entities have acknowledged their insolvency in the affidavit filed in support of the application.

³ R.S.C. 1985, c. B-3, as amended.

⁴ (2004), 48 C.B.R. (4th) 299; leave to appeal refused 2004 CarswellOnt 2936 (C.A.).

[26] Secondly, the required statement of projected cash-flow and other financial documents required under section 11(2) of the CCAA have been filed.

(b) Stay of Proceedings

[27] Under section 11 of the CCAA, the Court has broad jurisdiction to grant a stay of proceedings and to give a debtor company a chance to develop a plan of compromise or arrangement. In my view, given the facts outlined, a stay is necessary to create stability and to allow the CMI Entities to pursue their restructuring.

(b) Partnerships and Foreign Subsidiaries

[28] The applicants seek to extend the stay of proceedings and other relief to the aforementioned partnerships. The partnerships are intertwined with the applicants' ongoing operations. They own the National Post daily newspaper and Canadian free-to-air television assets and certain of its specialty television channels and some other television assets. These businesses constitute a significant portion of the overall enterprise value of the CMI Entities. The partnerships are also guarantors of the 8% senior subordinated notes.

[29] While the CCAA definition of a company does not include a partnership or limited partnership, courts have repeatedly exercised their inherent jurisdiction to extend the scope of CCAA proceedings to encompass them. See for example *Re Lehndorff General Partners Ltd.*⁵; *Re Smurfit-Stone Container Canada Inc.*⁶; and *Re Calpine Canada Energy Ltd.*⁷. In this case, the partnerships carry on operations that are integral and closely interrelated to the business of the applicants. The operations and obligations of the partnerships are so intertwined with those of the applicants that irreparable harm would ensue if the requested stay were not granted. In my view, it is just and convenient to grant the relief requested with respect to the partnerships.

⁵ (1993), 9 B.L.R. (2d) 275.

⁶ [2009] O.J. No. 349.

⁷ (2006), 19 C.B.R. (5th) 187.

[30] Certain applicants are foreign subsidiaries of CMI. Each is a guarantor under the 8% senior subordinated notes, the CIT credit agreement (and therefore the DIP facility), the intercompany notes and is party to the support agreement and the Use of Cash Collateral and Consent Agreement. If the stay of proceedings was not extended to these entities, creditors could seek to enforce their guarantees. I am persuaded that the foreign subsidiary applicants as that term is defined in the affidavit filed are debtor companies within the meaning of section 2 of the CCAA and that I have jurisdiction and ought to grant the order requested as it relates to them. In this regard, I note that they are insolvent and each holds assets in Ontario in that they each maintain funds on deposit at the Bank of Nova Scotia in Toronto. See in this regard *Re Cadillac Fairview*⁸ and *Re Global Light Telecommunications Ltd.*⁹

(c) DIP Financing

[31] Turning to the DIP financing, the premise underlying approval of DIP financing is that it is a benefit to all stakeholders as it allows the debtors to protect going-concern value while they attempt to devise a plan acceptable to creditors. While in the past, courts relied on inherent jurisdiction to approve the terms of a DIP financing charge, the September 18, 2009 amendments to the CCAA now expressly provide jurisdiction to grant a DIP financing charge. Section 11.2 of the Act states:

(1) On application by a debtor company and on notice to the secured creditors who are likely to be affected by the security or charge, a court may make an order declaring that all or part of the company's property is subject to a security or charge — in an amount that the court considers appropriate — in favour of a person specified in the order who agrees to lend to the company an amount approved by the court as being required by the company, having regard to its cash-flow statement. The security or charge may not secure an obligation that exists before the order is made.

(2) The court may order that the security or charge rank in priority over the claim of any secured creditor of the company.

⁸ (1995), 30 C.B.R. (3d) 29.

⁹ (2004), 33 B.C.L.R. (4th) 155.

(3) The court may order that the security or charge rank in priority over any security or charge arising from a previous order made under subsection (1) only with the consent of the person in whose favour the previous order was made.

(4) In deciding whether to make an order, the court is to consider, among other things,

(a) the period during which the company is expected to be subject to proceedings under this Act;

(b) how the company's business and financial affairs are to be managed during the proceedings;

(c) whether the company's management has the confidence of its major creditors;

(d) whether the loan would enhance the prospects of a viable compromise or arrangement being made in respect of the company;

(e) the nature and value of the company's property;

(f) whether any creditor would be materially prejudiced as a result of the security or charge; and

(g) the monitor's report referred to in paragraph 23(1)(b), if any.

[32] In light of the language of section 11.2(1), the first issue to consider is whether notice has been given to secured creditors who are likely to be affected by the security or charge. Paragraph 57 of the proposed order affords priority to the DIP charge, the administration charge, the Directors' and Officers' charge and the KERP charge with the following exception: "any validly perfected purchase money security interest in favour of a secured creditor or any statutory encumbrance existing on the date of this order in favour of any person which is a "secured creditor" as defined in the CCAA in respect of any of source deductions from wages, employer health tax, workers compensation, GST/QST, PST payables, vacation pay and banked overtime for employees, and amounts under the Wage Earners' Protection Program that are subject to a super priority claim under the BIA". This provision coupled with the notice that was provided satisfied me that secured creditors either were served or are unaffected by the DIP charge. This approach is both consistent with the legislation and practical.

[33] Secondly, the Court must determine that the amount of the DIP is appropriate and required having regard to the debtors' cash-flow statement. The DIP charge is for up to

\$100 million. Prior to entering into the CIT facility, the CMI Entities sought proposals from other third party lenders for a credit facility that would convert to a DIP facility should the CMI Entities be required to file for protection under the CCAA. The CIT facility was the best proposal submitted. In this case, it is contemplated that implementation of the plan will occur no later than April 15, 2010. The total amount of cash on hand is expected to be down to approximately \$10 million by late December, 2009 based on the cash flow forecast. The applicants state that this is an insufficient cushion for an enterprise of this magnitude. The cash-flow statements project the need for the liquidity provided by the DIP facility for the recapitalization transaction to be finalized. The facility is to accommodate additional liquidity requirements during the CCAA proceedings. It will enable the CMI Entities to operate as going concerns while pursuing the implementation and completion of a viable plan and will provide creditors with assurances of same. I also note that the proposed facility is simply a conversion of the pre-existing CIT facility and as such, it is expected that there would be no material prejudice to any of the creditors of the CMI Entities that arises from the granting of the DIP charge. I am persuaded that the amount is appropriate and required.

[34] Thirdly, the DIP charge must not and does not secure an obligation that existed before the order was made. The only amount outstanding on the CIT facility is \$10.7 in outstanding letters of credit. These letters of credit are secured by existing security and it is proposed that that security rank ahead of the DIP charge.

[35] Lastly, I must consider amongst others, the enumerated factors in paragraph 11.2(4) of the Act. I have already addressed some of them. The Management Directors of the applicants as that term is used in the materials filed will continue to manage the CMI Entities during the CCAA proceedings. It would appear that management has the confidence of its major creditors. The CMI Entities have appointed a CRA and a Restructuring Officer to negotiate and implement the recapitalization transaction and the aforementioned directors will continue to manage the CMI Entities during the CCAA proceedings. The DIP facility will enhance the prospects of a completed restructuring. CIT has stated that it will not convert the CIT facility into a DIP facility if the DIP charge

is not approved. In its report, the proposed Monitor observes that the ability to borrow funds from a court approved DIP facility secured by the DIP charge is crucial to retain the confidence of the CMI Entities' creditors, employees and suppliers and would enhance the prospects of a viable compromise or arrangement being made. The proposed Monitor is supportive of the DIP facility and charge.

[36] For all of these reasons, I was prepared to approve the DIP facility and charge.

(d) Administration Charge

[37] While an administration charge was customarily granted by courts to secure the fees and disbursements of the professional advisors who guided a debtor company through the CCAA process, as a result of the amendments to the CCAA, there is now statutory authority to grant such a charge. Section 11.52 of the CCAA states:

(1) On notice to the secured creditors who are likely to be affected by the security or charge, the court may make an order declaring that all or part of the property of a debtor company is subject to a security or charge — in an amount that the court considers appropriate — in respect of the fees and expenses of

(a) the monitor, including the fees and expenses of any financial, legal or other experts engaged by the monitor in the performance of the monitor's duties;

(b) any financial, legal or other experts engaged by the company for the purpose of proceedings under this Act; and

(c) any financial, legal or other experts engaged by any other interested person if the court is satisfied that the security or charge is necessary for their effective participation in proceedings under this Act.

(2) The court may order that the security or charge rank in priority over the claim of any secured creditor of the company.

[38] I must therefore be convinced that (1) notice has been given to the secured creditors likely to be affected by the charge; (2) the amount is appropriate; and (3) the charge should extend to all of the proposed beneficiaries.

[39] As with the DIP charge, the issue relating to notice to affected secured creditors has been addressed appropriately by the applicants. The amount requested is up to \$15 million. The beneficiaries of the charge are: the Monitor and its counsel; counsel to the CMI Entities; the financial advisor to the Special Committee and its counsel; counsel to the Management Directors; the CRA; the financial advisor to the Ad Hoc Committee; and RBC Capital Markets and its counsel. The proposed Monitor supports the aforementioned charge and considers it to be required and reasonable in the circumstances in order to preserve the going concern operations of the CMI Entities. The applicants submit that the above-note professionals who have played a necessary and integral role in the restructuring activities to date are necessary to implement the recapitalization transaction.

[40] Estimating quantum is an inexact exercise but I am prepared to accept the amount as being appropriate. There has obviously been extensive negotiation by stakeholders and the restructuring is of considerable magnitude and complexity. I was prepared to accept the submissions relating to the administration charge. I have not included any requirement that all of these professionals be required to have their accounts scrutinized and approved by the Court but they should not preclude this possibility.

(e) Critical Suppliers

[41] The next issue to consider is the applicants' request for authorization to pay pre-filing amounts owed to critical suppliers. In recognition that one of the purposes of the CCAA is to permit an insolvent corporation to remain in business, typically courts exercised their inherent jurisdiction to grant such authorization and a charge with respect to the provision of essential goods and services. In the recent amendments, Parliament codified the practice of permitting the payment of pre-filing amounts to critical suppliers and the provision of a charge. Specifically, section 11.4 provides:

(1) On application by a debtor company and on notice to the secured creditors who are likely to be affected by the security or charge, the court may make an order declaring a person to be a critical supplier to the company if the court is satisfied that

the person is a supplier of goods or services to the company and that the goods or services that are supplied are critical to the company's continued operation.

(2) If the court declares a person to be a critical supplier, the court may make an order requiring the person to supply any goods or services specified by the court to the company on any terms and conditions that are consistent with the supply relationship or that the court considers appropriate.

(3) If the court makes an order under subsection (2), the court shall, in the order, declare that all or part of the property of the company is subject to a security or charge in favour of the person declared to be a critical supplier, in an amount equal to the value of the goods or services supplied under the terms of the order.

(4) The court may order that the security or charge rank in priority over the claim of any secured creditor of the company.

[42] Under these provisions, the Court must be satisfied that there has been notice to creditors likely to be affected by the charge, the person is a supplier of goods or services to the company, and that the goods or services that are supplied are critical to the company's continued operation. While one might interpret section 11.4 (3) as requiring a charge any time a person is declared to be a critical supplier, in my view, this provision only applies when a court is compelling a person to supply. The charge then provides protection to the unwilling supplier.

[43] In this case, no charge is requested and no additional notice is therefore required. Indeed, there is an issue as to whether in the absence of a request for a charge, section 11.4 is even applicable and the Court is left to rely on inherent jurisdiction. The section seems to be primarily directed to the conditions surrounding the granting of a charge to secure critical suppliers. That said, even if it is applicable, I am satisfied that the applicants have met the requirements. The CMI Entities seek authorization to make certain payments to third parties that provide goods and services integral to their business. These include television programming suppliers given the need for continuous and undisturbed flow of programming, newsprint suppliers given the dependency of the National Post on a continuous and uninterrupted supply of newsprint to enable it to publish and on newspaper distributors, and the American Express Corporate Card Program and Central Billed Accounts that are required for CMI Entity employees to perform their job functions. No payment would be made without the consent of the

Monitor. I accept that these suppliers are critical in nature. The CMI Entities also seek more general authorization allowing them to pay other suppliers if in the opinion of the CMI Entities, the supplier is critical. Again, no payment would be made without the consent of the Monitor. In addition, again no charge securing any payments is sought. This is not contrary to the language of section 11.4 (1) or to its purpose. The CMI Entities seek the ability to pay other suppliers if in their opinion the supplier is critical to their business and ongoing operations. The order requested is facilitative and practical in nature. The proposed Monitor supports the applicants' request and states that it will work to ensure that payments to suppliers in respect of pre-filing liabilities are minimized. The Monitor is of course an officer of the Court and is always able to seek direction from the Court if necessary. In addition, it will report on any such additional payments when it files its reports for Court approval. In the circumstances outlined, I am prepared to grant the relief requested in this regard.

(f) Directors' and Officers' Charge

[44] The applicants also seek a directors' and officers' ("D &O") charge in the amount of \$20 million. The proposed charge would rank after the administration charge, the existing CIT security, and the DIP charge. It would rank *pari passu* with the KERP charge discussed subsequently in this endorsement but postponed in right of payment to the extent of the first \$85 million payable under the secured intercompany note.

[45] Again, the recent amendments to the CCAA allow for such a charge. Section 11.51 provides that:

- (1) On application by a debtor company and on notice to the secured creditors who are likely to be affected by the security or charge, the court may make an order declaring that all or part of the property of the company is subject to a security or charge — in an amount that the court considers appropriate — in favour of any director or officer of the company to indemnify the director or officer against obligations and liabilities that they may incur as a director or officer of the company
- (2) The court may order that the security or charge rank in priority over the claim of any secured creditor of the company.
- (3) The court may not make the order if in its opinion the company could obtain adequate indemnification insurance for the director or officer at a reasonable cost.

(4) The court shall make an order declaring that the security or charge does not apply in respect of a specific obligation or liability incurred by a director or officer if in its opinion the obligation or liability was incurred as a result of the director's or officer's gross negligence or wilful misconduct or, in Quebec, the director's or officer's gross or intentional fault.

[46] I have already addressed the issue of notice to affected secured creditors. I must also be satisfied with the amount and that the charge is for obligations and liabilities the directors and officers may incur after the commencement of proceedings. It is not to extend to coverage of wilful misconduct or gross negligence and no order should be granted if adequate insurance at a reasonable cost could be obtained.

[47] The proposed Monitor reports that the amount of \$20 million was estimated taking into consideration the existing D&O insurance and the potential liabilities which may attach including certain employee related and tax related obligations. The amount was negotiated with the DIP lender and the Ad Hoc Committee. The order proposed speaks of indemnification relating to the failure of any of the CMI Entities, after the date of the order, to make certain payments. It also excludes gross negligence and wilful misconduct. The D&O insurance provides for \$30 million in coverage and \$10 million in excess coverage for a total of \$40 million. It will expire in a matter of weeks and Canwest Global has been unable to obtain additional or replacement coverage. I am advised that it also extends to others in the Canwest enterprise and not just to the CMI Entities. The directors and senior management are described as highly experienced, fully functional and qualified. The directors have indicated that they cannot continue in the restructuring effort unless the order includes the requested directors' charge.

[48] The purpose of such a charge is to keep the directors and officers in place during the restructuring by providing them with protection against liabilities they could incur during the restructuring: *Re General Publishing Co.*¹⁰ Retaining the current directors and officers of the applicants would avoid destabilization and would assist in the restructuring. The proposed charge would enable the applicants to keep the experienced board of directors supported by experienced senior management. The proposed Monitor

believes that the charge is required and is reasonable in the circumstances and also observes that it will not cover all of the directors' and officers' liabilities in the worst case scenario. In all of these circumstances, I approved the request.

(g) Key Employee Retention Plans

[49] Approval of a KERP and a KERP charge are matters of discretion. In this case, the CMI Entities have developed KERPs that are designed to facilitate and encourage the continued participation of certain of the CMI Entities' senior executives and other key employees who are required to guide the CMI Entities through a successful restructuring with a view to preserving enterprise value. There are 20 KERP participants all of whom are described by the applicants as being critical to the successful restructuring of the CMI Entities. Details of the KERPs are outlined in the materials and the proposed Monitor's report. A charge of \$5.9 million is requested. The three Management Directors are seasoned executives with extensive experience in the broadcasting and publishing industries. They have played critical roles in the restructuring initiatives taken to date. The applicants state that it is probable that they would consider other employment opportunities if the KERPs were not secured by a KERP charge. The other proposed participants are also described as being crucial to the restructuring and it would be extremely difficult to find replacements for them

[50] Significantly in my view, the Monitor who has scrutinized the proposed KERPs and charge is supportive. Furthermore, they have been approved by the Board, the Special Committee, the Human Resources Committee of Canwest Global and the Ad Hoc Committee. The factors enumerated in *Re Grant Forest*¹¹ have all been met and I am persuaded that the relief in this regard should be granted.

[51] The applicants ask that the Confidential Supplement containing unredacted copies of the KERPs that reveal individually identifiable information and compensation information be sealed. Generally speaking, judges are most reluctant to grant sealing

¹⁰ (2003), 39 C.B.R. (4th) 216.

orders. An open court and public access are fundamental to our system of justice. Section 137(2) of the *Courts of Justice Act* provides authority to grant a sealing order and the Supreme Court of Canada's decision in *Sierra Club of Canada v. Canada (Minister of Finance)*¹² provides guidance on the appropriate legal principles to be applied. Firstly, the Court must be satisfied that the order is necessary in order to prevent a serious risk to an important interest, including a commercial interest, in the context of litigation because reasonable alternative measures will not prevent the risk. Secondly, the salutary effects of the order should outweigh its deleterious effects including the effects on the right to free expression which includes the public interest in open and accessible court proceedings.

- [52] In this case, the unredacted KERPs reveal individually identifiable information including compensation information. Protection of sensitive personal and compensation information the disclosure of which could cause harm to the individuals and to the CMI Entities is an important commercial interest that should be protected. The KERP participants have a reasonable expectation that their personal information would be kept confidential. As to the second branch of the test, the aggregate amount of the KERPs has been disclosed and the individual personal information adds nothing. It seems to me that this second branch of the test has been met. The relief requested is granted.

Annual Meeting

- [53] The CMI Entities seek an order postponing the annual general meeting of shareholders of Canwest Global. Pursuant to section 133 (1)(b) of the CBCA, a corporation is required to call an annual meeting by no later than February 28, 2010, being six months after the end of its preceding financial year which ended on August 31, 2009. Pursuant to section 133 (3), despite subsection (1), the corporation may apply to the court for an order extending the time for calling an annual meeting.

¹¹ [2009] O.J. No. 3344. That said, given the nature of the relationship between a board of directors and senior management, it may not always be appropriate to give undue consideration to the principle of business judgment.

¹² [2002] 2 S.C.R. 522.

- [54] CCAA courts have commonly granted extensions of time for the calling of an annual general meeting. In this case, the CMI Entities including Canwest Global are devoting their time to stabilizing business and implementing a plan. Time and resources would be diverted if the time was not extended as requested and the preparation for and the holding of the annual meeting would likely impede the timely and desirable restructuring of the CMI Entities. Under section 106(6) of the CBCA, if directors of a corporation are not elected, the incumbent directors continue. Financial and other information will be available on the proposed Monitor's website. An extension is properly granted.

Other

- [55] The applicants request authorization to commence Chapter 15 proceedings in the U.S. Continued timely supply of U.S. network and other programming is necessary to preserve going concern value. Commencement of Chapter 15 proceedings to have the CCAA proceedings recognized as "foreign main proceedings" is a prerequisite to the conversion of the CIT facility into the DIP facility. Authorization is granted.
- [56] Canwest's various corporate and other entities share certain business services. They are seeking to continue to provide and receive inter-company services in the ordinary course during the CCAA proceedings. This is supported by the proposed Monitor and FTI will monitor and report to the Court on matters pertaining to the provision of inter-company services.
- [57] Section 23 of the amended CCAA now addresses certain duties and functions of the Monitor including the provision of notice of an Initial Order although the Court may order otherwise. Here the financial threshold for notice to creditors has been increased from \$1000 to \$5000 so as to reduce the burden and cost of such a process. The proceedings will be widely published in the media and the Initial Order is to be posted on the Monitor's website. Other meritorious adjustments were also made to the notice provisions.

[58] This is a “pre-packaged” restructuring and as such, stakeholders have negotiated and agreed on the terms of the requested order. That said, not every stakeholder was before me. For this reason, interested parties are reminded that the order includes the usual come back provision. The return date of any motion to vary, rescind or affect the provisions relating to the CIT credit agreement or the CMI DIP must be no later than November 5, 2009.

[59] I have obviously not addressed every provision in the order but have attempted to address some key provisions. In support of the requested relief, the applicants filed a factum and the proposed Monitor filed a report. These were most helpful. A factum is required under Rule 38.09 of the Rules of Civil Procedure. Both a factum and a proposed Monitor’s report should customarily be filed with a request for an Initial Order under the CCAA.

Conclusion

[60] Weak economic conditions and a high debt load do not a happy couple make but clearly many of the stakeholders have been working hard to produce as desirable an outcome as possible in the circumstances. Hopefully the cooperation will persist.

Pepall J.

Released: October 13, 2009

TAB 5

CITATION: Canwest Publishing Inc., 2010 ONSC 222
COURT FILE NO.: CV-10-8533-00CL
DATE: 20100118

ONTARIO

**SUPERIOR COURT OF JUSTICE
(COMMERCIAL LIST)**

IN THE MATTER OF THE COMPANIES' CREDITORS ARRANGEMENT ACT,
R.S.C. 1985, C-36, AS AMENDED

AND IN THE MATTER OF A PROPOSED PLAN OF COMPROMISE OR
ARRANGEMENT OF CANWEST PUBLISHING INC./PUBLICATIONS CANWEST
INC., CANWEST BOOKS INC. AND CANWEST (CANADA) INC.

COUNSEL: *Lyndon Barnes, Alex Cobb and Duncan Ault* for the Applicant LP Entities
Mario Forte for the Special Committee of the Board of Directors
Andrew Kent and Hilary Clarke for the Administrative Agent of the Senior
Secured Lenders' Syndicate
Peter Griffin for the Management Directors
Robin B. Schwill and Natalie Renner for the Ad Hoc Committee of 9.25% Senior
Subordinated Noteholders
David Byers and Maria Konyukhova for the proposed Monitor, FTI Consulting
Canada Inc.

PEPALL J.

REASONS FOR DECISION

Introduction

[1] Canwest Global Communications Corp. ("Canwest Global") is a leading Canadian media company with interests in (i) newspaper publishing and digital media; and (ii) free-to-air television stations and subscription based specialty television channels. Canwest Global, the entities in its Canadian television business (excluding CW Investments Co. and its subsidiaries) and the National Post Company (which prior to October 30, 2009 owned and published the National Post) (collectively, the "CMI Entities"), obtained protection from their creditors in a

*Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act*¹ ("CCAA") proceeding on October 6, 2009.² Now, the Canwest Global Canadian newspaper entities with the exception of National Post Inc. seek similar protection. Specifically, Canwest Publishing Inc./Publications Canwest Inc. ("CPI"), Canwest Books Inc. ("CBI"), and Canwest (Canada) Inc. ("CCI") apply for an order pursuant to the CCAA. They also seek to have the stay of proceedings and the other benefits of the order extend to Canwest Limited Partnership/Canwest Société en Commandite (the "Limited Partnership"). The Applicants and the Limited Partnership are referred to as the "LP Entities" throughout these reasons. The term "Canwest" will be used to refer to the Canwest enterprise as a whole. It includes the LP Entities and Canwest Global's other subsidiaries which are not applicants in this proceeding.

[2] All appearing on this application supported the relief requested with the exception of the Ad Hoc Committee of 9.25% Senior Subordinated Noteholders. That Committee represents certain unsecured creditors whom I will discuss more fully later.

[3] I granted the order requested with reasons to follow. These are my reasons.

[4] I start with three observations. Firstly, Canwest Global, through its ownership interests in the LP Entities, is the largest publisher of daily English language newspapers in Canada. The LP Entities own and operate 12 daily newspapers across Canada. These newspapers are part of the Canadian heritage and landscape. The oldest, The Gazette, was established in Montreal in 1778. The others are the Vancouver Sun, The Province, the Ottawa Citizen, the Edmonton Journal, the Calgary Herald, The Windsor Star, the Times Colonist, The Star Phoenix, the Leader-Post, the Nanaimo Daily News and the Alberni Valley Times. These newspapers have an estimated average weekly readership that exceeds 4 million. The LP Entities also publish 23 non-daily

¹ R.S.C. 1985, c. C. 36, as amended.

² On October 30, 2009, substantially all of the assets and business of the National Post Company were transferred to the company now known as National Post Inc.

newspapers and own and operate a number of digital media and online operations. The community served by the LP Entities is huge. In addition, based on August 31, 2009 figures, the LP Entities employ approximately 5,300 employees in Canada with approximately 1,300 of those employees working in Ontario. The granting of the order requested is premised on an anticipated going concern sale of the newspaper business of the LP Entities. This serves not just the interests of the LP Entities and their stakeholders but the Canadian community at large.

[5] Secondly, the order requested may contain some shortcomings; it may not be perfect. That said, insolvency proceedings typically involve what is feasible, not what is flawless.

[6] Lastly, although the builders of this insolvent business are no doubt unhappy with its fate, gratitude is not misplaced by acknowledging their role in its construction.

Background Facts

(i) Financial Difficulties

[7] The LP Entities generate the majority of their revenues through the sale of advertising. In the fiscal year ended August 31, 2009, approximately 72% of the LP Entities' consolidated revenue derived from advertising. The LP Entities have been seriously affected by the economic downturn in Canada and their consolidated advertising revenues declined substantially in the latter half of 2008 and in 2009. In addition, they experienced increases in certain of their operating costs.

[8] On May 29, 2009 the Limited Partnership failed, for the first time, to make certain interest and principal reduction payments and related interest and cross currency swap payments totaling approximately \$10 million in respect of its senior secured credit facilities. On the same day, the Limited Partnership announced that, as of May 31, 2009, it would be in breach of certain financial covenants set out in the credit agreement dated as of July 10, 2007 between its predecessor, Canwest Media Works Limited Partnership, The Bank of Nova Scotia as administrative agent, a syndicate of secured lenders ("the LP Secured Lenders"), and the predecessors of CCI, CPI and CBI as guarantors. The Limited Partnership also failed to make

principal, interest and fee payments due pursuant to this credit agreement on June 21, June 22, July 21, July 22 and August 21, 2009.

[9] The May 29, 2009, defaults under the senior secured credit facilities triggered defaults in respect of related foreign currency and interest rate swaps. The swap counterparties (the “Hedging Secured Creditors”) demanded payment of \$68.9 million. These unpaid amounts rank pari passu with amounts owing under the LP Secured Lenders’ credit facilities.

[10] On or around August 31, 2009, the Limited Partnership and certain of the LP Secured Lenders entered into a forbearance agreement in order to allow the LP Entities and the LP Secured Lenders the opportunity to negotiate a pre-packaged restructuring or reorganization of the affairs of the LP Entities. On November 9, 2009, the forbearance agreement expired and since then, the LP Secured Lenders have been in a position to demand payment of approximately \$953.4 million, the amount outstanding as at August 31, 2009. Nonetheless, they continued negotiations with the LP Entities. The culmination of this process is that the LP Entities are now seeking a stay of proceedings under the CCAA in order to provide them with the necessary “breathing space” to restructure and reorganize their businesses and to preserve their enterprise value for the ultimate benefit of their broader stakeholder community.

[11] The Limited Partnership released its annual consolidated financial statements for the twelve months ended August 31, 2009 and 2008 on November 26, 2009. As at August 31, 2009, the Limited Partnership had total consolidated assets with a net book value of approximately \$644.9 million. This included consolidated current assets of \$182.7 million and consolidated non-current assets of approximately \$462.2 million. As at that date, the Limited Partnership had total consolidated liabilities of approximately \$1.719 billion (increased from \$1.656 billion as at August 31, 2008). These liabilities consisted of consolidated current liabilities of \$1.612 billion and consolidated non-current liabilities of \$107 million.

[12] The Limited Partnership had been experiencing deteriorating financial results over the past year. For the year ended August 31, 2009, the Limited Partnership’s consolidated revenues decreased by \$181.7 million or 15% to \$1.021 billion as compared to \$1.203 billion for the year

ended August 31, 2008. For the year ended August 31, 2009, the Limited Partnership reported a consolidated net loss of \$66 million compared to consolidated net earnings of \$143.5 million for fiscal 2008.

(ii) Indebtedness under the Credit Facilities

[13] The indebtedness under the credit facilities of the LP Entities consists of the following.

- (a) The LP senior secured credit facilities are the subject matter of the July 10, 2007 credit agreement already mentioned. They are guaranteed by CCI, CPI and CBI. The security held by the LP Secured Lenders has been reviewed by the solicitors for the proposed Monitor, FTI Consulting Canada Inc. and considered to be valid and enforceable.³ As at August 31, 2009, the amounts owing by the LP Entities totaled \$953.4 million exclusive of interest.⁴
- (b) The Limited Partnership is a party to the aforementioned foreign currency and interest rate swaps with the Hedging Secured Creditors. Defaults under the LP senior secured credit facilities have triggered defaults in respect of these swap arrangements. Demand for repayment of amounts totaling \$68.9 million (exclusive of unpaid interest) has been made. These obligations are secured.
- (c) Pursuant to a senior subordinated credit agreement dated as of July 10, 2007, between the Limited Partnership, The Bank of Nova Scotia as administrative agent for a syndicate of lenders, and others, certain subordinated lenders agreed to provide the Limited Partnership with access to a term credit facility of up to \$75

³ Subject to certain assumptions and qualifications.

⁴ Although not formally in evidence before the court, counsel for the LP Secured Lenders advised the court that currently \$382,889,000 in principal in Canadian dollars is outstanding along with \$458,042,000 in principal in American dollars.

million. CCI, CPI, and CBI are guarantors. This facility is unsecured, guaranteed on an unsecured basis and currently fully drawn. On June 20, 2009, the Limited Partnership failed to make an interest payment resulting in an event of default under the credit agreement. In addition, the defaults under the senior secured credit facilities resulted in a default under this facility. The senior subordinated lenders are in a position to take steps to demand payment.

- (d) Pursuant to a note indenture between the Limited Partnership, The Bank of New York Trust Company of Canada as trustee, and others, the Limited Partnership issued 9.5% per annum senior subordinated unsecured notes due 2015 in the aggregate principal amount of US \$400 million. CPI and CBI are guarantors. The notes are unsecured and guaranteed on an unsecured basis. The noteholders are in a position to take steps to demand immediate payment of all amounts outstanding under the notes as a result of events of default.

[14] The LP Entities use a centralized cash management system at the Bank of Nova Scotia which they propose to continue. Obligations owed pursuant to the existing cash management arrangements are secured (the “Cash Management Creditor”).

(iii) LP Entities’ Response to Financial Difficulties

[15] The LP Entities took a number of steps to address their circumstances with a view to improving cash flow and strengthening their balance sheet. Nonetheless, they began to experience significant tightening of credit from critical suppliers and other trade creditors. The LP Entities’ debt totals approximately \$1.45 billion and they do not have the liquidity required to make payment in respect of this indebtedness. They are clearly insolvent.

[16] The board of directors of Canwest Global struck a special committee of directors (the “Special Committee”) with a mandate to explore and consider strategic alternatives. The Special Committee has appointed Thomas Strike, the President, Corporate Development & Strategy Implementation, as Recapitalization Officer and has retained Gary Colter of CRS Inc. as

Restructuring Advisor for the LP Entities (the “CRA”). The President of CPI, Dennis Skulsky, will report directly to the Special Committee.

[17] Given their problems, throughout the summer and fall of 2009, the LP Entities have participated in difficult and complex negotiations with their lenders and other stakeholders to obtain forbearance and to work towards a consensual restructuring or recapitalization.

[18] An ad hoc committee of the holders of the senior subordinated unsecured notes (the “Ad Hoc Committee”) was formed in July, 2009 and retained Davies Ward Phillips & Vineberg as counsel. Among other things, the Limited Partnership agreed to pay the Committee’s legal fees up to a maximum of \$250,000. Representatives of the Limited Partnership and their advisors have had ongoing discussions with representatives of the Ad Hoc Committee and their counsel was granted access to certain confidential information following execution of a confidentiality agreement. The Ad Hoc Committee has also engaged a financial advisor who has been granted access to the LP Entities’ virtual data room which contains confidential information regarding the business and affairs of the LP Entities. There is no evidence of any satisfactory proposal having been made by the noteholders. They have been in a position to demand payment since August, 2009, but they have not done so.

[19] In the meantime and in order to permit the businesses of the LP Entities to continue to operate as going concerns and in an effort to preserve the greatest number of jobs and maximize value for the stakeholders of the LP Entities, the LP Entities have been engaged in negotiations with the LP Senior Lenders, the result of which is this CCAA application.

(iv) The Support Agreement, the Secured Creditors’ Plan and the Solicitation Process

[20] Since August 31, 2009, the LP Entities and the LP administrative agent for the LP Secured Lenders have worked together to negotiate terms for a consensual, prearranged restructuring, recapitalization or reorganization of the business and affairs of the LP Entities as a going concern. This is referred to by the parties as the Support Transaction.

[21] As part of this Support Transaction, the LP Entities are seeking approval of a Support Agreement entered into by them and the administrative agent for the LP Secured Lenders. 48% of the LP Secured Lenders, the Hedging Secured Creditors, and the Cash Management Creditor (the “Secured Creditors”) are party to the Support Agreement.

[22] Three interrelated elements are contemplated by the Support Agreement and the Support Transaction: the credit acquisition, the Secured Creditors’ plan (the “Plan”), and the sale and investor solicitation process which the parties refer to as SISP.

[23] The Support Agreement contains various milestones with which the LP Entities are to comply and, subject to a successful bid arising from the solicitation process (an important caveat in my view), commits them to support a credit acquisition. The credit acquisition involves an acquisition by an entity capitalized by the Secured Creditors and described as AcquireCo. AcquireCo. would acquire substantially all of the assets of the LP Entities (including the shares in National Post Inc.) and assume certain of the liabilities of the LP Entities. It is contemplated that AcquireCo. would offer employment to all or substantially all of the employees of the LP Entities and would assume all of the LP Entities’ existing pension plans and existing post-retirement and post-employment benefit plans subject to a right by AcquireCo., acting commercially reasonably and after consultation with the operational management of the LP Entities, to exclude certain specified liabilities. The credit acquisition would be the subject matter of a Plan to be voted on by the Secured Creditors on or before January 31, 2010. There would only be one class. The Plan would only compromise the LP Entities’ secured claims and would not affect or compromise any other claims against any of the LP Entities (“unaffected claims”). No holders of the unaffected claims would be entitled to vote on or receive any distributions of their claims. The Secured Creditors would exchange their outstanding secured claims against the LP Entities under the LP credit agreement and the swap obligations respectively for their *pro rata* shares of the debt and equity to be issued by AcquireCo. All of the LP Entities’ obligations under the LP secured claims calculated as of the date of closing less \$25 million would be deemed to be satisfied following the closing of the Acquisition Agreement.

LP secured claims in the amount of \$25 million would continue to be held by AcquireCo. and constitute an outstanding unsecured claim against the LP Entities.

[24] The Support Agreement contemplates that the Financial Advisor, namely RBC Dominion Securities Inc., under the supervision of the Monitor, will conduct the solicitation process. Completion of the credit acquisition process is subject to a successful bid arising from the solicitation process. In general terms, the objective of the solicitation process is to obtain a better offer (with some limitations described below) than that reflected in the credit acquisition. If none is obtained in that process, the LP Entities intend for the credit acquisition to proceed assuming approval of the Plan. Court sanction would also be required.

[25] In more detailed terms, Phase I of the solicitation process is expected to last approximately 7 weeks and qualified interested parties may submit non-binding proposals to the Financial Advisor on or before February 26, 2010. Thereafter, the Monitor will assess the proposals to determine whether there is a reasonable prospect of obtaining a Superior Offer. This is in essence a cash offer that is equal to or higher than that represented by the credit acquisition. If there is such a prospect, the Monitor will recommend that the process continue into Phase II. If there is no such prospect, the Monitor will then determine whether there is a Superior Alternative Offer, that is, an offer that is not a Superior Offer but which might nonetheless receive approval from the Secured Creditors. If so, to proceed into Phase II, the Superior Alternative Offer must be supported by Secured Creditors holding more than at least 33.3% of the secured claims. If it is not so supported, the process would be terminated and the LP Entities would then apply for court sanction of the Plan.

[26] Phase II is expected to last approximately 7 weeks as well. This period allows for due diligence and the submission of final binding proposals. The Monitor will then conduct an assessment akin to the Phase 1 process with somewhat similar attendant outcomes if there are no Superior Offers and no acceptable Alternative Superior Offers. If there were a Superior Offer or an acceptable Alternative Superior Offer, an agreement would be negotiated and the requisite approvals sought.

[27] The solicitation process is designed to allow the LP Entities to test the market. One concern is that a Superior Offer that benefits the secured lenders might operate to preclude a Superior Alternative Offer that could provide a better result for the unsecured creditors. That said, the LP Entities are of the view that the solicitation process and the support transaction present the best opportunity for the businesses of the LP Entities to continue as going concerns, thereby preserving jobs as well as the economic and social benefits of their continued operation. At this stage, the alternative is a bankruptcy or liquidation which would result in significant detriment not only to the creditors and employees of the LP Entities but to the broader community that benefits from the continued operation of the LP Entities' business. I also take some comfort from the position of the Monitor which is best captured in an excerpt from its preliminary Report:

The terms of the Support Agreement and SISP were the subject of lengthy and intense arm's length negotiations between the LP Entities and the LP Administrative Agent. The Proposed Monitor supports approval of the process contemplated therein and of the approval of those documents, but without in any way fettering the various powers and discretions of the Monitor.

[28] It goes without saying that the Monitor, being a court appointed officer, may apply to the court for advice and directions and also owes reporting obligations to the court.

[29] As to the objection of the Ad Hoc Committee, I make the following observations. Firstly, they represent unsecured subordinated debt. They have been in a position to take action since August, 2009. Furthermore, the LP Entities have provided up to \$250,000 for them to retain legal counsel. Meanwhile, the LP Secured Lenders have been in a position to enforce their rights through a non-consensual court proceeding and have advised the LP Entities of their abilities in that regard in the event that the LP Entities did not move forward as contemplated by the Support Agreement. With the Support Agreement and the solicitation process, there is an enhanced likelihood of the continuation of going concern operations, the preservation of jobs and the maximization of value for stakeholders of the LP Entities. It seemed to me that in the face of these facts and given that the Support Agreement expired on January 8, 2010, adjourning the

proceeding was not merited in the circumstances. The Committee did receive very short notice. Without being taken as encouraging or discouraging the use of the comeback clause in the order, I disagree with the submission of counsel to the Ad Hoc Committee to the effect that it is very difficult if not impossible to stop a process relying on that provision. That provision in the order is a meaningful one as is clear from the decision in *Muscletech Research & Development Inc.*⁵. On a come back motion, although the positions of parties who have relied bona fide on an Initial Order should not be prejudiced, the onus is on the applicants for an Initial Order to satisfy the court that the existing terms should be upheld.

Proposed Monitor

[30] The Applicants propose that FTI Consulting Canada Inc. serve as the Monitor. It currently serves as the Monitor in the CMI Entities' CCAA proceeding. It is desirable for FTI to act; it is qualified to act; and it has consented to act. It has not served in any of the incompatible capacities described in section 11.7(2) of the CCAA. The proposed Monitor has an enhanced role that is reflected in the order and which is acceptable.

Proposed Order

[31] As mentioned, I granted the order requested. It is clear that the LP Entities need protection under the CCAA. The order requested will provide stability and enable the LP Entities to pursue their restructuring and preserve enterprise value for their stakeholders. Without the benefit of a stay, the LP Entities would be required to pay approximately \$1.45 billion and would be unable to continue operating their businesses.

⁵ 2006 CarswellOnt 264 (S.C.J.).

(a) Threshold Issues

[32] The chief place of business of the Applicants is Ontario. They qualify as debtor companies under the CCAA. They are affiliated companies with total claims against them that far exceed \$5 million. Demand for payment of the swap indebtedness has been made and the Applicants are in default under all of the other facilities outlined in these reasons. They do not have sufficient liquidity to satisfy their obligations. They are clearly insolvent.

(b) Limited Partnership

[33] The Applicants seek to extend the stay of proceedings and the other relief requested to the Limited Partnership. The CCAA definition of a company does not include a partnership or a limited partnership but courts have exercised their inherent jurisdiction to extend the protections of an Initial CCAA Order to partnerships when it was just and convenient to do so. The relief has been held to be appropriate where the operations of the partnership are so intertwined with those of the debtor companies that irreparable harm would ensue if the requested stay were not granted: *Re Canwest Global Communications Corp*⁶ and *Re Lehndorff General Partners Ltd*⁷.

[34] In this case, the Limited Partnership is the administrative backbone of the LP Entities and is integral to and intertwined with the Applicants' ongoing operations. It owns all shared information technology assets; it provides hosting services for all Canwest properties; it holds all software licences used by the LP Entities; it is party to many of the shared services agreements involving other Canwest entities; and employs approximately 390 full-time equivalent employees who work in Canwest's shared services area. The Applicants state that failure to extend the stay to the Limited Partnership would have a profoundly negative impact on the value of the Applicants, the Limited Partnership and the Canwest Global enterprise as a whole. In

⁶ 2009 CarswellOnt 6184 at para. 29 (S.C.J.).

⁷ (1993), 9 B.L.R. (2d) 275 (Ont. Gen. Div.).

addition, exposing the assets of the Limited Partnership to the demands of creditors would make it impossible for the LP Entities to successfully restructure. I am persuaded that under these circumstances it is just and convenient to grant the request.

(c) Filing of the Secured Creditors' Plan

[35] The LP Entities propose to present the Plan only to the Secured Creditors. Claims of unsecured creditors will not be addressed.

[36] The CCAA seems to contemplate a single creditor-class plan. Sections 4 and 5 state:

s.4 Where a compromise or an arrangement is proposed between a debtor company and its unsecured creditors or any class of them, the court may, on the application in a summary way of the company or of any such creditor or of the trustee in bankruptcy or liquidator of the company, order a meeting of the creditors or class of creditors and, if the court so determines, of the shareholders of the company, to be summoned in such manner as the court directs.

s.5 Where a compromise or an arrangement is proposed between a debtor company and its secured creditors or any class of them, the court may, on the application in a summary way of the company or of any such creditor or of the trustee in bankruptcy or liquidator of the company, order a meeting of the creditors or class of creditors and, if the court so determines, of the shareholders of the company, to be summoned in such manner as the court directs.

[37] Case law has interpreted these provisions as authorizing a single creditor-class plan. For instance, Blair J. (as he then was) stated in *Re Philip Services Corp.*⁸ : " There is no doubt that a debtor is at liberty, under the terms of sections 4 and 5 of the CCAA, to make a proposal to

⁸ 1999 CarswellOnt 4673 (S.C.J.).

secured creditors or to unsecured creditors or to both groups."⁹ Similarly, in *Re Anvil Range Mining Corp.*¹⁰, the Court of Appeal stated: "It may also be noted that s. 5 of the CCAA contemplates a plan which is a compromise between a debtor company and its secured creditors and that by the terms of s. 6 of the Act, applied to the facts of this case, the plan is binding only on the secured creditors and the company and not on the unsecured creditors."¹¹

[38] Based on the foregoing, it is clear that a debtor has the statutory authority to present a plan to a single class of creditors. In *Re Anvil Range Mining Corp.*, the issue was raised in the context of the plan's sanction by the court and a consideration of whether the plan was fair and reasonable as it eliminated the opportunity for unsecured creditors to realize anything. The basis of the argument was that the motions judge had erred in not requiring a more complete and in depth valuation of the company's assets relative to the claims of the secured creditors.

[39] In this case, I am not being asked to sanction the Plan at this stage. Furthermore, the Monitor will supervise a vigorous and lengthy solicitation process to thoroughly canvass the market for alternative transactions. The solicitation should provide a good indication of market value. In addition, as counsel for the LP Entities observed, the noteholders and the LP Entities never had any forbearance agreement. The noteholders have been in a position to take action since last summer but chose not to do so. One would expect some action on their part if they themselves believed that they "were in the money". While the process is not perfect, it is subject to the supervision of the court and the Monitor is obliged to report on its results to the court.

[40] In my view it is appropriate in the circumstances to authorize the LP Entities to file and present a Plan only to the Secured Creditors.

⁹ Ibid at para. 16.

¹⁰ (2002), 34 C.B.R. (4th) 157 (Ont. C.A.), leave to appeal to S.C.C. refused (March 6, 2003).

¹¹ Ibid at para. 34.

(d) DIP Financing

[41] The Applicants seek approval of a DIP facility in the amount of \$25 million which would be secured by a charge over all of the assets of the LP Entities and rank ahead of all other charges except the Administration Charge, and ahead of all other existing security interests except validly perfected purchase money security interests and certain specific statutory encumbrances.

[42] Section 11.2 of the CCAA provides the statutory jurisdiction to grant a DIP charge. In *Re Canwest*¹², I addressed this provision. Firstly, an applicant should address the requirements contained in section 11.2 (1) and then address the enumerated factors found in section 11.2(4) of the CCAA. As that list is not exhaustive, it may be appropriate to consider other factors as well.

[43] Applying these principles to this case and dealing firstly with section 11.2(1) of the CCAA, notice either has been given to secured creditors likely to be affected by the security or charge or alternatively they are not affected by the DIP charge. While funds are not anticipated to be immediately necessary, the cash flow statements project a good likelihood that the LP Entities will require the additional liquidity afforded by the \$25 million. The ability to borrow funds that are secured by a charge will help retain the confidence of the LP Entities' trade creditors, employees and suppliers. It is expected that the DIP facility will permit the LP Entities to conduct the solicitation process and consummate a recapitalization transaction of a sale of all or some of its assets. The charge does not secure any amounts that were owing prior to the filing. As such, there has been compliance with the provisions of section 11.2 (1).

[44] Turning then to a consideration of the factors found in section 11.2(4) of the Act, the LP Entities are expected to be subject to these CCAA proceedings until July 31, 2010. Their business and financial affairs will be amply managed during the proceedings. This is a

¹² Supra, note 7 at paras. 31-35.

consensual filing which is reflective of the confidence of the major creditors in the current management configuration. All of these factors favour the granting of the charge. The DIP loan would enhance the prospects of a viable compromise or arrangement and would ensure the necessary stability during the CCAA process. I have already touched upon the issue of value. That said, in relative terms, the quantum of the DIP financing is not large and there is no readily apparent material prejudice to any creditor arising from the granting of the charge and approval of the financing. I also note that it is endorsed by the proposed Monitor in its report.

[45] Other factors to consider in assessing whether to approve a DIP charge include the reasonableness of the financing terms and more particularly the associated fees. Ideally there should be some evidence on this issue. Prior to entering into the forbearance agreement, the LP Entities sought proposals from other third party lenders for a DIP facility. In this case, some but not all of the Secured Creditors are participating in the financing of the DIP loan. Therefore, only some would benefit from the DIP while others could bear the burden of it. While they may have opted not to participate in the DIP financing for various reasons, the concurrence of the non participating Secured Creditors is some market indicator of the appropriateness of the terms of the DIP financing.

[46] Lastly, I note that the DIP lenders have indicated that they would not provide a DIP facility if the charge was not approved. In all of these circumstances, I was prepared to approve the DIP facility and grant the DIP charge.

(e) Critical Suppliers

[47] The LP Entities ask that they be authorized but not required to pay pre-filing amounts owing in arrears to certain suppliers if the supplier is critical to the business and ongoing operations of the LP Entities or the potential future benefit of the payments is considerable and of value to the LP Entities as a whole. Such payments could only be made with the consent of the proposed Monitor. At present, it is contemplated that such suppliers would consist of certain newspaper suppliers, newspaper distributors, logistic suppliers and the Amex Bank of Canada. The LP Entities do not seek a charge to secure payments to any of its critical suppliers.

[48] Section 11.4 of the CCAA addresses critical suppliers. It states:

11.4(1) On application by a debtor company and on notice to the secured creditors who are likely to be affected by the security or charge, the court may make an order declaring a person to be a critical supplier to the company if the court is satisfied that the person is a supplier of goods and services to the company and that the goods or services that are supplied are critical to the company's continued operation.

(2) If the court declares the person to be a critical supplier, the court may make an order requiring the person to supply any goods or services specified by the court to the company on any terms and conditions that are consistent with the supply relationship or that the court considers appropriate.

(3) If the court makes an order under subsection (2), the court shall, in the order, declare that all or part of the property of the company is subject to a security or charge in favour of the person declared to be a critical supplier, in an amount equal to the value of the goods or services supplied upon the terms of the order.

(4) The court may order that the security or charge rank in priority over the claim of any secured creditor of the company.

[49] Mr. Byers, who is counsel for the Monitor, submits that the court has always had discretion to authorize the payment of critical suppliers and that section 11.4 is not intended to address that issue. Rather, it is intended to respond to a post-filing situation where a debtor company wishes to compel a supplier to supply. In those circumstances, the court may declare a person to be a critical supplier and require the person to supply. If the court chooses to compel a person to supply, it must authorize a charge as security for the supplier. Mr. Barnes, who is counsel for the LP Entities, submits that section 11.4 is not so limited. Section 11.4 (1) gives the court general jurisdiction to declare a supplier to be a "critical supplier" where the supplier provides goods or services that are essential to the ongoing business of the debtor company. The permissive as opposed to mandatory language of section 11.4 (2) supports this interpretation.

[50] Section 11.4 is not very clear. As a matter of principle, one would expect the purpose of section 11.4 to be twofold: (i) to codify the authority to permit suppliers who are critical to the continued operation of the company to be paid and (ii) to require the granting of a charge in circumstances where the court is compelling a person to supply. If no charge is proposed to be granted, there is no need to give notice to the secured creditors. I am not certain that the distinction between Mr. Byers and Mr. Barnes' interpretation is of any real significance for the purposes of this case. Either section 11.4(1) does not oust the court's inherent jurisdiction to make provision for the payment of critical suppliers where no charge is requested or it provides authority to the court to declare persons to be critical suppliers. Section 11.4(1) requires the person to be a supplier of goods and services that are critical to the companies' operation but does not impose any additional conditions or limitations.

[51] The LP Entities do not seek a charge but ask that they be authorized but not required to make payments for the pre-filing provision of goods and services to certain third parties who are critical and integral to their businesses. This includes newsprint and ink suppliers. The LP Entities are dependent upon a continuous and uninterrupted supply of newsprint and ink and they have insufficient inventory on hand to meet their needs. It also includes newspaper distributors who are required to distribute the newspapers of the LP Entities; American Express whose corporate card programme and accounts are used by LP Entities employees for business related expenses; and royalty fees accrued and owing to content providers for the subscription-based on-line service provided by FPinfomart.ca, one of the businesses of the LP Entities. The LP Entities believe that it would be damaging to both their ongoing operations and their ability to restructure if they are unable to pay their critical suppliers. I am satisfied that the LP Entities may treat these parties and those described in Mr. Strike's affidavit as critical suppliers but none will be paid without the consent of the Monitor.

(f) Administration Charge and Financial Advisor Charge

[52] The Applicants also seek a charge in the amount of \$3 million to secure the fees of the Monitor, its counsel, the LP Entities' counsel, the Special Committee's financial advisor and

counsel to the Special Committee, the CRA and counsel to the CRA. These are professionals whose services are critical to the successful restructuring of the LP Entities' business. This charge is to rank in priority to all other security interests in the LP Entities' assets, with the exception of purchase money security interests and specific statutory encumbrances as provided for in the proposed order.¹³ The LP Entities also request a \$10 million charge in favour of the Financial Advisor, RBC Dominion Securities Inc. The Financial Advisor is providing investment banking services to the LP Entities and is essential to the solicitation process. This charge would rank in third place, subsequent to the administration charge and the DIP charge.

[53] In the past, an administration charge was granted pursuant to the inherent jurisdiction of the court. Section 11.52 of the amended CCAA now provides statutory jurisdiction to grant an administration charge. Section 11.52 states:

On notice to the secured creditors who are likely to be affected by the security or charge, the court may make an order declaring that all or part of the property of the debtor company is subject to a security or charge – in an amount that the court considers appropriate – in respect of the fees and expenses of

- (a) the monitor, including the fees and expenses of any financial, legal or other experts engaged by the monitor in the performance of the monitor's duties;
- (b) any financial, legal or other experts engaged by the company for the purpose of proceedings under this Act; and
- (c) any financial, legal or other experts engaged by any other interested person if the court is satisfied that the security or charge is necessary for their effective participation in proceedings under this Act.

¹³ This exception also applies to the other charges granted.

(2) The court may order that the security or charge rank in priority over the claim of any secured creditor of the company.

[54] I am satisfied that the issue of notice has been appropriately addressed by the LP Entities. As to whether the amounts are appropriate and whether the charges should extend to the proposed beneficiaries, the section does not contain any specific criteria for a court to consider in its assessment. It seems to me that factors that might be considered would include:

- (a) the size and complexity of the businesses being restructured;
- (b) the proposed role of the beneficiaries of the charge;
- (c) whether there is an unwarranted duplication of roles;
- (d) whether the quantum of the proposed charge appears to be fair and reasonable;
- (e) the position of the secured creditors likely to be affected by the charge; and
- (f) the position of the Monitor.

This is not an exhaustive list and no doubt other relevant factors will be developed in the jurisprudence.

[55] There is no question that the restructuring of the LP Entities is large and highly complex and it is reasonable to expect extensive involvement by professional advisors. Each of the professionals whose fees are to be secured has played a critical role in the LP Entities restructuring activities to date and each will continue to be integral to the solicitation and restructuring process. Furthermore, there is no unwarranted duplication of roles. As to quantum of both proposed charges, I accept the Applicants' submissions that the business of the LP Entities and the tasks associated with their restructuring are of a magnitude and complexity that justify the amounts. I also take some comfort from the fact that the administrative agent for the LP Secured Lenders has agreed to them. In addition, the Monitor supports the charges requested. The quantum of the administration charge appears to be fair and reasonable. As to the quantum

of the charge in favour of the Financial Advisor, it is more unusual as it involves an incentive payment but I note that the Monitor conducted its own due diligence and, as mentioned, is supportive of the request. The quantum reflects an appropriate incentive to secure a desirable alternative offer. Based on all of these factors, I concluded that the two charges should be approved.

(g) Directors and Officers

[56] The Applicants also seek a directors and officers charge (“D & O charge”) in the amount of \$35 million as security for their indemnification obligations for liabilities imposed upon the Applicants’ directors and officers. The D & O charge will rank after the Financial Advisor charge and will rank *pari passu* with the MIP charge discussed subsequently. Section 11.51 of the CCAA addresses a D & O charge. I have already discussed section 11.51 in *Re Canwest*¹⁴ as it related to the request by the CMI Entities for a D & O charge. Firstly, the charge is essential to the successful restructuring of the LP Entities. The continued participation of the experienced Boards of Directors, management and employees of the LP Entities is critical to the restructuring. Retaining the current officers and directors will also avoid destabilization. Furthermore, a CCAA restructuring creates new risks and potential liabilities for the directors and officers. The amount of the charge appears to be appropriate in light of the obligations and liabilities that may be incurred by the directors and officers. The charge will not cover all of the directors’ and officers’ liabilities in a worse case scenario. While Canwest Global maintains D & O liability insurance, it has only been extended to February 28, 2009 and further extensions are unavailable. As of the date of the Initial Order, Canwest Global had been unable to obtain additional or replacement insurance coverage.

[57] Understandably in my view, the directors have indicated that due to the potential for significant personal liability, they cannot continue their service and involvement in the

¹⁴ Supra note 7 at paras. 44-48.

restructuring absent a D & O charge. The charge also provides assurances to the employees of the LP Entities that obligations for accrued wages and termination and severance pay will be satisfied. All secured creditors have either been given notice or are unaffected by the D & O charge. Lastly, the Monitor supports the charge and I was satisfied that the charge should be granted as requested.

(h) Management Incentive Plan and Special Arrangements

[58] The LP Entities have made amendments to employment agreements with 2 key employees and have developed certain Management Incentive Plans for 24 participants (collectively the “MIPs”). They seek a charge in the amount of \$3 million to secure these obligations. It would be subsequent to the D & O charge.

[59] The CCAA is silent on charges in support of Key Employee Retention Plans (“KERPs”) but they have been approved in numerous CCAA proceedings. Most recently, in *Re Canwest*¹⁵, I approved the KERP requested on the basis of the factors enumerated in *Re Grant Forrest*¹⁶ and given that the Monitor had carefully reviewed the charge and was supportive of the request as were the Board of Directors, the Special Committee of the Board of Directors, the Human Resources Committee of Canwest Global and the Adhoc Committee of Noteholders.

[60] The MIPs in this case are designed to facilitate and encourage the continued participation of certain senior executives and other key employees who are required to guide the LP Entities through a successful restructuring. The participants are critical to the successful restructuring of the LP Entities. They are experienced executives and have played critical roles in the restructuring initiatives to date. They are integral to the continued operation of the business

¹⁵ Supra note 7.

¹⁶ [2009] O.J. No. 3344 (S.C.J.).

during the restructuring and the successful completion of a plan of restructuring, reorganization, compromise or arrangement.

[61] In addition, it is probable that they would consider other employment opportunities in the absence of a charge securing their payments. The departure of senior management would distract from and undermine the restructuring process that is underway and it would be extremely difficult to find replacements for these employees. The MIPs provide appropriate incentives for the participants to remain in their current positions and ensures that they are properly compensated for their assistance in the reorganization process.

[62] In this case, the MIPs and the MIP charge have been approved in form and substance by the Board of Directors and the Special Committee of Canwest Global. The proposed Monitor has also expressed its support for the MIPs and the MIP charge in its pre-filing report. In my view, the charge should be granted as requested.

(i) Confidential Information

[63] The LP Entities request that the court seal the confidential supplement which contains individually identifiable information and compensation information including sensitive salary information about the individuals who are covered by the MIPs. It also contains an unredacted copy of the Financial Advisor's agreement. I have discretion pursuant to Section 137(2) of the *Courts of Justice Act*¹⁷ to order that any document filed in a civil proceeding be treated as confidential, sealed and not form part of the public record. That said, public access in an important tenet of our system of justice.

[64] The threshold test for sealing orders is found in the Supreme Court of Canada decision of *Sierra Club of Canada v Canada (Minister of Finance)*¹⁸. In that case, Iacobucci J. stated that an

¹⁷ R.S.O. 1990, c. C.43, as amended.

¹⁸ [2002] 2 S.C.R. 522.

order should only be granted when: (i) it is necessary in order to prevent a serious risk to an important interest, including a commercial interest, in the context of litigation because reasonable alternative measures will not prevent the risk; and (ii) the salutary effects of the confidentiality order, including the effects on the right of civil litigants to a fair trial, outweigh its deleterious effects, including the effects on the right to free expression, which in this context includes the public interest in open and accessible court proceedings.

[65] In *Re Canwest*¹⁹ I applied the *Sierra Club* test and approved a similar request by the Applicants for the sealing of a confidential supplement containing unredacted copies of KERPs for the employees of the CMI Entities. Here, with respect to the first branch of the *Sierra Club* test, the confidential supplement contains unredacted copies of the MIPs. Protecting the disclosure of sensitive personal and compensation information of this nature, the disclosure of which would cause harm to both the LP Entities and the MIP participants, is an important commercial interest that should be protected. The information would be of obvious strategic advantage to competitors. Moreover, there are legitimate personal privacy concerns in issue. The MIP participants have a reasonable expectation that their names and their salary information will be kept confidential. With respect to the second branch of the *Sierra Club* test, keeping the information confidential will not have any deleterious effects. As in the *Re Canwest* case, the aggregate amount of the MIP charge has been disclosed and the individual personal information adds nothing. The salutary effects of sealing the confidential supplement outweigh any conceivable deleterious effects. In the normal course, outside of the context of a CCAA proceeding, confidential personal and salary information would be kept confidential by an employer and would not find its way into the public domain. With respect to the unredacted Financial Advisor agreement, it contains commercially sensitive information the disclosure of which could be harmful to the solicitation process and the salutary effects of sealing it outweigh

¹⁹ *Supra*, note 7 at para. 52.

any deleterious effects. The confidential supplements should be sealed and not form part of the public record at least at this stage of the proceedings.

Conclusion

[66] For all of these reasons, I was prepared to grant the order requested.

Pepall J.

Released: January 18, 2010

CITATION: CanWest Global Communications Corp., 2010 ONSC 222
COURT FILE NO.: CV-10-8533-00CL
DATE: 20100118

ONTARIO

**SUPERIOR COURT OF JUSTICE
(COMMERCIAL LIST)**

IN THE MATTER OF THE COMPANIES'
CREDITORS ARRANGEMENT ACT,
R.S.C. 1985, C-36, AS AMENDED

AND IN THE MATTER OF A PROPOSED PLAN
OF COMPROMISE OR
ARRANGEMENT OF CANWEST GLOBAL
COMMUNICATIONS CORP. AND THE OTHER
APPLICANTS LISTED ON SCHEDULE "A"

REASONS FOR DECISION

Pepall J.

Released: January 18, 2010

TAB 6

Century Services Inc. Appellant

v.

**Attorney General of Canada on behalf
of Her Majesty The Queen in Right of
Canada Respondent**

**INDEXED AS: CENTURY SERVICES INC. v. CANADA
(ATTORNEY GENERAL)**

2010 SCC 60

File No.: 33239.

2010: May 11; 2010: December 16.

Present: McLachlin C.J. and Binnie, LeBel, Deschamps,
Fish, Abella, Charron, Rothstein and Cromwell JJ.

**ON APPEAL FROM THE COURT OF APPEAL FOR
BRITISH COLUMBIA**

Bankruptcy and Insolvency — Priorities — Crown applying on eve of bankruptcy of debtor company to have GST monies held in trust paid to Receiver General of Canada — Whether deemed trust in favour of Crown under Excise Tax Act prevails over provisions of Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act purporting to nullify deemed trusts in favour of Crown — Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act, R.S.C. 1985, c. C-36, s. 18.3(1) — Excise Tax Act, R.S.C. 1985, c. E-15, s. 222(3).

Bankruptcy and insolvency — Procedure — Whether chambers judge had authority to make order partially lifting stay of proceedings to allow debtor company to make assignment in bankruptcy and to stay Crown's right to enforce GST deemed trust — Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act, R.S.C. 1985, c. C-36, s. 11.

Trusts — Express trusts — GST collected but unremitted to Crown — Judge ordering that GST be held by Monitor in trust account — Whether segregation of Crown's GST claim in Monitor's account created an express trust in favour of Crown.

Century Services Inc. Appelante

c.

**Procureur général du Canada au
nom de Sa Majesté la Reine du chef du
Canada Intimé**

**RÉPERTORIÉ : CENTURY SERVICES INC. c. CANADA
(PROCUREUR GÉNÉRAL)**

2010 CSC 60

N° du greffe : 33239.

2010 : 11 mai; 2010 : 16 décembre.

Présents : La juge en chef McLachlin et les juges Binnie,
LeBel, Deschamps, Fish, Abella, Charron, Rothstein et
Cromwell.

**EN APPEL DE LA COUR D'APPEL DE LA
COLOMBIE-BRITANNIQUE**

Faillite et insolvabilité — Priorités — Demande de la Couronne à la société débitrice, la veille de la faillite, sollicitant le paiement au receveur général du Canada de la somme détenue en fiducie au titre de la TPS — La fiducie réputée établie par la Loi sur la taxe d'accise en faveur de la Couronne l'emporte-t-elle sur les dispositions de la Loi sur les arrangements avec les créanciers des compagnies censées neutraliser ces fiducies? — Loi sur les arrangements avec les créanciers des compagnies, L.R.C. 1985, ch. C-36, art. 18.3(1) — Loi sur la taxe d'accise, L.R.C. 1985, ch. E-15, art. 222(3).

Faillite et insolvabilité — Procédure — Le juge en cabinet avait-il le pouvoir, d'une part, de lever partiellement la suspension des procédures pour permettre à la compagnie débitrice de faire cession de ses biens en faillite et, d'autre part, de suspendre les mesures prises par la Couronne pour bénéficier de la fiducie réputée se rapportant à la TPS? — Loi sur les arrangements avec les créanciers des compagnies, L.R.C. 1985, ch. C-36, art. 11.

Fiducies — Fiducies expresses — Somme perçue au titre de la TPS mais non versée à la Couronne — Ordonnance du juge exigeant que la TPS soit détenue par le contrôleur dans son compte en fiducie — Le fait que le montant de TPS réclamé par la Couronne soit détenu séparément dans le compte du contrôleur a-t-il créé une fiducie expresse en faveur de la Couronne?

The debtor company commenced proceedings under the *Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act* ("CCAA"), obtaining a stay of proceedings to allow it time to reorganize its financial affairs. One of the debtor company's outstanding debts at the commencement of the reorganization was an amount of unremitted Goods and Services Tax ("GST") payable to the Crown. Section 222(3) of the *Excise Tax Act* ("ETA") created a deemed trust over unremitted GST, which operated despite any other enactment of Canada except the *Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act* ("BIA"). However, s. 18.3(1) of the CCAA provided that any statutory deemed trusts in favour of the Crown did not operate under the CCAA, subject to certain exceptions, none of which mentioned GST.

Pursuant to an order of the CCAA chambers judge, a payment not exceeding \$5 million was approved to the debtor company's major secured creditor, Century Services. However, the chambers judge also ordered the debtor company to hold back and segregate in the Monitor's trust account an amount equal to the unremitted GST pending the outcome of the reorganization. On concluding that reorganization was not possible, the debtor company sought leave of the court to partially lift the stay of proceedings so it could make an assignment in bankruptcy under the BIA. The Crown moved for immediate payment of unremitted GST to the Receiver General. The chambers judge denied the Crown's motion, and allowed the assignment in bankruptcy. The Court of Appeal allowed the appeal on two grounds. First, it reasoned that once reorganization efforts had failed, the chambers judge was bound under the priority scheme provided by the ETA to allow payment of unremitted GST to the Crown and had no discretion under s. 11 of the CCAA to continue the stay against the Crown's claim. Second, the Court of Appeal concluded that by ordering the GST funds segregated in the Monitor's trust account, the chambers judge had created an express trust in favour of the Crown.

Held (Abella J. dissenting): The appeal should be allowed.

Per McLachlin C.J. and Binnie, LeBel, Deschamps, Charron, Rothstein and Cromwell JJ.: The apparent conflict between s. 222(3) of the ETA and s. 18.3(1) of the CCAA can be resolved through an interpretation that properly recognizes the history of the CCAA, its function amidst the body of insolvency legislation enacted by

La compagnie débitrice a déposé une requête sous le régime de la *Loi sur les arrangements avec les créanciers des compagnies* (« LACC ») et obtenu la suspension des procédures dans le but de réorganiser ses finances. Parmi les dettes de la compagnie débitrice au début de la réorganisation figurait une somme due à la Couronne, mais non versée encore, au titre de la taxe sur les produits et services (« TPS »). Le paragraphe 222(3) de la *Loi sur la taxe d'accise* (« LTA ») crée une fiducie réputée visant les sommes de TPS non versées. Cette fiducie s'applique malgré tout autre texte législatif du Canada sauf la *Loi sur la faillite et l'insolvabilité* (« LFI »). Toutefois, le par. 18.3(1) de la LACC prévoyait que, sous réserve de certaines exceptions, dont aucune ne concerne la TPS, les fiducies réputées établies par la loi en faveur de la Couronne ne s'appliquaient pas sous son régime.

Le juge siégeant en son cabinet chargé d'appliquer la LACC a approuvé par ordonnance le paiement à Century Services, le principal créancier garanti du débiteur, d'une somme d'au plus cinq millions de dollars. Toutefois, il a également ordonné à la compagnie débitrice de retenir un montant égal aux sommes de TPS non versées et de le déposer séparément dans le compte en fiducie du contrôleur jusqu'à l'issue de la réorganisation. Ayant conclu que la réorganisation n'était pas possible, la compagnie débitrice a demandé au tribunal de lever partiellement la suspension des procédures pour lui permettre de faire cession de ses biens en vertu de la LFI. La Couronne a demandé par requête le paiement immédiat au receveur général des sommes de TPS non versées. Le juge siégeant en son cabinet a rejeté la requête de la Couronne et autorisé la cession des biens. La Cour d'appel a accueilli l'appel pour deux raisons. Premièrement, elle a conclu que, après que la tentative de réorganisation eut échoué, le juge siégeant en son cabinet était tenu, en raison de la priorité établie par la LTA, d'autoriser le paiement à la Couronne des sommes qui lui étaient dues au titre de la TPS, et que l'art. 11 de la LACC ne lui conférait pas le pouvoir discrétionnaire de maintenir la suspension de la demande de la Couronne. Deuxièmement, la Cour d'appel a conclu que, en ordonnant la ségrégation des sommes de TPS dans le compte en fiducie du contrôleur, le juge siégeant en son cabinet avait créé une fiducie expresse en faveur de la Couronne.

Arrêt (la juge Abella est dissidente) : Le pourvoi est accueilli.

La juge en chef McLachlin et les juges Binnie, LeBel, Deschamps, Charron, Rothstein et Cromwell : Il est possible de résoudre le conflit apparent entre le par. 222(3) de la LTA et le par. 18.3(1) de la LACC en les interprétant d'une manière qui tienne compte adéquatement de l'historique de la LACC, de la fonction de cette loi parmi

Parliament and the principles for interpreting the *CCAA* that have been recognized in the jurisprudence. The history of the *CCAA* distinguishes it from the *BIA* because although these statutes share the same remedial purpose of avoiding the social and economic costs of liquidating a debtor's assets, the *CCAA* offers more flexibility and greater judicial discretion than the rules-based mechanism under the *BIA*, making the former more responsive to complex reorganizations. Because the *CCAA* is silent on what happens if reorganization fails, the *BIA* scheme of liquidation and distribution necessarily provides the backdrop against which creditors assess their priority in the event of bankruptcy. The contemporary thrust of legislative reform has been towards harmonizing aspects of insolvency law common to the *CCAA* and the *BIA*, and one of its important features has been a cutback in Crown priorities. Accordingly, the *CCAA* and the *BIA* both contain provisions nullifying statutory deemed trusts in favour of the Crown, and both contain explicit exceptions exempting source deductions deemed trusts from this general rule. Meanwhile, both Acts are harmonious in treating other Crown claims as unsecured. No such clear and express language exists in those Acts carving out an exception for GST claims.

When faced with the apparent conflict between s. 222(3) of the *ETA* and s. 18.3(1) of the *CCAA*, courts have been inclined to follow *Ottawa Senators Hockey Club Corp. (Re)* and resolve the conflict in favour of the *ETA*. *Ottawa Senators* should not be followed. Rather, the *CCAA* provides the rule. Section 222(3) of the *ETA* evinces no explicit intention of Parliament to repeal *CCAA* s. 18.3. Where Parliament has sought to protect certain Crown claims through statutory deemed trusts and intended that these deemed trusts continue in insolvency, it has legislated so expressly and elaborately. Meanwhile, there is no express statutory basis for concluding that GST claims enjoy a preferred treatment under the *CCAA* or the *BIA*. The internal logic of the *CCAA* appears to subject a GST deemed trust to the waiver by Parliament of its priority. A strange asymmetry would result if differing treatments of GST deemed trusts under the *CCAA* and the *BIA* were found to exist, as this would encourage statute shopping, undermine the *CCAA*'s remedial purpose and invite the very social ills that the statute was enacted to avert. The later in time enactment of the more general s. 222(3) of the *ETA* does not require application of the doctrine of implied repeal to the earlier and more specific s. 18.3(1) of the *CCAA* in the circumstances of this case. In any event,

l'ensemble des textes adoptés par le législateur fédéral en matière d'insolvabilité et des principes d'interprétation de la *LACC* reconnus dans la jurisprudence. L'historique de la *LACC* permet de distinguer celle-ci de la *LFI* en ce sens que, bien que ces lois aient pour objet d'éviter les coûts sociaux et économiques liés à la liquidation de l'actif d'un débiteur, la *LACC* offre plus de souplesse et accorde aux tribunaux un plus grand pouvoir discrétionnaire que le mécanisme fondé sur des règles de la *LFI*, ce qui rend la première mieux adaptée aux réorganisations complexes. Comme la *LACC* ne précise pas ce qui arrive en cas d'échec de la réorganisation, la *LFI* fournit la norme de référence permettant aux créanciers de savoir s'ils ont la priorité dans l'éventualité d'une faillite. Le travail de réforme législative contemporain a principalement visé à harmoniser les aspects communs à la *LACC* et à la *LFI*, et l'une des caractéristiques importantes de cette réforme est la réduction des priorités dont jouit la Couronne. Par conséquent, la *LACC* et la *LFI* contiennent toutes deux des dispositions neutralisant les fiducies réputées établies en vertu d'un texte législatif en faveur de la Couronne, et toutes deux comportent des exceptions expresses à la règle générale qui concernent les fiducies réputées établies à l'égard des retenues à la source. Par ailleurs, ces deux lois considèrent les autres créances de la Couronne comme des créances non garanties. Ces lois ne comportent pas de dispositions claires et expresses établissant une exception pour les créances relatives à la TPS.

Les tribunaux appelés à résoudre le conflit apparent entre le par. 222(3) de la *LTA* et le par. 18.3(1) de la *LACC* ont été enclins à appliquer l'arrêt *Ottawa Senators Hockey Club Corp. (Re)* et à trancher en faveur de la *LTA*. Il ne convient pas de suivre cet arrêt. C'est plutôt la *LACC* qui énonce la règle applicable. Le paragraphe 222(3) de la *LTA* ne révèle aucune intention explicite du législateur d'abroger l'art. 18.3 de la *LACC*. Quand le législateur a voulu protéger certaines créances de la Couronne au moyen de fiducies réputées et voulu que celles-ci continuent de s'appliquer en situation d'insolvabilité, il l'a indiqué de manière explicite et minutieuse. En revanche, il n'existe aucune disposition législative expresse permettant de conclure que les créances relatives à la TPS bénéficient d'un traitement préférentiel sous le régime de la *LACC* ou de la *LFI*. Il semble découler de la logique interne de la *LACC* que la fiducie réputée établie à l'égard de la TPS est visée par la renonciation du législateur à sa priorité. Il y aurait une étrange asymétrie si l'on concluait que la *LACC* ne traite pas les fiducies réputées à l'égard de la TPS de la même manière que la *LFI*, car cela encouragerait les créanciers à recourir à la loi la plus favorable, minerait les objectifs réparateurs de la *LACC* et risquerait de favoriser les maux sociaux que l'édiction de ce texte législatif visait justement à

recent amendments to the *CCAA* in 2005 resulted in s. 18.3 of the Act being renumbered and reformulated, making it the later in time provision. This confirms that Parliament's intent with respect to GST deemed trusts is to be found in the *CCAA*. The conflict between the *ETA* and the *CCAA* is more apparent than real.

The exercise of judicial discretion has allowed the *CCAA* to adapt and evolve to meet contemporary business and social needs. As reorganizations become increasingly complex, *CCAA* courts have been called upon to innovate. In determining their jurisdiction to sanction measures in a *CCAA* proceeding, courts should first interpret the provisions of the *CCAA* before turning to their inherent or equitable jurisdiction. Noteworthy in this regard is the expansive interpretation the language of the *CCAA* is capable of supporting. The general language of the *CCAA* should not be read as being restricted by the availability of more specific orders. The requirements of appropriateness, good faith and due diligence are baseline considerations that a court should always bear in mind when exercising *CCAA* authority. The question is whether the order will usefully further efforts to avoid the social and economic losses resulting from liquidation of an insolvent company, which extends to both the purpose of the order and the means it employs. Here, the chambers judge's order staying the Crown's GST claim was in furtherance of the *CCAA*'s objectives because it blunted the impulse of creditors to interfere in an orderly liquidation and fostered a harmonious transition from the *CCAA* to the *BIA*, meeting the objective of a single proceeding that is common to both statutes. The transition from the *CCAA* to the *BIA* may require the partial lifting of a stay of proceedings under the *CCAA* to allow commencement of *BIA* proceedings, but no gap exists between the two statutes because they operate in tandem and creditors in both cases look to the *BIA* scheme of distribution to foreshadow how they will fare if the reorganization is unsuccessful. The breadth of the court's discretion under the *CCAA* is sufficient to construct a bridge to liquidation under the *BIA*. Hence, the chambers judge's order was authorized.

prévenir. Le paragraphe 222(3) de la *LTA*, une disposition plus récente et générale que le par. 18.3(1) de la *LACC*, n'exige pas l'application de la doctrine de l'abrogation implicite dans les circonstances de la présente affaire. En tout état de cause, par suite des modifications apportées récemment à la *LACC* en 2005, l'art. 18.3 a été reformulé et renuméroté, ce qui en fait la disposition postérieure. Cette constatation confirme que c'est dans la *LACC* qu'est exprimée l'intention du législateur en ce qui a trait aux fiducies réputées visant la TPS. Le conflit entre la *LTA* et la *LACC* est plus apparent que réel.

L'exercice par les tribunaux de leurs pouvoirs discrétionnaires a fait en sorte que la *LACC* a évolué et s'est adaptée aux besoins commerciaux et sociaux contemporains. Comme les réorganisations deviennent très complexes, les tribunaux chargés d'appliquer la *LACC* ont été appelés à innover. Les tribunaux doivent d'abord interpréter les dispositions de la *LACC* avant d'invoquer leur compétence inhérente ou leur compétence en equity pour établir leur pouvoir de prendre des mesures dans le cadre d'une procédure fondée sur la *LACC*. À cet égard, il faut souligner que le texte de la *LACC* peut être interprété très largement. La possibilité pour le tribunal de rendre des ordonnances plus spécifiques n'a pas pour effet de restreindre la portée des termes généraux utilisés dans la *LACC*. L'opportunité, la bonne foi et la diligence sont des considérations de base que le tribunal devrait toujours garder à l'esprit lorsqu'il exerce les pouvoirs conférés par la *LACC*. Il s'agit de savoir si l'ordonnance contribuera utilement à la réalisation de l'objectif d'éviter les pertes sociales et économiques résultant de la liquidation d'une compagnie insolvable. Ce critère s'applique non seulement à l'objectif de l'ordonnance, mais aussi aux moyens utilisés. En l'espèce, l'ordonnance du juge siégeant en son cabinet qui a suspendu l'exécution des mesures de recouvrement de la Couronne à l'égard de la TPS contribuait à la réalisation des objectifs de la *LACC*, parce qu'elle avait pour effet de dissuader les créanciers d'entraver une liquidation ordonnée et favorisait une transition harmonieuse entre la *LACC* et la *LFI*, répondant ainsi à l'objectif — commun aux deux lois — qui consiste à avoir une seule procédure. Le passage de la *LACC* à la *LFI* peut exiger la levée partielle d'une suspension de procédures ordonnée en vertu de la *LACC*, de façon à permettre l'engagement des procédures fondées sur la *LFI*, mais il n'existe aucun hiatus entre ces lois étant donné qu'elles s'appliquent de concert et que, dans les deux cas, les créanciers examinent le régime de distribution prévu par la *LFI* pour connaître la situation qui serait la leur en cas d'échec de la réorganisation. L'ampleur du pouvoir discrétionnaire conféré au tribunal par la *LACC* suffit pour établir une passerelle vers une liquidation opérée sous le régime de la *LFI*. Le juge siégeant en son cabinet pouvait donc rendre l'ordonnance qu'il a prononcée.

No express trust was created by the chambers judge's order in this case because there is no certainty of object inferable from his order. Creation of an express trust requires certainty of intention, subject matter and object. At the time the chambers judge accepted the proposal to segregate the monies in the Monitor's trust account there was no certainty that the Crown would be the beneficiary, or object, of the trust because exactly who might take the money in the final result was in doubt. In any event, no dispute over the money would even arise under the interpretation of s. 18.3(1) of the CCAA established above, because the Crown's deemed trust priority over GST claims would be lost under the CCAA and the Crown would rank as an unsecured creditor for this amount.

Per Fish J.: The GST monies collected by the debtor are not subject to a deemed trust or priority in favour of the Crown. In recent years, Parliament has given detailed consideration to the Canadian insolvency scheme but has declined to amend the provisions at issue in this case, a deliberate exercise of legislative discretion. On the other hand, in upholding deemed trusts created by the *ETA* notwithstanding insolvency proceedings, courts have been unduly protective of Crown interests which Parliament itself has chosen to subordinate to competing prioritized claims. In the context of the Canadian insolvency regime, deemed trusts exist only where there is a statutory provision creating the trust and a CCAA or BIA provision explicitly confirming its effective operation. The *Income Tax Act*, the *Canada Pension Plan* and the *Employment Insurance Act* all contain deemed trust provisions that are strikingly similar to that in s. 222 of the *ETA* but they are all also confirmed in s. 37 of the CCAA and in s. 67(3) of the BIA in clear and unmistakable terms. The same is not true of the deemed trust created under the *ETA*. Although Parliament created a deemed trust in favour of the Crown to hold unremitted GST monies, and although it purports to maintain this trust notwithstanding any contrary federal or provincial legislation, it did not confirm the continued operation of the trust in either the BIA or the CCAA, reflecting Parliament's intention to allow the deemed trust to lapse with the commencement of insolvency proceedings.

L'ordonnance du juge siégeant en son cabinet n'a pas créé de fiducie expresse en l'espèce, car aucune certitude d'objet ne peut être inférée de cette ordonnance. La création d'une fiducie expresse exige la présence de certitudes quant à l'intention, à la matière et à l'objet. Lorsque le juge siégeant en son cabinet a accepté la proposition que les sommes soient détenues séparément dans le compte en fiducie du contrôleur, il n'existait aucune certitude que la Couronne serait le bénéficiaire ou l'objet de la fiducie, car il y avait un doute quant à la question de savoir qui au juste pourrait toucher l'argent en fin de compte. De toute façon, suivant l'interprétation du par. 18.3(1) de la LACC dérogée précédemment, aucun différend ne saurait même exister quant à l'argent, étant donné que la priorité accordée aux réclamations de la Couronne fondées sur la fiducie réputée visant la TPS ne s'applique pas sous le régime de la LACC et que la Couronne est reléguée au rang de créancier non garanti à l'égard des sommes en question.

Le juge Fish : Les sommes perçues par la débitrice au titre de la TPS ne font l'objet d'aucune fiducie réputée ou priorité en faveur de la Couronne. Au cours des dernières années, le législateur fédéral a procédé à un examen approfondi du régime canadien d'insolvabilité, mais il a refusé de modifier les dispositions qui sont en cause dans la présente affaire. Il s'agit d'un exercice délibéré du pouvoir discrétionnaire de légiférer. Par contre, en maintenant, malgré l'existence des procédures d'insolvabilité, la validité de fiducies réputées créées en vertu de la LTA, les tribunaux ont protégé indûment des droits de la Couronne que le Parlement avait lui-même choisi de subordonner à d'autres créances prioritaires. Dans le contexte du régime canadien d'insolvabilité, il existe une fiducie réputée uniquement lorsqu'une disposition législative crée la fiducie et qu'une disposition de la LACC ou de la LFI confirme explicitement l'existence de la fiducie. La *Loi de l'impôt sur le revenu*, le *Régime de pensions du Canada* et la *Loi sur l'assurance-emploi* renferment toutes des dispositions relatives aux fiducies réputées dont le libellé offre une ressemblance frappante avec celui de l'art. 222 de la LTA, mais le maintien en vigueur des fiducies réputées créées en vertu de ces dispositions est confirmé à l'art. 37 de la LACC et au par. 67(3) de la LFI en termes clairs et explicites. La situation est différente dans le cas de la fiducie réputée créée par la LTA. Bien que le législateur crée en faveur de la Couronne une fiducie réputée dans laquelle seront conservées les sommes recueillies au titre de la TPS mais non encore versées, et bien qu'il prétende maintenir cette fiducie en vigueur malgré les dispositions à l'effet contraire de toute loi fédérale ou provinciale, il ne confirme pas l'existence de la fiducie dans la LFI ou la LACC, ce qui témoigne de son intention de laisser la fiducie réputée devenir caduque au moment de l'introduction de la procédure d'insolvabilité.

Per Abella J. (dissenting): Section 222(3) of the *ETA* gives priority during *CCAA* proceedings to the Crown's deemed trust in unremitted GST. This provision unequivocally defines its boundaries in the clearest possible terms and excludes only the *BIA* from its legislative grasp. The language used reflects a clear legislative intention that s. 222(3) would prevail if in conflict with any other law except the *BIA*. This is borne out by the fact that following the enactment of s. 222(3), amendments to the *CCAA* were introduced, and despite requests from various constituencies, s. 18.3(1) was not amended to make the priorities in the *CCAA* consistent with those in the *BIA*. This indicates a deliberate legislative choice to protect the deemed trust in s. 222(3) from the reach of s. 18.3(1) of the *CCAA*.

The application of other principles of interpretation reinforces this conclusion. An earlier, specific provision may be overruled by a subsequent general statute if the legislature indicates, through its language, an intention that the general provision prevails. Section 222(3) achieves this through the use of language stating that it prevails despite any law of Canada, of a province, or "any other law" other than the *BIA*. Section 18.3(1) of the *CCAA* is thereby rendered inoperative for purposes of s. 222(3). By operation of s. 44(f) of the *Interpretation Act*, the transformation of s. 18.3(1) into s. 37(1) after the enactment of s. 222(3) of the *ETA* has no effect on the interpretive queue, and s. 222(3) of the *ETA* remains the "later in time" provision. This means that the deemed trust provision in s. 222(3) of the *ETA* takes precedence over s. 18.3(1) during *CCAA* proceedings. While s. 11 gives a court discretion to make orders notwithstanding the *BIA* and the *Winding-up Act*, that discretion is not liberated from the operation of any other federal statute. Any exercise of discretion is therefore circumscribed by whatever limits are imposed by statutes other than the *BIA* and the *Winding-up Act*. That includes the *ETA*. The chambers judge in this case was, therefore, required to respect the priority regime set out in s. 222(3) of the *ETA*. Neither s. 18.3(1) nor s. 11 of the *CCAA* gave him the authority to ignore it. He could not, as a result, deny the Crown's request for payment of the GST funds during the *CCAA* proceedings.

La juge Abella (dissidente) : Le paragraphe 222(3) de la *LTA* donne préséance, dans le cadre d'une procédure relevant de la *LACC*, à la fiducie réputée qui est établie en faveur de la Couronne à l'égard de la TPS non versée. Cette disposition définit sans équivoque sa portée dans des termes on ne peut plus clairs et n'exclut que la *LFI* de son champ d'application. Les termes employés révèlent l'intention claire du législateur que le par. 222(3) l'emporte en cas de conflit avec toute autre loi sauf la *LFI*. Cette opinion est confortée par le fait que des modifications ont été apportées à la *LACC* après l'édiction du par. 222(3) et que, malgré les demandes répétées de divers groupes, le par. 18.3(1) n'a pas été modifié pour aligner l'ordre de priorité établi par la *LACC* sur celui de la *LFI*. Cela indique que le législateur a délibérément choisi de soustraire la fiducie réputée établie au par. 222(3) à l'application du par. 18.3(1) de la *LACC*.

Cette conclusion est renforcée par l'application d'autres principes d'interprétation. Une disposition spécifique antérieure peut être supplantée par une loi ultérieure de portée générale si le législateur, par les mots qu'il a employés, a exprimé l'intention de faire prévaloir la loi générale. Le paragraphe 222(3) accomplit cela de par son libellé, lequel précise que la disposition l'emporte sur tout autre texte législatif fédéral, tout texte législatif provincial ou « toute autre règle de droit » sauf la *LFI*. Le paragraphe 18.3(1) de la *LACC* est par conséquent rendu inopérant aux fins d'application du par. 222(3). Selon l'alinéa 44f) de la *Loi d'interprétation*, le fait que le par. 18.3(1) soit devenu le par. 37(1) à la suite de l'édiction du par. 222(3) de la *LTA* n'a aucune incidence sur l'ordre chronologique du point de vue de l'interprétation, et le par. 222(3) de la *LTA* demeure la disposition « postérieure ». Il s'ensuit que la disposition créant une fiducie réputée que l'on trouve au par. 222(3) de la *LTA* l'emporte sur le par. 18.3(1) dans le cadre d'une procédure fondée sur la *LACC*. Bien que l'art. 11 accorde au tribunal le pouvoir discrétionnaire de rendre des ordonnances malgré les dispositions de la *LFI* et de la *Loi sur les liquidations*, ce pouvoir discrétionnaire demeure assujéti à l'application de toute autre loi fédérale. L'exercice de ce pouvoir discrétionnaire est donc circonscrit par les limites imposées par toute loi autre que la *LFI* et la *Loi sur les liquidations*, et donc par la *LTA*. En l'espèce, le juge siégeant en son cabinet était donc tenu de respecter le régime de priorités établi au par. 222(3) de la *LTA*. Ni le par. 18.3(1), ni l'art. 11 de la *LACC* ne l'autorisaient à en faire abstraction. Par conséquent, il ne pouvait pas refuser la demande présentée par la Couronne en vue de se faire payer la TPS dans le cadre de la procédure introduite en vertu de la *LACC*.

Cases Cited

By Deschamps J.

Overruled: *Ottawa Senators Hockey Club Corp. (Re)* (2005), 73 O.R. (3d) 737; **distinguished:** *Doré v. Verdun (City)*, [1997] 2 S.C.R. 862; **referred to:** *Reference re Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act*, [1934] S.C.R. 659; *Quebec (Revenu) v. Caisse populaire Desjardins de Montmagny*, 2009 SCC 49, [2009] 3 S.C.R. 286; *Deputy Minister of Revenue v. Rainville*, [1980] 1 S.C.R. 35; *Gauntlet Energy Corp., Re*, 2003 ABQB 894, 30 Alta. L.R. (4th) 192; *Komunik Corp. (Arrangement relatif à)*, 2009 QCCS 6332 (CanLII), leave to appeal granted, 2010 QCCA 183 (CanLII); *Royal Bank of Canada v. Sparrow Electric Corp.*, [1997] 1 S.C.R. 411; *First Vancouver Finance v. M.N.R.*, 2002 SCC 49, [2002] 2 S.C.R. 720; *Solid Resources Ltd., Re* (2002), 40 C.B.R. (4th) 219; *Metcalf & Mansfield Alternative Investments II Corp. (Re)*, 2008 ONCA 587, 92 O.R. (3d) 513; *Dylex Ltd., Re* (1995), 31 C.B.R. (3d) 106; *Elan Corp. v. Comiskey* (1990), 41 O.A.C. 282; *Chef Ready Foods Ltd. v. Hongkong Bank of Can.* (1990), 51 B.C.L.R. (2d) 84; *Pacific National Lease Holding Corp., Re* (1992), 19 B.C.A.C. 134; *Canadian Airlines Corp., Re*, 2000 ABQB 442, 84 Alta. L.R. (3d) 9; *Air Canada, Re* (2003), 42 C.B.R. (4th) 173; *Air Canada, Re*, 2003 CanLII 49366; *Canadian Red Cross Society/Société Canadienne de la Croix Rouge, Re* (2000), 19 C.B.R. (4th) 158; *Skydome Corp., Re* (1998), 16 C.B.R. (4th) 118; *United Used Auto & Truck Parts Ltd., Re*, 2000 BCCA 146, 135 B.C.A.C. 96, aff'g (1999), 12 C.B.R. (4th) 144; *Skeena Cellulose Inc., Re*, 2003 BCCA 344, 13 B.C.L.R. (4th) 236; *Stelco Inc. (Re)* (2005), 75 O.R. (3d) 5; *Philip's Manufacturing Ltd., Re* (1992), 9 C.B.R. (3d) 25; *Ivaco Inc. (Re)* (2006), 83 O.R. (3d) 108.

By Fish J.

Referred to: *Ottawa Senators Hockey Club Corp. (Re)* (2005), 73 O.R. (3d) 737.

By Abella J. (dissenting)

Ottawa Senators Hockey Club Corp. (Re) (2005), 73 O.R. (3d) 737; *Tele-Mobile Co. v. Ontario*, 2008 SCC 12, [2008] 1 S.C.R. 305; *Doré v. Verdun (City)*, [1997] 2 S.C.R. 862; *Attorney General of Canada v. Public Service Staff Relations Board*, [1977] 2 F.C. 663.

Statutes and Regulations Cited

An Act to establish the Wage Earner Protection Program Act, to amend the Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act and

Jurisprudence

Citée par la juge Deschamps

Arrêt renversé : *Ottawa Senators Hockey Club Corp. (Re)* (2005), 73 O.R. (3d) 737; **distinction d'avec l'arrêt :** *Doré c. Verdun (Ville)*, [1997] 2 R.C.S. 862; **arrêts mentionnés :** *Reference re Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act*, [1934] R.C.S. 659; *Québec (Revenu) c. Caisse populaire Desjardins de Montmagny*, 2009 CSC 49, [2009] 3 R.C.S. 286; *Sous-ministre du Revenu c. Rainville*, [1980] 1 R.C.S. 35; *Gauntlet Energy Corp., Re*, 2003 ABQB 894, 30 Alta. L.R. (4th) 192; *Komunik Corp. (Arrangement relatif à)*, 2009 QCCS 6332 (CanLII), autorisation d'appel accordée, 2010 QCCA 183 (CanLII); *Banque Royale du Canada c. Sparrow Electric Corp.*, [1997] 1 R.C.S. 411; *First Vancouver Finance c. M.R.N.*, 2002 CSC 49, [2002] 2 R.C.S. 720; *Solid Resources Ltd., Re* (2002), 40 C.B.R. (4th) 219; *Metcalf & Mansfield Alternative Investments II Corp. (Re)*, 2008 ONCA 587, 92 O.R. (3d) 513; *Dylex Ltd., Re* (1995), 31 C.B.R. (3d) 106; *Elan Corp. c. Comiskey* (1990), 41 O.A.C. 282; *Chef Ready Foods Ltd. v. Hongkong Bank of Can.* (1990), 51 B.C.L.R. (2d) 84; *Pacific National Lease Holding Corp., Re* (1992), 19 B.C.A.C. 134; *Canadian Airlines Corp., Re*, 2000 ABQB 442, 84 Alta. L.R. (3d) 9; *Air Canada, Re* (2003), 42 C.B.R. (4th) 173; *Air Canada, Re*, 2003 CanLII 49366; *Canadian Red Cross Society/Société Canadienne de la Croix Rouge, Re* (2000), 19 C.B.R. (4th) 158; *Skydome Corp., Re* (1998), 16 C.B.R. (4th) 118; *United Used Auto & Truck Parts Ltd., Re*, 2000 BCCA 146, 135 B.C.A.C. 96, conf. (1999), 12 C.B.R. (4th) 144; *Skeena Cellulose Inc., Re*, 2003 BCCA 344, 13 B.C.L.R. (4th) 236; *Stelco Inc. (Re)* (2005), 75 O.R. (3d) 5; *Philip's Manufacturing Ltd., Re* (1992), 9 C.B.R. (3d) 25; *Ivaco Inc. (Re)* (2006), 83 O.R. (3d) 108.

Citée par le juge Fish

Arrêt mentionné : *Ottawa Senators Hockey Club Corp. (Re)* (2005), 73 O.R. (3d) 737.

Citée par la juge Abella (dissidente)

Ottawa Senators Hockey Club Corp. (Re) (2005), 73 O.R. (3d) 737; *Société Télé-Mobile Co. c. Ontario*, 2008 CSC 12, [2008] 1 R.C.S. 305; *Doré c. Verdun (Ville)*, [1997] 2 R.C.S. 862; *Procureur général du Canada c. Commission des relations de travail dans la Fonction publique*, [1977] 2 C.F. 663.

Lois et règlements cités

Loi d'interprétation, L.R.C. 1985, ch. I-21, art. 2 « texte », 44f).

- the Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act and to make consequential amendments to other Acts*, S.C. 2005, c. 47, ss. 69, 128, 131.
- Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act*, R.S.C. 1985, c. B-3, ss. 67, 81.1, 81.2, 86 [am. 1992, c. 27, s. 39; 1997, c. 12, s. 73; 2000, c. 30, s. 148; 2005, c. 47, s. 69; 2009, c. 33, s. 25].
- Canada Pension Plan*, R.S.C. 1985, c. C-8, s. 23.
- Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act*, R.S.C. 1985, c. C-36, ss. 11 [am. 2005, c. 47, s. 128], 11.02 [ad. *idem*], 11.09 [ad. *idem*], 11.4 [am. *idem*], 18.3 [ad. 1997, c. 12, s. 125; rep. 2005, c. 47, s. 131], 18.4 [*idem*], 20 [am. 2005, c. 47, s. 131], 21 [ad. 1997, c. 12, s. 126; am. 2005, c. 47, s. 131], s. 37 [ad. 2005, c. 47, s. 131].
- Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act, 1933*, S.C. 1932-33, c. 36 [am. 1952-53, c. 3].
- Employment Insurance Act*, S.C. 1996, c. 23, ss. 86(2), (2.1).
- Excise Tax Act*, R.S.C. 1985, c. E-15, s. 222.
- Income Tax Act*, R.S.C. 1985, c. 1 (5th Supp.), ss. 227(4), (4.1).
- Interpretation Act*, R.S.C. 1985, c. I-21, ss. 2 "enactment", 44(f).
- Winding-up Act*, R.S.C. 1985, c. W-11.
- Loi de l'impôt sur le revenu*, L.R.C. 1985, ch. 1 (5^e suppl.), art. 227(4), (4.1).
- Loi édictant la Loi sur le Programme de protection des salariés et modifiant la Loi sur la faillite et l'insolvabilité, la Loi sur les arrangements avec les créanciers des compagnies et d'autres lois en conséquence*, L.C. 2005, ch. 47, art. 69, 128, 131.
- Loi sur l'assurance-emploi*, L.C. 1996, ch. 23, art. 86(2), (2.1).
- Loi sur la faillite et l'insolvabilité*, L.R.C. 1985, ch. B-3, art. 67, 81.1, 81.2, 86 [mod. 1992, ch. 27, art. 39; 1997, ch. 12, art. 73; 2000, ch. 30, art. 148; 2005, ch. 47, art. 69; 2009, ch. 33, art. 25].
- Loi sur la taxe d'accise*, L.R.C. 1985, ch. E-15, art. 222.
- Loi sur les arrangements avec les créanciers des compagnies*, L.R.C. 1985, ch. C-36, art. 11 [mod. 2005, ch. 47, art. 128], 11.02 [aj. *idem*], 11.09 [aj. *idem*], 11.4 [mod. *idem*], 18.3 [aj. 1997, ch. 12, art. 125; abr. 2005, ch. 47, art. 131], 18.4 [*idem*], 20 [mod. 2005, ch. 47, art. 131], 21 [aj. 1997, ch. 12, art. 126; mod. 2005, ch. 47, art. 131], 37 [aj. 2005, ch. 47, art. 131].
- Loi sur les arrangements avec les créanciers des compagnies*, S.C. 1932-33, ch. 36 [mod. 1952-53, ch. 3].
- Loi sur les liquidations*, L.R.C. 1985, ch. W-11.
- Régime de pensions du Canada*, L.R.C. 1985, ch. C-8, art. 23.

Authors Cited

- Canada. Advisory Committee on Bankruptcy and Insolvency. *Proposed Bankruptcy Act Amendments: Report of the Advisory Committee on Bankruptcy and Insolvency*. Ottawa: Minister of Supply and Services Canada, 1986.
- Canada. House of Commons. *Minutes of Proceedings and Evidence of the Standing Committee on Consumer and Corporate Affairs and Government Operations*, Issue No. 15, 3rd Sess., 34th Parl., October 3, 1991, 15:15.
- Canada. Industry Canada. Marketplace Framework Policy Branch. *Report on the Operation and Administration of the Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act and the Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act*. Ottawa: Corporate and Insolvency Law Policy Directorate, 2002.
- Canada. Senate. *Debates of the Senate*, vol. 142, 1st Sess., 38th Parl., November 23, 2005, p. 2147.
- Canada. Senate. Standing Committee on Banking, Trade and Commerce. *Debtors and Creditors Sharing the Burden: A Review of the Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act and the Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act*. Ottawa: Senate of Canada, 2003.
- Canada. Study Committee on Bankruptcy and Insolvency Legislation. *Bankruptcy and Insolvency: Report of*

Doctrine citée

- Canada. Chambre des communes. *Procès-verbaux et témoignages du Comité permanent des Consommateurs et Sociétés et Administration gouvernementale*, fascicule n^o 15, 3^e sess., 34^e lég., 3 octobre 1991, 15:15.
- Canada. Comité consultatif en matière de faillite et d'insolvabilité. *Propositions d'amendements à la Loi sur la faillite : Rapport du Comité consultatif en matière de faillite et d'insolvabilité*. Ottawa : Ministre des Approvisionnements et Services Canada, 1986.
- Canada. Comité d'étude sur la législation en matière de faillite et d'insolvabilité. *Faillite et Insolvabilité : Rapport du comité d'étude sur la législation en matière de faillite et d'insolvabilité*. Ottawa : Information Canada, 1970.
- Canada. Industrie Canada. Direction générale des politiques-cadres du marché. *Rapport sur la mise en application de la Loi sur la faillite et l'insolvabilité et de la Loi sur les arrangements avec les créanciers des compagnies*. Ottawa : Direction des politiques du droit corporatif et de l'insolvabilité, 2002.
- Canada. Sénat. Comité sénatorial permanent des banques et du commerce. *Les débiteurs et les créanciers doivent se partager le fardeau : Examen de la Loi sur la faillite et l'insolvabilité et de la Loi sur les arrange-*

- the Study Committee on Bankruptcy and Insolvency Legislation*. Ottawa: Information Canada, 1970.
- Côté, Pierre-André. *The Interpretation of Legislation in Canada*, 3rd ed. Scarborough, Ont.: Carswell, 2000.
- Côté, Pierre-André, avec la collaboration de Stéphane Beaulac et Mathieu Devinat. *Interprétation des lois*, 4^e éd. Montréal: Thémis, 2009.
- Edwards, Stanley E. "Reorganizations Under the Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act" (1947), 25 *Can. Bar Rev.* 587.
- Insolvency Institute of Canada and Canadian Association of Insolvency and Restructuring Professionals. Joint Task Force on Business Insolvency Law Reform. *Report* (2002) (online: <http://www.cairp.ca/publications/submissions-to-government/law-reform/index.php>).
- Insolvency Institute of Canada and Canadian Association of Insolvency and Restructuring Professionals. Legislative Review Task Force (Commercial). *Report on the Commercial Provisions of Bill C-55* (2005).
- Jackson, Georgina R. and Janis Sarra. "Selecting the Judicial Tool to get the Job Done: An Examination of Statutory Interpretation, Discretionary Power and Inherent Jurisdiction in Insolvency Matters", in Janis P. Sarra, ed., *Annual Review of Insolvency Law 2007*. Toronto: Thomson Carswell, 2008, 41.
- Jones, Richard B. "The Evolution of Canadian Restructuring: Challenges for the Rule of Law", in Janis P. Sarra, ed., *Annual Review of Insolvency Law 2005*. Toronto: Thomson Carswell, 2006, 481.
- Lamer, Francis L. *Priority of Crown Claims in Insolvency*. Toronto: Carswell, 1996 (loose-leaf updated 2010, release 1).
- Morgan, Barbara K. "Should the Sovereign be Paid First? A Comparative International Analysis of the Priority for Tax Claims in Bankruptcy" (2000), 74 *Am. Bankr. L.J.* 461.
- Sarra, Janis. *Creditor Rights and the Public Interest: Restructuring Insolvent Corporations*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2003.
- Sarra, Janis P. *Rescue! The Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act*. Toronto: Thomson Carswell, 2007.
- Sullivan, Ruth. *Sullivan on the Construction of Statutes*, 5th ed. Markham, Ont.: LexisNexis, 2008.
- Waters, Donovan W. M., Mark R. Gillen and Lionel D. Smith, eds. *Waters' Law of Trusts in Canada*, 3rd ed. Toronto: Thomson Carswell, 2005.
- Wood, Roderick J. *Bankruptcy and Insolvency Law*. Toronto: Irwin Law, 2009.
- ments avec les créanciers des compagnies*. Ottawa : 2003.
- Canada. Sénat. *Débats du Sénat*, vol. 142, 1^{re} sess., 38^e lég., 23 novembre 2005, p. 2147.
- Côté, Pierre-André. *The Interpretation of Legislation in Canada*, 3rd ed. Scarborough, Ont. : Carswell, 2000.
- Côté, Pierre-André, avec la collaboration de Stéphane Beaulac et Mathieu Devinat. *Interprétation des lois*, 4^e éd. Montréal : Thémis, 2009.
- Edwards, Stanley E. « Reorganizations Under the Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act » (1947), 25 *R. du B. can.* 587.
- Institut d'insolvabilité du Canada et Association canadienne des professionnels de l'insolvabilité et de la réorganisation. Joint Task Force on Business Insolvency Law Reform. *Report* (2002) (en ligne : <http://www.cairp.ca/publications/submissions-to-government/law-reform/index.php>).
- Institut d'insolvabilité du Canada et Association canadienne des professionnels de l'insolvabilité et de la réorganisation. Legislative Review Task Force (Commercial). *Report on the Commercial Provisions of Bill C-55* (2005).
- Jackson, Georgina R. and Janis Sarra. « Selecting the Judicial Tool to get the Job Done : An Examination of Statutory Interpretation, Discretionary Power and Inherent Jurisdiction in Insolvency Matters », in Janis P. Sarra, ed., *Annual Review of Insolvency Law 2007*. Toronto : Thomson Carswell, 2008, 41.
- Jones, Richard B. « The Evolution of Canadian Restructuring : Challenges for the Rule of Law », in Janis P. Sarra, ed., *Annual Review of Insolvency Law 2005*. Toronto : Thomson Carswell, 2006, 481.
- Lamer, Francis L. *Priority of Crown Claims in Insolvency*. Toronto : Carswell, 1996 (loose-leaf updated 2010, release 1).
- Morgan, Barbara K. « Should the Sovereign be Paid First? A Comparative International Analysis of the Priority for Tax Claims in Bankruptcy » (2000), 74 *Am. Bankr. L.J.* 461.
- Sarra, Janis. *Creditor Rights and the Public Interest : Restructuring Insolvent Corporations*. Toronto : University of Toronto Press, 2003.
- Sarra, Janis P. *Rescue! The Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act*. Toronto : Thomson Carswell, 2007.
- Sullivan, Ruth. *Sullivan on the Construction of Statutes*, 5th ed. Markham, Ont. : LexisNexis, 2008.
- Waters, Donovan W. M., Mark R. Gillen and Lionel D. Smith, eds. *Waters' Law of Trusts in Canada*, 3rd ed. Toronto : Thomson Carswell, 2005.
- Wood, Roderick J. *Bankruptcy and Insolvency Law*. Toronto : Irwin Law, 2009.

APPEAL from a judgment of the British Columbia Court of Appeal (Newbury, Tysoe and Smith J.J.A.), 2009 BCCA 205, 98 B.C.L.R. (4th) 242, 270 B.C.A.C. 167, 454 W.A.C. 167, [2009] 12 W.W.R. 684, [2009] G.S.T.C. 79, [2009] B.C.J. No. 918 (QL), 2009 CarswellBC 1195, reversing a judgment of Brenner C.J.S.C., 2008 BCSC 1805, [2008] G.S.T.C. 221, [2008] B.C.J. No. 2611 (QL), 2008 CarswellBC 2895, dismissing a Crown application for payment of GST monies. Appeal allowed, Abella J. dissenting.

Mary I. A. Buttery, Owen J. James and Matthew J. G. Curtis, for the appellant.

Gordon Bourgard, David Jacyk and Michael J. Lema, for the respondent.

The judgment of McLachlin C.J. and Binnie, LeBel, Deschamps, Charron, Rothstein and Cromwell J.J. was delivered by

[1] DESCHAMPS J. — For the first time this Court is called upon to directly interpret the provisions of the *Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act*, R.S.C. 1985, c. C-36 ("CCAA"). In that respect, two questions are raised. The first requires reconciliation of provisions of the CCAA and the *Excise Tax Act*, R.S.C. 1985, c. E-15 ("ETA"), which lower courts have held to be in conflict with one another. The second concerns the scope of a court's discretion when supervising reorganization. The relevant statutory provisions are reproduced in the Appendix. On the first question, having considered the evolution of Crown priorities in the context of insolvency and the wording of the various statutes creating Crown priorities, I conclude that it is the CCAA and not the ETA that provides the rule. On the second question, I conclude that the broad discretionary jurisdiction conferred on the supervising judge must be interpreted having regard to the remedial nature of the CCAA and insolvency legislation generally. Consequently, the court had the discretion to partially lift a stay of proceedings to allow the debtor to make an assignment under the *Bankruptcy and Insolvency*

POURVOI contre un arrêt de la Cour d'appel de la Colombie-Britannique (les juges Newbury, Tysoe et Smith), 2009 BCCA 205, 98 B.C.L.R. (4th) 242, 270 B.C.A.C. 167, 454 W.A.C. 167, [2009] 12 W.W.R. 684, [2009] G.S.T.C. 79, [2009] B.C.J. No. 918 (QL), 2009 CarswellBC 1195, qui a infirmé une décision du juge en chef Brenner, 2008 BCSC 1805, [2008] G.S.T.C. 221, [2008] B.C.J. No. 2611 (QL), 2008 CarswellBC 2895, qui a rejeté la demande de la Couronne sollicitant le paiement de la TPS. Pourvoi accueilli, la juge Abella est dissidente.

Mary I. A. Buttery, Owen J. James et Matthew J. G. Curtis, pour l'appelante.

Gordon Bourgard, David Jacyk et Michael J. Lema, pour l'intimé.

Version française du jugement de la juge en chef McLachlin et des juges Binnie, LeBel, Deschamps, Charron, Rothstein et Cromwell rendu par

[1] LA JUGE DESCHAMPS — C'est la première fois que la Cour est appelée à interpréter directement les dispositions de la *Loi sur les arrangements avec les créanciers des compagnies*, L.R.C. 1985, ch. C-36 (« LACC »). À cet égard, deux questions sont soulevées. La première requiert la conciliation d'une disposition de la LACC et d'une disposition de la *Loi sur la taxe d'accise*, L.R.C. 1985, ch. E-15 (« LTA »), qui, selon des juridictions inférieures, sont en conflit l'une avec l'autre. La deuxième concerne la portée du pouvoir discrétionnaire du tribunal qui surveille une réorganisation. Les dispositions législatives pertinentes sont reproduites en annexe. Pour ce qui est de la première question, après avoir examiné l'évolution des priorités de la Couronne en matière d'insolvabilité et le libellé des diverses lois qui établissent ces priorités, j'arrive à la conclusion que c'est la LACC, et non la LTA, qui énonce la règle applicable. Pour ce qui est de la seconde question, je conclus qu'il faut interpréter les larges pouvoirs discrétionnaires conférés au juge en tenant compte de la nature réparatrice de la LACC et de la législation sur l'insolvabilité en général. Par conséquent, le tribunal avait le pouvoir

Act, R.S.C. 1985, c. B-3 (“*BIA*”). I would allow the appeal.

1. Facts and Decisions of the Courts Below

[2] Ted LeRoy Trucking Ltd. (“LeRoy Trucking”) commenced proceedings under the *CCAA* in the Supreme Court of British Columbia on December 13, 2007, obtaining a stay of proceedings with a view to reorganizing its financial affairs. LeRoy Trucking sold certain redundant assets as authorized by the order.

[3] Amongst the debts owed by LeRoy Trucking was an amount for Goods and Services Tax (“GST”) collected but unremitted to the Crown. The *ETA* creates a deemed trust in favour of the Crown for amounts collected in respect of GST. The deemed trust extends to any property or proceeds held by the person collecting GST and any property of that person held by a secured creditor, requiring that property to be paid to the Crown in priority to all security interests. The *ETA* provides that the deemed trust operates despite any other enactment of Canada except the *BIA*. However, the *CCAA* also provides that subject to certain exceptions, none of which mentions GST, deemed trusts in favour of the Crown do not operate under the *CCAA*. Accordingly, under the *CCAA* the Crown ranks as an unsecured creditor in respect of GST. Nonetheless, at the time LeRoy Trucking commenced *CCAA* proceedings the leading line of jurisprudence held that the *ETA* took precedence over the *CCAA* such that the Crown enjoyed priority for GST claims under the *CCAA*, even though it would have lost that same priority under the *BIA*. The *CCAA* underwent substantial amendments in 2005 in which some of the provisions at issue in this appeal were renumbered and reformulated (S.C. 2005, c. 47). However, these amendments only came into force on September 18, 2009. I will refer to the amended provisions only where relevant.

discrétionnaire de lever partiellement la suspension des procédures pour permettre au débiteur de faire cession de ses biens en vertu de la *Loi sur la faillite et l’insolvabilité*, L.R.C. 1985, ch. B-3 (« *LFI* »). Je suis d’avis d’accueillir le pourvoi.

1. Faits et décisions des juridictions inférieures

[2] Le 13 décembre 2007, Ted LeRoy Trucking Ltd. (« LeRoy Trucking ») a déposé une requête sous le régime de la *LACC* devant la Cour suprême de la Colombie-Britannique et obtenu la suspension des procédures dans le but de réorganiser ses finances. L’entreprise a vendu certains éléments d’actif excédentaires, comme l’y autorisait l’ordonnance.

[3] Parmi les dettes de LeRoy Trucking figurait une somme perçue par celle-ci au titre de la taxe sur les produits et services (« TPS ») mais non versée à la Couronne. La *LTA* crée en faveur de la Couronne une fiducie réputée visant les sommes perçues au titre de la TPS. Cette fiducie réputée s’applique à tout bien ou toute recette détenue par la personne qui perçoit la TPS et à tout bien de cette personne détenu par un créancier garanti, et le produit découlant de ces biens doit être payé à la Couronne par priorité sur tout droit en garantie. Aux termes de la *LTA*, la fiducie réputée s’applique malgré tout autre texte législatif du Canada sauf la *LFI*. Cependant, la *LACC* prévoit également que, sous réserve de certaines exceptions, dont aucune ne concerne la TPS, ne s’appliquent pas sous son régime les fiducies réputées qui existent en faveur de la Couronne. Par conséquent, pour ce qui est de la TPS, la Couronne est un créancier non garanti dans le cadre de cette loi. Néanmoins, à l’époque où LeRoy Trucking a débuté ses procédures en vertu de la *LACC*, la jurisprudence dominante indiquait que la *LTA* l’emportait sur la *LACC*, la Couronne jouissant ainsi d’un droit prioritaire à l’égard des créances relatives à la TPS dans le cadre de la *LACC*, malgré le fait qu’elle aurait perdu cette priorité en vertu de la *LFI*. La *LACC* a fait l’objet de modifications substantielles en 2005, et certaines des dispositions en cause dans le présent pourvoi ont alors été renumérotées et reformulées (L.C. 2005, ch. 47). Mais ces modifications ne sont entrées en vigueur que le 18 septembre 2009. Je ne me reporterai aux dispositions modifiées que lorsqu’il sera utile de le faire.

[4] On April 29, 2008, Brenner C.J.S.C., in the context of the CCAA proceedings, approved a payment not exceeding \$5 million, the proceeds of redundant asset sales, to Century Services, the debtor's major secured creditor. LeRoy Trucking proposed to hold back an amount equal to the GST monies collected but unremitted to the Crown and place it in the Monitor's trust account until the outcome of the reorganization was known. In order to maintain the *status quo* while the success of the reorganization was uncertain, Brenner C.J.S.C. agreed to the proposal and ordered that an amount of \$305,202.30 be held by the Monitor in its trust account.

[5] On September 3, 2008, having concluded that reorganization was not possible, LeRoy Trucking sought leave to make an assignment in bankruptcy under the BIA. The Crown sought an order that the GST monies held by the Monitor be paid to the Receiver General of Canada. Brenner C.J.S.C. dismissed the latter application. Reasoning that the purpose of segregating the funds with the Monitor was "to facilitate an ultimate payment of the GST monies which were owed pre-filing, but only if a viable plan emerged", the failure of such a reorganization, followed by an assignment in bankruptcy, meant the Crown would lose priority under the BIA (2008 BCSC 1805, [2008] G.S.T.C. 221).

[6] The Crown's appeal was allowed by the British Columbia Court of Appeal (2009 BCCA 205, 270 B.C.A.C. 167). Tysoe J.A. for a unanimous court found two independent bases for allowing the Crown's appeal.

[7] First, the court's authority under s. 11 of the CCAA was held not to extend to staying the Crown's application for immediate payment of the GST funds subject to the deemed trust after it was clear that reorganization efforts had failed and

[4] Le 29 avril 2008, le juge en chef Brenner de la Cour suprême de la Colombie-Britannique, dans le contexte des procédures intentées en vertu de la LACC, a approuvé le paiement à Century Services, le principal créancier garanti du débiteur, d'une somme d'au plus cinq millions de dollars, soit le produit de la vente d'éléments d'actif excédentaires. LeRoy Trucking a proposé de retenir un montant égal aux sommes perçues au titre de la TPS mais non versées à la Couronne et de le déposer dans le compte en fiducie du contrôleur jusqu'à ce que l'issue de la réorganisation soit connue. Afin de maintenir le statu quo, en raison du succès incertain de la réorganisation, le juge en chef Brenner a accepté la proposition et ordonné qu'une somme de 305 202,30 \$ soit détenue par le contrôleur dans son compte en fiducie.

[5] Le 3 septembre 2008, ayant conclu que la réorganisation n'était pas possible, LeRoy Trucking a demandé à la Cour suprême de la Colombie-Britannique l'autorisation de faire cession de ses biens en vertu de la LFI. Pour sa part, la Couronne a demandé au tribunal d'ordonner le paiement au receveur général du Canada de la somme détenue par le contrôleur au titre de la TPS. Le juge en chef Brenner a rejeté cette dernière demande. Selon lui, comme la détention des fonds dans le compte en fiducie du contrôleur visait à [TRADUCTION] « faciliter le paiement final des sommes de TPS qui étaient dues avant que l'entreprise ne débute les procédures, mais seulement si un plan viable était proposé », l'impossibilité de procéder à une telle réorganisation, suivie d'une cession de biens, signifiait que la Couronne perdrait sa priorité sous le régime de la LFI (2008 BCSC 1805, [2008] G.S.T.C. 221).

[6] La Cour d'appel de la Colombie-Britannique a accueilli l'appel interjeté par la Couronne (2009 BCCA 205, 270 B.C.A.C. 167). Rédigeant l'arrêt unanime de la cour, le juge Tysoe a invoqué deux raisons distinctes pour y faire droit.

[7] Premièrement, le juge d'appel Tysoe a conclu que le pouvoir conféré au tribunal par l'art. 11 de la LACC n'autorisait pas ce dernier à rejeter la demande de la Couronne sollicitant le paiement immédiat des sommes de TPS faisant l'objet de la fiducie réputée,

that bankruptcy was inevitable. As restructuring was no longer a possibility, staying the Crown's claim to the GST funds no longer served a purpose under the CCAA and the court was bound under the priority scheme provided by the *ETA* to allow payment to the Crown. In so holding, Tysoe J.A. adopted the reasoning in *Ottawa Senators Hockey Club Corp. (Re)* (2005), 73 O.R. (3d) 737 (C.A.), which found that the *ETA* deemed trust for GST established Crown priority over secured creditors under the CCAA.

[8] Second, Tysoe J.A. concluded that by ordering the GST funds segregated in the Monitor's trust account on April 29, 2008, the judge had created an express trust in favour of the Crown from which the monies in question could not be diverted for any other purposes. The Court of Appeal therefore ordered that the money held by the Monitor in trust be paid to the Receiver General.

2. Issues

[9] This appeal raises three broad issues which are addressed in turn:

- (1) Did s. 222(3) of the *ETA* displace s. 18.3(1) of the CCAA and give priority to the Crown's *ETA* deemed trust during CCAA proceedings as held in *Ottawa Senators*?
- (2) Did the court exceed its CCAA authority by lifting the stay to allow the debtor to make an assignment in bankruptcy?
- (3) Did the court's order of April 29, 2008 requiring segregation of the Crown's GST claim in the Monitor's trust account create an express trust in favour of the Crown in respect of those funds?

après qu'il fut devenu clair que la tentative de réorganisation avait échoué et que la faillite était inévitable. Comme la restructuration n'était plus une possibilité, il ne servait plus à rien, dans le cadre de la LACC, de suspendre le paiement à la Couronne des sommes de TPS et le tribunal était tenu, en raison de la priorité établie par la LTA, d'en autoriser le versement à la Couronne. Ce faisant, le juge Tysoe a adopté le raisonnement énoncé dans l'arrêt *Ottawa Senators Hockey Club Corp. (Re)* (2005), 73 O.R. (3d) 737 (C.A.), suivant lequel la fiducie réputée que crée la LTA à l'égard des sommes dues au titre de la TPS établissait la priorité de la Couronne sur les créanciers garantis dans le cadre de la LACC.

[8] Deuxièmement, le juge Tysoe a conclu que, en ordonnant la ségrégation des sommes de TPS dans le compte en fiducie du contrôleur le 29 avril 2008, le tribunal avait créé une fiducie expresse en faveur de la Couronne, et que les sommes visées ne pouvaient être utilisées à quelque autre fin que ce soit. En conséquence, la Cour d'appel a ordonné que les sommes détenues par le contrôleur en fiducie pour la Couronne soient versées au receveur général.

2. Questions en litige

[9] Le pourvoi soulève trois grandes questions que j'examinerai à tour de rôle :

- (1) Le paragraphe 222(3) de la LTA l'emporte-t-il sur le par. 18.3(1) de la LACC et donne-t-il priorité à la fiducie réputée qui est établie par la LTA en faveur de la Couronne pendant des procédures régies par la LACC, comme il a été décidé dans l'arrêt *Ottawa Senators*?
- (2) Le tribunal a-t-il outrepassé les pouvoirs qui lui étaient conférés par la LACC en levant la suspension des procédures dans le but de permettre au débiteur de faire cession de ses biens?
- (3) L'ordonnance du tribunal datée du 29 avril 2008 exigeant que le montant de TPS réclamé par la Couronne soit détenu séparément dans le compte en fiducie du contrôleur a-t-elle créé une fiducie expresse en faveur de la Couronne à l'égard des fonds en question?

3. Analysis

[10] The first issue concerns Crown priorities in the context of insolvency. As will be seen, the *ETA* provides for a deemed trust in favour of the Crown in respect of GST owed by a debtor “[d]espite . . . any other enactment of Canada (except the *Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act*)” (s. 222(3)), while the *CCAA* stated at the relevant time that “notwithstanding any provision in federal or provincial legislation that has the effect of deeming property to be held in trust for Her Majesty, property of a debtor company shall not be [so] regarded” (s. 18.3(1)). It is difficult to imagine two statutory provisions more apparently in conflict. However, as is often the case, the apparent conflict can be resolved through interpretation.

[11] In order to properly interpret the provisions, it is necessary to examine the history of the *CCAA*, its function amidst the body of insolvency legislation enacted by Parliament, and the principles that have been recognized in the jurisprudence. It will be seen that Crown priorities in the insolvency context have been significantly pared down. The resolution of the second issue is also rooted in the context of the *CCAA*, but its purpose and the manner in which it has been interpreted in the case law are also key. After examining the first two issues in this case, I will address Tysoe J.A.’s conclusion that an express trust in favour of the Crown was created by the court’s order of April 29, 2008.

3.1 *Purpose and Scope of Insolvency Law*

[12] Insolvency is the factual situation that arises when a debtor is unable to pay creditors (see generally, R. J. Wood, *Bankruptcy and Insolvency Law* (2009), at p. 16). Certain legal proceedings become available upon insolvency, which typically allow a debtor to obtain a court order staying its creditors’ enforcement actions and attempt to obtain

3. Analyse

[10] La première question porte sur les priorités de la Couronne dans le contexte de l’insolvabilité. Comme nous le verrons, la *LTA* crée en faveur de la Couronne une fiducie réputée à l’égard de la TPS due par un débiteur « [m]algré [. . .] tout autre texte législatif fédéral (sauf la *Loi sur la faillite et l’insolvabilité*) » (par. 222(3)), alors que selon la disposition de la *LACC* en vigueur à l’époque, « par dérogation à toute disposition législative fédérale ou provinciale ayant pour effet d’assimiler certains biens à des biens détenus en fiducie pour Sa Majesté, aucun des biens de la compagnie débitrice ne peut être considéré comme [tel] » (par. 18.3(1)). Il est difficile d’imaginer deux dispositions législatives plus contradictoires en apparence. Cependant, comme c’est souvent le cas, le conflit apparent peut être résolu au moyen des principes d’interprétation législative.

[11] Pour interpréter correctement ces dispositions, il faut examiner l’historique de la *LACC*, la fonction de cette loi parmi l’ensemble des textes adoptés par le législateur fédéral en matière d’insolvabilité et les principes reconnus dans la jurisprudence. Nous verrons que les priorités de la Couronne en matière d’insolvabilité ont été restreintes de façon appréciable. La réponse à la deuxième question repose aussi sur le contexte de la *LACC*, mais l’objectif de cette loi et l’interprétation qu’en a donnée la jurisprudence jouent également un rôle essentiel. Après avoir examiné les deux premières questions soulevées en l’espèce, j’aborderai la conclusion du juge Tysoe selon laquelle l’ordonnance rendue par le tribunal le 29 avril 2008 a eu pour effet de créer une fiducie expresse en faveur de la Couronne.

3.1 *Objectif et portée du droit relatif à l’insolvabilité*

[12] L’insolvabilité est la situation de fait qui se présente quand un débiteur n’est pas en mesure de payer ses créanciers (voir, généralement, R. J. Wood, *Bankruptcy and Insolvency Law* (2009), p. 16). Certaines procédures judiciaires peuvent être intentées en cas d’insolvabilité. Ainsi, le débiteur peut généralement obtenir une ordonnance judiciaire

a binding compromise with creditors to adjust the payment conditions to something more realistic. Alternatively, the debtor's assets may be liquidated and debts paid from the proceeds according to statutory priority rules. The former is usually referred to as reorganization or restructuring while the latter is termed liquidation.

[13] Canadian commercial insolvency law is not codified in one exhaustive statute. Instead, Parliament has enacted multiple insolvency statutes, the main one being the *BIA*. The *BIA* offers a self-contained legal regime providing for both reorganization and liquidation. Although bankruptcy legislation has a long history, the *BIA* itself is a fairly recent statute — it was enacted in 1992. It is characterized by a rules-based approach to proceedings. The *BIA* is available to insolvent debtors owing \$1000 or more, regardless of whether they are natural or legal persons. It contains mechanisms for debtors to make proposals to their creditors for the adjustment of debts. If a proposal fails, the *BIA* contains a bridge to bankruptcy whereby the debtor's assets are liquidated and the proceeds paid to creditors in accordance with the statutory scheme of distribution.

[14] Access to the *CCAA* is more restrictive. A debtor must be a company with liabilities in excess of \$5 million. Unlike the *BIA*, the *CCAA* contains no provisions for liquidation of a debtor's assets if reorganization fails. There are three ways of exiting *CCAA* proceedings. The best outcome is achieved when the stay of proceedings provides the debtor with some breathing space during which solvency is restored and the *CCAA* process terminates without reorganization being needed. The second most desirable outcome occurs when the debtor's compromise or arrangement is accepted by its creditors and the reorganized company emerges from the *CCAA* proceedings as a going concern. Lastly, if the compromise or arrangement fails, either

ayant pour effet de suspendre les mesures d'exécution de ses créanciers, puis tenter de conclure avec eux une transaction à caractère exécutoire contenant des conditions de paiement plus réalistes. Ou alors, les biens du débiteur sont liquidés et ses dettes sont remboursées sur le produit de cette liquidation, selon les règles de priorité établies par la loi. Dans le premier cas, on emploie habituellement les termes de réorganisation ou de restructuration, alors que dans le second, on parle de liquidation.

[13] Le droit canadien en matière d'insolvabilité commerciale n'est pas codifié dans une seule loi exhaustive. En effet, le législateur a plutôt adopté plusieurs lois sur l'insolvabilité, la principale étant la *LFI*. Cette dernière établit un régime juridique autonome qui concerne à la fois la réorganisation et la liquidation. Bien qu'il existe depuis longtemps des mesures législatives relatives à la faillite, la *LFI* elle-même est une loi assez récente — elle a été adoptée en 1992. Ses procédures se caractérisent par une approche fondée sur des règles préétablies. Les débiteurs insolvable — personnes physiques ou personnes morales — qui doivent 1 000 \$ ou plus peuvent recourir à la *LFI*. Celle-ci comporte des mécanismes permettant au débiteur de présenter à ses créanciers une proposition de rajustement des dettes. Si la proposition est rejetée, la *LFI* établit la démarche aboutissant à la faillite : les biens du débiteur sont liquidés et le produit de cette liquidation est versé aux créanciers conformément à la répartition prévue par la loi.

[14] La possibilité de recourir à la *LACC* est plus restreinte. Le débiteur doit être une compagnie dont les dettes dépassent cinq millions de dollars. Contrairement à la *LFI*, la *LACC* ne contient aucune disposition relative à la liquidation de l'actif d'un débiteur en cas d'échec de la réorganisation. Une procédure engagée sous le régime de la *LACC* peut se terminer de trois façons différentes. Le scénario idéal survient dans les cas où la suspension des recours donne au débiteur un répit lui permettant de rétablir sa solvabilité et où le processus régi par la *LACC* prend fin sans qu'une réorganisation soit nécessaire. Le deuxième scénario le plus souhaitable est le cas où la transaction ou l'arrangement proposé par le débiteur est

the company or its creditors usually seek to have the debtor's assets liquidated under the applicable provisions of the *BIA* or to place the debtor into receivership. As discussed in greater detail below, the key difference between the reorganization regimes under the *BIA* and the *CCAA* is that the latter offers a more flexible mechanism with greater judicial discretion, making it more responsive to complex reorganizations.

[15] As I will discuss at greater length below, the purpose of the *CCAA* — Canada's first reorganization statute — is to permit the debtor to continue to carry on business and, where possible, avoid the social and economic costs of liquidating its assets. Proposals to creditors under the *BIA* serve the same remedial purpose, though this is achieved through a rules-based mechanism that offers less flexibility. Where reorganization is impossible, the *BIA* may be employed to provide an orderly mechanism for the distribution of a debtor's assets to satisfy creditor claims according to predetermined priority rules.

[16] Prior to the enactment of the *CCAA* in 1933 (S.C. 1932-33, c. 36), practice under existing commercial insolvency legislation tended heavily towards the liquidation of a debtor company (J. Sarra, *Creditor Rights and the Public Interest: Restructuring Insolvent Corporations* (2003), at p. 12). The battering visited upon Canadian businesses by the Great Depression and the absence of an effective mechanism for reaching a compromise between debtors and creditors to avoid liquidation required a legislative response. The *CCAA* was innovative as it allowed the insolvent debtor to attempt reorganization under judicial supervision outside the existing insolvency legislation which, once engaged, almost invariably resulted in liquidation (*Reference re Companies' Creditors*

accepté par ses créanciers et où la compagnie réorganisée poursuit ses activités au terme de la procédure engagée en vertu de la *LACC*. Enfin, dans le dernier scénario, la transaction ou l'arrangement échoue et la compagnie ou ses créanciers cherchent habituellement à obtenir la liquidation des biens en vertu des dispositions applicables de la *LFI* ou la mise sous séquestre du débiteur. Comme nous le verrons, la principale différence entre les régimes de réorganisation prévus par la *LFI* et la *LACC* est que le second établit un mécanisme plus souple, dans lequel les tribunaux disposent d'un plus grand pouvoir discrétionnaire, ce qui rend le mécanisme mieux adapté aux réorganisations complexes.

[15] Comme je vais le préciser davantage plus loin, la *LACC* — la première loi canadienne régissant la réorganisation — a pour objectif de permettre au débiteur de continuer d'exercer ses activités et, dans les cas où cela est possible, d'éviter les coûts sociaux et économiques liés à la liquidation de son actif. Les propositions faites aux créanciers en vertu de la *LFI* répondent au même objectif, mais au moyen d'un mécanisme fondé sur des règles et offrant moins de souplesse. Quand la réorganisation s'avère impossible, les dispositions de la *LFI* peuvent être appliquées pour répartir de manière ordonnée les biens du débiteur entre les créanciers, en fonction des règles de priorité qui y sont établies.

[16] Avant l'adoption de la *LACC* en 1933 (S.C. 1932-33, ch. 36), la liquidation de la compagnie débitrice constituait la pratique la plus courante en vertu de la législation existante en matière d'insolvabilité commerciale (J. Sarra, *Creditor Rights and the Public Interest: Restructuring Insolvent Corporations* (2003), p. 12). Les ravages de la Grande Dépression sur les entreprises canadiennes et l'absence d'un mécanisme efficace susceptible de permettre aux débiteurs et aux créanciers d'arriver à des compromis afin d'éviter la liquidation commandaient une solution législative. La *LACC* a innové en permettant au débiteur insolvable de tenter une réorganisation sous surveillance judiciaire, hors du cadre de la législation existante en matière d'insolvabilité qui, une fois entrée en jeu,

Arrangement Act, [1934] S.C.R. 659, at pp. 660-61; Sarra, *Creditor Rights*, at pp. 12-13).

[17] Parliament understood when adopting the CCAA that liquidation of an insolvent company was harmful for most of those it affected — notably creditors and employees — and that a workout which allowed the company to survive was optimal (Sarra, *Creditor Rights*, at pp. 13-15).

[18] Early commentary and jurisprudence also endorsed the CCAA's remedial objectives. It recognized that companies retain more value as going concerns while underscoring that intangible losses, such as the evaporation of the companies' goodwill, result from liquidation (S. E. Edwards, "Reorganizations Under the Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act" (1947), 25 *Can. Bar Rev.* 587, at p. 592). Reorganization serves the public interest by facilitating the survival of companies supplying goods or services crucial to the health of the economy or saving large numbers of jobs (*ibid.*, at p. 593). Insolvency could be so widely felt as to impact stakeholders other than creditors and employees. Variants of these views resonate today, with reorganization justified in terms of rehabilitating companies that are key elements in a complex web of interdependent economic relationships in order to avoid the negative consequences of liquidation.

[19] The CCAA fell into disuse during the next several decades, likely because amendments to the Act in 1953 restricted its use to companies issuing bonds (S.C. 1952-53, c. 3). During the economic downturn of the early 1980s, insolvency lawyers and courts adapting to the resulting wave of insolvencies resurrected the statute and deployed it in response to new economic challenges. Participants in insolvency proceedings grew to recognize and appreciate the statute's distinguishing feature: a grant of broad and flexible authority to the supervising court to make

aboutissait presque invariablement à la liquidation (*Reference re Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act*, [1934] R.C.S. 659, p. 660-661; Sarra, *Creditor Rights*, p. 12-13).

[17] Le législateur comprenait, lorsqu'il a adopté la LACC, que la liquidation d'une compagnie insolvable causait préjudice à la plupart des personnes touchées — notamment les créanciers et les employés — et que la meilleure solution consistait dans un arrangement permettant à la compagnie de survivre (Sarra, *Creditor Rights*, p. 13-15).

[18] Les premières analyses et décisions judiciaires à cet égard ont également entériné les objectifs réparateurs de la LACC. On y reconnaissait que la valeur de la compagnie demeurait plus grande lorsque celle-ci pouvait poursuivre ses activités, tout en soulignant les pertes intangibles découlant d'une liquidation, par exemple la disparition de la clientèle (S. E. Edwards, « Reorganizations Under the Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act » (1947), 25 *R. du B. can.* 587, p. 592). La réorganisation sert l'intérêt public en permettant la survie de compagnies qui fournissent des biens ou des services essentiels à la santé de l'économie ou en préservant un grand nombre d'emplois (*ibid.*, p. 593). Les effets de l'insolvabilité pouvaient même toucher d'autres intéressés que les seuls créanciers et employés. Ces arguments se font entendre encore aujourd'hui sous une forme un peu différente, lorsqu'on justifie la réorganisation par la nécessité de remettre sur pied des compagnies qui constituent des volets essentiels d'un réseau complexe de rapports économiques interdépendants, dans le but d'éviter les effets négatifs de la liquidation.

[19] La LACC est tombée en désuétude au cours des décennies qui ont suivi, vraisemblablement parce que des modifications apportées en 1953 ont restreint son application aux compagnies émettant des obligations (S.C. 1952-53, ch. 3). Pendant la récession du début des années 1980, obligés de s'adapter au nombre grandissant d'entreprises en difficulté, les avocats travaillant dans le domaine de l'insolvabilité ainsi que les tribunaux ont redécouvert cette loi et s'en sont servis pour relever les nouveaux défis de l'économie. Les participants aux

the orders necessary to facilitate the reorganization of the debtor and achieve the CCAA's objectives. The manner in which courts have used CCAA jurisdiction in increasingly creative and flexible ways is explored in greater detail below.

[20] Efforts to evolve insolvency law were not restricted to the courts during this period. In 1970, a government-commissioned panel produced an extensive study recommending sweeping reform but Parliament failed to act (see *Bankruptcy and Insolvency: Report of the Study Committee on Bankruptcy and Insolvency Legislation* (1970)). Another panel of experts produced more limited recommendations in 1986 which eventually resulted in enactment of the *Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act* of 1992 (S.C. 1992, c. 27) (see *Proposed Bankruptcy Act Amendments: Report of the Advisory Committee on Bankruptcy and Insolvency* (1986)). Broader provisions for reorganizing insolvent debtors were then included in Canada's bankruptcy statute. Although the 1970 and 1986 reports made no specific recommendations with respect to the CCAA, the House of Commons committee studying the BIA's predecessor bill, C-22, seemed to accept expert testimony that the BIA's new reorganization scheme would shortly supplant the CCAA, which could then be repealed, with commercial insolvency and bankruptcy being governed by a single statute (*Minutes of Proceedings and Evidence of the Standing Committee on Consumer and Corporate Affairs and Government Operations*, Issue No. 15, 3rd Sess., 34th Parl., October 3, 1991, at 15:15-15:16).

[21] In retrospect, this conclusion by the House of Commons committee was out of step with reality. It overlooked the renewed vitality the CCAA enjoyed in contemporary practice and the advantage that a

procédures en sont peu à peu venus à reconnaître et à apprécier la caractéristique propre de la loi : l'attribution, au tribunal chargé de surveiller le processus, d'une grande latitude lui permettant de rendre les ordonnances nécessaires pour faciliter la réorganisation du débiteur et réaliser les objectifs de la LACC. Nous verrons plus loin comment les tribunaux ont utilisé de façon de plus en plus souple et créative les pouvoirs qui leur sont conférés par la LACC.

[20] Ce ne sont pas seulement les tribunaux qui se sont employés à faire évoluer le droit de l'insolvabilité pendant cette période. En 1970, un comité constitué par le gouvernement a mené une étude approfondie au terme de laquelle il a recommandé une réforme majeure, mais le législateur n'a rien fait (voir *Faillite et insolvabilité : Rapport du comité d'étude sur la législation en matière de faillite et d'insolvabilité* (1970)). En 1986, un autre comité d'experts a formulé des recommandations de portée plus restreinte, qui ont finalement conduit à l'adoption de la *Loi sur la faillite et l'insolvabilité* de 1992 (L.C. 1992, ch. 27) (voir *Propositions d'amendements à la Loi sur la faillite : Rapport du Comité consultatif en matière de faillite et d'insolvabilité* (1986)). Des dispositions à caractère plus général concernant la réorganisation des débiteurs insolvable ont alors été ajoutées à la loi canadienne relative à la faillite. Malgré l'absence de recommandations spécifiques au sujet de la LACC dans les rapports de 1970 et 1986, le comité de la Chambre des communes qui s'est penché sur le projet de loi C-22 à l'origine de la *LFI* a semblé accepter le témoignage d'un expert selon lequel le nouveau régime de réorganisation de la *LFI* supplanterait rapidement la LACC, laquelle pourrait alors être abrogée et l'insolvabilité commerciale et la faillite seraient ainsi régies par un seul texte législatif (*Procès-verbaux et témoignages du Comité permanent des Consommateurs et Sociétés et Administration gouvernementale*, fascicule n° 15, 3^e sess., 34^e lég., 3 octobre 1991, 15:15-15:16).

[21] En rétrospective, cette conclusion du comité de la Chambre des communes ne correspondait pas à la réalité. Elle ne tenait pas compte de la nouvelle vitalité de la LACC dans la pratique contemporaine,

flexible judicially supervised reorganization process presented in the face of increasingly complex reorganizations, when compared to the stricter rules-based scheme contained in the *BIA*. The “flexibility of the *CCAA* [was seen as] a great benefit, allowing for creative and effective decisions” (Industry Canada, Marketplace Framework Policy Branch, *Report on the Operation and Administration of the Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act and the Companies’ Creditors Arrangement Act* (2002), at p. 41). Over the past three decades, resurrection of the *CCAA* has thus been the mainspring of a process through which, one author concludes, “the legal setting for Canadian insolvency restructuring has evolved from a rather blunt instrument to one of the most sophisticated systems in the developed world” (R. B. Jones, “The Evolution of Canadian Restructuring: Challenges for the Rule of Law”, in J. P. Sarra, ed., *Annual Review of Insolvency Law 2005* (2006), 481, at p. 481).

[22] While insolvency proceedings may be governed by different statutory schemes, they share some commonalities. The most prominent of these is the single proceeding model. The nature and purpose of the single proceeding model are described by Professor Wood in *Bankruptcy and Insolvency Law*:

They all provide a collective proceeding that supersedes the usual civil process available to creditors to enforce their claims. The creditors’ remedies are collectivized in order to prevent the free-for-all that would otherwise prevail if creditors were permitted to exercise their remedies. In the absence of a collective process, each creditor is armed with the knowledge that if they do not strike hard and swift to seize the debtor’s assets, they will be beat out by other creditors. [pp. 2-3]

The single proceeding model avoids the inefficiency and chaos that would attend insolvency if each creditor initiated proceedings to recover its debt. Grouping all possible actions against the debtor into a single proceeding controlled in a single forum facilitates negotiation with creditors because it places them all on an equal footing,

ni des avantages qu’offrait, en présence de réorganisations de plus en plus complexes, un processus souple de réorganisation sous surveillance judiciaire par rapport au régime plus rigide de la *LFI*, fondé sur des règles préétablies. La « souplesse de la *LACC* [était considérée comme offrant] de grands avantages car elle permet de prendre des décisions créatives et efficaces » (Industrie Canada, Direction générale des politiques-cadres du marché, *Rapport sur la mise en application de la Loi sur la faillite et l’insolvabilité et de la Loi sur les arrangements avec les créanciers des compagnies* (2002), p. 50). Au cours des trois dernières décennies, la résurrection de la *LACC* a donc été le moteur d’un processus grâce auquel, selon un auteur, [TRADUCTION] « le régime juridique canadien de restructuration en cas d’insolvabilité — qui était au départ un instrument plutôt rudimentaire — a évolué pour devenir un des systèmes les plus sophistiqués du monde développé » (R. B. Jones, « The Evolution of Canadian Restructuring : Challenges for the Rule of Law », dans J. P. Sarra, dir., *Annual Review of Insolvency Law 2005* (2006), 481, p. 481).

[22] Si les instances en matière d’insolvabilité peuvent être régies par des régimes législatifs différents, elles n’en présentent pas moins certains points communs, dont le plus frappant réside dans le modèle de la procédure unique. Le professeur Wood a décrit ainsi la nature et l’objectif de ce modèle dans *Bankruptcy and Insolvency Law* :

[TRADUCTION] Elles prévoient toutes une procédure collective qui remplace la procédure civile habituelle dont peuvent se prévaloir les créanciers pour faire valoir leurs droits. Les recours des créanciers sont collectivisés afin d’éviter l’anarchie qui régnerait si ceux-ci pouvaient exercer leurs recours individuellement. En l’absence d’un processus collectif, chaque créancier sait que faute d’agir de façon rapide et déterminée pour saisir les biens du débiteur, il sera devancé par les autres créanciers. [p. 2-3]

Le modèle de la procédure unique vise à faire échec à l’inefficacité et au chaos qui résulteraient de l’insolvabilité si chaque créancier engageait sa propre procédure dans le but de recouvrer sa créance. La réunion — en une seule instance relevant d’un même tribunal — de toutes les actions possibles contre le débiteur a pour effet de faciliter la négociation avec

rather than exposing them to the risk that a more aggressive creditor will realize its claims against the debtor's limited assets while the other creditors attempt a compromise. With a view to achieving that purpose, both the *CCAA* and the *BIA* allow a court to order all actions against a debtor to be stayed while a compromise is sought.

[23] Another point of convergence of the *CCAA* and the *BIA* relates to priorities. Because the *CCAA* is silent about what happens if reorganization fails, the *BIA* scheme of liquidation and distribution necessarily supplies the backdrop for what will happen if a *CCAA* reorganization is ultimately unsuccessful. In addition, one of the important features of legislative reform of both statutes since the enactment of the *BIA* in 1992 has been a cutback in Crown priorities (S.C. 1992, c. 27, s. 39; S.C. 1997, c. 12, ss. 73 and 125; S.C. 2000, c. 30, s. 148; S.C. 2005, c. 47, ss. 69 and 131; S.C. 2009, c. 33, s. 25; see also *Quebec (Revenue) v. Caisse populaire Desjardins de Montmagny*, 2009 SCC 49, [2009] 3 S.C.R. 286; *Deputy Minister of Revenue v. Rainville*, [1980] 1 S.C.R. 35; *Proposed Bankruptcy Act Amendments: Report of the Advisory Committee on Bankruptcy and Insolvency*).

[24] With parallel *CCAA* and *BIA* restructuring schemes now an accepted feature of the insolvency law landscape, the contemporary thrust of legislative reform has been towards harmonizing aspects of insolvency law common to the two statutory schemes to the extent possible and encouraging reorganization over liquidation (see *An Act to establish the Wage Earner Protection Program Act, to amend the Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act and the Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act and to make consequential amendments to other Acts*, S.C. 2005, c. 47; *Gauntlet Energy Corp., Re*, 2003 ABQB 894, 30 Alta. L.R. (4th) 192, at para. 19).

[25] Mindful of the historical background of the *CCAA* and *BIA*, I now turn to the first question at issue.

les créanciers en les mettant tous sur le même pied. Cela évite le risque de voir un créancier plus combatif obtenir le paiement de ses créances sur l'actif limité du débiteur pendant que les autres créanciers tentent d'arriver à une transaction. La *LACC* et la *LFI* autorisent toutes deux pour cette raison le tribunal à ordonner la suspension de toutes les actions intentées contre le débiteur pendant qu'on cherche à conclure une transaction.

[23] Un autre point de convergence entre la *LACC* et la *LFI* concerne les priorités. Comme la *LACC* ne précise pas ce qui arrive en cas d'échec de la réorganisation, la *LFI* fournit la norme de référence pour ce qui se produira dans une telle situation. De plus, l'une des caractéristiques importantes de la réforme dont ces deux lois ont fait l'objet depuis 1992 est la réduction des priorités de la Couronne (L.C. 1992, ch. 27, art. 39; L.C. 1997, ch. 12, art. 73 et 125; L.C. 2000, ch. 30, art. 148; L.C. 2005, ch. 47, art. 69 et 131; L.C. 2009, ch. 33, art. 25; voir aussi *Québec (Revenu) c. Caisse populaire Desjardins de Montmagny*, 2009 CSC 49, [2009] 3 R.C.S. 286; *Sous-ministre du Revenu c. Rainville*, [1980] 1 R.C.S. 35; *Propositions d'amendements à la Loi sur la faillite : Rapport du Comité consultatif en matière de faillite et d'insolvabilité*).

[24] Comme les régimes de restructuration parallèles de la *LACC* et de la *LFI* constituent désormais une caractéristique reconnue dans le domaine du droit de l'insolvabilité, le travail de réforme législative contemporain a principalement visé à harmoniser, dans la mesure du possible, les aspects communs aux deux régimes et à privilégier la réorganisation plutôt que la liquidation (voir la *Loi édictant la Loi sur le Programme de protection des salariés et modifiant la Loi sur la faillite et l'insolvabilité, la Loi sur les arrangements avec les créanciers des compagnies et d'autres lois en conséquence*, L.C. 2005, ch. 47; *Gauntlet Energy Corp., Re*, 2003 ABQB 894, 30 Alta L.R. (4th) 192, par. 19).

[25] Ayant à l'esprit le contexte historique de la *LACC* et de la *LFI*, je vais maintenant aborder la première question en litige.

3.2 *GST Deemed Trust Under the CCAA*

[26] The Court of Appeal proceeded on the basis that the *ETA* precluded the court from staying the Crown's enforcement of the GST deemed trust when partially lifting the stay to allow the debtor to enter bankruptcy. In so doing, it adopted the reasoning in a line of cases culminating in *Ottawa Senators*, which held that an *ETA* deemed trust remains enforceable during CCAA reorganization despite language in the CCAA that suggests otherwise.

[27] The Crown relies heavily on the decision of the Ontario Court of Appeal in *Ottawa Senators* and argues that the later in time provision of the *ETA* creating the GST deemed trust trumps the provision of the CCAA purporting to nullify most statutory deemed trusts. The Court of Appeal in this case accepted this reasoning but not all provincial courts follow it (see, e.g., *Komunik Corp. (Arrangement relatif à)*, 2009 QCCS 6332 (CanLII), leave to appeal granted, 2010 QCCA 183 (CanLII)). Century Services relied, in its written submissions to this Court, on the argument that the court had authority under the CCAA to continue the stay against the Crown's claim for unremitted GST. In oral argument, the question of whether *Ottawa Senators* was correctly decided nonetheless arose. After the hearing, the parties were asked to make further written submissions on this point. As appears evident from the reasons of my colleague Abella J., this issue has become prominent before this Court. In those circumstances, this Court needs to determine the correctness of the reasoning in *Ottawa Senators*.

[28] The policy backdrop to this question involves the Crown's priority as a creditor in insolvency situations which, as I mentioned above, has evolved considerably. Prior to the 1990s, Crown claims

3.2 *Fiducie réputée se rapportant à la TPS dans le cadre de la LACC*

[26] La Cour d'appel a estimé que la *LTA* empêchait le tribunal de suspendre les mesures prises par la Couronne pour bénéficier de la fiducie réputée se rapportant à la TPS, lorsqu'il a partiellement levé la suspension des procédures engagées contre le débiteur afin de permettre à celui-ci de faire cession de ses biens. Ce faisant, la cour a adopté un raisonnement qui s'insère dans un courant jurisprudentiel dominé par l'arrêt *Ottawa Senators*, suivant lequel il demeure possible de demander le bénéfice d'une fiducie réputée établie par la *LTA* pendant une réorganisation opérée en vertu de la *LACC*, et ce, malgré les dispositions de la *LACC* qui semblent dire le contraire.

[27] S'appuyant largement sur l'arrêt *Ottawa Senators* de la Cour d'appel de l'Ontario, la Couronne plaide que la disposition postérieure de la *LTA* créant la fiducie réputée visant la TPS l'emporte sur la disposition de la *LACC* censée neutraliser la plupart des fiducies réputées qui sont créées par des dispositions législatives. Si la Cour d'appel a accepté ce raisonnement dans la présente affaire, les tribunaux provinciaux ne l'ont pas tous adopté (voir, p. ex., *Komunik Corp. (Arrangement relatif à)*, 2009 QCCS 6332 (CanLII), autorisation d'appel accordée, 2010 QCCA 183 (CanLII)). Dans ses observations écrites adressées à la Cour, Century Services s'est fondée sur l'argument suivant lequel le tribunal pouvait, en vertu de la *LACC*, maintenir la suspension de la demande de la Couronne visant le paiement de la TPS non versée. Au cours des plaidoiries, la question de savoir si l'arrêt *Ottawa Senators* était bien fondé a néanmoins été soulevée. Après l'audience, la Cour a demandé aux parties de présenter des observations écrites supplémentaires à ce sujet. Comme il ressort clairement des motifs de ma collègue la juge Abella, cette question a pris une grande importance devant notre Cour. Dans ces circonstances, la Cour doit statuer sur le bien-fondé du raisonnement adopté dans l'arrêt *Ottawa Senators*.

[28] Le contexte général dans lequel s'inscrit cette question concerne l'évolution considérable, signalée plus haut, de la priorité dont jouit la Couronne en tant que créancier en cas d'insolvabilité. Avant les

largely enjoyed priority in insolvency. This was widely seen as unsatisfactory as shown by both the 1970 and 1986 insolvency reform proposals, which recommended that Crown claims receive no preferential treatment. A closely related matter was whether the *CCAA* was binding at all upon the Crown. Amendments to the *CCAA* in 1997 confirmed that it did indeed bind the Crown (see *CCAA*, s. 21, as added by S.C. 1997, c. 12, s. 126).

[29] Claims of priority by the state in insolvency situations receive different treatment across jurisdictions worldwide. For example, in Germany and Australia, the state is given no priority at all, while the state enjoys wide priority in the United States and France (see B. K. Morgan, “Should the Sovereign be Paid First? A Comparative International Analysis of the Priority for Tax Claims in Bankruptcy” (2000), 74 *Am. Bankr. L.J.* 461, at p. 500). Canada adopted a middle course through legislative reform of Crown priority initiated in 1992. The Crown retained priority for source deductions of income tax, Employment Insurance (“EI”) and Canada Pension Plan (“CPP”) premiums, but ranks as an ordinary unsecured creditor for most other claims.

[30] Parliament has frequently enacted statutory mechanisms to secure Crown claims and permit their enforcement. The two most common are statutory deemed trusts and powers to garnish funds third parties owe the debtor (see F. L. Lamer, *Priority of Crown Claims in Insolvency* (loose-leaf), at §2).

[31] With respect to GST collected, Parliament has enacted a deemed trust. The *ETA* states that every person who collects an amount on account of GST is deemed to hold that amount in trust for the Crown (s. 222(1)). The deemed trust extends to other property of the person collecting the tax equal in value to the amount deemed to be in trust if that amount has not been remitted in accordance with the *ETA*. The deemed trust also extends to property

années 1990, les créances de la Couronne bénéficiaient dans une large mesure d’une priorité en cas d’insolvabilité. Cette situation avantageuse suscitait une grande controverse. Les propositions de réforme du droit de l’insolvabilité de 1970 et de 1986 en témoignent — elles recommandaient que les créances de la Couronne ne fassent l’objet d’aucun traitement préférentiel. Une question connexe se posait : celle de savoir si la Couronne était même assujettie à la *LACC*. Les modifications apportées à la *LACC* en 1997 ont confirmé qu’elle l’était bel et bien (voir *LACC*, art. 21, ajouté par L.C. 1997, ch. 12, art. 126).

[29] Les revendications de priorité par l’État en cas d’insolvabilité sont abordées de différentes façons selon les pays. Par exemple, en Allemagne et en Australie, l’État ne bénéficie d’aucune priorité, alors qu’aux États-Unis et en France il jouit au contraire d’une large priorité (voir B. K. Morgan, « Should the Sovereign be Paid First? A Comparative International Analysis of the Priority for Tax Claims in Bankruptcy » (2000), 74 *Am. Bankr. L.J.* 461, p. 500). Le Canada a choisi une voie intermédiaire dans le cadre d’une réforme législative amorcée en 1992 : la Couronne a conservé sa priorité pour les sommes retenues à la source au titre de l’impôt sur le revenu et des cotisations à l’assurance-emploi (« AE ») et au Régime de pensions du Canada (« RPC »), mais elle est un créancier ordinaire non garanti pour la plupart des autres sommes qui lui sont dues.

[30] Le législateur a fréquemment adopté des mécanismes visant à protéger les créances de la Couronne et à permettre leur exécution. Les deux plus courants sont les fiducies présumées et les pouvoirs de saisie-arrêt (voir F. L. Lamer, *Priority of Crown Claims in Insolvency* (feuilles mobiles), §2).

[31] Pour ce qui est des sommes de TPS perçues, le législateur a établi une fiducie réputée. La *LTA* précise que la personne qui perçoit une somme au titre de la TPS est réputée la détenir en fiducie pour la Couronne (par. 222(1)). La fiducie réputée s’applique aux autres biens de la personne qui perçoit la taxe, pour une valeur égale à la somme réputée détenue en fiducie, si la somme en question n’a pas été versée en conformité avec la *LTA*. La fiducie réputée vise

held by a secured creditor that, but for the security interest, would be property of the person collecting the tax (s. 222(3)).

[32] Parliament has created similar deemed trusts using almost identical language in respect of source deductions of income tax, EI premiums and CPP premiums (see s. 227(4) of the *Income Tax Act*, R.S.C. 1985, c. 1 (5th Supp.) (“*ITA*”), ss. 86(2) and (2.1) of the *Employment Insurance Act*, S.C. 1996, c. 23, and ss. 23(3) and (4) of the *Canada Pension Plan*, R.S.C. 1985, c. C-8). I will refer to income tax, EI and CPP deductions as “source deductions”.

[33] In *Royal Bank of Canada v. Sparrow Electric Corp.*, [1997] 1 S.C.R. 411, this Court addressed a priority dispute between a deemed trust for source deductions under the *ITA* and security interests taken under both the *Bank Act*, S.C. 1991, c. 46, and the *Alberta Personal Property Security Act*, S.A. 1988, c. P-4.05 (“*PPSA*”). As then worded, an *ITA* deemed trust over the debtor’s property equivalent to the amount owing in respect of income tax became effective at the time of liquidation, receivership, or assignment in bankruptcy. *Sparrow Electric* held that the *ITA* deemed trust could not prevail over the security interests because, being fixed charges, the latter attached as soon as the debtor acquired rights in the property such that the *ITA* deemed trust had no property on which to attach when it subsequently arose. Later, in *First Vancouver Finance v. M.N.R.*, 2002 SCC 49, [2002] 2 S.C.R. 720, this Court observed that Parliament had legislated to strengthen the statutory deemed trust in the *ITA* by deeming it to operate from the moment the deductions were not paid to the Crown as required by the *ITA*, and by granting the Crown priority over all security interests (paras. 27-29) (the “*Sparrow Electric* amendment”).

également les biens détenus par un créancier garanti qui, si ce n’était de la sûreté, seraient les biens de la personne qui perçoit la taxe (par. 222(3)).

[32] Utilisant pratiquement les mêmes termes, le législateur a créé de semblables fiducies réputées à l’égard des retenues à la source relatives à l’impôt sur le revenu et aux cotisations à l’AE et au RPC (voir par. 227(4) de la *Loi de l’impôt sur le revenu*, L.R.C. 1985, ch. 1 (5^e suppl.) (« *LIR* »), par. 86(2) et (2.1) de la *Loi sur l’assurance-emploi*, L.C. 1996, ch. 23, et par. 23(3) et (4) du *Régime de pensions du Canada*, L.R.C. 1985, ch. C-8). J’emploierai ci-après le terme « retenues à la source » pour désigner les retenues relatives à l’impôt sur le revenu et aux cotisations à l’AE et au RPC.

[33] Dans *Banque Royale du Canada c. Sparrow Electric Corp.*, [1997] 1 R.C.S. 411, la Cour était saisie d’un litige portant sur la priorité de rang entre, d’une part, une fiducie réputée établie en vertu de la *LIR* à l’égard des retenues à la source, et, d’autre part, des sûretés constituées en vertu de la *Loi sur les banques*, L.C. 1991, ch. 46, et de la loi de l’Alberta intitulée *Personal Property Security Act*, S.A. 1988, ch. P-4.05 (« *PPSA* »). D’après les dispositions alors en vigueur, une fiducie réputée — établie en vertu de la *LIR* à l’égard des biens du débiteur pour une valeur égale à la somme due au titre de l’impôt sur le revenu — commençait à s’appliquer au moment de la liquidation, de la mise sous séquestre ou de la cession de biens. Dans *Sparrow Electric*, la Cour a conclu que la fiducie réputée de la *LIR* ne pouvait pas l’emporter sur les sûretés, au motif que, comme celles-ci constituaient des privilèges fixes grevant les biens dès que le débiteur acquérait des droits sur eux, il n’existait pas de biens susceptibles d’être visés par la fiducie réputée de la *LIR* lorsqu’elle prenait naissance par la suite. Ultérieurement, dans *First Vancouver Finance c. M.R.N.*, 2002 CSC 49, [2002] 2 R.C.S. 720, la Cour a souligné que le législateur était intervenu pour renforcer la fiducie réputée de la *LIR* en précisant qu’elle est réputée s’appliquer dès le moment où les retenues ne sont pas versées à la Couronne conformément aux exigences de la *LIR*, et en donnant à la Couronne la priorité sur toute autre garantie (par. 27-29) (la « modification découlant de l’arrêt *Sparrow Electric* »).

[34] The amended text of s. 227(4.1) of the *ITA* and concordant source deductions deemed trusts in the *Canada Pension Plan* and the *Employment Insurance Act* state that the deemed trust operates notwithstanding any other enactment of Canada, except ss. 81.1 and 81.2 of the *BIA*. The *ETA* deemed trust at issue in this case is similarly worded, but it excepts the *BIA* in its entirety. The provision reads as follows:

222. . . .

. . . .

(3) Despite any other provision of this Act (except subsection (4)), any other enactment of Canada (except the *Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act*), any enactment of a province or any other law, if at any time an amount deemed by subsection (1) to be held by a person in trust for Her Majesty is not remitted to the Receiver General or withdrawn in the manner and at the time provided under this Part, property of the person and property held by any secured creditor of the person that, but for a security interest, would be property of the person, equal in value to the amount so deemed to be held in trust, is deemed

[35] The Crown submits that the *Sparrow Electric* amendment, added by Parliament to the *ETA* in 2000, was intended to preserve the Crown's priority over collected GST under the *CCAA* while subordinating the Crown to the status of an unsecured creditor in respect of GST only under the *BIA*. This is because the *ETA* provides that the GST deemed trust is effective "despite" any other enactment except the *BIA*.

[36] The language used in the *ETA* for the GST deemed trust creates an apparent conflict with the *CCAA*, which provides that subject to certain exceptions, property deemed by statute to be held in trust for the Crown shall not be so regarded.

[37] Through a 1997 amendment to the *CCAA* (S.C. 1997, c. 12, s. 125), Parliament appears to have,

[34] Selon le texte modifié du par. 227(4.1) de la *LIR* et celui des fiducies réputées correspondantes établies dans le *Régime de pensions du Canada* et la *Loi sur l'assurance-emploi* à l'égard des retenues à la source, la fiducie réputée s'applique malgré tout autre texte législatif fédéral sauf les art. 81.1 et 81.2 de la *LFI*. La fiducie réputée de la *LTA* qui est en cause en l'espèce est formulée en des termes semblables sauf que la limite à son application vise la *LFI* dans son entier. Voici le texte de la disposition pertinente :

222. . . .

. . . .

(3) Malgré les autres dispositions de la présente loi (sauf le paragraphe (4) du présent article), tout autre texte législatif fédéral (sauf la *Loi sur la faillite et l'insolvabilité*), tout texte législatif provincial ou toute autre règle de droit, lorsqu'un montant qu'une personne est réputée par le paragraphe (1) détenir en fiducie pour Sa Majesté du chef du Canada n'est pas versé au receveur général ni retiré selon les modalités et dans le délai prévus par la présente partie, les biens de la personne — y compris les biens détenus par ses créanciers garantis qui, en l'absence du droit en garantie, seraient ses biens — d'une valeur égale à ce montant sont réputés . . .

[35] La Couronne soutient que la modification découlant de l'arrêt *Sparrow Electric*, qui a été ajoutée à la *LTA* par le législateur en 2000, visait à maintenir la priorité de Sa Majesté sous le régime de la *LACC* à l'égard du montant de TPS perçu, tout en reléguant celle-ci au rang de créancier non garanti à l'égard de ce montant sous le régime de la *LFI* uniquement. De l'avis de la Couronne, il en est ainsi parce que, selon la *LTA*, la fiducie réputée visant la TPS demeure en vigueur « malgré » tout autre texte législatif sauf la *LFI*.

[36] Les termes utilisés dans la *LTA* pour établir la fiducie réputée à l'égard de la TPS créent un conflit apparent avec la *LACC*, laquelle précise que, sous réserve de certaines exceptions, les biens qui sont réputés selon un texte législatif être détenus en fiducie pour la Couronne ne doivent pas être considérés comme tels.

[37] Par une modification apportée à la *LACC* en 1997 (L.C. 1997, ch. 12, art. 125), le législateur

subject to specific exceptions, nullified deemed trusts in favour of the Crown once reorganization proceedings are commenced under the Act. The relevant provision reads:

18.3 (1) Subject to subsection (2), notwithstanding any provision in federal or provincial legislation that has the effect of deeming property to be held in trust for Her Majesty, property of a debtor company shall not be regarded as held in trust for Her Majesty unless it would be so regarded in the absence of that statutory provision.

This nullification of deemed trusts was continued in further amendments to the *CCAA* (S.C. 2005, c. 47), where s. 18.3(1) was renumbered and reformulated as s. 37(1):

37. (1) Subject to subsection (2), despite any provision in federal or provincial legislation that has the effect of deeming property to be held in trust for Her Majesty, property of a debtor company shall not be regarded as being held in trust for Her Majesty unless it would be so regarded in the absence of that statutory provision.

[38] An analogous provision exists in the *BIA*, which, subject to the same specific exceptions, nullifies statutory deemed trusts and makes property of the bankrupt that would otherwise be subject to a deemed trust part of the debtor's estate and available to creditors (S.C. 1992, c. 27, s. 39; S.C. 1997, c. 12, s. 73; *BIA*, s. 67(2)). It is noteworthy that in both the *CCAA* and the *BIA*, the exceptions concern source deductions (*CCAA*, s. 18.3(2); *BIA*, s. 67(3)). The relevant provision of the *CCAA* reads:

18.3 . . .

(2) Subsection (1) does not apply in respect of amounts deemed to be held in trust under subsection 227(4) or (4.1) of the *Income Tax Act*, subsection 23(3) or (4) of the *Canada Pension Plan* or subsection 86(2) or (2.1) of the *Employment Insurance Act*

Thus, the Crown's deemed trust and corresponding priority in source deductions remain effective both in reorganization and in bankruptcy.

semble, sous réserve d'exceptions spécifiques, avoir neutralisé les fiducies réputées créées en faveur de la Couronne lorsque des procédures de réorganisation sont engagées sous le régime de cette loi. La disposition pertinente, à l'époque le par. 18.3(1), était libellée ainsi :

18.3 (1) Sous réserve du paragraphe (2) et par dérogation à toute disposition législative fédérale ou provinciale ayant pour effet d'assimiler certains biens à des biens détenus en fiducie pour Sa Majesté, aucun des biens de la compagnie débitrice ne peut être considéré comme détenu en fiducie pour Sa Majesté si, en l'absence de la disposition législative en question, il ne le serait pas.

Cette neutralisation des fiducies réputées a été maintenue dans des modifications apportées à la *LACC* en 2005 (L.C. 2005, ch. 47), où le par. 18.3(1) a été reformulé et renuméroté, devenant le par. 37(1) :

37. (1) Sous réserve du paragraphe (2) et par dérogation à toute disposition législative fédérale ou provinciale ayant pour effet d'assimiler certains biens à des biens détenus en fiducie pour Sa Majesté, aucun des biens de la compagnie débitrice ne peut être considéré comme tel par le seul effet d'une telle disposition.

[38] La *LFI* comporte une disposition analogue, qui — sous réserve des mêmes exceptions spécifiques — neutralise les fiducies réputées établies en vertu d'un texte législatif et fait en sorte que les biens du failli qui autrement seraient visés par une telle fiducie font partie de l'actif du débiteur et sont à la disposition des créanciers (L.C. 1992, ch. 27, art. 39; L.C. 1997, ch. 12, art. 73; *LFI*, par. 67(2)). Il convient de souligner que, tant dans la *LACC* que dans la *LFI*, les exceptions visent les retenues à la source (*LACC*, par. 18.3(2); *LFI*, par. 67(3)). Voici la disposition pertinente de la *LACC* :

18.3 . . .

(2) Le paragraphe (1) ne s'applique pas à l'égard des montants réputés détenus en fiducie aux termes des paragraphes 227(4) ou (4.1) de la *Loi de l'impôt sur le revenu*, des paragraphes 23(3) ou (4) du *Régime de pensions du Canada* ou des paragraphes 86(2) ou (2.1) de la *Loi sur l'assurance-emploi*

Par conséquent, la fiducie réputée établie en faveur de la Couronne et la priorité dont celle-ci jouit de ce fait sur les retenues à la source continuent de s'appliquer autant pendant la réorganisation que pendant la faillite.

[39] Meanwhile, in both s. 18.4(1) of the *CCAA* and s. 86(1) of the *BIA*, other Crown claims are treated as unsecured. These provisions, establishing the Crown's status as an unsecured creditor, explicitly exempt statutory deemed trusts in source deductions (*CCAA*, s. 18.4(3); *BIA*, s. 86(3)). The *CCAA* provision reads as follows:

18.4 . . .

. . . .

(3) Subsection (1) [Crown ranking as unsecured creditor] does not affect the operation of

(a) subsections 224(1.2) and (1.3) of the *Income Tax Act*,

(b) any provision of the *Canada Pension Plan* or of the *Employment Insurance Act* that refers to subsection 224(1.2) of the *Income Tax Act* and provides for the collection of a contribution

Therefore, not only does the *CCAA* provide that Crown claims do not enjoy priority over the claims of other creditors (s. 18.3(1)), but the exceptions to this rule (i.e., that Crown priority is maintained for source deductions) are repeatedly stated in the statute.

[40] The apparent conflict in this case is whether the rule in the *CCAA* first enacted as s. 18.3 in 1997, which provides that subject to certain explicit exceptions, statutory deemed trusts are ineffective under the *CCAA*, is overridden by the one in the *ETA* enacted in 2000 stating that GST deemed trusts operate despite any enactment of Canada except the *BIA*. With respect for my colleague Fish J., I do not think the apparent conflict can be resolved by denying it and creating a rule requiring both a statutory provision enacting the deemed trust, and a second statutory provision confirming it. Such a rule is unknown to the law. Courts must recognize

[39] Par ailleurs, les autres créances de la Couronne sont considérées par la *LACC* et la *LFI* comme des créances non garanties (*LACC*, par. 18.4(1); *LFI*, par. 86(1)). Ces dispositions faisant de la Couronne un créancier non garanti comportent une exception expresse concernant les fiducies réputées établies par un texte législatif à l'égard des retenues à la source (*LACC*, par. 18.4(3); *LFI*, par. 86(3)). Voici la disposition de la *LACC* :

18.4 . . .

. . . .

(3) Le paragraphe (1) [suivant lequel la Couronne a le rang de créancier non garanti] n'a pas pour effet de porter atteinte à l'application des dispositions suivantes :

a) les paragraphes 224(1.2) et (1.3) de la *Loi de l'impôt sur le revenu*;

b) toute disposition du *Régime de pensions du Canada* ou de la *Loi sur l'assurance-emploi* qui renvoie au paragraphe 224(1.2) de la *Loi de l'impôt sur le revenu* et qui prévoit la perception d'une cotisation

Par conséquent, non seulement la *LACC* précise que les créances de la Couronne ne bénéficient pas d'une priorité par rapport à celles des autres créanciers (par. 18.3(1)), mais les exceptions à cette règle (maintien de la priorité de la Couronne dans le cas des retenues à la source) sont mentionnées à plusieurs reprises dans la Loi.

[40] Le conflit apparent qui existe dans la présente affaire fait qu'on doit se demander si la règle de la *LTA* adoptée en 2000, selon laquelle les fiducies réputées visant la TPS s'appliquent malgré tout autre texte législatif fédéral sauf la *LFI*, l'emporte sur la règle énoncée dans la *LACC* — qui a d'abord été édictée en 1997 à l'art. 18.3 — suivant laquelle, sous réserve de certaines exceptions explicites, les fiducies réputées établies par une disposition législative sont sans effet dans le cadre de la *LACC*. Avec égards pour l'opinion contraire exprimée par mon collègue le juge Fish, je ne crois pas qu'on puisse résoudre ce conflit apparent

conflicts, apparent or real, and resolve them when possible.

[41] A line of jurisprudence across Canada has resolved the apparent conflict in favour of the *ETA*, thereby maintaining GST deemed trusts under the *CCAA*. *Ottawa Senators*, the leading case, decided the matter by invoking the doctrine of implied repeal to hold that the later in time provision of the *ETA* should take precedence over the *CCAA* (see also *Solid Resources Ltd., Re* (2002), 40 C.B.R. (4th) 219 (Alta. Q.B.); *Gauntlet*).

[42] The Ontario Court of Appeal in *Ottawa Senators* rested its conclusion on two considerations. First, it was persuaded that by explicitly mentioning the *BIA* in *ETA* s. 222(3), but not the *CCAA*, Parliament made a deliberate choice. In the words of MacPherson J.A.:

The *BIA* and the *CCAA* are closely related federal statutes. I cannot conceive that Parliament would specifically identify the *BIA* as an exception, but accidentally fail to consider the *CCAA* as a possible second exception. In my view, the omission of the *CCAA* from s. 222(3) of the *ETA* was almost certainly a considered omission. [para. 43]

[43] Second, the Ontario Court of Appeal compared the conflict between the *ETA* and the *CCAA* to that before this Court in *Doré v. Verdun (City)*, [1997] 2 S.C.R. 862, and found them to be “identical” (para. 46). It therefore considered *Doré* binding (para. 49). In *Doré*, a limitations provision in the more general and recently enacted *Civil Code of Québec*, S.Q. 1991, c. 64 (“*C.C.Q.*”), was held to have repealed a more specific provision of the earlier *Quebec Cities and Towns Act*, R.S.Q., c. C-19, with which it conflicted. By analogy,

en niant son existence et en créant une règle qui exige à la fois une disposition législative établissant la fiducie présumée et une autre la confirmant. Une telle règle est inconnue en droit. Les tribunaux doivent reconnaître les conflits, apparents ou réels, et les résoudre lorsque la chose est possible.

[41] Un courant jurisprudentiel pancanadien a résolu le conflit apparent en faveur de la *LTA*, confirmant ainsi la validité des fiducies réputées à l’égard de la TPS dans le cadre de la *LACC*. Dans l’arrêt déterminant à ce sujet, *Ottawa Senators*, la Cour d’appel de l’Ontario a invoqué la doctrine de l’abrogation implicite et conclu que la disposition postérieure de la *LTA* devait avoir préséance sur la *LACC* (voir aussi *Solid Resources Ltd., Re* (2002), 40 C.B.R. (4th) 219 (B.R. Alb.); *Gauntlet*).

[42] Dans *Ottawa Senators*, la Cour d’appel de l’Ontario a fondé sa conclusion sur deux considérations. Premièrement, elle était convaincue qu’en mentionnant explicitement la *LFI* — mais pas la *LACC* — au par. 222(3) de la *LTA*, le législateur a fait un choix délibéré. Je cite le juge MacPherson :

[TRADUCTION] La *LFI* et la *LACC* sont des lois fédérales étroitement liées entre elles. Je ne puis concevoir que le législateur ait pu mentionner expressément la *LFI* à titre d’exception, mais ait involontairement omis de considérer la *LACC* comme une deuxième exception possible. À mon avis, le fait que la *LACC* ne soit pas mentionnée au par. 222(3) de la *LTA* était presque assurément une omission mûrement réfléchie de la part du législateur. [par. 43]

[43] Deuxièmement, la Cour d’appel de l’Ontario a comparé le conflit entre la *LTA* et la *LACC* à celui dont a été saisie la Cour dans *Doré c. Verdun (Ville)*, [1997] 2 R.C.S. 862, et les a jugés [TRADUCTION] « identiques » (par. 46). Elle s’estimait donc tenue de suivre l’arrêt *Doré* (par. 49). Dans cet arrêt, la Cour a conclu qu’une disposition d’une loi de nature plus générale et récemment adoptée établissant un délai de prescription — le *Code civil du Québec*, L.Q. 1991, ch. 64 (« *C.c.Q.* ») — avait eu pour effet d’abroger une disposition plus spécifique

the Ontario Court of Appeal held that the later in time and more general provision, s. 222(3) of the *ETA*, impliedly repealed the more specific and earlier in time provision, s. 18.3(1) of the *CCAA* (paras. 47-49).

[44] Viewing this issue in its entire context, several considerations lead me to conclude that neither the reasoning nor the result in *Ottawa Senators* can stand. While a conflict may exist at the level of the statutes' wording, a purposive and contextual analysis to determine Parliament's true intent yields the conclusion that Parliament could not have intended to restore the Crown's deemed trust priority in GST claims under the *CCAA* when it amended the *ETA* in 2000 with the *Sparrow Electric* amendment.

[45] I begin by recalling that Parliament has shown its willingness to move away from asserting priority for Crown claims in insolvency law. Section 18.3(1) of the *CCAA* (subject to the s. 18.3(2) exceptions) provides that the Crown's deemed trusts have no effect under the *CCAA*. Where Parliament has sought to protect certain Crown claims through statutory deemed trusts and intended that these deemed trusts continue in insolvency, it has legislated so explicitly and elaborately. For example, s. 18.3(2) of the *CCAA* and s. 67(3) of the *BIA* expressly provide that deemed trusts for source deductions remain effective in insolvency. Parliament has, therefore, clearly carved out exceptions from the general rule that deemed trusts are ineffective in insolvency. The *CCAA* and *BIA* are in harmony, preserving deemed trusts and asserting Crown priority only in respect of source deductions. Meanwhile, there is no express statutory basis for concluding that GST claims enjoy a preferred treatment under the *CCAA* or the *BIA*. Unlike source deductions, which are clearly and expressly dealt with under both these insolvency statutes, no such clear and express language exists

d'un texte de loi antérieur, la *Loi sur les cités et villes* du Québec, L.R.Q., ch. C-19, avec laquelle elle entrerait en conflit. Par analogie, la Cour d'appel de l'Ontario a conclu que le par. 222(3) de la *LTA*, une disposition plus récente et plus générale, abrogeait implicitement la disposition antérieure plus spécifique, à savoir le par. 18.3(1) de la *LACC* (par. 47-49).

[44] En examinant la question dans tout son contexte, je suis amenée à conclure, pour plusieurs raisons, que ni le raisonnement ni le résultat de l'arrêt *Ottawa Senators* ne peuvent être adoptés. Bien qu'il puisse exister un conflit entre le libellé des textes de loi, une analyse téléologique et contextuelle visant à déterminer la véritable intention du législateur conduit à la conclusion que ce dernier ne saurait avoir eu l'intention de redonner la priorité, dans le cadre de la *LACC*, à la fiducie réputée de la Couronne à l'égard de ses créances relatives à la TPS quand il a apporté à la *LTA*, en 2000, la modification découlant de l'arrêt *Sparrow Electric*.

[45] Je rappelle d'abord que le législateur a manifesté sa volonté de mettre un terme à la priorité accordée aux créances de la Couronne dans le cadre du droit de l'insolvabilité. Selon le par. 18.3(1) de la *LACC* (sous réserve des exceptions prévues au par. 18.3(2)), les fiducies réputées de la Couronne n'ont aucun effet sous le régime de cette loi. Quand le législateur a voulu protéger certaines créances de la Couronne au moyen de fiducies réputées et voulu que celles-ci continuent de s'appliquer en situation d'insolvabilité, il l'a indiqué de manière explicite et minutieuse. Par exemple, le par. 18.3(2) de la *LACC* et le par. 67(3) de la *LFI* énoncent expressément que les fiducies réputées visant les retenues à la source continuent de produire leurs effets en cas d'insolvabilité. Le législateur a donc clairement établi des exceptions à la règle générale selon laquelle les fiducies réputées n'ont plus d'effet dans un contexte d'insolvabilité. La *LACC* et la *LFI* sont en harmonie : elles préservent les fiducies réputées et établissent la priorité de la Couronne seulement à l'égard des retenues à la source. En revanche, il n'existe aucune disposition législative expresse permettant de conclure que les créances relatives à la

in those Acts carving out an exception for GST claims.

[46] The internal logic of the *CCAA* also militates against upholding the *ETA* deemed trust for GST. The *CCAA* imposes limits on a suspension by the court of the Crown's rights in respect of source deductions but does not mention the *ETA* (s. 11.4). Since source deductions deemed trusts are granted explicit protection under the *CCAA*, it would be inconsistent to afford a better protection to the *ETA* deemed trust absent explicit language in the *CCAA*. Thus, the logic of the *CCAA* appears to subject the *ETA* deemed trust to the waiver by Parliament of its priority (s. 18.4).

[47] Moreover, a strange asymmetry would arise if the interpretation giving the *ETA* priority over the *CCAA* urged by the Crown is adopted here: the Crown would retain priority over GST claims during *CCAA* proceedings but not in bankruptcy. As courts have reflected, this can only encourage statute shopping by secured creditors in cases such as this one where the debtor's assets cannot satisfy both the secured creditors' and the Crown's claims (*Gauntlet*, at para. 21). If creditors' claims were better protected by liquidation under the *BIA*, creditors' incentives would lie overwhelmingly with avoiding proceedings under the *CCAA* and not risking a failed reorganization. Giving a key player in any insolvency such skewed incentives against reorganizing under the *CCAA* can only undermine that statute's remedial objectives and risk inviting the very social ills that it was enacted to avert.

TPS bénéficient d'un traitement préférentiel sous le régime de la *LACC* ou de la *LFI*. Alors que les retenues à la source font l'objet de dispositions explicites dans ces deux lois concernant l'insolvabilité, celles-ci ne comportent pas de dispositions claires et expresses analogues établissant une exception pour les créances relatives à la TPS.

[46] La logique interne de la *LACC* va également à l'encontre du maintien de la fiducie réputée établie dans la *LTA* à l'égard de la TPS. En effet, la *LACC* impose certaines limites à la suspension par les tribunaux des droits de la Couronne à l'égard des retenues à la source, mais elle ne fait pas mention de la *LTA* (art. 11.4). Comme les fiducies réputées visant les retenues à la source sont explicitement protégées par la *LACC*, il serait incohérent d'accorder une meilleure protection à la fiducie réputée établie par la *LTA* en l'absence de dispositions explicites en ce sens dans la *LACC*. Par conséquent, il semble découler de la logique de la *LACC* que la fiducie réputée établie par la *LTA* est visée par la renonciation du législateur à sa priorité (art. 18.4).

[47] De plus, il y aurait une étrange asymétrie si l'interprétation faisant primer la *LTA* sur la *LACC* préconisée par la Couronne était retenue en l'espèce : les créances de la Couronne relatives à la TPS conserveraient leur priorité de rang pendant les procédures fondées sur la *LACC*, mais pas en cas de faillite. Comme certains tribunaux l'ont bien vu, cela ne pourrait qu'encourager les créanciers à recourir à la loi la plus favorable dans les cas où, comme en l'espèce, l'actif du débiteur n'est pas suffisant pour permettre à la fois le paiement des créanciers garantis et le paiement des créances de la Couronne (*Gauntlet*, par. 21). Or, si les réclamations des créanciers étaient mieux protégées par la liquidation sous le régime de la *LFI*, les créanciers seraient très fortement incités à éviter les procédures prévues par la *LACC* et les risques d'échec d'une réorganisation. Le fait de donner à un acteur clé de telles raisons de s'opposer aux procédures de réorganisation fondées sur la *LACC* dans toute situation d'insolvabilité ne peut que miner les objectifs réparateurs de ce texte législatif et risque au contraire de favoriser les maux sociaux que son édicton visait justement à prévenir.

[48] Arguably, the effect of *Ottawa Senators* is mitigated if restructuring is attempted under the *BIA* instead of the *CCAA*, but it is not cured. If *Ottawa Senators* were to be followed, Crown priority over GST would differ depending on whether restructuring took place under the *CCAA* or the *BIA*. The anomaly of this result is made manifest by the fact that it would deprive companies of the option to restructure under the more flexible and responsive *CCAA* regime, which has been the statute of choice for complex reorganizations.

[49] Evidence that Parliament intended different treatments for GST claims in reorganization and bankruptcy is scant, if it exists at all. Section 222(3) of the *ETA* was enacted as part of a wide-ranging budget implementation bill in 2000. The summary accompanying that bill does not indicate that Parliament intended to elevate Crown priority over GST claims under the *CCAA* to the same or a higher level than source deductions claims. Indeed, the summary for deemed trusts states only that amendments to existing provisions are aimed at “ensuring that employment insurance premiums and Canada Pension Plan contributions that are required to be remitted by an employer are fully recoverable by the Crown in the case of the bankruptcy of the employer” (Summary to S.C. 2000, c. 30, at p. 4a). The wording of GST deemed trusts resembles that of statutory deemed trusts for source deductions and incorporates the same overriding language and reference to the *BIA*. However, as noted above, Parliament’s express intent is that only source deductions deemed trusts remain operative. An exception for the *BIA* in the statutory language establishing the source deductions deemed trusts accomplishes very little, because the explicit language of the *BIA* itself (and the *CCAA*) carves out these source deductions deemed trusts and maintains their effect. It is however noteworthy that no equivalent language maintaining GST deemed trusts exists under either the *BIA* or the *CCAA*.

[48] Peut-être l’effet de l’arrêt *Ottawa Senators* est-il atténué si la restructuration est tentée en vertu de la *LFI* au lieu de la *LACC*, mais il subsiste néanmoins. Si l’on suivait cet arrêt, la priorité de la créance de la Couronne relative à la TPS différerait selon le régime — *LACC* ou *LFI* — sous lequel la restructuration a lieu. L’anomalie de ce résultat ressort clairement du fait que les compagnies seraient ainsi privées de la possibilité de se restructurer sous le régime plus souple et mieux adapté de la *LACC*, régime privilégié en cas de réorganisations complexes.

[49] Les indications selon lesquelles le législateur voulait que les créances relatives à la TPS soient traitées différemment dans les cas de réorganisations et de faillites sont rares, voire inexistantes. Le paragraphe 222(3) de la *LTA* a été adopté dans le cadre d’un projet de loi d’exécution du budget de nature générale en 2000. Le sommaire accompagnant ce projet de loi n’indique pas que, dans le cadre de la *LACC*, le législateur entendait élever la priorité de la créance de la Couronne à l’égard de la TPS au même rang que les créances relatives aux retenues à la source ou encore à un rang supérieur à celles-ci. En fait, le sommaire mentionne simplement, en ce qui concerne les fiducies réputées, que les modifications apportées aux dispositions existantes visent à « faire en sorte que les cotisations à l’assurance-emploi et au Régime de pensions du Canada qu’un employeur est tenu de verser soient pleinement recouvrables par la Couronne en cas de faillite de l’employeur » (Sommaire de la L.C. 2000, ch. 30, p. 4a). Le libellé de la disposition créant une fiducie réputée à l’égard de la TPS ressemble à celui des dispositions créant de telles fiducies relatives aux retenues à la source et il comporte la même formule dérogatoire et la même mention de la *LFI*. Cependant, comme il a été souligné précédemment, le législateur a expressément précisé que seules les fiducies réputées visant les retenues à la source demeurent en vigueur. Une exception concernant la *LFI* dans la disposition créant les fiducies réputées à l’égard des retenues à la source est sans grande conséquence, car le texte explicite de la *LFI* elle-même (et celui de la *LACC*) établit ces fiducies et maintient leur effet. Il convient toutefois de souligner que ni la *LFI* ni la *LACC* ne comportent de disposition équivalente assurant le maintien en vigueur des fiducies réputées visant la TPS.

[50] It seems more likely that by adopting the same language for creating GST deemed trusts in the *ETA* as it did for deemed trusts for source deductions, and by overlooking the inclusion of an exception for the *CCAA* alongside the *BIA* in s. 222(3) of the *ETA*, Parliament may have inadvertently succumbed to a drafting anomaly. Because of a statutory lacuna in the *ETA*, the GST deemed trust could be seen as remaining effective in the *CCAA*, while ceasing to have any effect under the *BIA*, thus creating an apparent conflict with the wording of the *CCAA*. However, it should be seen for what it is: a facial conflict only, capable of resolution by looking at the broader approach taken to Crown priorities and by giving precedence to the statutory language of s. 18.3 of the *CCAA* in a manner that does not produce an anomalous outcome.

[51] Section 222(3) of the *ETA* evinces no explicit intention of Parliament to repeal *CCAA* s. 18.3. It merely creates an apparent conflict that must be resolved by statutory interpretation. Parliament's intent when it enacted *ETA* s. 222(3) was therefore far from unambiguous. Had it sought to give the Crown a priority for GST claims, it could have done so explicitly as it did for source deductions. Instead, one is left to infer from the language of *ETA* s. 222(3) that the GST deemed trust was intended to be effective under the *CCAA*.

[52] I am not persuaded that the reasoning in *Doré* requires the application of the doctrine of implied repeal in the circumstances of this case. The main issue in *Doré* concerned the impact of the adoption of the *C.C.Q.* on the administrative law rules with respect to municipalities. While Gonthier J. concluded in that case that the limitation provision in art. 2930 *C.C.Q.* had repealed by implication a limitation provision in the *Cities and Towns Act*, he did so on the basis of more than a textual analysis. The conclusion in *Doré* was reached after thorough

[50] Il semble plus probable qu'en adoptant, pour créer dans la *LTA* les fiducies réputées visant la TPS, le même libellé que celui utilisé pour les fiducies réputées visant les retenues à la source, et en omettant d'inclure au par. 222(3) de la *LTA* une exception à l'égard de la *LACC* en plus de celle établie pour la *LFI*, le législateur ait par inadvertance commis une anomalie rédactionnelle. En raison d'une lacune législative dans la *LTA*, il serait possible de considérer que la fiducie réputée visant la TPS continue de produire ses effets dans le cadre de la *LACC*, tout en cessant de le faire dans le cas de la *LFI*, ce qui entraînerait un conflit apparent avec le libellé de la *LACC*. Il faut cependant voir ce conflit comme il est : un conflit apparent seulement, que l'on peut résoudre en considérant l'approche générale adoptée envers les créances prioritaires de la Couronne et en donnant préséance au texte de l'art. 18.3 de la *LACC* d'une manière qui ne produit pas un résultat insolite.

[51] Le paragraphe 222(3) de la *LTA* ne révèle aucune intention explicite du législateur d'abroger l'art. 18.3 de la *LACC*. Il crée simplement un conflit apparent qui doit être résolu par voie d'interprétation législative. L'intention du législateur était donc loin d'être dépourvue d'ambiguïté quand il a adopté le par. 222(3) de la *LTA*. S'il avait voulu donner priorité aux créances de la Couronne relatives à la TPS dans le cadre de la *LACC*, il aurait pu le faire de manière aussi explicite qu'il l'a fait pour les retenues à la source. Or, au lieu de cela, on se trouve réduit à inférer du texte du par. 222(3) de la *LTA* que le législateur entendait que la fiducie réputée visant la TPS produise ses effets dans les procédures fondées sur la *LACC*.

[52] Je ne suis pas convaincue que le raisonnement adopté dans *Doré* exige l'application de la doctrine de l'abrogation implicite dans les circonstances de la présente affaire. La question principale dans *Doré* était celle de l'impact de l'adoption du *C.c.Q.* sur les règles de droit administratif relatives aux municipalités. Bien que le juge Gonthier ait conclu, dans cet arrêt, que le délai de prescription établi à l'art. 2930 du *C.c.Q.* avait eu pour effet d'abroger implicitement une disposition de la *Loi sur les cités et villes* portant sur la prescription, sa conclusion n'était pas

contextual analysis of both pieces of legislation, including an extensive review of the relevant legislative history (paras. 31-41). Consequently, the circumstances before this Court in *Doré* are far from “identical” to those in the present case, in terms of text, context and legislative history. Accordingly, *Doré* cannot be said to require the automatic application of the rule of repeal by implication.

[53] A noteworthy indicator of Parliament’s overall intent is the fact that in subsequent amendments it has not displaced the rule set out in the *CCAA*. Indeed, as indicated above, the recent amendments to the *CCAA* in 2005 resulted in the rule previously found in s. 18.3 being renumbered and reformulated as s. 37. Thus, to the extent the interpretation allowing the GST deemed trust to remain effective under the *CCAA* depends on *ETA* s. 222(3) having impliedly repealed *CCAA* s. 18.3(1) because it is later in time, we have come full circle. Parliament has renumbered and reformulated the provision of the *CCAA* stating that, subject to exceptions for source deductions, deemed trusts do not survive the *CCAA* proceedings and thus the *CCAA* is now the later in time statute. This confirms that Parliament’s intent with respect to GST deemed trusts is to be found in the *CCAA*.

[54] I do not agree with my colleague Abella J. that s. 44(f) of the *Interpretation Act*, R.S.C. 1985, c. I-21, can be used to interpret the 2005 amendments as having no effect. The new statute can hardly be said to be a mere re-enactment of the former statute. Indeed, the *CCAA* underwent a substantial review in 2005. Notably, acting consistently with its goal of treating both the *BIA* and the *CCAA* as sharing the same approach to insolvency, Parliament made parallel amendments to both statutes with respect to corporate proposals. In addition, new provisions were introduced regarding

fondée seulement sur une analyse textuelle. Il a en effet procédé à une analyse contextuelle approfondie des deux textes, y compris de l’historique législatif pertinent (par. 31-41). Par conséquent, les circonstances du cas dont était saisie la Cour dans *Doré* sont loin d’être « identiques » à celles du présent pourvoi, tant sur le plan du texte que sur celui du contexte et de l’historique législatif. On ne peut donc pas dire que l’arrêt *Doré* commande l’application automatique d’une règle d’abrogation implicite.

[53] Un bon indice de l’intention générale du législateur peut être tiré du fait qu’il n’a pas, dans les modifications subséquentes, écarté la règle énoncée dans la *LACC*. D’ailleurs, par suite des modifications apportées à cette loi en 2005, la règle figurant initialement à l’art. 18.3 a, comme nous l’avons vu plus tôt, été reprise sous une formulation différente à l’art. 37. Par conséquent, dans la mesure où l’interprétation selon laquelle la fiducie réputée visant la TPS demeurerait en vigueur dans le contexte de procédures en vertu de la *LACC* repose sur le fait que le par. 222(3) de la *LTA* constitue la disposition postérieure et a eu pour effet d’abroger implicitement le par. 18.3(1) de la *LACC*, nous revenons au point de départ. Comme le législateur a reformulé et renuméroté la disposition de la *LACC* précisant que, sous réserve des exceptions relatives aux retenues à la source, les fiducies réputées ne survivent pas à l’engagement de procédures fondées sur la *LACC*, c’est cette loi qui se trouve maintenant à être le texte postérieur. Cette constatation confirme que c’est dans la *LACC* qu’est exprimée l’intention du législateur en ce qui a trait aux fiducies réputées visant la TPS.

[54] Je ne suis pas d’accord avec ma collègue la juge Abella pour dire que l’al. 44f) de la *Loi d’interprétation*, L.R.C. 1985, ch. I-21, permet d’interpréter les modifications de 2005 comme n’ayant aucun effet. La nouvelle loi peut difficilement être considérée comme une simple refonte de la loi antérieure. De fait, la *LACC* a fait l’objet d’un examen approfondi en 2005. En particulier, conformément à son objectif qui consiste à faire concorder l’approche de la *LFI* et celle de la *LACC* à l’égard de l’insolvabilité, le législateur a apporté aux deux textes des modifications allant dans le même sens en ce qui concerne les

the treatment of contracts, collective agreements, interim financing and governance agreements. The appointment and role of the Monitor was also clarified. Noteworthy are the limits imposed by CCAA s. 11.09 on the court's discretion to make an order staying the Crown's source deductions deemed trusts, which were formerly found in s. 11.4. No mention whatsoever is made of GST deemed trusts (see Summary to S.C. 2005, c. 47). The review went as far as looking at the very expression used to describe the statutory override of deemed trusts. The comments cited by my colleague only emphasize the clear intent of Parliament to maintain its policy that only source deductions deemed trusts survive in CCAA proceedings.

[55] In the case at bar, the legislative context informs the determination of Parliament's legislative intent and supports the conclusion that *ETA* s. 222(3) was not intended to narrow the scope of the CCAA's override provision. Viewed in its entire context, the conflict between the *ETA* and the CCAA is more apparent than real. I would therefore not follow the reasoning in *Ottawa Senators* and affirm that CCAA s. 18.3 remained effective.

[56] My conclusion is reinforced by the purpose of the CCAA as part of Canadian remedial insolvency legislation. As this aspect is particularly relevant to the second issue, I will now discuss how courts have interpreted the scope of their discretionary powers in supervising a CCAA reorganization and how Parliament has largely endorsed this interpretation. Indeed, the interpretation courts have given to the CCAA helps in understanding how the CCAA grew to occupy such a prominent role in Canadian insolvency law.

propositions présentées par les entreprises. De plus, de nouvelles dispositions ont été ajoutées au sujet des contrats, des conventions collectives, du financement temporaire et des accords de gouvernance. Des clarifications ont aussi été apportées quant à la nomination et au rôle du contrôleur. Il convient par ailleurs de souligner les limites imposées par l'art. 11.09 de la *LACC* au pouvoir discrétionnaire du tribunal d'ordonner la suspension de l'effet des fiducies réputées créées en faveur de la Couronne relativement aux retenues à la source, limites qui étaient auparavant énoncées à l'art. 11.4. Il n'est fait aucune mention des fiducies réputées visant la TPS (voir le Sommaire de la L.C. 2005, ch. 47). Dans le cadre de cet examen, le législateur est allé jusqu'à se pencher sur les termes mêmes utilisés dans la loi pour écarter l'application des fiducies réputées. Les commentaires cités par ma collègue ne font que souligner l'intention manifeste du législateur de maintenir sa politique générale suivant laquelle seules les fiducies réputées visant les retenues à la source survivent en cas de procédures fondées sur la *LACC*.

[55] En l'espèce, le contexte législatif aide à déterminer l'intention du législateur et conforte la conclusion selon laquelle le par. 222(3) de la *LTA* ne visait pas à restreindre la portée de la disposition de la *LACC* écartant l'application des fiducies réputées. Eu égard au contexte dans son ensemble, le conflit entre la *LTA* et la *LACC* est plus apparent que réel. Je n'adopterais donc pas le raisonnement de l'arrêt *Ottawa Senators* et je confirmerais que l'art. 18.3 de la *LACC* a continué de produire ses effets.

[56] Ma conclusion est renforcée par l'objectif de la *LACC* en tant que composante du régime réparateur instauré la législation canadienne en matière d'insolvabilité. Comme cet aspect est particulièrement pertinent à propos de la deuxième question, je vais maintenant examiner la façon dont les tribunaux ont interprété l'étendue des pouvoirs discrétionnaires dont ils disposent lorsqu'ils surveillent une réorganisation fondée sur la *LACC*, ainsi que la façon dont le législateur a dans une large mesure entériné cette interprétation. L'interprétation de la *LACC* par les tribunaux aide en fait à comprendre comment celle-ci en est venue à jouer un rôle si important dans le droit canadien de l'insolvabilité.

3.3 *Discretionary Power of a Court Supervising a CCAA Reorganization*

[57] Courts frequently observe that “[t]he CCAA is skeletal in nature” and does not “contain a comprehensive code that lays out all that is permitted or barred” (*Metcalfe & Mansfield Alternative Investments II Corp. (Re)*, 2008 ONCA 587, 92 O.R. (3d) 513, at para. 44, *per* Blair J.A.). Accordingly, “[t]he history of CCAA law has been an evolution of judicial interpretation” (*Dylex Ltd., Re* (1995), 31 C.B.R. (3d) 106 (Ont. Ct. (Gen. Div.)), at para. 10, *per* Farley J.).

[58] CCAA decisions are often based on discretionary grants of jurisdiction. The incremental exercise of judicial discretion in commercial courts under conditions one practitioner aptly describes as “the hothouse of real-time litigation” has been the primary method by which the CCAA has been adapted and has evolved to meet contemporary business and social needs (see Jones, at p. 484).

[59] Judicial discretion must of course be exercised in furtherance of the CCAA’s purposes. The remedial purpose I referred to in the historical overview of the Act is recognized over and over again in the jurisprudence. To cite one early example:

The legislation is remedial in the purest sense in that it provides a means whereby the devastating social and economic effects of bankruptcy or creditor initiated termination of ongoing business operations can be avoided while a court-supervised attempt to reorganize the financial affairs of the debtor company is made.

(*Elan Corp. v. Comiskey* (1990), 41 O.A.C. 282, at para. 57, *per* Doherty J.A., dissenting)

[60] Judicial decision making under the CCAA takes many forms. A court must first of all provide the conditions under which the debtor can attempt to reorganize. This can be achieved by

3.3 *Pouvoirs discrétionnaires du tribunal chargé de surveiller une réorganisation fondée sur la LACC*

[57] Les tribunaux font souvent remarquer que [TRADUCTION] « [l]a LACC est par nature schématique » et ne « contient pas un code complet énonçant tout ce qui est permis et tout ce qui est interdit » (*Metcalfe & Mansfield Alternative Investments II Corp. (Re)*, 2008 ONCA 587, 92 O.R. (3d) 513, par. 44, le juge Blair). Par conséquent, [TRADUCTION] « [l]’histoire du droit relatif à la LACC correspond à l’évolution de ce droit au fil de son interprétation par les tribunaux » (*Dylex Ltd., Re* (1995), 31 C.B.R. (3d) 106 (C. Ont. (Div. gén.)), par. 10, le juge Farley).

[58] Les décisions prises en vertu de la LACC découlent souvent de l’exercice discrétionnaire de certains pouvoirs. C’est principalement au fil de l’exercice par les juridictions commerciales de leurs pouvoirs discrétionnaires, et ce, dans des conditions décrites avec justesse par un praticien comme constituant [TRADUCTION] « la pépinière du contentieux en temps réel », que la LACC a évolué de façon graduelle et s’est adaptée aux besoins commerciaux et sociaux contemporains (voir Jones, p. 484).

[59] L’exercice par les tribunaux de leurs pouvoirs discrétionnaires doit évidemment tendre à la réalisation des objectifs de la LACC. Le caractère réparateur dont j’ai fait état dans mon aperçu historique de la Loi a à maintes reprises été reconnu dans la jurisprudence. Voici l’un des premiers exemples :

[TRADUCTION] La loi est réparatrice au sens le plus pur du terme, en ce qu’elle fournit un moyen d’éviter les effets dévastateurs, — tant sur le plan social qu’économique — de la faillite ou de l’arrêt des activités d’une entreprise, à l’initiation des créanciers, pendant que des efforts sont déployés, sous la surveillance du tribunal, en vue de réorganiser la situation financière de la compagnie débitrice.

(*Elan Corp. c. Comiskey* (1990), 41 O.A.C. 282, par. 57, le juge Doherty, dissident)

[60] Le processus décisionnel des tribunaux sous le régime de la LACC comporte plusieurs aspects. Le tribunal doit d’abord créer les conditions propres à permettre au débiteur de tenter une réorganisation.

staying enforcement actions by creditors to allow the debtor's business to continue, preserving the *status quo* while the debtor plans the compromise or arrangement to be presented to creditors, and supervising the process and advancing it to the point where it can be determined whether it will succeed (see, e.g., *Chef Ready Foods Ltd. v. Hongkong Bank of Can.* (1990), 51 B.C.L.R. (2d) 84 (C.A.), at pp. 88-89; *Pacific National Lease Holding Corp., Re* (1992), 19 B.C.A.C. 134, at para. 27). In doing so, the court must often be cognizant of the various interests at stake in the reorganization, which can extend beyond those of the debtor and creditors to include employees, directors, shareholders, and even other parties doing business with the insolvent company (see, e.g., *Canadian Airlines Corp., Re*, 2000 ABQB 442, 84 Alta. L.R. (3d) 9, at para. 144, *per* Paperny J. (as she then was); *Air Canada, Re* (2003), 42 C.B.R. (4th) 173 (Ont. S.C.J.), at para. 3; *Air Canada, Re*, 2003 CanLII 49366 (Ont. S.C.J.), at para. 13, *per* Farley J.; Sarra, *Creditor Rights*, at pp. 181-92 and 217-26). In addition, courts must recognize that on occasion the broader public interest will be engaged by aspects of the reorganization and may be a factor against which the decision of whether to allow a particular action will be weighed (see, e.g., *Canadian Red Cross Society/Société Canadienne de la Croix Rouge, Re* (2000), 19 C.B.R. (4th) 158 (Ont. S.C.J.), at para. 2, *per* Blair J. (as he then was); Sarra, *Creditor Rights*, at pp. 195-214).

[61] When large companies encounter difficulty, reorganizations become increasingly complex. CCAA courts have been called upon to innovate accordingly in exercising their jurisdiction beyond merely staying proceedings against the debtor to allow breathing room for reorganization. They have been asked to sanction measures for which there is no explicit authority in the CCAA. Without exhaustively cataloguing the various measures taken under the authority of the CCAA, it is useful to refer briefly to a few examples to illustrate the flexibility the statute affords supervising courts.

Il peut à cette fin suspendre les mesures d'exécution prises par les créanciers afin que le débiteur puisse continuer d'exploiter son entreprise, préserver le statu quo pendant que le débiteur prépare la transaction ou l'arrangement qu'il présentera aux créanciers et surveiller le processus et le mener jusqu'au point où il sera possible de dire s'il aboutira (voir, p. ex., *Chef Ready Foods Ltd. c. Hongkong Bank of Can.* (1990), 51 B.C.L.R. (2d) 84 (C.A.), p. 88-89; *Pacific National Lease Holding Corp., Re* (1992), 19 B.C.A.C. 134, par. 27). Ce faisant, le tribunal doit souvent déterminer les divers intérêts en jeu dans la réorganisation, lesquels peuvent fort bien ne pas se limiter aux seuls intérêts du débiteur et des créanciers, mais englober aussi ceux des employés, des administrateurs, des actionnaires et même de tiers qui font affaire avec la compagnie insolvable (voir, p. ex., *Canadian Airlines Corp., Re*, 2000 ABQB 442, 84 Alta. L.R. (3d) 9, par. 144, la juge Paperny (maintenant juge de la Cour d'appel); *Air Canada, Re* (2003), 42 C.B.R. (4th) 173 (C.S.J. Ont.), par. 3; *Air Canada, Re*, 2003 CanLII 49366 (C.S.J. Ont.), par. 13, le juge Farley; Sarra, *Creditor Rights*, p. 181-192 et 217-226). En outre, les tribunaux doivent reconnaître que, à l'occasion, certains aspects de la réorganisation concernent l'intérêt public et qu'il pourrait s'agir d'un facteur devant être pris en compte afin de décider s'il y a lieu d'autoriser une mesure donnée (voir, p. ex., *Canadian Red Cross Society/Société Canadienne de la Croix Rouge, Re* (2000), 19 C.B.R. (4th) 158 (C.S.J. Ont.), par. 2, le juge Blair (maintenant juge de la Cour d'appel); Sarra, *Creditor Rights*, p. 195-214).

[61] Quand de grandes entreprises éprouvent des difficultés, les réorganisations deviennent très complexes. Les tribunaux chargés d'appliquer la LACC ont ainsi été appelés à innover dans l'exercice de leur compétence et ne se sont pas limités à suspendre les procédures engagées contre le débiteur afin de lui permettre de procéder à une réorganisation. On leur a demandé de sanctionner des mesures non expressément prévues par la LACC. Sans dresser la liste complète des diverses mesures qui ont été prises par des tribunaux en vertu de la LACC, il est néanmoins utile d'en donner brièvement quelques exemples, pour bien illustrer la marge de manœuvre que la loi accorde à ceux-ci.

[62] Perhaps the most creative use of CCAA authority has been the increasing willingness of courts to authorize post-filing security for debtor in possession financing or super-priority charges on the debtor's assets when necessary for the continuation of the debtor's business during the reorganization (see, e.g., *Skydome Corp., Re* (1998), 16 C.B.R. (4th) 118 (Ont. Ct. (Gen. Div.)); *United Used Auto & Truck Parts Ltd., Re*, 2000 BCCA 146, 135 B.C.A.C. 96, aff'g (1999), 12 C.B.R. (4th) 144 (S.C.); and generally, J. P. Sarra, *Rescue! The Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act* (2007), at pp. 93-115). The CCAA has also been used to release claims against third parties as part of approving a comprehensive plan of arrangement and compromise, even over the objections of some dissenting creditors (see *Metcalfe & Mansfield*). As well, the appointment of a Monitor to oversee the reorganization was originally a measure taken pursuant to the CCAA's supervisory authority; Parliament responded, making the mechanism mandatory by legislative amendment.

[63] Judicial innovation during CCAA proceedings has not been without controversy. At least two questions it raises are directly relevant to the case at bar: (1) What are the sources of a court's authority during CCAA proceedings? (2) What are the limits of this authority?

[64] The first question concerns the boundary between a court's statutory authority under the CCAA and a court's residual authority under its inherent and equitable jurisdiction when supervising a reorganization. In authorizing measures during CCAA proceedings, courts have on occasion purported to rely upon their equitable jurisdiction to advance the purposes of the Act or their inherent jurisdiction to fill gaps in the statute. Recent appellate decisions have counselled against

[62] L'utilisation la plus créative des pouvoirs conférés par la LACC est sans doute le fait que les tribunaux se montrent de plus en plus disposés à autoriser, après le dépôt des procédures, la constitution de sûretés pour financer le débiteur demeuré en possession des biens ou encore la constitution de charges super-prioritaires grevant l'actif du débiteur lorsque cela est nécessaire pour que ce dernier puisse continuer d'exploiter son entreprise pendant la réorganisation (voir, p. ex., *Skydome Corp., Re* (1998), 16 C.B.R. (4th) 118 (C. Ont. (Div. gén.)); *United Used Auto & Truck Parts Ltd., Re*, 2000 BCCA 146, 135 B.C.A.C. 96, conf. (1999), 12 C.B.R. (4th) 144 (C.S.); et, d'une manière générale, J. P. Sarra, *Rescue! The Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act* (2007), p. 93-115). La LACC a aussi été utilisée pour libérer des tiers des actions susceptibles d'être intentées contre eux, dans le cadre de l'approbation d'un plan global d'arrangement et de transaction, malgré les objections de certains créanciers dissidents (voir *Metcalfe & Mansfield*). Au départ, la nomination d'un contrôleur chargé de surveiller la réorganisation était elle aussi une mesure prise en vertu du pouvoir de surveillance conféré par la LACC, mais le législateur est intervenu et a modifié la loi pour rendre cette mesure obligatoire.

[63] L'esprit d'innovation dont ont fait montre les tribunaux pendant des procédures fondées sur la LACC n'a toutefois pas été sans susciter de controverses. Au moins deux des questions que soulève leur approche sont directement pertinentes en l'espèce : (1) Quelles sont les sources des pouvoirs dont dispose le tribunal pendant les procédures fondées sur la LACC? (2) Quelles sont les limites de ces pouvoirs?

[64] La première question porte sur la frontière entre les pouvoirs d'origine législative dont dispose le tribunal en vertu de la LACC et les pouvoirs résiduels dont jouit un tribunal en raison de sa compétence inhérente et de sa compétence en equity, lorsqu'il est question de surveiller une réorganisation. Pour justifier certaines mesures autorisées à l'occasion de procédures engagées sous le régime de la LACC, les tribunaux ont parfois prétendu se fonder sur leur compétence en equity dans le but

purporting to rely on inherent jurisdiction, holding that the better view is that courts are in most cases simply construing the authority supplied by the CCAA itself (see, e.g., *Skeena Cellulose Inc., Re*, 2003 BCCA 344, 13 B.C.L.R. (4th) 236, at paras. 45-47, *per* Newbury J.A.; *Stelco Inc. (Re)* (2005), 75 O.R. (3d) 5 (C.A.), at paras. 31-33, *per* Blair J.A.).

[65] I agree with Justice Georgina R. Jackson and Professor Janis Sarra that the most appropriate approach is a hierarchical one in which courts rely first on an interpretation of the provisions of the CCAA text before turning to inherent or equitable jurisdiction to anchor measures taken in a CCAA proceeding (see G. R. Jackson and J. Sarra, “Selecting the Judicial Tool to get the Job Done: An Examination of Statutory Interpretation, Discretionary Power and Inherent Jurisdiction in Insolvency Matters”, in J. P. Sarra, ed., *Annual Review of Insolvency Law 2007* (2008), 41, at p. 42). The authors conclude that when given an appropriately purposive and liberal interpretation, the CCAA will be sufficient in most instances to ground measures necessary to achieve its objectives (p. 94).

[66] Having examined the pertinent parts of the CCAA and the recent history of the legislation, I accept that in most instances the issuance of an order during CCAA proceedings should be considered an exercise in statutory interpretation. Particularly noteworthy in this regard is the expansive interpretation the language of the statute at issue is capable of supporting.

[67] The initial grant of authority under the CCAA empowered a court “where an application is made under this Act in respect of a company . . . on the application of any person interested in the

de réaliser les objectifs de la Loi ou sur leur compétence inhérente afin de combler les lacunes de celle-ci. Or, dans de récentes décisions, des cours d’appel ont déconseillé aux tribunaux d’invoquer leur compétence inhérente, concluant qu’il est plus juste de dire que, dans la plupart des cas, les tribunaux ne font simplement qu’interpréter les pouvoirs se trouvant dans la LACC elle-même (voir, p. ex., *Skeena Cellulose Inc., Re*, 2003 BCCA 344, 13 B.C.L.R. (4th) 236, par. 45-47, la juge Newbury; *Stelco Inc. (Re)* (2005), 75 O.R. (3d) 5 (C.A.), par. 31-33, le juge Blair).

[65] Je suis d’accord avec la juge Georgina R. Jackson et la professeure Janis Sarra pour dire que la méthode la plus appropriée est une approche hiérarchisée. Suivant cette approche, les tribunaux procèdent d’abord à une interprétation des dispositions de la LACC avant d’invoquer leur compétence inhérente ou leur compétence en equity pour justifier des mesures prises dans le cadre d’une procédure fondée sur la LACC (voir G. R. Jackson et J. Sarra, « Selecting the Judicial Tool to get the Job Done : An Examination of Statutory Interpretation, Discretionary Power and Inherent Jurisdiction in Insolvency Matters », dans J. P. Sarra, dir., *Annual Review of Insolvency Law 2007* (2008), 41, p. 42). Selon ces auteures, pourvu qu’on lui donne l’interprétation téléologique et large qui s’impose, la LACC permettra dans la plupart des cas de justifier les mesures nécessaires à la réalisation de ses objectifs (p. 94).

[66] L’examen des parties pertinentes de la LACC et de l’évolution récente de la législation me font adhérer à ce point de vue jurisprudentiel et doctrinal : dans la plupart des cas, la décision de rendre une ordonnance durant une procédure fondée sur la LACC relève de l’interprétation législative. D’ailleurs, à cet égard, il faut souligner d’une façon particulière que le texte de loi dont il est question en l’espèce peut être interprété très largement.

[67] En vertu du pouvoir conféré initialement par la LACC, le tribunal pouvait, « chaque fois qu’une demande [était] faite sous le régime de la présente loi à l’égard d’une compagnie, [. . .] sur demande

matter, . . . subject to this Act, [to] make an order under this section” (*CCAA*, s. 11(1)). The plain language of the statute was very broad.

[68] In this regard, though not strictly applicable to the case at bar, I note that Parliament has in recent amendments changed the wording contained in s. 11(1), making explicit the discretionary authority of the court under the *CCAA*. Thus, in s. 11 of the *CCAA* as currently enacted, a court may, “subject to the restrictions set out in this Act, . . . make any order that it considers appropriate in the circumstances” (S.C. 2005, c. 47, s. 128). Parliament appears to have endorsed the broad reading of *CCAA* authority developed by the jurisprudence.

[69] The *CCAA* also explicitly provides for certain orders. Both an order made on an initial application and an order on subsequent applications may stay, restrain, or prohibit existing or new proceedings against the debtor. The burden is on the applicant to satisfy the court that the order is appropriate in the circumstances and that the applicant has been acting in good faith and with due diligence (*CCAA*, ss. 11(3), (4) and (6)).

[70] The general language of the *CCAA* should not be read as being restricted by the availability of more specific orders. However, the requirements of appropriateness, good faith, and due diligence are baseline considerations that a court should always bear in mind when exercising *CCAA* authority. Appropriateness under the *CCAA* is assessed by inquiring whether the order sought advances the policy objectives underlying the *CCAA*. The question is whether the order will usefully further efforts to achieve the remedial purpose of the *CCAA* — avoiding the social and economic losses resulting from liquidation of an insolvent company. I would add that appropriateness extends not only to the purpose of the order, but also to the means it employs. Courts should be mindful that chances for successful reorganizations are enhanced where participants achieve common ground and all

d’un intéressé, [. . .] sous réserve des autres dispositions de la présente loi [. . .] rendre l’ordonnance prévue au présent article » (*LACC*, par. 11(1)). Cette formulation claire était très générale.

[68] Bien que ces dispositions ne soient pas strictement applicables en l’espèce, je signale à ce propos que le législateur a, dans des modifications récentes, apporté au texte du par. 11(1) un changement qui rend plus explicite le pouvoir discrétionnaire conféré au tribunal par la *LACC*. Ainsi, aux termes de l’art. 11 actuel de la *LACC*, le tribunal peut « rendre [. . .] sous réserve des restrictions prévues par la présente loi [. . .] toute ordonnance qu’il estime indiquée » (L.C. 2005, ch. 47, art. 128). Le législateur semble ainsi avoir jugé opportun de sanctionner l’interprétation large du pouvoir conféré par la *LACC* qui a été élaborée par la jurisprudence.

[69] De plus, la *LACC* prévoit explicitement certaines ordonnances. Tant à la suite d’une demande initiale que d’une demande subséquente, le tribunal peut, par ordonnance, suspendre ou interdire toute procédure contre le débiteur, ou surseoir à sa continuation. Il incombe à la personne qui demande une telle ordonnance de convaincre le tribunal qu’elle est indiquée et qu’il a agi et continue d’agir de bonne foi et avec la diligence voulue (*LACC*, par. 11(3), (4) et (6)).

[70] La possibilité pour le tribunal de rendre des ordonnances plus spécifiques n’a pas pour effet de restreindre la portée des termes généraux utilisés dans la *LACC*. Toutefois, l’opportunité, la bonne foi et la diligence sont des considérations de base que le tribunal devrait toujours garder à l’esprit lorsqu’il exerce les pouvoirs conférés par la *LACC*. Sous le régime de la *LACC*, le tribunal évalue l’opportunité de l’ordonnance demandée en déterminant si elle favorisera la réalisation des objectifs de politique générale qui sous-tendent la Loi. Il s’agit donc de savoir si cette ordonnance contribuera utilement à la réalisation de l’objectif réparateur de la *LACC* — à savoir éviter les pertes sociales et économiques résultant de la liquidation d’une compagnie insolvable. J’ajouterais que le critère de l’opportunité s’applique non seulement à l’objectif de l’ordonnance, mais aussi aux moyens utilisés. Les tribunaux

stakeholders are treated as advantageously and fairly as the circumstances permit.

[71] It is well established that efforts to reorganize under the *CCAA* can be terminated and the stay of proceedings against the debtor lifted if the reorganization is “doomed to failure” (see *Chef Ready*, at p. 88; *Philip’s Manufacturing Ltd., Re* (1992), 9 C.B.R. (3d) 25 (B.C.C.A.), at paras. 6-7). However, when an order is sought that does realistically advance the *CCAA*’s purposes, the ability to make it is within the discretion of a *CCAA* court.

[72] The preceding discussion assists in determining whether the court had authority under the *CCAA* to continue the stay of proceedings against the Crown once it was apparent that reorganization would fail and bankruptcy was the inevitable next step.

[73] In the Court of Appeal, Tysoe J.A. held that no authority existed under the *CCAA* to continue staying the Crown’s enforcement of the GST deemed trust once efforts at reorganization had come to an end. The appellant submits that in so holding, Tysoe J.A. failed to consider the underlying purpose of the *CCAA* and give the statute an appropriately purposive and liberal interpretation under which the order was permissible. The Crown submits that Tysoe J.A. correctly held that the mandatory language of the *ETA* gave the court no option but to permit enforcement of the GST deemed trust when lifting the *CCAA* stay to permit the debtor to make an assignment under the *BIA*. Whether the *ETA* has a mandatory effect in the context of a *CCAA* proceeding has already been discussed. I will now address the question of whether the order was authorized by the *CCAA*.

doivent se rappeler que les chances de succès d’une réorganisation sont meilleures lorsque les participants arrivent à s’entendre et que tous les intéressés sont traités de la façon la plus avantageuse et juste possible dans les circonstances.

[71] Il est bien établi qu’il est possible de mettre fin aux efforts déployés pour procéder à une réorganisation fondée sur la *LACC* et de lever la suspension des procédures contre le débiteur si la réorganisation est [TRADUCTION] « vouée à l’échec » (voir *Chef Ready*, p. 88; *Philip’s Manufacturing Ltd., Re* (1992), 9 C.B.R. (3d) 25 (C.A.C.-B.), par. 6-7). Cependant, quand l’ordonnance demandée contribue vraiment à la réalisation des objectifs de la *LACC*, le pouvoir discrétionnaire dont dispose le tribunal en vertu de cette loi l’habilite à rendre à cette ordonnance.

[72] L’analyse qui précède est utile pour répondre à la question de savoir si le tribunal avait, en vertu de la *LACC*, le pouvoir de maintenir la suspension des procédures à l’encontre de la Couronne, une fois qu’il est devenu évident que la réorganisation échouerait et que la faillite était inévitable.

[73] En Cour d’appel, le juge Tysoe a conclu que la *LACC* n’habilitait pas le tribunal à maintenir la suspension des mesures d’exécution de la Couronne à l’égard de la fiducie réputée visant la TPS après l’arrêt des efforts de réorganisation. Selon l’appelante, en tirant cette conclusion, le juge Tysoe a omis de tenir compte de l’objectif fondamental de la *LACC* et n’a pas donné à ce texte l’interprétation téléologique et large qu’il convient de lui donner et qui autorise le prononcé d’une telle ordonnance. La Couronne soutient que le juge Tysoe a conclu à bon droit que les termes impératifs de la *LTA* ne laissaient au tribunal d’autre choix que d’autoriser les mesures d’exécution à l’endroit de la fiducie réputée visant la TPS lorsqu’il a levé la suspension de procédures qui avait été ordonnée en application de la *LACC* afin de permettre au débiteur de faire cession de ses biens en vertu de la *LFI*. J’ai déjà traité de la question de savoir si la *LTA* a un effet contraignant dans une procédure fondée sur la *LACC*. Je vais maintenant traiter de la question de savoir si l’ordonnance était autorisée par la *LACC*.

[74] It is beyond dispute that the *CCAA* imposes no explicit temporal limitations upon proceedings commenced under the Act that would prohibit ordering a continuation of the stay of the Crown's GST claims while lifting the general stay of proceedings temporarily to allow the debtor to make an assignment in bankruptcy.

[75] The question remains whether the order advanced the underlying purpose of the *CCAA*. The Court of Appeal held that it did not because the reorganization efforts had come to an end and the *CCAA* was accordingly spent. I disagree.

[76] There is no doubt that had reorganization been commenced under the *BIA* instead of the *CCAA*, the Crown's deemed trust priority for the GST funds would have been lost. Similarly, the Crown does not dispute that under the scheme of distribution in bankruptcy under the *BIA* the deemed trust for GST ceases to have effect. Thus, after reorganization under the *CCAA* failed, creditors would have had a strong incentive to seek immediate bankruptcy and distribution of the debtor's assets under the *BIA*. In order to conclude that the discretion does not extend to partially lifting the stay in order to allow for an assignment in bankruptcy, one would have to assume a gap between the *CCAA* and the *BIA* proceedings. Brenner C.J.S.C.'s order staying Crown enforcement of the GST claim ensured that creditors would not be disadvantaged by the attempted reorganization under the *CCAA*. The effect of his order was to blunt any impulse of creditors to interfere in an orderly liquidation. His order was thus in furtherance of the *CCAA*'s objectives to the extent that it allowed a bridge between the *CCAA* and *BIA* proceedings. This interpretation of the tribunal's discretionary power is buttressed by s. 20 of the *CCAA*. That section provides that the *CCAA* "may be applied together with the provisions of any Act of Parliament . . . that authorizes or makes provision for the sanction of compromises or arrangements between a company and its shareholders or any class of them", such as

[74] Il n'est pas contesté que la *LACC* n'assujettit les procédures engagées sous son régime à aucune limite temporelle explicite qui interdirait au tribunal d'ordonner le maintien de la suspension des procédures engagées par la Couronne pour recouvrer la TPS, tout en levant temporairement la suspension générale des procédures prononcée pour permettre au débiteur de faire cession de ses biens.

[75] Il reste à se demander si l'ordonnance contribuait à la réalisation de l'objectif fondamental de la *LACC*. La Cour d'appel a conclu que non, parce que les efforts de réorganisation avaient pris fin et que, par conséquent, la *LACC* n'était plus d'aucune utilité. Je ne partage pas cette conclusion.

[76] Il ne fait aucun doute que si la réorganisation avait été entreprise sous le régime de la *LFI* plutôt qu'en vertu de la *LACC*, la Couronne aurait perdu la priorité que lui confère la fiducie réputée visant la TPS. De même, la Couronne ne conteste pas que, selon le plan de répartition prévu par la *LFI* en cas de faillite, cette fiducie réputée cesse de produire ses effets. Par conséquent, après l'échec de la réorganisation tentée sous le régime de la *LACC*, les créanciers auraient eu toutes les raisons de solliciter la mise en faillite immédiate du débiteur et la répartition de ses biens en vertu de la *LFI*. Pour pouvoir conclure que le pouvoir discrétionnaire dont dispose le tribunal ne l'autorise pas à lever partiellement la suspension des procédures afin de permettre la cession des biens, il faudrait présumer l'existence d'un hiatus entre la procédure fondée sur la *LACC* et celle fondée sur la *LFI*. L'ordonnance du juge en chef Brenner suspendant l'exécution des mesures de recouvrement de la Couronne à l'égard de la TPS faisait en sorte que les créanciers ne soient pas désavantagés par la tentative de réorganisation fondée sur la *LACC*. Cette ordonnance avait pour effet de dissuader les créanciers d'entraver une liquidation ordonnée et, de ce fait, elle contribuait à la réalisation des objectifs de la *LACC*, dans la mesure où elle établit une passerelle entre les procédures régies par la *LACC* d'une part et celles régies par la *LFI* d'autre part. Cette interprétation du pouvoir discrétionnaire du tribunal se trouve renforcée par

the *BIA*. Section 20 clearly indicates the intention of Parliament for the *CCAA* to operate *in tandem* with other insolvency legislation, such as the *BIA*.

[77] The *CCAA* creates conditions for preserving the *status quo* while attempts are made to find common ground amongst stakeholders for a reorganization that is fair to all. Because the alternative to reorganization is often bankruptcy, participants will measure the impact of a reorganization against the position they would enjoy in liquidation. In the case at bar, the order fostered a harmonious transition between reorganization and liquidation while meeting the objective of a single collective proceeding that is common to both statutes.

[78] Tysoe J.A. therefore erred in my view by treating the *CCAA* and the *BIA* as distinct regimes subject to a temporal gap between the two, rather than as forming part of an integrated body of insolvency law. Parliament's decision to maintain two statutory schemes for reorganization, the *BIA* and the *CCAA*, reflects the reality that reorganizations of differing complexity require different legal mechanisms. By contrast, only one statutory scheme has been found to be needed to liquidate a bankrupt debtor's estate. The transition from the *CCAA* to the *BIA* may require the partial lifting of a stay of proceedings under the *CCAA* to allow commencement of the *BIA* proceedings. However, as Laskin J.A. for the Ontario Court of Appeal noted in a similar competition between secured creditors and the Ontario Superintendent of Financial Services seeking to enforce a deemed trust, "[t]he two statutes are related" and no "gap" exists between the two statutes which would allow the enforcement of property interests at the conclusion of *CCAA* proceedings that would be

l'art. 20 de la *LACC*, qui précise que les dispositions de la Loi « peuvent être appliquées conjointement avec celles de toute loi fédérale [...] autorisant ou prévoyant l'homologation de transactions ou arrangements entre une compagnie et ses actionnaires ou une catégorie de ces derniers », par exemple la *LFI*. L'article 20 indique clairement que le législateur entend voir la *LACC* être appliquée *de concert* avec les autres lois concernant l'insolvabilité, telle la *LFI*.

[77] La *LACC* établit les conditions qui permettent de préserver le statu quo pendant qu'on tente de trouver un terrain d'entente entre les intéressés en vue d'une réorganisation qui soit juste pour tout le monde. Étant donné que, souvent, la seule autre solution est la faillite, les participants évaluent l'impact d'une réorganisation en regard de la situation qui serait la leur en cas de liquidation. En l'espèce, l'ordonnance favorisait une transition harmonieuse entre la réorganisation et la liquidation, tout en répondant à l'objectif — commun aux deux lois — qui consiste à avoir une seule procédure collective.

[78] À mon avis, le juge d'appel Tysoe a donc commis une erreur en considérant la *LACC* et la *LFI* comme des régimes distincts, séparés par un hiatus temporel, plutôt que comme deux lois faisant partie d'un ensemble intégré de règles du droit de l'insolvabilité. La décision du législateur de conserver deux régimes législatifs en matière de réorganisation, la *LFI* et la *LACC*, reflète le fait bien réel que des réorganisations de complexité différente requièrent des mécanismes légaux différents. En revanche, un seul régime législatif est jugé nécessaire pour la liquidation de l'actif d'un débiteur en faillite. Le passage de la *LACC* à la *LFI* peut exiger la levée partielle d'une suspension de procédures ordonnée en vertu de la *LACC*, de façon à permettre l'engagement des procédures fondées sur la *LFI*. Toutefois, comme l'a signalé le juge Laskin de la Cour d'appel de l'Ontario dans un litige semblable opposant des créanciers garantis et le Surintendant des services financiers de l'Ontario qui invoquait le bénéfice d'une fiducie réputée, [TRADUCTION] « [L]es deux lois sont

lost in bankruptcy (*Ivaco Inc. (Re)* (2006), 83 O.R. (3d) 108, at paras. 62-63).

[79] The Crown's priority in claims pursuant to source deductions deemed trusts does not undermine this conclusion. Source deductions deemed trusts survive under both the *CCAA* and the *BIA*. Accordingly, creditors' incentives to prefer one Act over another will not be affected. While a court has a broad discretion to stay source deductions deemed trusts in the *CCAA* context, this discretion is nevertheless subject to specific limitations applicable only to source deductions deemed trusts (*CCAA*, s. 11.4). Thus, if *CCAA* reorganization fails (e.g., either the creditors or the court refuse a proposed reorganization), the Crown can immediately assert its claim in unremitted source deductions. But this should not be understood to affect a seamless transition into bankruptcy or create any "gap" between the *CCAA* and the *BIA* for the simple reason that, regardless of what statute the reorganization had been commenced under, creditors' claims in both instances would have been subject to the priority of the Crown's source deductions deemed trust.

[80] Source deductions deemed trusts aside, the comprehensive and exhaustive mechanism under the *BIA* must control the distribution of the debtor's assets once liquidation is inevitable. Indeed, an orderly transition to liquidation is mandatory under the *BIA* where a proposal is rejected by creditors. The *CCAA* is silent on the transition into liquidation but the breadth of the court's discretion under the Act is sufficient to construct a bridge to liquidation under the *BIA*. The court must do so in a manner that does not subvert the scheme of distribution under the *BIA*. Transition

liées » et il n'existe entre elles aucun « hiatus » qui permettrait d'obtenir l'exécution, à l'issue de procédures engagées sous le régime de la *LACC*, de droits de propriété qui seraient perdus en cas de faillite (*Ivaco Inc. (Re)* (2006), 83 O.R. (3d) 108, par. 62-63).

[79] La priorité accordée aux réclamations de la Couronne fondées sur une fiducie réputée visant des retenues à la source n'affaiblit en rien cette conclusion. Comme ces fiducies réputées survivent tant sous le régime de la *LACC* que sous celui de la *LFI*, ce facteur n'a aucune incidence sur l'intérêt que pourraient avoir les créanciers à préférer une loi plutôt que l'autre. S'il est vrai que le tribunal agissant en vertu de la *LACC* dispose d'une grande latitude pour suspendre les réclamations fondée sur des fiducies réputées visant des retenues à la source, cette latitude n'en demeure pas moins soumise à des limitations particulières, applicables uniquement à ces fiducies réputées (*LACC*, art. 11.4). Par conséquent, si la réorganisation tentée sous le régime de la *LACC* échoue (p. ex. parce que le tribunal ou les créanciers refusent une proposition de réorganisation), la Couronne peut immédiatement présenter sa réclamation à l'égard des retenues à la source non versées. Mais il ne faut pas en conclure que cela compromet le passage harmonieux au régime de faillite ou crée le moindre « hiatus » entre la *LACC* et la *LFI*, car le fait est que, peu importe la loi en vertu de laquelle la réorganisation a été amorcée, les réclamations des créanciers auraient dans les deux cas été subordonnées à la priorité de la fiducie réputée de la Couronne à l'égard des retenues à la source.

[80] Abstraction faite des fiducies réputées visant les retenues à la source, c'est le mécanisme complet et exhaustif prévu par la *LFI* qui doit régir la répartition des biens du débiteur une fois que la liquidation est devenue inévitable. De fait, une transition ordonnée aux procédures de liquidation est obligatoire sous le régime de la *LFI* lorsqu'une proposition est rejetée par les créanciers. La *LACC* est muette à l'égard de cette transition, mais l'ampleur du pouvoir discrétionnaire conféré au tribunal par cette loi est suffisante pour établir une passerelle vers une liquidation opérée sous le régime

to liquidation requires partially lifting the *CCAA* stay to commence proceedings under the *BIA*. This necessary partial lifting of the stay should not trigger a race to the courthouse in an effort to obtain priority unavailable under the *BIA*.

[81] I therefore conclude that Brenner C.J.S.C. had the authority under the *CCAA* to lift the stay to allow entry into liquidation.

3.4 *Express Trust*

[82] The last issue in this case is whether Brenner C.J.S.C. created an express trust in favour of the Crown when he ordered on April 29, 2008, that proceeds from the sale of LeRoy Trucking's assets equal to the amount of unremitted GST be held back in the Monitor's trust account until the results of the reorganization were known. Tysoe J.A. in the Court of Appeal concluded as an alternative ground for allowing the Crown's appeal that it was the beneficiary of an express trust. I disagree.

[83] Creation of an express trust requires the presence of three certainties: intention, subject matter, and object. Express or "true trusts" arise from the acts and intentions of the settlor and are distinguishable from other trusts arising by operation of law (see D. W. M. Waters, M. R. Gillen and L. D. Smith, eds., *Waters' Law of Trusts in Canada* (3rd ed. 2005), at pp. 28-29, especially fn. 42).

[84] Here, there is no certainty to the object (i.e. the beneficiary) inferable from the court's order of April 29, 2008 sufficient to support an express trust.

de la *LFI*. Ce faisant, le tribunal doit veiller à ne pas perturber le plan de répartition établi par la *LFI*. La transition au régime de liquidation nécessite la levée partielle de la suspension des procédures ordonnée en vertu de la *LACC*, afin de permettre l'introduction de procédures en vertu de la *LFI*. Il ne faudrait pas que cette indispensable levée partielle de la suspension des procédures provoque une ruée des créanciers vers le palais de justice pour l'obtention d'une priorité inexistante sous le régime de la *LFI*.

[81] Je conclus donc que le juge en chef Brenner avait, en vertu de la *LACC*, le pouvoir de lever la suspension des procédures afin de permettre la transition au régime de liquidation.

3.4 *Fiducie expresse*

[82] La dernière question à trancher en l'espèce est celle de savoir si le juge en chef Brenner a créé une fiducie expresse en faveur de la Couronne quand il a ordonné, le 29 avril 2008, que le produit de la vente des biens de LeRoy Trucking — jusqu'à concurrence des sommes de TPS non remises — soit détenu dans le compte en fiducie du contrôleur jusqu'à ce que l'issue de la réorganisation soit connue. Un autre motif invoqué par le juge Tysoe de la Cour d'appel pour accueillir l'appel interjeté par la Couronne était que, selon lui, celle-ci était effectivement la bénéficiaire d'une fiducie expresse. Je ne peux souscrire à cette conclusion.

[83] La création d'une fiducie expresse exige la présence de trois certitudes : certitude d'intention, certitude de matière et certitude d'objet. Les fiducies expresses ou « fiducies au sens strict » découlent des actes et des intentions du constituant et se distinguent des autres fiducies découlant de l'effet de la loi (voir D. W. M. Waters, M. R. Gillen et L. D. Smith, dir., *Waters' Law of Trusts in Canada* (3^e éd. 2005), p. 28-29, particulièrement la note en bas de page 42).

[84] En l'espèce, il n'existe aucune certitude d'objet (c.-à-d. relative au bénéficiaire) pouvant être inférée de l'ordonnance prononcée le 29 avril 2008 par le tribunal et suffisante pour donner naissance à une fiducie expresse.

[85] At the time of the order, there was a dispute between Century Services and the Crown over part of the proceeds from the sale of the debtor's assets. The court's solution was to accept LeRoy Trucking's proposal to segregate those monies until that dispute could be resolved. Thus, there was no certainty that the Crown would actually be the beneficiary, or object, of the trust.

[86] The fact that the location chosen to segregate those monies was the Monitor's trust account has no independent effect such that it would overcome the lack of a clear beneficiary. In any event, under the interpretation of CCAA s. 18.3(1) established above, no such priority dispute would even arise because the Crown's deemed trust priority over GST claims would be lost under the CCAA and the Crown would rank as an unsecured creditor for this amount. However, Brenner C.J.S.C. may well have been proceeding on the basis that, in accordance with *Ottawa Senators*, the Crown's GST claim would remain effective if reorganization was successful, which would not be the case if transition to the liquidation process of the BIA was allowed. An amount equivalent to that claim would accordingly be set aside pending the outcome of reorganization.

[87] Thus, uncertainty surrounding the outcome of the CCAA restructuring eliminates the existence of any certainty to permanently vest in the Crown a beneficial interest in the funds. That much is clear from the oral reasons of Brenner C.J.S.C. on April 29, 2008, when he said: "Given the fact that [CCAA proceedings] are known to fail and filings in bankruptcy result, it seems to me that maintaining the status quo in the case at bar supports the proposal to have the monitor hold these funds in trust." Exactly who might take the money in the final result was therefore evidently in doubt. Brenner C.J.S.C.'s subsequent order of September 3, 2008 denying the Crown's application to enforce the trust once it was clear

[85] Au moment où l'ordonnance a été rendue, il y avait un différend entre Century Services et la Couronne au sujet d'une partie du produit de la vente des biens du débiteur. La solution retenue par le tribunal a consisté à accepter, selon la proposition de LeRoy Trucking, que la somme en question soit détenue séparément jusqu'à ce que le différend puisse être réglé. Par conséquent, il n'existait aucune certitude que la Couronne serait véritablement le bénéficiaire ou l'objet de la fiducie.

[86] Le fait que le compte choisi pour conserver séparément la somme en question était le compte en fiducie du contrôleur n'a pas à lui seul un effet tel qu'il suppléerait à l'absence d'un bénéficiaire certain. De toute façon, suivant l'interprétation du par. 18.3(1) de la LACC dégagée précédemment, aucun différend ne saurait même exister quant à la priorité de rang, étant donné que la priorité accordée aux réclamations de la Couronne fondées sur la fiducie réputée visant la TPS ne s'applique pas sous le régime de la LACC et que la Couronne est reléguée au rang de créancier non garanti à l'égard des sommes en question. Cependant, il se peut fort bien que le juge en chef Brenner ait estimé que, conformément à l'arrêt *Ottawa Senators*, la créance de la Couronne à l'égard de la TPS demeurerait effective si la réorganisation aboutissait, ce qui ne serait pas le cas si le passage au processus de liquidation régi par la LFI était autorisé. Une somme équivalente à cette créance serait ainsi mise de côté jusqu'à ce que le résultat de la réorganisation soit connu.

[87] Par conséquent, l'incertitude entourant l'issue de la restructuration tentée sous le régime de la LACC exclut l'existence d'une certitude permettant de conférer de manière permanente à la Couronne un intérêt bénéficiaire sur la somme en question. Cela ressort clairement des motifs exposés de vive voix par le juge en chef Brenner le 29 avril 2008, lorsqu'il a dit : [TRADUCTION] « Comme il est notoire que [des procédures fondées sur la LACC] peuvent échouer et que cela entraîne des faillites, le maintien du statu quo en l'espèce me semble militer en faveur de l'acceptation de la proposition d'ordonner au contrôleur de détenir ces fonds en fiducie. » Il y avait donc manifestement un doute quant à la question de savoir qui au juste pourrait toucher l'argent

that bankruptcy was inevitable, confirms the absence of a clear beneficiary required to ground an express trust.

4. Conclusion

[88] I conclude that Brenner C.J.S.C. had the discretion under the *CCAA* to continue the stay of the Crown's claim for enforcement of the GST deemed trust while otherwise lifting it to permit LeRoy Trucking to make an assignment in bankruptcy. My conclusion that s. 18.3(1) of the *CCAA* nullified the GST deemed trust while proceedings under that Act were pending confirms that the discretionary jurisdiction under s. 11 utilized by the court was not limited by the Crown's asserted GST priority, because there is no such priority under the *CCAA*.

[89] For these reasons, I would allow the appeal and declare that the \$305,202.30 collected by LeRoy Trucking in respect of GST but not yet remitted to the Receiver General of Canada is not subject to deemed trust or priority in favour of the Crown. Nor is this amount subject to an express trust. Costs are awarded for this appeal and the appeal in the court below.

The following are the reasons delivered by

FISH J. —

I

[90] I am in general agreement with the reasons of Justice Deschamps and would dispose of the appeal as she suggests.

[91] More particularly, I share my colleague's interpretation of the scope of the judge's discretion under s. 11 of the *Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act*, R.S.C. 1985, c. C-36 ("*CCAA*").

en fin de compte. L'ordonnance ultérieure du juge en chef Brenner — dans laquelle ce dernier a rejeté, le 3 septembre 2008, la demande de la Couronne sollicitant le bénéfice de la fiducie présumée après qu'il fut devenu évident que la faillite était inévitable — confirme l'absence du bénéficiaire certain sans lequel il ne saurait y avoir de fiducie expresse.

4. Conclusion

[88] Je conclus que le juge en chef Brenner avait, en vertu de la *LACC*, le pouvoir discrétionnaire de maintenir la suspension de la demande de la Couronne sollicitant le bénéfice de la fiducie réputée visant la TPS, tout en levant par ailleurs la suspension des procédures de manière à permettre à LeRoy Trucking de faire cession de ses biens. Ma conclusion selon laquelle le par. 18.3(1) de la *LACC* neutralisait la fiducie réputée visant la TPS pendant la durée des procédures fondées sur cette loi confirme que les pouvoirs discrétionnaires exercés par le tribunal en vertu de l'art. 11 n'étaient pas limités par la priorité invoquée par la Couronne au titre de la TPS, puisqu'il n'existe aucune priorité de la sorte sous le régime de la *LACC*.

[89] Pour ces motifs, je suis d'avis d'accueillir le pourvoi et de déclarer que la somme de 305 202,30 \$ perçue par LeRoy Trucking au titre de la TPS mais non encore versée au receveur général du Canada ne fait l'objet d'aucune fiducie réputée ou priorité en faveur de la Couronne. Cette somme ne fait pas non plus l'objet d'une fiducie expresse. Les dépens sont accordés à l'égard du présent pourvoi et de l'appel interjeté devant la juridiction inférieure.

Version française des motifs rendus par

LE JUGE FISH —

I

[90] Je souscris dans l'ensemble aux motifs de la juge Deschamps et je disposerais du pourvoi comme elle le propose.

[91] Plus particulièrement, je me rallie à son interprétation de la portée du pouvoir discrétionnaire conféré au juge par l'art. 11 de la *Loi sur les arrangements avec les créanciers des compagnies*, L.R.C.

And I share my colleague's conclusion that Brenner C.J.S.C. did not create an express trust in favour of the Crown when he segregated GST funds into the Monitor's trust account (2008 BCSC 1805, [2008] G.S.T.C. 221).

[92] I nonetheless feel bound to add brief reasons of my own regarding the interaction between the CCAA and the *Excise Tax Act*, R.S.C. 1985, c. E-15 ("ETA").

[93] In upholding deemed trusts created by the *ETA* notwithstanding insolvency proceedings, *Ottawa Senators Hockey Club Corp. (Re)* (2005), 73 O.R. (3d) 737 (C.A.), and its progeny have been unduly protective of Crown interests which Parliament itself has chosen to subordinate to competing prioritized claims. In my respectful view, a clearly marked departure from that jurisprudential approach is warranted in this case.

[94] Justice Deschamps develops important historical and policy reasons in support of this position and I have nothing to add in that regard. I do wish, however, to explain why a comparative analysis of related statutory provisions adds support to our shared conclusion.

[95] Parliament has in recent years given detailed consideration to the Canadian insolvency scheme. It has declined to amend the provisions at issue in this case. Ours is not to wonder why, but rather to treat Parliament's preservation of the relevant provisions as a deliberate exercise of the legislative discretion that is Parliament's alone. With respect, I reject any suggestion that we should instead characterize the apparent conflict between s. 18.3(1) (now s. 37(1)) of the CCAA and s. 222 of the *ETA* as a drafting anomaly or statutory lacuna properly subject to judicial correction or repair.

1985, ch. C-36 (« *LACC* »). Je partage en outre sa conclusion suivant laquelle le juge en chef Brenner n'a pas créé de fiducie expresse en faveur de la Couronne en ordonnant que les sommes recueillies au titre de la TPS soient détenues séparément dans le compte en fiducie du contrôleur (2008 BCSC 1805, [2008] G.S.T.C. 221).

[92] J'estime néanmoins devoir ajouter de brefs motifs qui me sont propres au sujet de l'interaction entre la *LACC* et la *Loi sur la taxe d'accise*, L.R.C. 1985, ch. E-15 (« *LTA* »).

[93] En maintenant, malgré l'existence des procédures d'insolvabilité, la validité de fiducies réputées créées en vertu de la *LTA*, l'arrêt *Ottawa Senators Hockey Club Corp. (Re)* (2005), 73 O.R. (3d) 737 (C.A.), et les décisions rendues dans sa foulée ont eu pour effet de protéger indûment des droits de la Couronne que le Parlement avait lui-même choisi de subordonner à d'autres créances prioritaires. À mon avis, il convient en l'espèce de rompre nettement avec ce courant jurisprudentiel.

[94] La juge Deschamps expose d'importantes raisons d'ordre historique et d'intérêt général à l'appui de cette position et je n'ai rien à ajouter à cet égard. Je tiens toutefois à expliquer pourquoi une analyse comparative de certaines dispositions législatives connexes vient renforcer la conclusion à laquelle ma collègue et moi-même en arrivons.

[95] Au cours des dernières années, le législateur fédéral a procédé à un examen approfondi du régime canadien d'insolvabilité. Il a refusé de modifier les dispositions qui sont en cause dans la présente affaire. Il ne nous appartient pas de nous interroger sur les raisons de ce choix. Nous devons plutôt considérer la décision du législateur de maintenir en vigueur les dispositions en question comme un exercice délibéré du pouvoir discrétionnaire de légiférer, pouvoir qui est exclusivement le sien. Avec égards, je rejette le point de vue suivant lequel nous devrions plutôt qualifier l'apparente contradiction entre le par. 18.3(1) (maintenant le par. 37(1)) de la *LACC* et l'art. 222 de la *LTA* d'anomalie rédactionnelle ou de lacune législative susceptible d'être corrigée par un tribunal.

II

[96] In the context of the Canadian insolvency regime, a deemed trust will be found to exist only where two complementary elements co-exist: first, a statutory provision *creating* the trust; and second, a CCAA or *Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act*, R.S.C. 1985, c. B-3 (“BIA”) provision *confirming* — or explicitly preserving — its effective operation.

[97] This interpretation is reflected in three federal statutes. Each contains a deemed trust provision framed in terms strikingly similar to the wording of s. 222 of the *ETA*.

[98] The first is the *Income Tax Act*, R.S.C. 1985, c. 1 (5th Supp.) (“*ITA*”), where s. 227(4) *creates* a deemed trust:

(4) Every person who deducts or withholds an amount under this Act is deemed, notwithstanding any security interest (as defined in subsection 224(1.3)) in the amount so deducted or withheld, to hold the amount separate and apart from the property of the person and from property held by any secured creditor (as defined in subsection 224(1.3)) of that person that but for the security interest would be property of the person, in trust for Her Majesty and for payment to Her Majesty in the manner and at the time provided under this Act. [Here and below, the emphasis is of course my own.]

[99] In the next subsection, Parliament has taken care to make clear that this trust is unaffected by federal or provincial legislation to the contrary:

(4.1) Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, the *Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act* (except sections 81.1 and 81.2 of that Act), any other enactment of Canada, any enactment of a province or any other law, where at any time an amount deemed by subsection 227(4) to be held by a person in trust for Her Majesty is not paid to Her Majesty in the manner and at the time provided under this Act, property of the person . . . equal in value to the amount so deemed to be held in trust is deemed

(a) to be held, from the time the amount was deducted or withheld by the person, separate and

II

[96] Dans le contexte du régime canadien d’insolvabilité, on conclut à l’existence d’une fiducie réputée uniquement lorsque deux éléments complémentaires sont réunis : en premier lieu, une disposition législative qui *crée* la fiducie et, en second lieu, une disposition de la *LACC* ou de la *Loi sur la faillite et l’insolvabilité*, L.R.C. 1985, ch. B-3 (« *LFI* ») qui *confirme* l’existence de la fiducie ou la maintient explicitement en vigueur.

[97] Cette interprétation se retrouve dans trois lois fédérales, qui renferment toutes une disposition relative aux fiducies réputées dont le libellé offre une ressemblance frappante avec celui de l’art. 222 de la *LTA*.

[98] La première est la *Loi de l’impôt sur le revenu*, L.R.C. 1985, ch. 1 (5^e suppl.) (« *LIR* »), dont le par. 227(4) *crée* une fiducie réputée :

(4) Toute personne qui déduit ou retient un montant en vertu de la présente loi est réputée, malgré toute autre garantie au sens du paragraphe 224(1.3) le concernant, le détenir en fiducie pour Sa Majesté, séparé de ses propres biens et des biens détenus par son créancier garanti au sens de ce paragraphe qui, en l’absence de la garantie, seraient ceux de la personne, et en vue de le verser à Sa Majesté selon les modalités et dans le délai prévus par la présente loi. [Dans la présente citation et dans celles qui suivent, les soulignements sont évidemment de moi.]

[99] Dans le paragraphe suivant, le législateur prend la peine de bien préciser que toute disposition législative fédérale ou provinciale à l’effet contraire n’a aucune incidence sur la fiducie ainsi constituée :

(4.1) Malgré les autres dispositions de la présente loi, la *Loi sur la faillite et l’insolvabilité* (sauf ses articles 81.1 et 81.2), tout autre texte législatif fédéral ou provincial ou toute règle de droit, en cas de non-versement à Sa Majesté, selon les modalités et dans le délai prévus par la présente loi, d’un montant qu’une personne est réputée par le paragraphe (4) détenir en fiducie pour Sa Majesté, les biens de la personne [. . .] d’une valeur égale à ce montant sont réputés :

a) être détenus en fiducie pour Sa Majesté, à compter du moment où le montant est déduit ou retenu,

apart from the property of the person, in trust for Her Majesty whether or not the property is subject to such a security interest, . . .

séparés des propres biens de la personne, qu'ils soient ou non assujettis à une telle garantie;

. . . and the proceeds of such property shall be paid to the Receiver General in priority to all such security interests.

. . . et le produit découlant de ces biens est payé au receveur général par priorité sur une telle garantie.

[100] The continued operation of this deemed trust is expressly *confirmed* in s. 18.3 of the CCAA:

[100] Le maintien en vigueur de cette fiducie réputée est expressément *confirmé* à l'art. 18.3 de la LACC :

18.3 (1) Subject to subsection (2), notwithstanding any provision in federal or provincial legislation that has the effect of deeming property to be held in trust for Her Majesty, property of a debtor company shall not be regarded as held in trust for Her Majesty unless it would be so regarded in the absence of that statutory provision.

18.3(1) Sous réserve du paragraphe (2) et par dérogation à toute disposition législative fédérale ou provinciale ayant pour effet d'assimiler certains biens à des biens détenus en fiducie pour Sa Majesté, aucun des biens de la compagnie débitrice ne peut être considéré comme détenu en fiducie pour Sa Majesté si, en l'absence de la disposition législative en question, il ne le serait pas.

(2) Subsection (1) does not apply in respect of amounts deemed to be held in trust under subsection 227(4) or (4.1) of the *Income Tax Act*, subsection 23(3) or (4) of the *Canada Pension Plan* or subsection 86(2) or (2.1) of the *Employment Insurance Act* . . .

(2) Le paragraphe (1) ne s'applique pas à l'égard des montants réputés détenus en fiducie aux termes des paragraphes 227(4) ou (4.1) de la *Loi de l'impôt sur le revenu*, des paragraphes 23(3) ou (4) du *Régime de pensions du Canada* ou des paragraphes 86(2) ou (2.1) de la *Loi sur l'assurance-emploi* . . .

[101] The operation of the *ITA* deemed trust is also confirmed in s. 67 of the *BIA*:

[101] L'application de la fiducie réputée prévue par la *LIR* est également confirmée par l'art. 67 de la *LFI* :

(2) Subject to subsection (3), notwithstanding any provision in federal or provincial legislation that has the effect of deeming property to be held in trust for Her Majesty, property of a bankrupt shall not be regarded as held in trust for Her Majesty for the purpose of paragraph (1)(a) unless it would be so regarded in the absence of that statutory provision.

(2) Sous réserve du paragraphe (3) et par dérogation à toute disposition législative fédérale ou provinciale ayant pour effet d'assimiler certains biens à des biens détenus en fiducie pour Sa Majesté, aucun des biens du failli ne peut, pour l'application de l'alinéa (1)a), être considéré comme détenu en fiducie pour Sa Majesté si, en l'absence de la disposition législative en question, il ne le serait pas.

(3) Subsection (2) does not apply in respect of amounts deemed to be held in trust under subsection 227(4) or (4.1) of the *Income Tax Act*, subsection 23(3) or (4) of the *Canada Pension Plan* or subsection 86(2) or (2.1) of the *Employment Insurance Act* . . .

(3) Le paragraphe (2) ne s'applique pas à l'égard des montants réputés détenus en fiducie aux termes des paragraphes 227(4) ou (4.1) de la *Loi de l'impôt sur le revenu*, des paragraphes 23(3) ou (4) du *Régime de pensions du Canada* ou des paragraphes 86(2) ou (2.1) de la *Loi sur l'assurance-emploi* . . .

[102] Thus, Parliament has first *created* and then *confirmed the continued operation* of the Crown's *ITA* deemed trust under *both* the CCAA and the *BIA* regimes.

[102] Par conséquent, le législateur a *créé*, puis *confirmé le maintien en vigueur* de la fiducie réputée établie par la *LIR* en faveur de Sa Majesté *tant* sous le régime de la *LACC* *que* sous celui de la *LFI*.

[103] The second federal statute for which this scheme holds true is the *Canada Pension Plan*, R.S.C. 1985, c. C-8 (“*CPP*”). At s. 23, Parliament creates a deemed trust in favour of the Crown and specifies that it exists despite all contrary provisions in any other Canadian statute. Finally, and in almost identical terms, the *Employment Insurance Act*, S.C. 1996, c. 23 (“*EIA*”), creates a deemed trust in favour of the Crown: see ss. 86(2) and (2.1).

[104] As we have seen, the survival of the deemed trusts created under these provisions of the *ITA*, the *CPP* and the *EIA* is confirmed in s. 18.3(2) of the *CCAA* and in s. 67(3) of the *BIA*. In all three cases, Parliament’s intent to enforce the Crown’s deemed trust through insolvency proceedings is expressed in clear and unmistakable terms.

[105] The same is not true with regard to the deemed trust created under the *ETA*. Although Parliament creates a deemed trust in favour of the Crown to hold unremitted GST monies, and although it purports to maintain this trust notwithstanding any contrary federal or provincial legislation, it does not *confirm* the trust — or expressly provide for its continued operation — in either the *BIA* or the *CCAA*. The second of the two mandatory elements I have mentioned is thus absent reflecting Parliament’s intention to allow the deemed trust to lapse with the commencement of insolvency proceedings.

[106] The language of the relevant *ETA* provisions is identical in substance to that of the *ITA*, *CPP*, and *EIA* provisions:

222. (1) Subject to subsection (1.1), every person who collects an amount as or on account of tax under Division II is deemed, for all purposes and despite any security interest in the amount, to hold the amount in trust for Her Majesty in right of Canada, separate and apart from the property of the person and from property held by any secured creditor of the person that, but for a

[103] La deuxième loi fédérale où l’on retrouve ce mécanisme est le *Régime de pensions du Canada*, L.R.C. 1985, ch. C-8 (« *RPC* »). À l’article 23, le législateur crée une fiducie réputée en faveur de la Couronne et précise qu’elle existe malgré les dispositions contraires de toute autre loi fédérale. Enfin, la *Loi sur l’assurance-emploi*, L.C. 1996, ch. 23 (« *LAE* »), crée dans des termes quasi identiques, une fiducie réputée en faveur de la Couronne : voir les par. 86(2) et (2.1).

[104] Comme nous l’avons vu, le maintien en vigueur des fiducies réputées créées en vertu de ces dispositions de la *LIR*, du *RPC* et de la *LAE* est confirmé au par. 18.3(2) de la *LACC* et au par. 67(3) de la *LFI*. Dans les trois cas, le législateur a exprimé en termes clairs et explicites sa volonté de voir la fiducie réputée établie en faveur de la Couronne produire ses effets pendant le déroulement de la procédure d’insolvabilité.

[105] La situation est différente dans le cas de la fiducie réputée créée par la *LTA*. Bien que le législateur crée en faveur de la Couronne une fiducie réputée dans laquelle seront conservées les sommes recueillies au titre de la TPS mais non encore versées, et bien qu’il prétende maintenir cette fiducie en vigueur malgré les dispositions à l’effet contraire de toute loi fédérale ou provinciale, il ne *confirme* pas l’existence de la fiducie — ni ne prévoit expressément le maintien en vigueur de celle-ci — dans la *LFI* ou dans la *LACC*. Le second des deux éléments obligatoires que j’ai mentionnés fait donc défaut, ce qui témoigne de l’intention du législateur de laisser la fiducie réputée devenir caduque au moment de l’introduction de la procédure d’insolvabilité.

[106] Le texte des dispositions en cause de la *LTA* est substantiellement identique à celui des dispositions de la *LIR*, du *RPC* et de la *LAE* :

222. (1) La personne qui perçoit un montant au titre de la taxe prévue à la section II est réputée, à toutes fins utiles et malgré tout droit en garantie le concernant, le détenir en fiducie pour Sa Majesté du chef du Canada, séparé de ses propres biens et des biens détenus par ses créanciers garantis qui, en l’absence du droit en garantie, seraient ceux de la personne, jusqu’à ce qu’il soit

security interest, would be property of the person, until the amount is remitted to the Receiver General or withdrawn under subsection (2).

. . .

(3) Despite any other provision of this Act (except subsection (4)), any other enactment of Canada (except the *Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act*), any enactment of a province or any other law, if at any time an amount deemed by subsection (1) to be held by a person in trust for Her Majesty is not remitted to the Receiver General or withdrawn in the manner and at the time provided under this Part, property of the person and property held by any secured creditor of the person that, but for a security interest, would be property of the person, equal in value to the amount so deemed to be held in trust, is deemed

(a) to be held, from the time the amount was collected by the person, in trust for Her Majesty, separate and apart from the property of the person, whether or not the property is subject to a security interest, . . .

. . .

. . . and the proceeds of the property shall be paid to the Receiver General in priority to all security interests.

[107] Yet no provision of the *CCAA* provides for the continuation of this deemed trust after the *CCAA* is brought into play.

[108] In short, Parliament has imposed *two* explicit conditions, or “building blocks”, for survival under the *CCAA* of deemed trusts created by the *ITA*, *CPP*, and *EIA*. Had Parliament intended to likewise preserve under the *CCAA* deemed trusts created by the *ETA*, it would have included in the *CCAA* the sort of confirmatory provision that explicitly preserves other deemed trusts.

[109] With respect, unlike Tysoe J.A., I do not find it “inconceivable that Parliament would specifically identify the *BIA* as an exception when enacting the current version of s. 222(3) of the *ETA* without considering the *CCAA* as a possible second exception” (2009 BCCA 205, 98 B.C.L.R. (4th) 242, at para. 37). *All* of the deemed trust

versé au receveur général ou retiré en application du paragraphe (2).

. . .

(3) Malgré les autres dispositions de la présente loi (sauf le paragraphe (4) du présent article), tout autre texte législatif fédéral (sauf la *Loi sur la faillite et l'insolvabilité*), tout texte législatif provincial ou toute autre règle de droit, lorsqu'un montant qu'une personne est réputée par le paragraphe (1) détenir en fiducie pour Sa Majesté du chef du Canada n'est pas versé au receveur général ni retiré selon les modalités et dans le délai prévus par la présente partie, les biens de la personne — y compris les biens détenus par ses créanciers garantis qui, en l'absence du droit en garantie, seraient ses biens — d'une valeur égale à ce montant sont réputés :

a) être détenus en fiducie pour Sa Majesté du chef du Canada, à compter du moment où le montant est perçu par la personne, séparés des propres biens de la personne, qu'ils soient ou non assujettis à un droit en garantie;

. . .

. . . et le produit découlant de ces biens est payé au receveur général par priorité sur tout droit en garantie.

[107] Pourtant, aucune disposition de la *LACC* ne prévoit le maintien en vigueur de la fiducie réputée une fois que la *LACC* entre en jeu.

[108] En résumé, le législateur a imposé *deux* conditions explicites — ou « composantes de base » — devant être réunies pour que survivent, sous le régime de la *LACC*, les fiducies réputées qui ont été établies par la *LIR*, le *RPC* et la *LAE*. S'il avait voulu préserver de la même façon, sous le régime de la *LACC*, les fiducies réputées qui sont établies par la *LTA*, il aurait inséré dans la *LACC* le type de disposition confirmatoire qui maintient explicitement en vigueur d'autres fiducies réputées.

[109] Avec égards pour l'opinion contraire exprimée par le juge Tysoe de la Cour d'appel, je ne trouve pas [TRADUCTION] « inconcevable que le législateur, lorsqu'il a adopté la version actuelle du par. 222(3) de la *LTA*, ait désigné expressément la *LFI* comme une exception sans envisager que la *LACC* puisse constituer une deuxième exception » (2009 BCCA

provisions excerpted above make explicit reference to the *BIA*. Section 222 of the *ETA* does not break the pattern. Given the near-identical wording of the four deemed trust provisions, it would have been surprising indeed had Parliament not addressed the *BIA* at all in the *ETA*.

[110] Parliament's evident intent was to render GST deemed trusts inoperative upon the institution of insolvency proceedings. Accordingly, s. 222 mentions the *BIA* so as to *exclude* it from its ambit — rather than to *include* it, as do the *ITA*, the *CPP*, and the *EIA*.

[111] Conversely, I note that *none* of these statutes mentions the *CCAA* expressly. Their specific reference to the *BIA* has no bearing on their interaction with the *CCAA*. Again, it is the confirmatory provisions *in the insolvency statutes* that determine whether a given deemed trust will subsist during insolvency proceedings.

[112] Finally, I believe that chambers judges should not segregate GST monies into the Monitor's trust account during *CCAA* proceedings, as was done in this case. The result of Justice Deschamps's reasoning is that GST claims become unsecured under the *CCAA*. Parliament has deliberately chosen to nullify certain Crown super-priorities during insolvency; this is one such instance.

III

[113] For these reasons, like Justice Deschamps, I would allow the appeal with costs in this Court and in the courts below and order that the \$305,202.30 collected by LeRoy Trucking in respect of GST but not yet remitted to the Receiver General of Canada

205, 98 B.C.L.R. (4th) 242, par. 37). *Toutes* les dispositions établissant des fiducies réputées qui sont reproduites ci-dessus font explicitement mention de la *LFI*. L'article 222 de la *LTA* ne rompt pas avec ce modèle. Compte tenu du libellé presque identique des quatre dispositions établissant une fiducie réputée, il aurait d'ailleurs été étonnant que le législateur ne fasse aucune mention de la *LFI* dans la *LTA*.

[110] L'intention du législateur était manifestement de rendre inopérantes les fiducies réputées visant la TPS dès l'introduction d'une procédure d'insolvabilité. Par conséquent, l'art. 222 mentionne la *LFI* de manière à l'*exclure* de son champ d'application — et non de l'y *inclure*, comme le font la *LIR*, le *RPC* et la *LAE*.

[111] En revanche, je constate qu'*aucune* de ces lois ne mentionne expressément la *LACC*. La mention explicite de la *LFI* dans ces textes n'a aucune incidence sur leur interaction avec la *LACC*. Là encore, ce sont les dispositions confirmatoires que l'on trouve *dans les lois sur l'insolvabilité* qui déterminent si une fiducie réputée continuera d'exister durant une procédure d'insolvabilité.

[112] Enfin, j'estime que les juges siégeant en leur cabinet ne devraient pas, comme cela s'est produit en l'espèce, ordonner que les sommes perçues au titre de la TPS soient détenues séparément dans le compte en fiducie du contrôleur pendant le déroulement d'une procédure fondée sur la *LACC*. Il résulte du raisonnement de la juge Deschamps que les réclamations de TPS deviennent des créances non garanties sous le régime de la *LACC*. Le législateur a délibérément décidé de supprimer certaines superpriorités accordées à la Couronne pendant l'insolvabilité; nous sommes en présence de l'un de ces cas.

III

[113] Pour les motifs qui précèdent, je suis d'avis, à l'instar de la juge Deschamps, d'accueillir le pourvoi avec dépens devant notre Cour et devant les juridictions inférieures, et d'ordonner que la somme de 305 202,30 \$ — qui a été perçue par LeRoy Trucking

be subject to no deemed trust or priority in favour of the Crown.

The following are the reasons delivered by

[114] ABELLA J. (dissenting) — The central issue in this appeal is whether s. 222 of the *Excise Tax Act*, R.S.C. 1985, c. E-15 (“ETA”), and specifically s. 222(3), gives priority during *Companies’ Creditors Arrangement Act*, R.S.C. 1985, c. C-36 (“CCAA”), proceedings to the Crown’s deemed trust in unremitted GST. I agree with Tysoe J.A. that it does. It follows, in my respectful view, that a court’s discretion under s. 11 of the CCAA is circumscribed accordingly.

[115] Section 11¹ of the CCAA stated:

11. (1) Notwithstanding anything in the *Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act* or the *Winding-up Act*, where an application is made under this Act in respect of a company, the court, on the application of any person interested in the matter, may, subject to this Act, on notice to any other person or without notice as it may see fit, make an order under this section.

To decide the scope of the court’s discretion under s. 11, it is necessary to first determine the priority issue. Section 222(3), the provision of the *ETA* at issue in this case, states:

¹ Section 11 was amended, effective September 18, 2009, and now states:

11. Despite anything in the *Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act* or the *Winding-up and Restructuring Act*, if an application is made under this Act in respect of a debtor company, the court, on the application of any person interested in the matter, may, subject to the restrictions set out in this Act, on notice to any other person or without notice as it may see fit, make any order that it considers appropriate in the circumstances.

au titre de la TPS mais n’a pas encore été versée au receveur général du Canada — ne fasse l’objet d’aucune fiducie réputée ou priorité en faveur de la Couronne.

Version française des motifs rendus par

[114] LA JUGE ABELLA (dissidente) — La question qui est au cœur du présent pourvoi est celle de savoir si l’art. 222 de la *Loi sur la taxe d’accise*, L.R.C. 1985, ch. E-15 (« *LTA* »), et plus particulièrement le par. 222(3), donnent préséance, dans le cadre d’une procédure relevant de la *Loi sur les arrangements avec les créanciers des compagnies*, L.R.C. 1985, ch. C-36 (« *LACC* »), à la fiducie réputée qui est établie en faveur de la Couronne à l’égard de la TPS non versée. À l’instar du juge Tysoe de la Cour d’appel, j’estime que tel est le cas. Il s’ensuit, à mon avis, que le pouvoir discrétionnaire conféré au tribunal par l’art. 11 de la *LACC* est circonscrit en conséquence.

[115] L’article 11¹ de la *LACC* disposait :

11. (1) Malgré toute disposition de la *Loi sur la faillite et l’insolvabilité* ou de la *Loi sur les liquidations*, chaque fois qu’une demande est faite sous le régime de la présente loi à l’égard d’une compagnie, le tribunal, sur demande d’un intéressé, peut, sous réserve des autres dispositions de la présente loi et avec ou sans avis, rendre l’ordonnance prévue au présent article.

Pour être en mesure de déterminer la portée du pouvoir discrétionnaire conféré au tribunal par l’art. 11, il est nécessaire de trancher d’abord la question de la priorité. Le paragraphe 222(3), la disposition de la *LTA* en cause en l’espèce, prévoit ce qui suit :

¹ L’article 11 a été modifié et le texte modifié, qui est entré en vigueur le 18 septembre 2009, est rédigé ainsi :

11. Malgré toute disposition de la *Loi sur la faillite et l’insolvabilité* ou de la *Loi sur les liquidations et les restructurations*, le tribunal peut, dans le cas de toute demande sous le régime de la présente loi à l’égard d’une compagnie débitrice, rendre, sur demande d’un intéressé, mais sous réserve des restrictions prévues par la présente loi et avec ou sans avis, toute ordonnance qu’il estime indiquée.

(3) Despite any other provision of this Act (except subsection (4)), any other enactment of Canada (except the *Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act*), any enactment of a province or any other law, if at any time an amount deemed by subsection (1) to be held by a person in trust for Her Majesty is not remitted to the Receiver General or withdrawn in the manner and at the time provided under this Part, property of the person and property held by any secured creditor of the person that, but for a security interest, would be property of the person, equal in value to the amount so deemed to be held in trust, is deemed

(a) to be held, from the time the amount was collected by the person, in trust for Her Majesty, separate and apart from the property of the person, whether or not the property is subject to a security interest, and

(b) to form no part of the estate or property of the person from the time the amount was collected, whether or not the property has in fact been kept separate and apart from the estate or property of the person and whether or not the property is subject to a security interest

and is property beneficially owned by Her Majesty in right of Canada despite any security interest in the property or in the proceeds thereof and the proceeds of the property shall be paid to the Receiver General in priority to all security interests.

[116] Century Services argued that the CCAA's general override provision, s. 18.3(1), prevailed, and that the deeming provisions in s. 222 of the *ETA* were, accordingly, inapplicable during CCAA proceedings. Section 18.3(1) states:

18.3 (1) ... [N]otwithstanding any provision in federal or provincial legislation that has the effect of deeming property to be held in trust for Her Majesty, property of a debtor company shall not be regarded as held in trust for Her Majesty unless it would be so regarded in the absence of that statutory provision.

[117] As MacPherson J.A. correctly observed in *Ottawa Senators Hockey Club Corp. (Re)* (2005), 73 O.R. (3d) 737 (C.A.), s. 222(3) of the *ETA* is in "clear conflict" with s. 18.3(1) of the CCAA (para. 31). Resolving the conflict between the two provisions is, essentially, what seems to me to be a relatively uncomplicated exercise in statutory

(3) Malgré les autres dispositions de la présente loi (sauf le paragraphe (4) du présent article), tout autre texte législatif fédéral (sauf la *Loi sur la faillite et l'insolvabilité*), tout texte législatif provincial ou toute autre règle de droit, lorsqu'un montant qu'une personne est réputée par le paragraphe (1) détenir en fiducie pour Sa Majesté du chef du Canada n'est pas versé au receveur général ni retiré selon les modalités et dans le délai prévus par la présente partie, les biens de la personne — y compris les biens détenus par ses créanciers garantis qui, en l'absence du droit en garantie, seraient ses biens — d'une valeur égale à ce montant sont réputés :

a) être détenus en fiducie pour Sa Majesté du chef du Canada, à compter du moment où le montant est perçu par la personne, séparés des propres biens de la personne, qu'ils soient ou non assujettis à un droit en garantie;

b) ne pas faire partie du patrimoine ou des biens de la personne à compter du moment où le montant est perçu, que ces biens aient été ou non tenus séparés de ses propres biens ou de son patrimoine et qu'ils soient ou non assujettis à un droit en garantie.

Ces biens sont des biens dans lesquels Sa Majesté du chef du Canada a un droit de bénéficiaire malgré tout autre droit en garantie sur ces biens ou sur le produit en découlant, et le produit découlant de ces biens est payé au receveur général par priorité sur tout droit en garantie.

[116] Selon Century Services, la disposition dérogatoire générale de la *LACC*, le par. 18.3(1), l'emportait, et les dispositions déterminatives à l'art. 222 de la *LTA* étaient par conséquent inapplicables dans le cadre d'une procédure fondée sur la *LACC*. Le paragraphe 18.3(1) dispose :

18.3 (1) ... [P]ar dérogation à toute disposition législative fédérale ou provinciale ayant pour effet d'assimiler certains biens à des biens détenus en fiducie pour Sa Majesté, aucun des biens de la compagnie débitrice ne peut être considéré comme détenu en fiducie pour Sa Majesté si, en l'absence de la disposition législative en question, il ne le serait pas.

[117] Ainsi que l'a fait observer le juge d'appel MacPherson, dans l'arrêt *Ottawa Senators Hockey Club Corp. (Re)* (2005), 73 O.R. (3d) 737 (C.A.), le par. 222(3) de la *LTA* [TRADUCTION] « entre nettement en conflit » avec le par. 18.3(1) de la *LACC* (para. 31). Essentiellement, la résolution du conflit entre ces deux dispositions requiert à mon sens une

interpretation: Does the language reflect a clear legislative intention? In my view it does. The deemed trust provision, s. 222(3) of the *ETA*, has unambiguous language stating that it operates notwithstanding any law except the *Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act*, R.S.C. 1985, c. B-3 (“*BIA*”).

[118] By expressly excluding only one statute from its legislative grasp, and by unequivocally stating that it applies despite any other law anywhere in Canada *except* the *BIA*, s. 222(3) has defined its boundaries in the clearest possible terms. I am in complete agreement with the following comments of MacPherson J.A. in *Ottawa Senators*:

The legislative intent of s. 222(3) of the *ETA* is clear. If there is a conflict with “any other enactment of Canada (except the *Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act*)”, s. 222(3) prevails. In these words Parliament did two things: it decided that s. 222(3) should trump all other federal laws and, importantly, it addressed the topic of exceptions to its trumping decision and identified a single exception, the *Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act* The *BIA* and the *CCAA* are closely related federal statutes. I cannot conceive that Parliament would specifically identify the *BIA* as an exception, but accidentally fail to consider the *CCAA* as a possible second exception. In my view, the omission of the *CCAA* from s. 222(3) of the *ETA* was almost certainly a considered omission. [para. 43]

[119] MacPherson J.A.’s view that the failure to exempt the *CCAA* from the operation of the *ETA* is a reflection of a clear legislative intention, is borne out by how the *CCAA* was subsequently changed after s. 18.3(1) was enacted in 1997. In 2000, when s. 222(3) of the *ETA* came into force, amendments were also introduced to the *CCAA*. Section 18.3(1) was not amended.

[120] The failure to amend s. 18.3(1) is notable because its effect was to protect the legislative *status quo*, notwithstanding repeated requests from

opération relativement simple d’interprétation des lois : Est-ce que les termes employés révèlent une intention claire du législateur? À mon avis, c’est le cas. Le texte de la disposition créant une fiducie réputée, soit le par. 222(3) de la *LTA*, précise sans ambiguïté que cette disposition s’applique malgré toute autre règle de droit sauf la *Loi sur la faillite et l’insolvabilité*, L.R.C. 1985, ch. B-3 (« *LFI* »).

[118] En excluant explicitement une seule loi du champ d’application du par. 222(3) et en déclarant de façon non équivoque qu’il s’applique malgré toute autre loi ou règle de droit au Canada *sauf* la *LFI*, le législateur a défini la portée de cette disposition dans des termes on ne peut plus clairs. Je souscris sans réserve aux propos suivants du juge d’appel MacPherson dans l’arrêt *Ottawa Senators* :

[TRADUCTION] L’intention du législateur au par. 222(3) de la *LTA* est claire. En cas de conflit avec « tout autre texte législatif fédéral (sauf la *Loi sur la faillite et l’insolvabilité*) », c’est le par. 222(3) qui l’emporte. En employant ces mots, le législateur fédéral a fait deux choses : il a décidé que le par. 222(3) devait l’emporter sur tout autre texte législatif fédéral et, fait important, il a abordé la question des exceptions à cette préséance en en mentionnant une seule, la *Loi sur la faillite et l’insolvabilité* [. . .] La *LFI* et la *LACC* sont des lois fédérales étroitement liées entre elles. Je ne puis concevoir que le législateur ait pu mentionner expressément la *LFI* à titre d’exception, mais ait involontairement omis de considérer la *LACC* comme une deuxième exception possible. À mon avis, le fait que la *LACC* ne soit pas mentionnée au par. 222(3) de la *LTA* était presque assurément une omission mûrement réfléchie de la part du législateur. [par. 43]

[119] L’opinion du juge d’appel MacPherson suivant laquelle le fait que la *LACC* n’ait pas été soustraite à l’application de la *LTA* témoigne d’une intention claire du législateur est confortée par la façon dont la *LACC* a par la suite été modifiée après l’édiction du par. 18.3(1) en 1997. En 2000, lorsque le par. 222(3) de la *LTA* est entré en vigueur, des modifications ont également été apportées à la *LACC*, mais le par. 18.3(1) de cette loi n’a pas été modifié.

[120] L’absence de modification du par. 18.3(1) vaut d’être soulignée, car elle a eu pour effet de maintenir le statu quo législatif, malgré les

various constituencies that s. 18.3(1) be amended to make the priorities in the *CCAA* consistent with those in the *BIA*. In 2002, for example, when Industry Canada conducted a review of the *BIA* and the *CCAA*, the Insolvency Institute of Canada and the Canadian Association of Insolvency and Restructuring Professionals recommended that the priority regime under the *BIA* be extended to the *CCAA* (Joint Task Force on Business Insolvency Law Reform, *Report* (March 15, 2002), Sch. B, proposal 71). The same recommendations were made by the Standing Senate Committee on Banking, Trade and Commerce in its 2003 report, *Debtors and Creditors Sharing the Burden: A Review of the Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act and the Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act*; by the Legislative Review Task Force (Commercial) of the Insolvency Institute of Canada and the Canadian Association of Insolvency and Restructuring Professionals in its 2005 *Report on the Commercial Provisions of Bill C-55*; and in 2007 by the Insolvency Institute of Canada in a submission to the Standing Senate Committee on Banking, Trade and Commerce commenting on reforms then under consideration.

[121] Yet the *BIA* remains the only exempted statute under s. 222(3) of the *ETA*. Even after the 2005 decision in *Ottawa Senators* which confirmed that the *ETA* took precedence over the *CCAA*, there was no responsive legislative revision. I see this lack of response as relevant in this case, as it was in *Tele-Mobile Co. v. Ontario*, 2008 SCC 12, [2008] 1 S.C.R. 305, where this Court stated:

While it cannot be said that legislative silence is necessarily determinative of legislative intention, in this case the silence is Parliament's answer to the consistent urging of Telus and other affected businesses and organizations that there be express language in the legislation to ensure that businesses can be reimbursed for the reasonable costs of complying with evidence-gathering orders. I see the legislative history as reflecting Parliament's intention that compensation not be paid for compliance with production orders. [para. 42]

demandes répétées de divers groupes qui souhaitaient que cette disposition soit modifiée pour aligner l'ordre de priorité établi par la *LACC* sur celui de la *LFI*. En 2002, par exemple, lorsque Industrie Canada a procédé à l'examen de la *LFI* et de la *LACC*, l'Institut d'insolvabilité du Canada et l'Association canadienne des professionnels de l'insolvabilité et de la réorganisation ont recommandé que les règles de la *LFI* en matière de priorité soient étendues à la *LACC* (Joint Task Force on Business Insolvency Law Reform, *Report* (15 mars 2002), ann. B, proposition 71). Ces recommandations ont été reprises en 2003 par le Comité sénatorial permanent des banques et du commerce dans son rapport intitulé *Les débiteurs et les créanciers doivent se partager le fardeau : Examen de la Loi sur la faillite et l'insolvabilité et de la Loi sur les arrangements avec les créanciers des compagnies*, ainsi qu'en 2005 par le Legislative Review Task Force (Commercial) de l'Institut d'insolvabilité du Canada et de l'Association canadienne des professionnels de l'insolvabilité et de la réorganisation dans son *Report on the Commercial Provisions of Bill C-55*, et en 2007 par l'Institut d'insolvabilité du Canada dans un mémoire soumis au Comité sénatorial permanent des banques et du commerce au sujet de réformes alors envisagées.

[121] La *LFI* demeure néanmoins la seule loi soustraite à l'application du par. 222(3) de la *LTA*. Même à la suite de l'arrêt rendu en 2005 dans l'affaire *Ottawa Senators*, qui a confirmé que la *LTA* l'emportait sur la *LACC*, le législateur n'est pas intervenu. Cette absence de réaction de sa part me paraît tout aussi pertinente en l'espèce que dans l'arrêt *Société Télé-Mobile c. Ontario*, 2008 CSC 12, [2008] 1 R.C.S. 305, où la Cour a déclaré ceci :

Le silence du législateur n'est pas nécessairement déterminant quant à son intention, mais en l'espèce, il répond à la demande pressante de Telus et des autres entreprises et organisations intéressées que la loi prévoie expressément la possibilité d'un remboursement des frais raisonnables engagés pour communiquer des éléments de preuve conformément à une ordonnance. L'historique législatif confirme selon moi que le législateur n'a pas voulu qu'une indemnité soit versée pour l'obtempération à une ordonnance de communication. [par. 42]

[122] All this leads to a clear inference of a deliberate legislative choice to protect the deemed trust in s. 222(3) from the reach of s. 18.3(1) of the CCAA.

[123] Nor do I see any “policy” justification for interfering, through interpretation, with this clarity of legislative intention. I can do no better by way of explaining why I think the policy argument cannot succeed in this case, than to repeat the words of Tysoe J.A. who said:

I do not dispute that there are valid policy reasons for encouraging insolvent companies to attempt to restructure their affairs so that their business can continue with as little disruption to employees and other stakeholders as possible. It is appropriate for the courts to take such policy considerations into account, but only if it is in connection with a matter that has not been considered by Parliament. Here, Parliament must be taken to have weighed policy considerations when it enacted the amendments to the CCAA and ETA described above. As Mr. Justice MacPherson observed at para. 43 of *Ottawa Senators*, it is inconceivable that Parliament would specifically identify the BIA as an exception when enacting the current version of s. 222(3) of the ETA without considering the CCAA as a possible second exception. I also make the observation that the 1992 set of amendments to the BIA enabled proposals to be binding on secured creditors and, while there is more flexibility under the CCAA, it is possible for an insolvent company to attempt to restructure under the auspices of the BIA. [para. 37]

[124] Despite my view that the clarity of the language in s. 222(3) is dispositive, it is also my view that even the application of other principles of interpretation reinforces this conclusion. In their submissions, the parties raised the following as being particularly relevant: the Crown relied on the principle that the statute which is “later in time” prevails; and Century Services based its argument on the principle that the general provision gives way to the specific (*generalia specialibus non derogant*).

[122] Tout ce qui précède permet clairement d’inférer que le législateur a délibérément choisi de soustraire la fiducie réputée établie au par. 222(3) à l’application du par. 18.3(1) de la LACC.

[123] Je ne vois pas non plus de « considération de politique générale » qui justifierait d’aller à l’encontre, par voie d’interprétation législative, de l’intention aussi clairement exprimée par le législateur. Je ne saurais expliquer mieux que ne l’a fait le juge d’appel Tysoe les raisons pour lesquelles l’argument invoquant des considérations de politique générale ne peut, selon moi, être retenu en l’espèce. Je vais donc reprendre à mon compte ses propos à ce sujet :

[TRADUCTION] Je ne conteste pas qu’il existe des raisons de politique générale valables qui justifient d’inciter les entreprises insolvables à tenter de se restructurer de façon à pouvoir continuer à exercer leurs activités avec le moins de perturbations possibles pour leurs employés et pour les autres intéressés. Les tribunaux peuvent légitimement tenir compte de telles considérations de politique générale, mais seulement si elles ont trait à une question que le législateur n’a pas examinée. Or, dans le cas qui nous occupe, il y a lieu de présumer que le législateur a tenu compte de considérations de politique générale lorsqu’il a adopté les modifications susmentionnées à la LACC et à la LTA. Comme le juge MacPherson le fait observer au par. 43 de l’arrêt *Ottawa Senators*, il est inconcevable que le législateur, lorsqu’il a adopté la version actuelle du par. 222(3) de la LTA, ait désigné expressément la LFI comme une exception sans envisager que la LACC puisse constituer une deuxième exception. Je signale par ailleurs que les modifications apportées en 1992 à la LFI ont permis de rendre les propositions concordataires opposables aux créanciers garantis et que, malgré la plus grande souplesse de la LACC, il est possible pour une compagnie insolvable de se restructurer sous le régime de la LFI. [par. 37]

[124] Bien que je sois d’avis que la clarté des termes employés au par. 222(3) tranche la question, j’estime également que cette conclusion est même renforcée par l’application d’autres principes d’interprétation. Dans leurs observations, les parties indiquent que les principes suivants étaient, selon elles, particulièrement pertinents : la Couronne a invoqué le principe voulant que la loi « postérieure » l’emporte; Century Services a fondé son argumentation sur le principe de la préséance de la loi spécifique sur la loi générale (*generalia specialibus non derogant*).

[125] The “later in time” principle gives priority to a more recent statute, based on the theory that the legislature is presumed to be aware of the content of existing legislation. If a new enactment is inconsistent with a prior one, therefore, the legislature is presumed to have intended to derogate from the earlier provisions (Ruth Sullivan, *Sullivan on the Construction of Statutes* (5th ed. 2008), at pp. 346-47; Pierre-André Côté, *The Interpretation of Legislation in Canada* (3rd ed. 2000), at p. 358).

[126] The exception to this presumptive displacement of pre-existing inconsistent legislation, is the *generalia specialibus non derogant* principle that “[a] more recent, general provision will not be construed as affecting an earlier, special provision” (Côté, at p. 359). Like a Russian Doll, there is also an exception within this exception, namely, that an earlier, specific provision may in fact be “overruled” by a subsequent general statute if the legislature indicates, through its language, an intention that the general provision prevails (*Doré v. Verdun (City)*, [1997] 2 S.C.R. 862).

[127] The primary purpose of these interpretive principles is to assist in the performance of the task of determining the intention of the legislature. This was confirmed by MacPherson J.A. in *Ottawa Senators*, at para. 42:

... the overarching rule of statutory interpretation is that statutory provisions should be interpreted to give effect to the intention of the legislature in enacting the law. This primary rule takes precedence over all maxims or canons or aids relating to statutory interpretation, including the maxim that the specific prevails over the general (*generalia specialibus non derogant*). As expressed by Hudson J. in *Canada v. Williams*, [1944] S.C.R. 226, ... at p. 239 ... :

The maxim *generalia specialibus non derogant* is relied on as a rule which should dispose of the question, but the maxim is not a rule of law but a rule of construction and bows to the intention of the

[125] Le principe de la préséance de la « loi postérieure » accorde la priorité à la loi la plus récente, au motif que le législateur est présumé connaître le contenu des lois alors en vigueur. Si, dans la loi nouvelle, le législateur adopte une règle inconciliable avec une règle préexistante, on conclura qu’il a entendu déroger à celle-ci (Ruth Sullivan, *Sullivan on the Construction of Statutes* (5^e éd. 2008), p. 346-347; Pierre-André Côté, *The Interpretation of Legislation in Canada* (3^e éd. 2000), p. 358).

[126] L’exception à cette supplantation présumée des dispositions législatives préexistantes incompatibles réside dans le principe exprimé par la maxime *generalia specialibus non derogant* selon laquelle une disposition générale plus récente n’est pas réputée déroger à une loi spéciale antérieure (Côté, p. 359). Comme dans le jeu des poupées russes, cette exception comporte elle-même une exception. En effet, une disposition spécifique antérieure peut dans les faits être « supplantée » par une loi ultérieure de portée générale si le législateur, par les mots qu’il a employés, a exprimé l’intention de faire prévaloir la loi générale (*Doré c. Verdun (Ville)*, [1997] 2 R.C.S. 862).

[127] Ces principes d’interprétation visent principalement à faciliter la détermination de l’intention du législateur, comme l’a confirmé le juge d’appel MacPherson dans l’arrêt *Ottawa Senators*, au par. 42 :

[TRADUCTION] ... en matière d’interprétation des lois, la règle cardinale est la suivante : les dispositions législatives doivent être interprétées de manière à donner effet à l’intention du législateur lorsqu’il a adopté la loi. Cette règle fondamentale l’emporte sur toutes les maximes, outils ou canons d’interprétation législative, y compris la maxime suivant laquelle le particulier l’emporte sur le général (*generalia specialibus non derogant*). Comme l’a expliqué le juge Hudson dans l’arrêt *Canada c. Williams*, [1944] R.C.S. 226, [...] à la p. 239 ... :

On invoque la maxime *generalia specialibus non derogant* comme une règle qui devrait trancher la question. Or cette maxime, qui n’est pas une règle de droit mais un principe d’interprétation, cède le pas

legislature, if such intention can reasonably be gathered from all of the relevant legislation.

(See also Côté, at p. 358, and Pierre-Andre Côté, with the collaboration of S. Beaulac and M. Devinat, *Interprétation des lois* (4th ed. 2009), at para. 1335.)

[128] I accept the Crown's argument that the "later in time" principle is conclusive in this case. Since s. 222(3) of the *ETA* was enacted in 2000 and s. 18.3(1) of the *CCAA* was introduced in 1997, s. 222(3) is, on its face, the later provision. This chronological victory can be displaced, as Century Services argues, if it is shown that the more recent provision, s. 222(3) of the *ETA*, is a general one, in which case the earlier, specific provision, s. 18.3(1), prevails (*generalia specialibus non derogant*). But, as previously explained, the prior specific provision does not take precedence if the subsequent general provision appears to "overrule" it. This, it seems to me, is precisely what s. 222(3) achieves through the use of language stating that it prevails despite any law of Canada, of a province, or "any other law" *other than the BIA*. Section 18.3(1) of the *CCAA* is thereby rendered inoperative for purposes of s. 222(3).

[129] It is true that when the *CCAA* was amended in 2005,² s. 18.3(1) was re-enacted as s. 37(1) (S.C. 2005, c. 47, s. 131). Deschamps J. suggests that this makes s. 37(1) the new, "later in time" provision. With respect, her observation is refuted by the operation of s. 44(f) of the *Interpretation Act*, R.S.C. 1985, c. I-21, which expressly deals with the (non) effect of re-enacting, without significant substantive changes, a repealed provision (see *Attorney General of Canada v. Public Service Staff Relations Board*, [1977] 2 F.C. 663, dealing with the predecessor provision to s. 44(f)). It directs that new enactments not be construed as

devant l'intention du législateur, s'il est raisonnablement possible de la dégager de l'ensemble des dispositions législatives pertinentes.

(Voir aussi Côté, p. 358, et Pierre-André Côté, avec la collaboration de S. Beaulac et M. Devinat, *Interprétation des lois* (4^e éd. 2009), par. 1335.)

[128] J'accepte l'argument de la Couronne suivant lequel le principe de la loi « postérieure » est déterminant en l'espèce. Comme le par. 222(3) de la *LTA* a été édicté en 2000 et que le par. 18.3(1) de la *LACC* a été adopté en 1997, le par. 222(3) est, de toute évidence, la disposition postérieure. Cette victoire chronologique peut être neutralisée si, comme le soutient Century Services, on démontre que la disposition la plus récente, le par. 222(3) de la *LTA*, est une disposition générale, auquel cas c'est la disposition particulière antérieure, le par. 18.3(1), qui l'emporte (*generalia specialibus non derogant*). Mais, comme nous l'avons vu, la disposition particulière antérieure n'a pas préséance si la disposition générale ultérieure paraît la « supplanter ». C'est précisément, à mon sens, ce qu'accomplit le par. 222(3) de par son libellé, lequel précise que la disposition l'emporte sur tout autre texte législatif fédéral, tout texte législatif provincial ou « toute autre règle de droit » *sauf la LFI*. Le paragraphe 18.3(1) de la *LACC* est par conséquent rendu inopérant aux fins d'application du par. 222(3).

[129] Il est vrai que, lorsque la *LACC* a été modifiée en 2005², le par. 18.3(1) a été remplacé par le par. 37(1) (L.C. 2005, ch. 47, art. 131). Selon la juge Deschamps, le par. 37(1) est devenu, de ce fait, la disposition « postérieure ». Avec égards pour l'opinion exprimée par ma collègue, cette observation est réfutée par l'al. 44f) de la *Loi d'interprétation*, L.R.C. 1985, ch. I-21, qui décrit expressément l'effet (inexistant) qu'a le remplacement — sans modifications notables sur le fond — d'un texte antérieur qui a été abrogé (voir *Procureur général du Canada c. Commission des relations de travail dans la Fonction publique*, [1977] 2 C.F. 663, qui portait sur

2 The amendments did not come into force until September 18, 2009.

2 Les modifications ne sont entrées en vigueur que le 18 septembre 2009.

“new law” unless they differ in substance from the repealed provision:

44. Where an enactment, in this section called the “former enactment”, is repealed and another enactment, in this section called the “new enactment”, is substituted therefor,

. . .

(f) except to the extent that the provisions of the new enactment are not in substance the same as those of the former enactment, the new enactment shall not be held to operate as new law, but shall be construed and have effect as a consolidation and as declaratory of the law as contained in the former enactment;

Section 2 of the *Interpretation Act* defines an “enactment” as “an Act or regulation or any portion of an Act or regulation”.

[130] Section 37(1) of the current CCAA is almost identical to s. 18.3(1). These provisions are set out for ease of comparison, with the differences between them underlined:

37. (1) Subject to subsection (2), despite any provision in federal or provincial legislation that has the effect of deeming property to be held in trust for Her Majesty, property of a debtor company shall not be regarded as being held in trust for Her Majesty unless it would be so regarded in the absence of that statutory provision.

18.3 (1) Subject to subsection (2), notwithstanding any provision in federal or provincial legislation that has the effect of deeming property to be held in trust for Her Majesty, property of a debtor company shall not be regarded as held in trust for Her Majesty unless it would be so regarded in the absence of that statutory provision.

[131] The application of s. 44(f) of the *Interpretation Act* simply confirms the government’s clearly expressed intent, found in Industry Canada’s clause-by-clause review of Bill C-55, where s. 37(1) was identified as “a technical amendment to re-order the provisions of this Act”. During second reading, the Hon. Bill Rompkey, then the Deputy Leader of the Government in the

la disposition qui a précédé l’al. 44f)). Cet alinéa précise que le nouveau texte ne doit pas être considéré de « droit nouveau », sauf dans la mesure où il diffère au fond du texte abrogé :

44. En cas d’abrogation et de remplacement, les règles suivantes s’appliquent :

. . .

f) sauf dans la mesure où les deux textes diffèrent au fond, le nouveau texte n’est pas réputé de droit nouveau, sa teneur étant censée constituer une refonte et une clarification des règles de droit du texte antérieur;

Le mot « texte » est défini ainsi à l’art. 2 de la *Loi d’interprétation* : « Tout ou partie d’une loi ou d’un règlement. »

[130] Le paragraphe 37(1) de la LACC actuelle est pratiquement identique quant au fond au par. 18.3(1). Pour faciliter la comparaison de ces deux dispositions, je les ai reproduites ci-après :

37. (1) Sous réserve du paragraphe (2) et par dérogation à toute disposition législative fédérale ou provinciale ayant pour effet d’assimiler certains biens à des biens détenus en fiducie pour Sa Majesté, aucun des biens de la compagnie débitrice ne peut être considéré comme tel par le seul effet d’une telle disposition.

18.3 (1) Sous réserve du paragraphe (2) et par dérogation à toute disposition législative fédérale ou provinciale ayant pour effet d’assimiler certains biens à des biens détenus en fiducie pour Sa Majesté, aucun des biens de la compagnie débitrice ne peut être considéré comme détenu en fiducie pour Sa Majesté si, en l’absence de la disposition législative en question, il ne le serait pas.

[131] L’application de l’al. 44f) de la *Loi d’interprétation* vient tout simplement confirmer l’intention clairement exprimée par le législateur, qu’a indiquée Industrie Canada dans l’analyse du Projet de loi C-55, où le par. 37(1) était qualifié de « modification d’ordre technique concernant le réaménagement des dispositions de la présente loi ». Par ailleurs, durant la deuxième lecture du projet de loi

Senate, confirmed that s. 37(1) represented only a technical change:

On a technical note relating to the treatment of deemed trusts for taxes, the bill [*sic*] makes no changes to the underlying policy intent, despite the fact that in the case of a restructuring under the CCAA, sections of the act [*sic*] were repealed and substituted with renumbered versions due to the extensive reworking of the CCAA.

(*Debates of the Senate*, vol. 142, 1st Sess., 38th Parl., November 23, 2005, at p. 2147)

[132] Had the substance of s. 18.3(1) altered in any material way when it was replaced by s. 37(1), I would share Deschamps J.'s view that it should be considered a new provision. But since s. 18.3(1) and s. 37(1) are the same in substance, the transformation of s. 18.3(1) into s. 37(1) has no effect on the interpretive queue, and s. 222(3) of the *ETA* remains the "later in time" provision (Sullivan, at p. 347).

[133] This means that the deemed trust provision in s. 222(3) of the *ETA* takes precedence over s. 18.3(1) during *CCAA* proceedings. The question then is how that priority affects the discretion of a court under s. 11 of the *CCAA*.

[134] While s. 11 gives a court discretion to make orders notwithstanding the *BIA* and the *Winding-up Act*, R.S.C. 1985, c. W-11, that discretion is not liberated from the operation of any other federal statute. Any exercise of discretion is therefore circumscribed by whatever limits are imposed by statutes *other* than the *BIA* and the *Winding-up Act*. That includes the *ETA*. The chambers judge in this case was, therefore, required to respect the priority regime set out in s. 222(3) of the *ETA*. Neither s. 18.3(1) nor s. 11 of the *CCAA* gave him the authority to ignore it. He could not, as a result, deny the Crown's request

au Sénat, l'honorable Bill Rompkey, qui était alors leader adjoint du gouvernement au Sénat, a confirmé que le par. 37(1) représentait seulement une modification d'ordre technique :

Sur une note administrative, je signale que, dans le cas du traitement de fiducies présumées aux fins d'impôt, le projet de loi ne modifie aucunement l'intention qui sous-tend la politique, alors que dans le cas d'une restructuration aux termes de la LACC, des articles de la loi ont été abrogés et remplacés par des versions portant de nouveaux numéros lors de la mise à jour exhaustive de la LACC.

(*Débats du Sénat*, vol. 142, 1^{re} sess., 38^e lég., 23 novembre 2005, p. 2147)

[132] Si le par. 18.3(1) avait fait l'objet de modifications notables sur le fond lorsqu'il a été remplacé par le par. 37(1), je me rangerais à l'avis de la juge Deschamps qu'il doit être considéré comme un texte de droit nouveau. Mais comme les par. 18.3(1) et 37(1) ne diffèrent pas sur le fond, le fait que le par. 18.3(1) soit devenu le par. 37(1) n'a aucune incidence sur l'ordre chronologique du point de vue de l'interprétation, et le par. 222(3) de la *LTA* demeure la disposition « postérieure » (Sullivan, p. 347).

[133] Il s'ensuit que la disposition créant une fiducie réputée que l'on trouve au par. 222(3) de la *LTA* l'emporte sur le par. 18.3(1) dans le cadre d'une procédure fondée sur la *LACC*. La question qui se pose alors est celle de savoir quelle est l'incidence de cette préséance sur le pouvoir discrétionnaire conféré au tribunal par l'art. 11 de la *LACC*.

[134] Bien que l'art. 11 accorde au tribunal le pouvoir discrétionnaire de rendre des ordonnances malgré les dispositions de la *LFI* et de la *Loi sur les liquidations*, L.R.C. 1985, ch. W-11, ce pouvoir discrétionnaire demeure assujéti à l'application de toute autre loi fédérale. L'exercice de ce pouvoir discrétionnaire est donc circonscrit par les limites imposées par toute loi *autre* que la *LFI* et la *Loi sur les liquidations*, et donc par la *LTA*. En l'espèce, le juge siégeant en son cabinet était donc tenu de respecter le régime de priorités établi au par. 222(3) de la *LTA*. Ni le par. 18.3(1) ni l'art. 11 de la *LACC* ne l'autorisaient à en faire abstraction. Par conséquent,

for payment of the GST funds during the CCAA proceedings.

[135] Given this conclusion, it is unnecessary to consider whether there was an express trust.

[136] I would dismiss the appeal.

APPENDIX

Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act, R.S.C. 1985, c. C-36 (as at December 13, 2007)

11. (1) [Powers of court] Notwithstanding anything in the *Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act* or the *Winding-up Act*, where an application is made under this Act in respect of a company, the court, on the application of any person interested in the matter, may, subject to this Act, on notice to any other person or without notice as it may see fit, make an order under this section.

. . .

(3) [Initial application court orders] A court may, on an initial application in respect of a company, make an order on such terms as it may impose, effective for such period as the court deems necessary not exceeding thirty days,

(a) staying, until otherwise ordered by the court, all proceedings taken or that might be taken in respect of the company under an Act referred to in subsection (1);

(b) restraining, until otherwise ordered by the court, further proceedings in any action, suit or proceeding against the company; and

(c) prohibiting, until otherwise ordered by the court, the commencement of or proceeding with any other action, suit or proceeding against the company.

(4) [Other than initial application court orders] A court may, on an application in respect of a company other than an initial application, make an order on such terms as it may impose,

il ne pouvait pas refuser la demande présentée par la Couronne en vue de se faire payer la TPS dans le cadre de la procédure introduite en vertu de la *LACC*.

[135] Vu cette conclusion, il n'est pas nécessaire d'examiner la question de savoir s'il existait une fiducie expresse en l'espèce.

[136] Je rejetterais le présent pourvoi.

ANNEXE

Loi sur les arrangements avec les créanciers des compagnies, L.R.C. 1985, ch. C-36 (en date du 13 décembre 2007)

11. (1) [Pouvoir du tribunal] Malgré toute disposition de la *Loi sur la faillite et l'insolvabilité* ou de la *Loi sur les liquidations*, chaque fois qu'une demande est faite sous le régime de la présente loi à l'égard d'une compagnie, le tribunal, sur demande d'un intéressé, peut, sous réserve des autres dispositions de la présente loi et avec ou sans avis, rendre l'ordonnance prévue au présent article.

. . .

(3) [Demande initiale — ordonnances] Dans le cas d'une demande initiale visant une compagnie, le tribunal peut, par ordonnance, aux conditions qu'il peut imposer et pour une période maximale de trente jours :

a) suspendre, jusqu'à ce qu'il rende une nouvelle ordonnance à l'effet contraire, les procédures intentées contre la compagnie au titre des lois mentionnées au paragraphe (1), ou qui pourraient l'être;

b) surseoir, jusqu'à ce qu'il rende une nouvelle ordonnance à l'effet contraire, au cours de toute action, poursuite ou autre procédure contre la compagnie;

c) interdire, jusqu'à ce qu'il rende une nouvelle ordonnance à l'effet contraire, d'intenter ou de continuer toute action, poursuite ou autre procédure contre la compagnie.

(4) [Autres demandes — ordonnances] Dans le cas d'une demande, autre qu'une demande initiale, visant une compagnie, le tribunal peut, par ordonnance, aux conditions qu'il peut imposer et pour la période qu'il estime indiquée :

(a) staying, until otherwise ordered by the court, for such period as the court deems necessary, all proceedings taken or that might be taken in respect of the company under an Act referred to in subsection (1);

(b) restraining, until otherwise ordered by the court, further proceedings in any action, suit or proceeding against the company; and

(c) prohibiting, until otherwise ordered by the court, the commencement of or proceeding with any other action, suit or proceeding against the company.

. . . .

(6) [Burden of proof on application] The court shall not make an order under subsection (3) or (4) unless

(a) the applicant satisfies the court that circumstances exist that make such an order appropriate; and

(b) in the case of an order under subsection (4), the applicant also satisfies the court that the applicant has acted, and is acting, in good faith and with due diligence.

11.4 (1) [Her Majesty affected] An order made under section 11 may provide that

(a) Her Majesty in right of Canada may not exercise rights under subsection 224(1.2) of the *Income Tax Act* or any provision of the *Canada Pension Plan* or of the *Employment Insurance Act* that refers to subsection 224(1.2) of the *Income Tax Act* and provides for the collection of a contribution, as defined in the *Canada Pension Plan*, or an employee's premium, or employer's premium, as defined in the *Employment Insurance Act*, and of any related interest, penalties or other amounts, in respect of the company if the company is a tax debtor under that subsection or provision, for such period as the court considers appropriate but ending not later than

(i) the expiration of the order,

(ii) the refusal of a proposed compromise by the creditors or the court,

(iii) six months following the court sanction of a compromise or arrangement,

a) suspendre, jusqu'à ce qu'il rende une nouvelle ordonnance à l'effet contraire, les procédures intentées contre la compagnie au titre des lois mentionnées au paragraphe (1), ou qui pourraient l'être;

b) surseoir, jusqu'à ce qu'il rende une nouvelle ordonnance à l'effet contraire, au cours de toute action, poursuite ou autre procédure contre la compagnie;

c) interdire, jusqu'à ce qu'il rende une nouvelle ordonnance à l'effet contraire, d'intenter ou de continuer toute action, poursuite ou autre procédure contre la compagnie.

. . . .

(6) [Preuve] Le tribunal ne rend l'ordonnance visée aux paragraphes (3) ou (4) que si :

a) le demandeur le convainc qu'il serait indiqué de rendre une telle ordonnance;

b) dans le cas de l'ordonnance visée au paragraphe (4), le demandeur le convainc en outre qu'il a agi — et continue d'agir — de bonne foi et avec toute la diligence voulue.

11.4 (1) [Suspension des procédures] Le tribunal peut ordonner :

a) la suspension de l'exercice par Sa Majesté du chef du Canada des droits que lui confère le paragraphe 224(1.2) de la *Loi de l'impôt sur le revenu* ou toute disposition du *Régime de pensions du Canada* ou de la *Loi sur l'assurance-emploi* qui renvoie à ce paragraphe et qui prévoit la perception d'une cotisation, au sens du *Régime de pensions du Canada*, ou d'une cotisation ouvrière ou d'une cotisation patronale, au sens de la *Loi sur l'assurance-emploi*, et des intérêts, pénalités ou autres montants y afférents, à l'égard d'une compagnie lorsque celle-ci est un débiteur fiscal visé à ce paragraphe ou à cette disposition, pour une période se terminant au plus tard :

(i) à l'expiration de l'ordonnance rendue en application de l'article 11,

(ii) au moment du rejet, par le tribunal ou les créanciers, de la transaction proposée,

(iii) six mois après que le tribunal a homologué la transaction ou l'arrangement,

(iv) the default by the company on any term of a compromise or arrangement, or

(v) the performance of a compromise or arrangement in respect of the company; and

(b) Her Majesty in right of a province may not exercise rights under any provision of provincial legislation in respect of the company where the company is a debtor under that legislation and the provision has a similar purpose to subsection 224(1.2) of the *Income Tax Act*, or refers to that subsection, to the extent that it provides for the collection of a sum, and of any related interest, penalties or other amounts, where the sum

(i) has been withheld or deducted by a person from a payment to another person and is in respect of a tax similar in nature to the income tax imposed on individuals under the *Income Tax Act*, or

(ii) is of the same nature as a contribution under the *Canada Pension Plan* if the province is a “province providing a comprehensive pension plan” as defined in subsection 3(1) of the *Canada Pension Plan* and the provincial legislation establishes a “provincial pension plan” as defined in that subsection,

for such period as the court considers appropriate but ending not later than the occurrence or time referred to in whichever of subparagraphs (a)(i) to (v) may apply.

(2) [When order ceases to be in effect] An order referred to in subsection (1) ceases to be in effect if

(a) the company defaults on payment of any amount that becomes due to Her Majesty after the order is made and could be subject to a demand under

(i) subsection 224(1.2) of the *Income Tax Act*,

(ii) any provision of the *Canada Pension Plan* or of the *Employment Insurance Act* that refers to subsection 224(1.2) of the *Income Tax Act* and provides for the collection of a contribution, as defined in the *Canada Pension Plan*, or an employee’s premium, or employer’s premium,

(iv) au moment de tout défaut d’exécution de la transaction ou de l’arrangement,

(v) au moment de l’exécution intégrale de la transaction ou de l’arrangement;

b) la suspension de l’exercice par Sa Majesté du chef d’une province, pour une période se terminant au plus tard au moment visé à celui des sous-alinéas a)(i) à (v) qui, le cas échéant, est applicable, des droits que lui confère toute disposition législative de cette province à l’égard d’une compagnie, lorsque celle-ci est un débiteur visé par la loi provinciale et qu’il s’agit d’une disposition dont l’objet est semblable à celui du paragraphe 224(1.2) de la *Loi de l’impôt sur le revenu*, ou qui renvoie à ce paragraphe, dans la mesure où elle prévoit la perception d’une somme, et des intérêts, pénalités ou autres montants y afférents, qui :

(i) soit a été retenue par une personne sur un paiement effectué à une autre personne, ou déduite d’un tel paiement, et se rapporte à un impôt semblable, de par sa nature, à l’impôt sur le revenu auquel les particuliers sont assujettis en vertu de la *Loi de l’impôt sur le revenu*,

(ii) soit est de même nature qu’une cotisation prévue par le *Régime de pensions du Canada*, si la province est « une province instituant un régime général de pensions » au sens du paragraphe 3(1) de cette loi et si la loi provinciale institue un « régime provincial de pensions » au sens de ce paragraphe.

(2) [Cessation] L’ordonnance cesse d’être en vigueur dans les cas suivants :

a) la compagnie manque à ses obligations de paiement pour un montant qui devient dû à Sa Majesté après l’ordonnance et qui pourrait faire l’objet d’une demande aux termes d’une des dispositions suivantes :

(i) le paragraphe 224(1.2) de la *Loi de l’impôt sur le revenu*,

(ii) toute disposition du *Régime de pensions du Canada* ou de la *Loi sur l’assurance-emploi* qui renvoie au paragraphe 224(1.2) de la *Loi de l’impôt sur le revenu* et qui prévoit la perception d’une cotisation, au sens du *Régime de pensions du Canada*, ou d’une cotisation ouvrière ou

as defined in the *Employment Insurance Act*, and of any related interest, penalties or other amounts, or

(iii) under any provision of provincial legislation that has a similar purpose to subsection 224(1.2) of the *Income Tax Act*, or that refers to that subsection, to the extent that it provides for the collection of a sum, and of any related interest, penalties or other amounts, where the sum

(A) has been withheld or deducted by a person from a payment to another person and is in respect of a tax similar in nature to the income tax imposed on individuals under the *Income Tax Act*, or

(B) is of the same nature as a contribution under the *Canada Pension Plan* if the province is a “province providing a comprehensive pension plan” as defined in subsection 3(1) of the *Canada Pension Plan* and the provincial legislation establishes a “provincial pension plan” as defined in that subsection; or

(b) any other creditor is or becomes entitled to realize a security on any property that could be claimed by Her Majesty in exercising rights under

(i) subsection 224(1.2) of the *Income Tax Act*,

(ii) any provision of the *Canada Pension Plan* or of the *Employment Insurance Act* that refers to subsection 224(1.2) of the *Income Tax Act* and provides for the collection of a contribution, as defined in the *Canada Pension Plan*, or an employee’s premium, or employer’s premium, as defined in the *Employment Insurance Act*, and of any related interest, penalties or other amounts, or

(iii) any provision of provincial legislation that has a similar purpose to subsection 224(1.2) of the *Income Tax Act*, or that refers to that subsection, to the extent that it provides for the collection of a sum, and of any related interest, penalties or other amounts, where the sum

(A) has been withheld or deducted by a person from a payment to another person

d’une cotisation patronale, au sens de la *Loi sur l’assurance-emploi*, et des intérêts, pénalités ou autres montants y afférents,

(iii) toute disposition législative provinciale dont l’objet est semblable à celui du paragraphe 224(1.2) de la *Loi de l’impôt sur le revenu*, ou qui renvoie à ce paragraphe, dans la mesure où elle prévoit la perception d’une somme, et des intérêts, pénalités ou autres montants y afférents, qui :

(A) soit a été retenue par une personne sur un paiement effectué à une autre personne, ou déduite d’un tel paiement, et se rapporte à un impôt semblable, de par sa nature, à l’impôt sur le revenu auquel les particuliers sont assujettis en vertu de la *Loi de l’impôt sur le revenu*,

(B) soit est de même nature qu’une cotisation prévue par le *Régime de pensions du Canada*, si la province est « une province instituant un régime général de pensions » au sens du paragraphe 3(1) de cette loi et si la loi provinciale institue un « régime provincial de pensions » au sens de ce paragraphe;

b) un autre créancier a ou acquiert le droit de réaliser sa garantie sur un bien qui pourrait être réclamé par Sa Majesté dans l’exercice des droits que lui confère l’une des dispositions suivantes :

(i) le paragraphe 224(1.2) de la *Loi de l’impôt sur le revenu*,

(ii) toute disposition du *Régime de pensions du Canada* ou de la *Loi sur l’assurance-emploi* qui renvoie au paragraphe 224(1.2) de la *Loi de l’impôt sur le revenu* et qui prévoit la perception d’une cotisation, au sens du *Régime de pensions du Canada*, ou d’une cotisation ouvrière ou d’une cotisation patronale, au sens de la *Loi sur l’assurance-emploi*, et des intérêts, pénalités ou autres montants y afférents,

(iii) toute disposition législative provinciale dont l’objet est semblable à celui du paragraphe 224(1.2) de la *Loi de l’impôt sur le revenu*, ou qui renvoie à ce paragraphe, dans la mesure où elle prévoit la perception d’une somme, et des intérêts, pénalités ou autres montants y afférents, qui :

(A) soit a été retenue par une personne sur un paiement effectué à une autre personne,

and is in respect of a tax similar in nature to the income tax imposed on individuals under the *Income Tax Act*, or

(B) is of the same nature as a contribution under the *Canada Pension Plan* if the province is a “province providing a comprehensive pension plan” as defined in subsection 3(1) of the *Canada Pension Plan* and the provincial legislation establishes a “provincial pension plan” as defined in that subsection.

(3) [Operation of similar legislation] An order made under section 11, other than an order referred to in subsection (1) of this section, does not affect the operation of

(a) subsections 224(1.2) and (1.3) of the *Income Tax Act*,

(b) any provision of the *Canada Pension Plan* or of the *Employment Insurance Act* that refers to subsection 224(1.2) of the *Income Tax Act* and provides for the collection of a contribution, as defined in the *Canada Pension Plan*, or an employee’s premium, or employer’s premium, as defined in the *Employment Insurance Act*, and of any related interest, penalties or other amounts, or

(c) any provision of provincial legislation that has a similar purpose to subsection 224(1.2) of the *Income Tax Act*, or that refers to that subsection, to the extent that it provides for the collection of a sum, and of any related interest, penalties or other amounts, where the sum

(i) has been withheld or deducted by a person from a payment to another person and is in respect of a tax similar in nature to the income tax imposed on individuals under the *Income Tax Act*, or

(ii) is of the same nature as a contribution under the *Canada Pension Plan* if the province is a “province providing a comprehensive pension plan” as defined in subsection 3(1) of the *Canada Pension Plan* and the provincial legislation establishes a “provincial pension plan” as defined in that subsection,

and for the purpose of paragraph (c), the provision of provincial legislation is, despite any Act of Canada or of a province or any other law, deemed to have the same

ou déduite d’un tel paiement, et se rapporte à un impôt semblable, de par sa nature, à l’impôt sur le revenu auquel les particuliers sont assujettis en vertu de la *Loi de l’impôt sur le revenu*,

(B) soit est de même nature qu’une cotisation prévue par le *Régime de pensions du Canada*, si la province est « une province instituant un régime général de pensions » au sens du paragraphe 3(1) de cette loi et si la loi provinciale institue un « régime provincial de pensions » au sens de ce paragraphe.

(3) [Effet] Les ordonnances du tribunal, autres que celles rendues au titre du paragraphe (1), n’ont pas pour effet de porter atteinte à l’application des dispositions suivantes :

a) les paragraphes 224(1.2) et (1.3) de la *Loi de l’impôt sur le revenu*;

b) toute disposition du *Régime de pensions du Canada* ou de la *Loi sur l’assurance-emploi* qui renvoie au paragraphe 224(1.2) de la *Loi de l’impôt sur le revenu* et qui prévoit la perception d’une cotisation, au sens du *Régime de pensions du Canada*, ou d’une cotisation ouvrière ou d’une cotisation patronale, au sens de la *Loi sur l’assurance-emploi*, et des intérêts, pénalités ou autres montants y afférents;

c) toute disposition législative provinciale dont l’objet est semblable à celui du paragraphe 224(1.2) de la *Loi de l’impôt sur le revenu*, ou qui renvoie à ce paragraphe, dans la mesure où elle prévoit la perception d’une somme, et des intérêts, pénalités ou autres montants y afférents, qui :

(i) soit a été retenue par une personne sur un paiement effectué à une autre personne, ou déduite d’un tel paiement, et se rapporte à un impôt semblable, de par sa nature, à l’impôt sur le revenu auquel les particuliers sont assujettis en vertu de la *Loi de l’impôt sur le revenu*,

(ii) soit est de même nature qu’une cotisation prévue par le *Régime de pensions du Canada*, si la province est « une province instituant un régime général de pensions » au sens du paragraphe 3(1) de cette loi et si la loi provinciale institue un « régime provincial de pensions » au sens de ce paragraphe.

Pour l’application de l’alinéa c), la disposition législative provinciale en question est réputée avoir, à l’encontre de tout créancier et malgré tout texte législatif fédéral ou

effect and scope against any creditor, however secured, as subsection 224(1.2) of the *Income Tax Act* in respect of a sum referred to in subparagraph (c)(i), or as subsection 23(2) of the *Canada Pension Plan* in respect of a sum referred to in subparagraph (c)(ii), and in respect of any related interest, penalties or other amounts.

18.3 (1) [Deemed trusts] Subject to subsection (2), notwithstanding any provision in federal or provincial legislation that has the effect of deeming property to be held in trust for Her Majesty, property of a debtor company shall not be regarded as held in trust for Her Majesty unless it would be so regarded in the absence of that statutory provision.

(2) [Exceptions] Subsection (1) does not apply in respect of amounts deemed to be held in trust under subsection 227(4) or (4.1) of the *Income Tax Act*, subsection 23(3) or (4) of the *Canada Pension Plan* or subsection 86(2) or (2.1) of the *Employment Insurance Act* (each of which is in this subsection referred to as a “federal provision”) nor in respect of amounts deemed to be held in trust under any law of a province that creates a deemed trust the sole purpose of which is to ensure remittance to Her Majesty in right of the province of amounts deducted or withheld under a law of the province where

(a) that law of the province imposes a tax similar in nature to the tax imposed under the *Income Tax Act* and the amounts deducted or withheld under that law of the province are of the same nature as the amounts referred to in subsection 227(4) or (4.1) of the *Income Tax Act*, or

(b) the province is a “province providing a comprehensive pension plan” as defined in subsection 3(1) of the *Canada Pension Plan*, that law of the province establishes a “provincial pension plan” as defined in that subsection and the amounts deducted or withheld under that law of the province are of the same nature as amounts referred to in subsection 23(3) or (4) of the *Canada Pension Plan*,

and for the purpose of this subsection, any provision of a law of a province that creates a deemed trust is, notwithstanding any Act of Canada or of a province or any other law, deemed to have the same effect and scope against any creditor, however secured, as the corresponding federal provision.

provincial et toute règle de droit, la même portée et le même effet que le paragraphe 224(1.2) de la *Loi de l'impôt sur le revenu* quant à la somme visée au sous-alinéa c)(i), ou que le paragraphe 23(2) du *Régime de pensions du Canada* quant à la somme visée au sous-alinéa c)(ii), et quant aux intérêts, pénalités ou autres montants y afférents, quelle que soit la garantie dont bénéficie le créancier.

18.3 (1) [Fiducies présumées] Sous réserve du paragraphe (2) et par dérogation à toute disposition législative fédérale ou provinciale ayant pour effet d'assimiler certains biens à des biens détenus en fiducie pour Sa Majesté, aucun des biens de la compagnie débitrice ne peut être considéré comme détenu en fiducie pour Sa Majesté si, en l'absence de la disposition législative en question, il ne le serait pas.

(2) [Exceptions] Le paragraphe (1) ne s'applique pas à l'égard des montants réputés détenus en fiducie aux termes des paragraphes 227(4) ou (4.1) de la *Loi de l'impôt sur le revenu*, des paragraphes 23(3) ou (4) du *Régime de pensions du Canada* ou des paragraphes 86(2) ou (2.1) de la *Loi sur l'assurance-emploi* (chacun étant appelé « disposition fédérale » au présent paragraphe) ou à l'égard des montants réputés détenus en fiducie aux termes de toute loi d'une province créant une fiducie présumée dans le seul but d'assurer à Sa Majesté du chef de cette province la remise de sommes déduites ou retenues aux termes d'une loi de cette province, dans la mesure où, dans ce dernier cas, se réalise l'une des conditions suivantes :

a) la loi de cette province prévoit un impôt semblable, de par sa nature, à celui prévu par la *Loi de l'impôt sur le revenu*, et les sommes déduites ou retenues aux termes de la loi de cette province sont de même nature que celles visées aux paragraphes 227(4) ou (4.1) de la *Loi de l'impôt sur le revenu*;

b) cette province est « une province instituant un régime général de pensions » au sens du paragraphe 3(1) du *Régime de pensions du Canada*, la loi de cette province institue un « régime provincial de pensions » au sens de ce paragraphe, et les sommes déduites ou retenues aux termes de la loi de cette province sont de même nature que celles visées aux paragraphes 23(3) ou (4) du *Régime de pensions du Canada*.

Pour l'application du présent paragraphe, toute disposition de la loi provinciale qui crée une fiducie présumée est réputée avoir, à l'encontre de tout créancier du failli et malgré tout texte législatif fédéral ou provincial et toute règle de droit, la même portée et le même effet que la disposition fédérale correspondante, quelle que soit la garantie dont bénéficie le créancier.

18.4 (1) [Status of Crown claims] In relation to a proceeding under this Act, all claims, including secured claims, of Her Majesty in right of Canada or a province or any body under an enactment respecting workers' compensation, in this section and in section 18.5 called a "workers' compensation body", rank as unsecured claims.

. . .

(3) [Operation of similar legislation] Subsection (1) does not affect the operation of

(a) subsections 224(1.2) and (1.3) of the *Income Tax Act*,

(b) any provision of the *Canada Pension Plan* or of the *Employment Insurance Act* that refers to subsection 224(1.2) of the *Income Tax Act* and provides for the collection of a contribution, as defined in the *Canada Pension Plan*, or an employee's premium, or employer's premium, as defined in the *Employment Insurance Act*, and of any related interest, penalties or other amounts, or

(c) any provision of provincial legislation that has a similar purpose to subsection 224(1.2) of the *Income Tax Act*, or that refers to that subsection, to the extent that it provides for the collection of a sum, and of any related interest, penalties or other amounts, where the sum

(i) has been withheld or deducted by a person from a payment to another person and is in respect of a tax similar in nature to the income tax imposed on individuals under the *Income Tax Act*, or

(ii) is of the same nature as a contribution under the *Canada Pension Plan* if the province is a "province providing a comprehensive pension plan" as defined in subsection 3(1) of the *Canada Pension Plan* and the provincial legislation establishes a "provincial pension plan" as defined in that subsection,

and for the purpose of paragraph (c), the provision of provincial legislation is, despite any Act of Canada or of a province or any other law, deemed to have the same effect and scope against any creditor, however secured, as subsection 224(1.2) of the *Income Tax Act* in respect of a sum referred to in subparagraph (c)(i), or as subsection 23(2) of the *Canada Pension Plan* in respect of a sum referred to in subparagraph (c)(ii), and

18.4 (1) [Réclamations de la Couronne] Dans le cadre de procédures intentées sous le régime de la présente loi, toutes les réclamations de Sa Majesté du chef du Canada ou d'une province ou d'un organisme compétent au titre d'une loi sur les accidents du travail, y compris les réclamations garanties, prennent rang comme réclamations non garanties.

. . .

(3) [Effet] Le paragraphe (1) n'a pas pour effet de porter atteinte à l'application des dispositions suivantes :

a) les paragraphes 224(1.2) et (1.3) de la *Loi de l'impôt sur le revenu*;

b) toute disposition du *Régime de pensions du Canada* ou de la *Loi sur l'assurance-emploi* qui renvoie au paragraphe 224(1.2) de la *Loi de l'impôt sur le revenu* et qui prévoit la perception d'une cotisation, au sens du *Régime de pensions du Canada*, ou d'une cotisation ouvrière ou d'une cotisation patronale, au sens de la *Loi sur l'assurance-emploi*, et des intérêts, pénalités ou autres montants y afférents;

c) toute disposition législative provinciale dont l'objet est semblable à celui du paragraphe 224(1.2) de la *Loi de l'impôt sur le revenu*, ou qui renvoie à ce paragraphe, dans la mesure où elle prévoit la perception d'une somme, et des intérêts, pénalités ou autres montants y afférents, qui :

(i) soit a été retenue par une personne sur un paiement effectué à une autre personne, ou déduite d'un tel paiement, et se rapporte à un impôt semblable, de par sa nature, à l'impôt sur le revenu auquel les particuliers sont assujettis en vertu de la *Loi de l'impôt sur le revenu*,

(ii) soit est de même nature qu'une cotisation prévue par le *Régime de pensions du Canada*, si la province est « une province instituant un régime général de pensions » au sens du paragraphe 3(1) de cette loi et si la loi provinciale institue un « régime provincial de pensions » au sens de ce paragraphe.

Pour l'application de l'alinéa c), la disposition législative provinciale en question est réputée avoir, à l'encontre de tout créancier et malgré tout texte législatif fédéral ou provincial et toute règle de droit, la même portée et le même effet que le paragraphe 224(1.2) de la *Loi de l'impôt sur le revenu* quant à la somme visée au sous-alinéa c)(i), ou que le paragraphe 23(2) du *Régime de pensions du Canada* quant à la somme visée au sous-alinéa c)(ii),

in respect of any related interest, penalties or other amounts.

20. [Act to be applied conjointly with other Acts] The provisions of this Act may be applied together with the provisions of any Act of Parliament or of the legislature of any province, that authorizes or makes provision for the sanction of compromises or arrangements between a company and its shareholders or any class of them.

Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act, R.S.C. 1985, c. C-36 (as at September 18, 2009)

11. [General power of court] Despite anything in the *Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act* or the *Winding-up and Restructuring Act*, if an application is made under this Act in respect of a debtor company, the court, on the application of any person interested in the matter, may, subject to the restrictions set out in this Act, on notice to any other person or without notice as it may see fit, make any order that it considers appropriate in the circumstances.

11.02 (1) [Stays, etc. — initial application] A court may, on an initial application in respect of a debtor company, make an order on any terms that it may impose, effective for the period that the court considers necessary, which period may not be more than 30 days,

(a) staying, until otherwise ordered by the court, all proceedings taken or that might be taken in respect of the company under the *Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act* or the *Winding-up and Restructuring Act*;

(b) restraining, until otherwise ordered by the court, further proceedings in any action, suit or proceeding against the company; and

(c) prohibiting, until otherwise ordered by the court, the commencement of any action, suit or proceeding against the company.

(2) [Stays, etc. — other than initial application] A court may, on an application in respect of a debtor company other than an initial application, make an order, on any terms that it may impose,

(a) staying, until otherwise ordered by the court, for any period that the court considers necessary, all proceedings taken or that might be taken in respect of the company under an Act referred to in paragraph (1)(a);

et quant aux intérêts, pénalités ou autres montants y afférents, quelle que soit la garantie dont bénéficie le créancier.

20. [La loi peut être appliquée conjointement avec d'autres lois] Les dispositions de la présente loi peuvent être appliquées conjointement avec celles de toute loi fédérale ou provinciale, autorisant ou prévoyant l'homologation de transactions ou arrangements entre une compagnie et ses actionnaires ou une catégorie de ces derniers.

Loi sur les arrangements avec les créanciers des compagnies, L.R.C. 1985, ch. C-36 (en date du 18 septembre 2009)

11. [Pouvoir général du tribunal] Malgré toute disposition de la *Loi sur la faillite et l'insolvabilité* ou de la *Loi sur les liquidations et les restructurations*, le tribunal peut, dans le cas de toute demande sous le régime de la présente loi à l'égard d'une compagnie débitrice, rendre, sur demande d'un intéressé, mais sous réserve des restrictions prévues par la présente loi et avec ou sans avis, toute ordonnance qu'il estime indiquée.

11.02 (1) [Suspension : demande initiale] Dans le cas d'une demande initiale visant une compagnie débitrice, le tribunal peut, par ordonnance, aux conditions qu'il peut imposer et pour la période maximale de trente jours qu'il estime nécessaire :

a) suspendre, jusqu'à nouvel ordre, toute procédure qui est ou pourrait être intentée contre la compagnie sous le régime de la *Loi sur la faillite et l'insolvabilité* ou de la *Loi sur les liquidations et les restructurations*;

b) surseoir, jusqu'à nouvel ordre, à la continuation de toute action, poursuite ou autre procédure contre la compagnie;

c) interdire, jusqu'à nouvel ordre, l'introduction de toute action, poursuite ou autre procédure contre la compagnie.

(2) [Suspension : demandes autres qu'initiales] Dans le cas d'une demande, autre qu'une demande initiale, visant une compagnie débitrice, le tribunal peut, par ordonnance, aux conditions qu'il peut imposer et pour la période qu'il estime nécessaire :

a) suspendre, jusqu'à nouvel ordre, toute procédure qui est ou pourrait être intentée contre la compagnie sous le régime des lois mentionnées à l'alinéa (1)a);

(b) restraining, until otherwise ordered by the court, further proceedings in any action, suit or proceeding against the company; and

(c) prohibiting, until otherwise ordered by the court, the commencement of any action, suit or proceeding against the company.

(3) [Burden of proof on application] The court shall not make the order unless

(a) the applicant satisfies the court that circumstances exist that make the order appropriate; and

(b) in the case of an order under subsection (2), the applicant also satisfies the court that the applicant has acted, and is acting, in good faith and with due diligence.

. . .

11.09 (1) [Stay — Her Majesty] An order made under section 11.02 may provide that

(a) Her Majesty in right of Canada may not exercise rights under subsection 224(1.2) of the *Income Tax Act* or any provision of the *Canada Pension Plan* or of the *Employment Insurance Act* that refers to subsection 224(1.2) of the *Income Tax Act* and provides for the collection of a contribution, as defined in the *Canada Pension Plan*, or an employee's premium, or employer's premium, as defined in the *Employment Insurance Act*, and of any related interest, penalties or other amounts, in respect of the company if the company is a tax debtor under that subsection or provision, for the period that the court considers appropriate but ending not later than

(i) the expiry of the order,

(ii) the refusal of a proposed compromise by the creditors or the court,

(iii) six months following the court sanction of a compromise or an arrangement,

(iv) the default by the company on any term of a compromise or an arrangement, or

(v) the performance of a compromise or an arrangement in respect of the company; and

(b) Her Majesty in right of a province may not exercise rights under any provision of provincial legislation in respect of the company if the company is a debtor under that legislation and the provision has a purpose similar to subsection 224(1.2) of the *Income*

b) surseoir, jusqu'à nouvel ordre, à la continuation de toute action, poursuite ou autre procédure contre la compagnie;

c) interdire, jusqu'à nouvel ordre, l'introduction de toute action, poursuite ou autre procédure contre la compagnie.

(3) [Preuve] Le tribunal ne rend l'ordonnance que si :

a) le demandeur le convainc que la mesure est opportune;

b) dans le cas de l'ordonnance visée au paragraphe (2), le demandeur le convainc en outre qu'il a agi et continue d'agir de bonne foi et avec la diligence voulue.

. . .

11.09 (1) [Suspension des procédures : Sa Majesté] L'ordonnance prévue à l'article 11.02 peut avoir pour effet de suspendre :

a) l'exercice par Sa Majesté du chef du Canada des droits que lui confère le paragraphe 224(1.2) de la *Loi de l'impôt sur le revenu* ou toute disposition du *Régime de pensions du Canada* ou de la *Loi sur l'assurance-emploi* qui renvoie à ce paragraphe et qui prévoit la perception d'une cotisation, au sens du *Régime de pensions du Canada*, ou d'une cotisation ouvrière ou d'une cotisation patronale, au sens de la *Loi sur l'assurance-emploi*, ainsi que des intérêts, pénalités et autres charges afférents, à l'égard d'une compagnie qui est un débiteur fiscal visé à ce paragraphe ou à cette disposition, pour la période se terminant au plus tard :

(i) à l'expiration de l'ordonnance,

(ii) au moment du rejet, par le tribunal ou les créanciers, de la transaction proposée,

(iii) six mois après que le tribunal a homologué la transaction ou l'arrangement,

(iv) au moment de tout défaut d'exécution de la transaction ou de l'arrangement,

(v) au moment de l'exécution intégrale de la transaction ou de l'arrangement;

b) l'exercice par Sa Majesté du chef d'une province, pour la période que le tribunal estime indiquée et se terminant au plus tard au moment visé à celui des sous-alinéas *a)(i)* à (v) qui, le cas échéant, est applicable, des droits que lui confère toute disposition

Tax Act, or refers to that subsection, to the extent that it provides for the collection of a sum, and of any related interest, penalties or other amounts, and the sum

(i) has been withheld or deducted by a person from a payment to another person and is in respect of a tax similar in nature to the income tax imposed on individuals under the *Income Tax Act*, or

(ii) is of the same nature as a contribution under the *Canada Pension Plan* if the province is a “province providing a comprehensive pension plan” as defined in subsection 3(1) of the *Canada Pension Plan* and the provincial legislation establishes a “provincial pension plan” as defined in that subsection,

for the period that the court considers appropriate but ending not later than the occurrence or time referred to in whichever of subparagraphs (a)(i) to (v) that may apply.

(2) [When order ceases to be in effect] The portions of an order made under section 11.02 that affect the exercise of rights of Her Majesty referred to in paragraph (1)(a) or (b) cease to be in effect if

(a) the company defaults on the payment of any amount that becomes due to Her Majesty after the order is made and could be subject to a demand under

(i) subsection 224(1.2) of the *Income Tax Act*,

(ii) any provision of the *Canada Pension Plan* or of the *Employment Insurance Act* that refers to subsection 224(1.2) of the *Income Tax Act* and provides for the collection of a contribution, as defined in the *Canada Pension Plan*, or an employee’s premium, or employer’s premium, as defined in the *Employment Insurance Act*, and of any related interest, penalties or other amounts, or

(iii) any provision of provincial legislation that has a purpose similar to subsection 224(1.2) of the *Income Tax Act*, or that refers to that subsection, to the extent that it provides for the

législative de cette province à l’égard d’une compagnie qui est un débiteur visé par la loi provinciale, s’il s’agit d’une disposition dont l’objet est semblable à celui du paragraphe 224(1.2) de la *Loi de l’impôt sur le revenu*, ou qui renvoie à ce paragraphe, et qui prévoit la perception d’une somme, ainsi que des intérêts, pénalités et autres charges afférents, laquelle :

(i) soit a été retenue par une personne sur un paiement effectué à une autre personne, ou déduite d’un tel paiement, et se rapporte à un impôt semblable, de par sa nature, à l’impôt sur le revenu auquel les particuliers sont assujettis en vertu de la *Loi de l’impôt sur le revenu*,

(ii) soit est de même nature qu’une cotisation prévue par le *Régime de pensions du Canada*, si la province est une province instituant un régime général de pensions au sens du paragraphe 3(1) de cette loi et si la loi provinciale institue un régime provincial de pensions au sens de ce paragraphe.

(2) [Cessation d’effet] Les passages de l’ordonnance qui suspendent l’exercice des droits de Sa Majesté visés aux alinéas (1)a) ou b) cessent d’avoir effet dans les cas suivants :

a) la compagnie manque à ses obligations de paiement à l’égard de toute somme qui devient due à Sa Majesté après le prononcé de l’ordonnance et qui pourrait faire l’objet d’une demande aux termes d’une des dispositions suivantes :

(i) le paragraphe 224(1.2) de la *Loi de l’impôt sur le revenu*,

(ii) toute disposition du *Régime de pensions du Canada* ou de la *Loi sur l’assurance-emploi* qui renvoie au paragraphe 224(1.2) de la *Loi de l’impôt sur le revenu* et qui prévoit la perception d’une cotisation, au sens du *Régime de pensions du Canada*, ou d’une cotisation ouvrière ou d’une cotisation patronale, au sens de la *Loi sur l’assurance-emploi*, ainsi que des intérêts, pénalités et autres charges afférents,

(iii) toute disposition législative provinciale dont l’objet est semblable à celui du paragraphe 224(1.2) de la *Loi de l’impôt sur le revenu*, ou qui renvoie à ce paragraphe, et qui prévoit la

collection of a sum, and of any related interest, penalties or other amounts, and the sum

(A) has been withheld or deducted by a person from a payment to another person and is in respect of a tax similar in nature to the income tax imposed on individuals under the *Income Tax Act*, or

(B) is of the same nature as a contribution under the *Canada Pension Plan* if the province is a “province providing a comprehensive pension plan” as defined in subsection 3(1) of the *Canada Pension Plan* and the provincial legislation establishes a “provincial pension plan” as defined in that subsection; or

(b) any other creditor is or becomes entitled to realize a security on any property that could be claimed by Her Majesty in exercising rights under

(i) subsection 224(1.2) of the *Income Tax Act*,

(ii) any provision of the *Canada Pension Plan* or of the *Employment Insurance Act* that refers to subsection 224(1.2) of the *Income Tax Act* and provides for the collection of a contribution, as defined in the *Canada Pension Plan*, or an employee’s premium, or employer’s premium, as defined in the *Employment Insurance Act*, and of any related interest, penalties or other amounts, or

(iii) any provision of provincial legislation that has a purpose similar to subsection 224(1.2) of the *Income Tax Act*, or that refers to that subsection, to the extent that it provides for the collection of a sum, and of any related interest, penalties or other amounts, and the sum

(A) has been withheld or deducted by a person from a payment to another person and is in respect of a tax similar in nature to the income tax imposed on individuals under the *Income Tax Act*, or

(B) is of the same nature as a contribution under the *Canada Pension Plan* if the province is a “province providing a comprehensive pension plan” as defined in subsection

perception d’une somme, ainsi que des intérêts, pénalités et autres charges afférents, laquelle :

(A) soit a été retenue par une personne sur un paiement effectué à une autre personne, ou déduite d’un tel paiement, et se rapporte à un impôt semblable, de par sa nature, à l’impôt sur le revenu auquel les particuliers sont assujettis en vertu de la *Loi de l’impôt sur le revenu*,

(B) soit est de même nature qu’une cotisation prévue par le *Régime de pensions du Canada*, si la province est une province instituant un régime général de pensions au sens du paragraphe 3(1) de cette loi et si la loi provinciale institue un régime provincial de pensions au sens de ce paragraphe;

b) un autre créancier a ou acquiert le droit de réaliser sa garantie sur un bien qui pourrait être réclamé par Sa Majesté dans l’exercice des droits que lui confère l’une des dispositions suivantes :

(i) le paragraphe 224(1.2) de la *Loi de l’impôt sur le revenu*,

(ii) toute disposition du *Régime de pensions du Canada* ou de la *Loi sur l’assurance-emploi* qui renvoie au paragraphe 224(1.2) de la *Loi de l’impôt sur le revenu* et qui prévoit la perception d’une cotisation, au sens du *Régime de pensions du Canada*, ou d’une cotisation ouvrière ou d’une cotisation patronale, au sens de la *Loi sur l’assurance-emploi*, ainsi que des intérêts, pénalités et autres charges afférents,

(iii) toute disposition législative provinciale dont l’objet est semblable à celui du paragraphe 224(1.2) de la *Loi de l’impôt sur le revenu*, ou qui renvoie à ce paragraphe, et qui prévoit la perception d’une somme, ainsi que des intérêts, pénalités et autres charges afférents, laquelle :

(A) soit a été retenue par une personne sur un paiement effectué à une autre personne, ou déduite d’un tel paiement, et se rapporte à un impôt semblable, de par sa nature, à l’impôt sur le revenu auquel les particuliers sont assujettis en vertu de la *Loi de l’impôt sur le revenu*,

(B) soit est de même nature qu’une cotisation prévue par le *Régime de pensions du Canada*, si la province est une province instituant un régime général de pensions au sens

3(1) of the *Canada Pension Plan* and the provincial legislation establishes a “provincial pension plan” as defined in that subsection.

(3) [Operation of similar legislation] An order made under section 11.02, other than the portions of that order that affect the exercise of rights of Her Majesty referred to in paragraph (1)(a) or (b), does not affect the operation of

(a) subsections 224(1.2) and (1.3) of the *Income Tax Act*,

(b) any provision of the *Canada Pension Plan* or of the *Employment Insurance Act* that refers to subsection 224(1.2) of the *Income Tax Act* and provides for the collection of a contribution, as defined in the *Canada Pension Plan*, or an employee’s premium, or employer’s premium, as defined in the *Employment Insurance Act*, and of any related interest, penalties or other amounts, or

(c) any provision of provincial legislation that has a purpose similar to subsection 224(1.2) of the *Income Tax Act*, or that refers to that subsection, to the extent that it provides for the collection of a sum, and of any related interest, penalties or other amounts, and the sum

(i) has been withheld or deducted by a person from a payment to another person and is in respect of a tax similar in nature to the income tax imposed on individuals under the *Income Tax Act*, or

(ii) is of the same nature as a contribution under the *Canada Pension Plan* if the province is a “province providing a comprehensive pension plan” as defined in subsection 3(1) of the *Canada Pension Plan* and the provincial legislation establishes a “provincial pension plan” as defined in that subsection,

and for the purpose of paragraph (c), the provision of provincial legislation is, despite any Act of Canada or of a province or any other law, deemed to have the same effect and scope against any creditor, however secured, as subsection 224(1.2) of the *Income Tax Act* in respect of a sum referred to in subparagraph (c)(i), or as subsection 23(2) of the *Canada Pension Plan* in respect of a sum referred to in subparagraph (c)(ii), and in respect of any related interest, penalties or other amounts.

du paragraphe 3(1) de cette loi et si la loi provinciale institue un régime provincial de pensions au sens de ce paragraphe.

(3) [Effet] L’ordonnance prévue à l’article 11.02, à l’exception des passages de celle-ci qui suspendent l’exercice des droits de Sa Majesté visés aux alinéas (1)a) ou b), n’a pas pour effet de porter atteinte à l’application des dispositions suivantes :

a) les paragraphes 224(1.2) et (1.3) de la *Loi de l’impôt sur le revenu*;

b) toute disposition du *Régime de pensions du Canada* ou de la *Loi sur l’assurance-emploi* qui renvoie au paragraphe 224(1.2) de la *Loi de l’impôt sur le revenu* et qui prévoit la perception d’une cotisation, au sens du *Régime de pensions du Canada*, ou d’une cotisation ouvrière ou d’une cotisation patronale, au sens de la *Loi sur l’assurance-emploi*, ainsi que des intérêts, pénalités et autres charges afférents;

c) toute disposition législative provinciale dont l’objet est semblable à celui du paragraphe 224(1.2) de la *Loi de l’impôt sur le revenu*, ou qui renvoie à ce paragraphe, et qui prévoit la perception d’une somme, ainsi que des intérêts, pénalités et autres charges afférents, laquelle :

(i) soit a été retenue par une personne sur un paiement effectué à une autre personne, ou déduite d’un tel paiement, et se rapporte à un impôt semblable, de par sa nature, à l’impôt sur le revenu auquel les particuliers sont assujettis en vertu de la *Loi de l’impôt sur le revenu*,

(ii) soit est de même nature qu’une cotisation prévue par le *Régime de pensions du Canada*, si la province est une province instituant un régime général de pensions au sens du paragraphe 3(1) de cette loi et si la loi provinciale institue un régime provincial de pensions au sens de ce paragraphe.

Pour l’application de l’alinéa c), la disposition législative provinciale en question est réputée avoir, à l’encontre de tout créancier et malgré tout texte législatif fédéral ou provincial et toute autre règle de droit, la même portée et le même effet que le paragraphe 224(1.2) de la *Loi de l’impôt sur le revenu* quant à la somme visée au sous-alinéa c)(i), ou que le paragraphe 23(2) du *Régime de pensions du Canada* quant à la somme visée au sous-alinéa c)(ii), et quant aux intérêts, pénalités et autres charges afférents, quelle que soit la garantie dont bénéficie le créancier.

37. (1) [Deemed trusts] Subject to subsection (2), despite any provision in federal or provincial legislation that has the effect of deeming property to be held in trust for Her Majesty, property of a debtor company shall not be regarded as being held in trust for Her Majesty unless it would be so regarded in the absence of that statutory provision.

(2) [Exceptions] Subsection (1) does not apply in respect of amounts deemed to be held in trust under subsection 227(4) or (4.1) of the *Income Tax Act*, subsection 23(3) or (4) of the *Canada Pension Plan* or subsection 86(2) or (2.1) of the *Employment Insurance Act* (each of which is in this subsection referred to as a “federal provision”), nor does it apply in respect of amounts deemed to be held in trust under any law of a province that creates a deemed trust the sole purpose of which is to ensure remittance to Her Majesty in right of the province of amounts deducted or withheld under a law of the province if

(a) that law of the province imposes a tax similar in nature to the tax imposed under the *Income Tax Act* and the amounts deducted or withheld under that law of the province are of the same nature as the amounts referred to in subsection 227(4) or (4.1) of the *Income Tax Act*, or

(b) the province is a “province providing a comprehensive pension plan” as defined in subsection 3(1) of the *Canada Pension Plan*, that law of the province establishes a “provincial pension plan” as defined in that subsection and the amounts deducted or withheld under that law of the province are of the same nature as amounts referred to in subsection 23(3) or (4) of the *Canada Pension Plan*,

and for the purpose of this subsection, any provision of a law of a province that creates a deemed trust is, despite any Act of Canada or of a province or any other law, deemed to have the same effect and scope against any creditor, however secured, as the corresponding federal provision.

Excise Tax Act, R.S.C. 1985, c. E-15 (as at December 13, 2007)

222. (1) [Trust for amounts collected] Subject to subsection (1.1), every person who collects an amount as or on account of tax under Division II is deemed, for all purposes and despite any security interest in the amount, to hold the amount in trust for Her Majesty in right of Canada, separate and apart from the property of the person and from property held by any secured

37. (1) [Fiducies présumées] Sous réserve du paragraphe (2) et par dérogation à toute disposition législative fédérale ou provinciale ayant pour effet d’assimiler certains biens à des biens détenus en fiducie pour Sa Majesté, aucun des biens de la compagnie débitrice ne peut être considéré comme tel par le seul effet d’une telle disposition.

(2) [Exceptions] Le paragraphe (1) ne s’applique pas à l’égard des sommes réputées détenues en fiducie aux termes des paragraphes 227(4) ou (4.1) de la *Loi de l’impôt sur le revenu*, des paragraphes 23(3) ou (4) du *Régime de pensions du Canada* ou des paragraphes 86(2) ou (2.1) de la *Loi sur l’assurance-emploi* (chacun étant appelé « disposition fédérale » au présent paragraphe) ou à l’égard des sommes réputées détenues en fiducie aux termes de toute loi d’une province créant une fiducie présumée dans le seul but d’assurer à Sa Majesté du chef de cette province la remise de sommes déduites ou retenues aux termes d’une loi de cette province, si, dans ce dernier cas, se réalise l’une des conditions suivantes :

a) la loi de cette province prévoit un impôt semblable, de par sa nature, à celui prévu par la *Loi de l’impôt sur le revenu*, et les sommes déduites ou retenues au titre de cette loi provinciale sont de même nature que celles visées aux paragraphes 227(4) ou (4.1) de la *Loi de l’impôt sur le revenu*;

b) cette province est une province instituant un régime général de pensions au sens du paragraphe 3(1) du *Régime de pensions du Canada*, la loi de cette province institue un régime provincial de pensions au sens de ce paragraphe, et les sommes déduites ou retenues au titre de cette loi provinciale sont de même nature que celles visées aux paragraphes 23(3) ou (4) du *Régime de pensions du Canada*.

Pour l’application du présent paragraphe, toute disposition de la loi provinciale qui crée une fiducie présumée est réputée avoir, à l’encontre de tout créancier de la compagnie et malgré tout texte législatif fédéral ou provincial et toute règle de droit, la même portée et le même effet que la disposition fédérale correspondante, quelle que soit la garantie dont bénéficie le créancier.

Loi sur la taxe d’accise, L.R.C. 1985, ch. E-15 (en date du 13 décembre 2007)

222. (1) [Montants perçus détenus en fiducie] La personne qui perçoit un montant au titre de la taxe prévue à la section II est réputée, à toutes fins utiles et malgré tout droit en garantie le concernant, le détenir en fiducie pour Sa Majesté du chef du Canada, séparé de ses propres biens et des biens détenus par ses créanciers garantis qui, en l’absence du droit en garantie, seraient ceux de la

creditor of the person that, but for a security interest, would be property of the person, until the amount is remitted to the Receiver General or withdrawn under subsection (2).

(1.1) [Amounts collected before bankruptcy] Subsection (1) does not apply, at or after the time a person becomes a bankrupt (within the meaning of the *Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act*), to any amounts that, before that time, were collected or became collectible by the person as or on account of tax under Division II.

. . .

(3) [Extension of trust] Despite any other provision of this Act (except subsection (4)), any other enactment of Canada (except the *Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act*), any enactment of a province or any other law, if at any time an amount deemed by subsection (1) to be held by a person in trust for Her Majesty is not remitted to the Receiver General or withdrawn in the manner and at the time provided under this Part, property of the person and property held by any secured creditor of the person that, but for a security interest, would be property of the person, equal in value to the amount so deemed to be held in trust, is deemed

(a) to be held, from the time the amount was collected by the person, in trust for Her Majesty, separate and apart from the property of the person, whether or not the property is subject to a security interest, and

(b) to form no part of the estate or property of the person from the time the amount was collected, whether or not the property has in fact been kept separate and apart from the estate or property of the person and whether or not the property is subject to a security interest

and is property beneficially owned by Her Majesty in right of Canada despite any security interest in the property or in the proceeds thereof and the proceeds of the property shall be paid to the Receiver General in priority to all security interests.

Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act, R.S.C. 1985, c. B-3 (as at December 13, 2007)

67. (1) [Property of bankrupt] The property of a bankrupt divisible among his creditors shall not comprise

personne, jusqu'à ce qu'il soit versé au receveur général ou retiré en application du paragraphe (2).

(1.1) [Montants perçus avant la faillite] Le paragraphe (1) ne s'applique pas, à compter du moment de la faillite d'un failli, au sens de la *Loi sur la faillite et l'insolvabilité*, aux montants perçus ou devenus percevables par lui avant la faillite au titre de la taxe prévue à la section II.

. . .

(3) [Non-versement ou non-retrait] Malgré les autres dispositions de la présente loi (sauf le paragraphe (4) du présent article), tout autre texte législatif fédéral (sauf la *Loi sur la faillite et l'insolvabilité*), tout texte législatif provincial ou toute autre règle de droit, lorsqu'un montant qu'une personne est réputée par le paragraphe (1) détenir en fiducie pour Sa Majesté du chef du Canada n'est pas versé au receveur général ni retiré selon les modalités et dans le délai prévus par la présente partie, les biens de la personne — y compris les biens détenus par ses créanciers garantis qui, en l'absence du droit en garantie, seraient ses biens — d'une valeur égale à ce montant sont réputés :

a) être détenus en fiducie pour Sa Majesté du chef du Canada, à compter du moment où le montant est perçu par la personne, séparés des propres biens de la personne, qu'ils soient ou non assujettis à un droit en garantie;

b) ne pas faire partie du patrimoine ou des biens de la personne à compter du moment où le montant est perçu, que ces biens aient été ou non tenus séparés de ses propres biens ou de son patrimoine et qu'ils soient ou non assujettis à un droit en garantie.

Ces biens sont des biens dans lesquels Sa Majesté du chef du Canada a un droit de bénéficiaire malgré tout autre droit en garantie sur ces biens ou sur le produit en découlant, et le produit découlant de ces biens est payé au receveur général par priorité sur tout droit en garantie.

Loi sur la faillite et l'insolvabilité, L.R.C. 1985, ch. B-3 (en date du 13 décembre 2007)

67. (1) [Biens du failli] Les biens d'un failli, constituant le patrimoine attribué à ses créanciers, ne comprennent pas les biens suivants :

(a) property held by the bankrupt in trust for any other person,

(b) any property that as against the bankrupt is exempt from execution or seizure under any laws applicable in the province within which the property is situated and within which the bankrupt resides, or

(b.1) such goods and services tax credit payments and prescribed payments relating to the essential needs of an individual as are made in prescribed circumstances and are not property referred to in paragraph (a) or (b),

but it shall comprise

(c) all property wherever situated of the bankrupt at the date of his bankruptcy or that may be acquired by or devolve on him before his discharge, and

(d) such powers in or over or in respect of the property as might have been exercised by the bankrupt for his own benefit.

(2) [Deemed trusts] Subject to subsection (3), notwithstanding any provision in federal or provincial legislation that has the effect of deeming property to be held in trust for Her Majesty, property of a bankrupt shall not be regarded as held in trust for Her Majesty for the purpose of paragraph (1)(a) unless it would be so regarded in the absence of that statutory provision.

(3) [Exceptions] Subsection (2) does not apply in respect of amounts deemed to be held in trust under subsection 227(4) or (4.1) of the *Income Tax Act*, subsection 23(3) or (4) of the *Canada Pension Plan* or subsection 86(2) or (2.1) of the *Employment Insurance Act* (each of which is in this subsection referred to as a “federal provision”) nor in respect of amounts deemed to be held in trust under any law of a province that creates a deemed trust the sole purpose of which is to ensure remittance to Her Majesty in right of the province of amounts deducted or withheld under a law of the province where

(a) that law of the province imposes a tax similar in nature to the tax imposed under the *Income Tax Act* and the amounts deducted or withheld under that law of the province are of the same nature as the amounts referred to in subsection 227(4) or (4.1) of the *Income Tax Act*, or

a) les biens détenus par le failli en fiducie pour toute autre personne;

b) les biens qui, à l'encontre du failli, sont exempts d'exécution ou de saisie sous le régime des lois applicables dans la province dans laquelle sont situés ces biens et où réside le failli;

b.1) dans les circonstances prescrites, les paiements au titre de crédits de la taxe sur les produits et services et les paiements prescrits qui sont faits à des personnes physiques relativement à leurs besoins essentiels et qui ne sont pas visés aux alinéas a) et b),

mais ils comprennent :

c) tous les biens, où qu'ils soient situés, qui appartiennent au failli à la date de la faillite, ou qu'il peut acquérir ou qui peuvent lui être dévolus avant sa libération;

d) les pouvoirs sur des biens ou à leur égard, qui auraient pu être exercés par le failli pour son propre bénéfice.

(2) [Fiducies présumées] Sous réserve du paragraphe (3) et par dérogation à toute disposition législative fédérale ou provinciale ayant pour effet d'assimiler certains biens à des biens détenus en fiducie pour Sa Majesté, aucun des biens du failli ne peut, pour l'application de l'alinéa (1)a), être considéré comme détenu en fiducie pour Sa Majesté si, en l'absence de la disposition législative en question, il ne le serait pas.

(3) [Exceptions] Le paragraphe (2) ne s'applique pas à l'égard des montants réputés détenus en fiducie aux termes des paragraphes 227(4) ou (4.1) de la *Loi de l'impôt sur le revenu*, des paragraphes 23(3) ou (4) du *Régime de pensions du Canada* ou des paragraphes 86(2) ou (2.1) de la *Loi sur l'assurance-emploi* (chacun étant appelé « disposition fédérale » au présent paragraphe) ou à l'égard des montants réputés détenus en fiducie aux termes de toute loi d'une province créant une fiducie présumée dans le seul but d'assurer à Sa Majesté du chef de cette province la remise de sommes déduites ou retenues aux termes d'une loi de cette province, dans la mesure où, dans ce dernier cas, se réalise l'une des conditions suivantes :

a) la loi de cette province prévoit un impôt semblable, de par sa nature, à celui prévu par la *Loi de l'impôt sur le revenu*, et les sommes déduites ou retenues aux termes de la loi de cette province sont de même nature que celles visées aux paragraphes 227(4) ou (4.1) de la *Loi de l'impôt sur le revenu*;

(b) the province is a “province providing a comprehensive pension plan” as defined in subsection 3(1) of the *Canada Pension Plan*, that law of the province establishes a “provincial pension plan” as defined in that subsection and the amounts deducted or withheld under that law of the province are of the same nature as amounts referred to in subsection 23(3) or (4) of the *Canada Pension Plan*,

and for the purpose of this subsection, any provision of a law of a province that creates a deemed trust is, notwithstanding any Act of Canada or of a province or any other law, deemed to have the same effect and scope against any creditor, however secured, as the corresponding federal provision.

86. (1) [Status of Crown claims] In relation to a bankruptcy or proposal, all provable claims, including secured claims, of Her Majesty in right of Canada or a province or of any body under an Act respecting workers’ compensation, in this section and in section 87 called a “workers’ compensation body”, rank as unsecured claims.

. . .

(3) [Exceptions] Subsection (1) does not affect the operation of

(a) subsections 224(1.2) and (1.3) of the *Income Tax Act*;

(b) any provision of the *Canada Pension Plan* or of the *Employment Insurance Act* that refers to subsection 224(1.2) of the *Income Tax Act* and provides for the collection of a contribution, as defined in the *Canada Pension Plan*, or an employee’s premium, or employer’s premium, as defined in the *Employment Insurance Act*, and of any related interest, penalties or other amounts; or

(c) any provision of provincial legislation that has a similar purpose to subsection 224(1.2) of the *Income Tax Act*, or that refers to that subsection, to the extent that it provides for the collection of a sum, and of any related interest, penalties or other amounts, where the sum

(i) has been withheld or deducted by a person from a payment to another person and is in respect of a tax similar in nature to the income tax imposed on individuals under the *Income Tax Act*, or

b) cette province est « une province instituant un régime général de pensions » au sens du paragraphe 3(1) du *Régime de pensions du Canada*, la loi de cette province institue un « régime provincial de pensions » au sens de ce paragraphe, et les sommes déduites ou retenues aux termes de la loi de cette province sont de même nature que celles visées aux paragraphes 23(3) ou (4) du *Régime de pensions du Canada*.

Pour l’application du présent paragraphe, toute disposition de la loi provinciale qui crée une fiducie présumée est réputée avoir, à l’encontre de tout créancier du failli et malgré tout texte législatif fédéral ou provincial et toute règle de droit, la même portée et le même effet que la disposition fédérale correspondante, quelle que soit la garantie dont bénéficie le créancier.

86. (1) [Réclamations de la Couronne] Dans le cadre d’une faillite ou d’une proposition, les réclamations prouvables — y compris les réclamations garanties — de Sa Majesté du chef du Canada ou d’une province ou d’un organisme compétent au titre d’une loi sur les accidents du travail prennent rang comme réclamations non garanties.

. . .

(3) [Effet] Le paragraphe (1) n’a pas pour effet de porter atteinte à l’application des dispositions suivantes :

a) les paragraphes 224(1.2) et (1.3) de la *Loi de l’impôt sur le revenu*;

b) toute disposition du *Régime de pensions du Canada* ou de la *Loi sur l’assurance-emploi* qui renvoie au paragraphe 224(1.2) de la *Loi de l’impôt sur le revenu* et qui prévoit la perception d’une cotisation, au sens du *Régime de pensions du Canada*, ou d’une cotisation ouvrière ou d’une cotisation patronale, au sens de la *Loi sur l’assurance-emploi*, et des intérêts, pénalités ou autres montants y afférents;

c) toute disposition législative provinciale dont l’objet est semblable à celui du paragraphe 224(1.2) de la *Loi de l’impôt sur le revenu*, ou qui renvoie à ce paragraphe, dans la mesure où elle prévoit la perception d’une somme, et des intérêts, pénalités ou autres montants y afférents, qui :

(i) soit a été retenue par une personne sur un paiement effectué à une autre personne, ou déduite d’un tel paiement, et se rapporte à un impôt semblable, de par sa nature, à l’impôt sur le revenu auquel les particuliers sont assujettis en vertu de la *Loi de l’impôt sur le revenu*,

(ii) is of the same nature as a contribution under the *Canada Pension Plan* if the province is a “province providing a comprehensive pension plan” as defined in subsection 3(1) of the *Canada Pension Plan* and the provincial legislation establishes a “provincial pension plan” as defined in that subsection,

and for the purpose of paragraph (c), the provision of provincial legislation is, despite any Act of Canada or of a province or any other law, deemed to have the same effect and scope against any creditor, however secured, as subsection 224(1.2) of the *Income Tax Act* in respect of a sum referred to in subparagraph (c)(i), or as subsection 23(2) of the *Canada Pension Plan* in respect of a sum referred to in subparagraph (c)(ii), and in respect of any related interest, penalties or other amounts.

Appeal allowed with costs, ABELLA J. dissenting.

Solicitors for the appellant: Fraser Milner Casgrain, Vancouver.

Solicitor for the respondent: Attorney General of Canada, Vancouver.

(ii) soit est de même nature qu’une cotisation prévue par le *Régime de pensions du Canada*, si la province est « une province instituant un régime général de pensions » au sens du paragraphe 3(1) de cette loi et si la loi provinciale institue un « régime provincial de pensions » au sens de ce paragraphe.

Pour l’application de l’alinéa c), la disposition législative provinciale en question est réputée avoir, à l’encontre de tout créancier et malgré tout texte législatif fédéral ou provincial et toute règle de droit, la même portée et le même effet que le paragraphe 224(1.2) de la *Loi de l’impôt sur le revenu* quant à la somme visée au sous-alinéa c)(i), ou que le paragraphe 23(2) du *Régime de pensions du Canada* quant à la somme visée au sous-alinéa c)(ii), et quant aux intérêts, pénalités ou autres montants y afférents, quelle que soit la garantie dont bénéficie le créancier.

Pourvoi accueilli avec dépens, la juge ABELLA est dissidente.

Procureurs de l’appelante : Fraser Milner Casgrain, Vancouver.

Procureur de l’intimé : Procureur général du Canada, Vancouver.

TAB 7

CITATION: Cinram International Inc. (Re), 2012 ONSC 3767
COURT FILE NO.: CV-12-9767-00CL
DATE: 20120626

**SUPERIOR COURT OF JUSTICE – ONTARIO
(COMMERCIAL LIST)**

RE: IN THE MATTER OF THE *COMPANIES’ CREDITORS ARRANGEMENT ACT*, R.S.C. 1985, c. C-36, AS AMENDED

**AND IN THE MATTER OF A PLAN OF COMPROMISE OR
ARRANGEMENT OF CINRAM INTERNATIONAL INC., CINRAM
INTERNATIONAL INCOME FUND, CII TRUST AND THE COMPANIES
LISTED IN SCHEDULE “A”, Applicants**

BEFORE: MORAWETZ J.

**COUNSEL: Robert J. Chadwick, Melaney Wagner and Caroline Descours, for the
Applicants**

Steven Golick, for Warner Electra-Atlantic Corp.

**Steven Weisz, for Pre-Petition First Lien Agent, Pre-Petition Second Lien
Agent and DIP Agent**

Tracy Sandler, for Twentieth Century Fox Film Corporation

David Byers, for the Proposed Monitor, FTI Consulting Inc.

**HEARD &
ENDORSED: JUNE 25, 2012**

REASONS: JUNE 26, 2012

ENDORSEMENT

[1] Cinram International Inc. (“CII”), Cinram International Income Fund (“Cinram Fund”), CII Trust and the Companies listed in Schedule “A” (collectively, the “Applicants”) brought this application seeking an initial order (the “Initial Order”) pursuant to the *Companies’ Creditors Arrangement Act* (“CCAA”). The Applicants also request that the court exercise its jurisdiction to extend a stay of proceedings and other benefits under the Initial Order to Cinram International Limited Partnership (“Cinram LP”, collectively with the Applicants, the “CCAA Parties”).

[2] Cinram Fund, together with its direct and indirect subsidiaries (collectively, “Cinram” or the “Cinram Group”) is a replicator and distributor of CDs and DVDs. Cinram has a diversified operational footprint across North America and Europe that enables it to meet the replication and logistics demands of its customers.

[3] The evidentiary record establishes that Cinram has experienced significant declines in revenue and EBITDA, which, according to Cinram, are a result of the economic downturn in Cinram’s primary markets of North America and Europe, which impacted consumers’ discretionary spending and adversely affected the entire industry.

[4] Cinram advises that over the past several years it has continued to evaluate its strategic alternatives and rationalize its operating footprint in order to attempt to balance its ongoing operations and financial challenges with its existing debt levels. However, despite cost reductions and recapitalized initiatives and the implementation of a variety of restructuring alternatives, the Cinram Group has experienced a number of challenges that has led to it seeking protection under the CCAA.

[5] Counsel to Cinram outlined the principal objectives of these CCAA proceedings as:

- (i) to ensure the ongoing operations of the Cinram Group;
- (ii) to ensure the CCAA Parties have the necessary availability of working capital funds to maximize the ongoing business of the Cinram Group for the benefit of its stakeholders; and
- (iii) to complete the sale and transfer of substantially all of the Cinram Group’s business as a going concern (the “Proposed Transaction”).

[6] Cinram contemplates that these CCAA proceedings will be the primary court supervised restructuring of the CCAA Parties. Cinram has operations in the United States and certain of the Applicants are incorporated under the laws of the United States. Cinram, however, takes the position that Canada is the nerve centre of the Cinram Group.

[7] The Applicants also seek authorization for Cinram International ULC (“Cinram ULC”) to act as “foreign representative” in the within proceedings to seek a recognition order under Chapter 15 of the United States Bankruptcy Code (“Chapter 15”). Cinram advises that the proceedings under Chapter 15 are intended to ensure that the CCAA Parties are protected from creditor actions in the United States and to assist with the global implementation of the Proposed Transaction to be undertaken pursuant to these CCAA proceedings.

[8] Counsel to the Applicants submits that the CCAA Parties are part of a consolidated business in Canada, the United States and Europe that is headquartered in Canada and operationally and functionally integrated in many significant respects. Cinram is one of the world’s largest providers of pre-recorded multi-media products and related logistics services. It has facilities in North America and Europe, and it:

- (i) manufactures DVDs, blue ray disks and CDs, and provides distribution services for motion picture studios, music labels, video game publishers, computer software companies, telecommunication companies and retailers around the world;
- (ii) provides various digital media services through One K Studios, LLC; and
- (iii) provides retail inventory control and forecasting services through Cinram Retail Services LLC (collectively, the “Cinram Business”).

[9] Cinram contemplates that the Proposed Transaction could allow it to restore itself as a market leader in the industry. Cinram takes the position that it requires CCAA protection to provide stability to its operations and to complete the Proposed Transaction.

[10] The Proposed Transaction has the support of the lenders forming the steering committee with respect to Cinram’s First Lien Credit Facilities (the “Steering Committee”), the members of which have been subject to confidentiality agreements and represent 40% of the loans under Cinram’s First Lien Credit Facilities (the “Initial Consenting Lenders”). Cinram also anticipates further support of the Proposed Transaction from additional lenders under its credit facilities following the public announcement of the Proposed Transaction.

[11] Cinram Fund is the direct or indirect parent and sole shareholder of all of the subsidiaries in Cinram’s corporate structure. A simplified corporate structure of the Cinram Group showing all of the CCAA Parties, including the designation of the CCAA Parties’ business segments and certain non-filing entities, is set out in the Pre-Filing Report of FTI Consulting Inc. (the “Monitor”) at paragraph 13. A copy is attached as Schedule “B”.

[12] Cinram Fund, CII, Cinram International General Partner Inc. (“Cinram GP”), CII Trust, Cinram ULC and 1362806 Ontario Limited are the Canadian entities in the Cinram Group that are Applicants in these proceedings (collectively, the “Canadian Applicants”). Cinram Fund and CII Trust are both open-ended limited purpose trusts, established under the laws of Ontario, and each of the remaining Canadian Applicants is incorporated pursuant to Federal or Provincial legislation.

[13] Cinram (US) Holdings Inc. (“CUSH”), Cinram Inc., IHC Corporation (“IHC”), Cinram Manufacturing, LLC (“Cinram Manufacturing”), Cinram Distribution, LLC (“Cinram Distribution”), Cinram Wireless, LLC (“Cinram Wireless”), Cinram Retail Services, LLC (“Cinram Retail”) and One K Studios, LLC (“One K”) are the U.S. entities in the Cinram Group that are Applicants in these proceedings (collectively, the “U.S. Applicants”). Each of the U.S. Applicants is incorporated under the laws of Delaware, with the exception of One K, which is incorporated under the laws of California. On May 25, 2012, each of the U.S. Applicants opened a new Canadian-based bank account with J.P. Morgan.

[14] Cinram LP is not an Applicant in these proceedings. However, the Applicants seek to have a stay of proceedings and other relief under the CCAA extended to Cinram LP as it forms

part of Cinram's income trust structure with Cinram Fund, the ultimate parent of the Cinram Group.

[15] Cinram's European entities are not part of these proceedings and it is not intended that any insolvency proceedings will be commenced with respect to Cinram's European entities, except for Cinram Optical Discs SAC, which has commenced insolvency proceedings in France.

[16] The Cinram Group's principal source of long-term debt is the senior secured credit facilities provided under credit agreements known as the "First-Lien Credit Agreement" and the "Second-Lien Credit Agreement" (together with the First-Lien Credit Agreement, the "Credit Agreements").

[17] All of the CCAA Parties, with the exception of Cinram Fund, Cinram GP, CII Trust and Cinram LP (collectively, the "Fund Entities"), are borrowers and/or guarantors under the Credit Agreements. The obligations under the Credit Agreements are secured by substantially all of the assets of the Applicants and certain of their European subsidiaries.

[18] As at March 31, 2012, there was approximately \$233 million outstanding under the First-Lien Term Loan Facility; \$19 million outstanding under the First-Lien Revolving Credit Facilities; approximately \$12 million of letter of credit exposure under the First-Lien Credit Agreement; and approximately \$12 million outstanding under the Second-Lien Credit Agreement.

[19] Cinram advises that in light of the financial circumstances of the Cinram Group, it is not possible to obtain additional financing that could be used to repay the amounts owing under the Credit Agreements.

[20] Mr. John Bell, Chief Financial Officer of CII, stated in his affidavit that in connection with certain defaults under the Credit Agreements, a series of waivers was extended from December 2011 to June 30, 2012 and that upon expiry of the waivers, the lenders have the ability to demand immediate repayment of the outstanding amounts under the Credit Agreements and the borrowers and the other Applicants that are guarantors under the Credit Agreements would be unable to meet their debt obligations. Mr. Bell further stated that there is no reasonable expectation that Cinram would be able to service its debt load in the short to medium term given forecasted net revenues and EBITDA for the remainder of fiscal 2012, fiscal 2013, and fiscal 2014. The cash flow forecast attached to his affidavit indicates that, without additional funding, the Applicants will exhaust their available cash resources and will thus be unable to meet their obligations as they become due.

[21] The Applicants request a stay of proceedings. They take the position that in light of their financial circumstances, there could be a vast and significant erosion of value to the detriment of all stakeholders. In particular, the Applicants are concerned about the following risks, which, because of the integration of the Cinram business, also apply to the Applicants' subsidiaries, including Cinram LP:

- (a) the lenders demanding payment in full for money owing under the Credit Agreements;
- (b) potential termination of contracts by key suppliers; and
- (c) potential termination of contracts by customers.

[22] As indicated in the cash flow forecast, the Applicants do not have sufficient funds available to meet their immediate cash requirements as a result of their current liquidity challenges. Mr. Bell states in his affidavit that the Applicants require access to Debtor-In-Possession (“DIP”) Financing in the amount of \$15 millions to continue operations while they implement their restructuring, including the Proposed Transaction. Cinram has negotiated a DIP Credit Agreement with the lenders forming the Steering Committee (the “DIP Lenders”) through J.P. Morgan Chase Bank, NA as Administrative Agent (the “DIP Agent”) whereby the DIP Lenders agree to provide the DIP Financing in the form of a term loan in the amount of \$15 million.

[23] The Applicants also indicate that during the course of the CCAA proceedings, the CCAA Parties intend to generally make payments to ensure their ongoing business operations for the benefit of their stakeholders, including obligations incurred prior to, on, or after the commencement of these proceedings relating to:

- (a) the active employment of employees in the ordinary course;
- (b) suppliers and service providers the CCAA Parties and the Monitor have determined to be critical to the continued operation of the Cinram business;
- (c) certain customer programs in place pursuant to existing contracts or arrangements with customers; and
- (d) inter-company payments among the CCAA Parties in respect of, among other things, shared services.

[24] Mr. Bell states that the ability to make these payments relating to critical suppliers and customer programs is subject to a consultation and approval process agreed to among the Monitor, the DIP Agent and the CCAA Parties.

[25] The Applicants also request an Administration Charge for the benefit of the Monitor and Moelis and Company, LLC (“Moelis”), an investment bank engaged to assist Cinram in a comprehensive and thorough review of its strategic alternatives.

[26] In addition, the directors (and in the case of Cinram Fund and CII Trust, the Trustees, referred to collectively with the directors as the “Directors/Trustees”) requested a Director’s Charge to provide certainty with respect to potential personal liability if they continue in their current capacities. Mr. Bell states that in order to complete a successful restructuring, including the Proposed Transaction, the Applicants require the active and committed involvement of their

Directors/Trustees and officers. Further, Cinram's insurers have advised that if Cinram was to file for CCAA protection, and the insurers agreed to renew the existing D&O policies, there would be a significant increase in the premium for that insurance.

[27] Cinram has also developed a key employee retention program (the "KERP") with the principal purpose of providing an incentive for eligible employees, including eligible officers, to remain with the Cinram Group despite its financial difficulties. The KERP has been reviewed and approved by the Board of Trustees of the Cinram Fund. The KERP includes retention payments (the "KERP Retention Payments") to certain existing employees, including certain officers employed at Canadian and U.S. Entities, who are critical to the preservation of Cinram's enterprise value.

[28] Cinram also advises that on June 22, 2012, Cinram Fund, the borrowers under the Credit Agreements, and the Initial Consenting Lenders entered into a support agreement pursuant to which the Initial Consenting Lenders agreed to support the Proposed Transaction to be pursued through these CCAA proceedings (the "Support Agreement").

[29] Pursuant to the Support Agreement, lenders under the First-Lien Credit Agreement who execute the Support Agreement or Consent Agreement prior to July 10, 2012 (the "Consent Date") are entitled to receive consent consideration (the "Early Consent Consideration") equal to 4% of the principal amount of loans under the First-Lien Credit Agreement held by such consenting lenders as of the Consent Date, payable in cash from the net sale proceeds of the Proposed Transaction upon distribution of such proceeds in the CCAA proceedings.

[30] Mr. Bell states that it is contemplated that the CCAA proceedings will be the primary court-supervised restructuring of the CCAA Parties. He states that the CCAA Parties are part of a consolidated business in Canada, the United States and Europe that is headquartered in Canada and operationally and functionally integrated in many significant respects. Mr. Bell further states that although Cinram has operations in the United States, and certain of the Applicants are incorporated under the laws of the United States, it is Ontario that is Cinram's home jurisdiction and the nerve centre of the CCAA Parties' management, business and operations.

[31] The CCAA Parties have advised that they will be seeking a recognition order under Chapter 15 to ensure that they are protected from creditor actions in the United States and to assist with the global implementation of the Proposed Transaction. Thus, the Applicants seek authorization in the Proposed Initial Order for:

Cinram ULC to seek recognition of these proceedings as "foreign main proceedings" and to seek such additional relief required in connection with the prosecution of any sale transaction, including the Proposed Transaction, as well as authorization for the Monitor, as a court-appointed officer, to assist the CCAA Parties with any matters relating to any of the CCAA Parties' subsidiaries and any foreign proceedings commenced in relation thereto.

[32] Mr. Bell further states that the Monitor will be actively involved in assisting Cinram ULC as the foreign representative of the Applicants in the Chapter 15 proceedings and will assist in keeping this court informed of developments in the Chapter 15 proceedings.

[33] The facts relating to the CCAA Parties, the Cinram business, and the requested relief are fully set out in Mr. Bell's affidavit.

[34] Counsel to the Applicants filed a comprehensive factum in support of the requested relief in the Initial Order. Part III of the factum sets out the issues and the law.

[35] The relief requested in the form of the Initial Order is extensive. It goes beyond what this court usually considers on an initial hearing. However, in the circumstances of this case, I have been persuaded that the requested relief is appropriate.

[36] In making this determination, I have taken into account that the Applicants have spent a considerable period of time reviewing their alternatives and have done so in a consultative manner with their senior secured lenders. The senior secured lenders support this application, notwithstanding that it is clear that they will suffer a significant shortfall on their positions. It is also noted that the Early Consent Consideration will be available to lenders under the First-Lien Credit Agreement who execute the Support Agreement prior to July 10, 2012. Thus, all of these lenders will have the opportunity to participate in this arrangement.

[37] As previously indicated, the Applicants' factum is comprehensive. The submissions on the law are extensive and cover all of the outstanding issues. It provides a fulsome review of the jurisprudence in the area, which for purposes of this application, I accept. For this reason, paragraphs 41-96 of the factum are attached as Schedule "C" for reference purposes.

[38] The Applicants have also requested that the confidential supplement – which contains the KERP summary listing the individual KERP Payments and certain DIP Schedules – be sealed. I am satisfied that the KERP summary contains individually identifiable information and compensation information, including sensitive salary information, about the individuals who are covered by the KERP and that the DIP schedules contain sensitive competitive information of the CCAA Parties which should also be treated as being confidential. Having considered the principals of *Sierra Club of Canada v. Canada (Minister of Finance)*, (2002) 2 S.C.R. 522, I accept the Applicants' submission on this issue and grant the requested sealing order in respect of the confidential supplement.

[39] Finally, the Applicants have advised that they intend to proceed with a Chapter 15 application on June 26, 2012 before the United States Bankruptcy Court in the District of Delaware. I am given to understand that Cinram ULC, as proposed foreign representative, will be seeking recognition of the CCAA proceedings as "foreign main proceedings" on the basis that Ontario, Canada is the Centre of Main Interest or "COMI" of the CCAA Applicants.

[40] In his affidavit at paragraph 195, Mr. Bell states that the CCAA Parties are part of a consolidated business that is headquartered in Canada and operationally and functionally

integrated in many significant respects and that, as a result of the following factors, the Applicants submit the COMI of the CCAA Parties is Ontario, Canada:

- (a) the Cinram Group is managed on a consolidated basis out of the corporate headquarters in Toronto, Ontario, where corporate-level decision-making and corporate administrative functions are centralized;
- (b) key contracts, including, among others, major customer service agreements, are negotiated at the corporate level and created in Canada;
- (c) the Chief Executive Officer and Chief Financial Officer of CII, who are also directors, trustees and/or officers of other entities in the Cinram Group, are based in Canada;
- (d) meetings of the board of trustees and board of directors typically take place in Canada;
- (e) pricing decisions for entities in the Cinram Group are ultimately made by the Chief Executive Officer and Chief Financial Officer in Toronto, Ontario;
- (f) cash management functions for Cinram's North American entities, including the administration of Cinram's accounts receivable and accounts payable, are managed from Cinram's head office in Toronto, Ontario;
- (g) although certain bookkeeping, invoicing and accounting functions are performed locally, corporate accounting, treasury, financial reporting, financial planning, tax planning and compliance, insurance procurement services and internal audits are managed at a consolidated level in Toronto, Ontario;
- (h) information technology, marketing, and real estate services are provided by CII at the head office in Toronto, Ontario;
- (i) with the exception of routine maintenance expenditures, all capital expenditure decisions affecting the Cinram Group are managed in Toronto, Ontario;
- (j) new business development initiatives are centralized and managed from Toronto, Ontario; and
- (k) research and development functions for the Cinram Group are corporate-level activities centralized at Toronto, Ontario, including the Cinram Group's corporate-level research and development budget and strategy.

[41] Counsel submits that the CCAA Parties are highly dependent upon the critical business functions performed on their behalf from Cinram's head office in Toronto and would not be able to function independently without significant disruptions to their operations.

[42] The above comments with respect to the COMI are provided for informational purposes only. This court clearly recognizes that it is the function of the receiving court – in this case, the United States Bankruptcy Court for the District of Delaware – to make the determination on the location of the COMI and to determine whether this CCAA proceeding is a “foreign main proceeding” for the purposes of Chapter 15.

[43] In the result, I am satisfied that the Applicants meet all of the qualifications established for relief under the CCAA and I have signed the Initial Order in the form submitted, which includes approvals of the Charges referenced in the Initial Order.

MORAWETZ J.

Date: June 26, 2012

SCHEDULE “A”
ADDITIONAL APPLICANTS

Cinram International General Partner Inc.

Cinram International ULC

1362806 Ontario Limited

Cinram (U.S.) Holdings Inc.

Cinram, Inc.

IHC Corporation

Cinram Manufacturing LLC


Cinram Distribution LLC

Cinram Wireless LLC

Cinram Retail Services, LLC

One K Studios, LLC

SCHEDULE “B”



SCHEDULE “C”

A. THE APPLICANTS ARE “DEBTOR COMPANIES” TO WHICH THE CCAA APPLIES

41. The CCAA applies in respect of a “debtor company” (including a foreign company having assets or doing business in Canada) or “affiliated debtor companies” where the total of claims against such company or companies exceeds \$5 million.

CCAA, Section 3(1).

42. The Applicants are eligible for protection under the CCAA because each is a “debtor company” and the total of the claims against the Applicants exceeds \$5 million.

(1) The Applicants are Debtor Companies

43. The terms “company” and “debtor company” are defined in Section 2 of the CCAA as follows:

“company” means any company, corporation or legal person incorporated by or under an Act of Parliament or of the legislature of a province and any incorporated company having assets or doing business in Canada, wherever incorporated, and any income trust, but does not include banks, authorized foreign banks within the meaning of section 2 of the *Bank Act*, railway or telegraph companies, insurance companies and companies to which the *Trust and Loan Companies Act* applies.

“debtor company” means any company that:

- (a) is bankrupt or insolvent;
- (b) has committed an act of bankruptcy within the meaning of the *Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act* or is deemed insolvent within the meaning of the *Winding-Up and Restructuring Act*, whether or not proceedings in respect of the company have been taken under either of those Acts;
- (c) has made an authorized assignment or against which a receiving order has been made under the *Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act*; or

(d) is in the course of being wound up under the *Winding-Up and Restructuring Act* because the company is insolvent.

CCAA, Section 2 (“company” and “debtor company”).

44. The Applicants are debtor companies within the meaning of these definitions.

(2) The Applicants are “companies”

45. The Applicants are “companies” because:

- a. with respect to the Canadian Applicants, each is incorporated pursuant to federal or provincial legislation or, in the case of Cinram Fund and CII Trust, is an income trust; and
- b. with respect to the U.S. Applicants, each is an incorporated company with certain funds in bank accounts in Canada opened in May 2012 and therefore each is a company having assets or doing business in Canada.

Bell Affidavit at paras. 4, 80, 84, 86, 91, 94, 98, 102, 105, 108, 111, 114, 117, 120, 123, 212; Application Record, Tab 2.

46. The test for “having assets or doing business in Canada” is disjunctive, such that either “having assets” in Canada or “doing business in Canada” is sufficient to qualify an incorporated company as a “company” within the meaning of the CCAA.

47. Having only nominal assets in Canada, such as funds on deposit in a Canadian bank account, brings a foreign corporation within the definition of “company”. In order to meet the threshold statutory requirements of the CCAA, an applicant need only be in technical compliance with the plain words of the CCAA.

Re Canwest Global Communications Corp. (2009), 59 C.B.R. (5th) 72 (Ont. Sup. Ct. J. [Commercial List]) at para. 30 [*Canwest Global*]; Book of Authorities of the Applicants (“**Book of Authorities**”), Tab 1.

Re Global Light Telecommunications Ltd. (2004), 2 C.B.R. (5th) 210 (B.C.S.C.) at para. 17 [*Global Light*]; Book of Authorities, Tab 2.

48. The Courts do not engage in a quantitative or qualitative analysis of the assets or the circumstances in which the assets were created. Accordingly, the use of “instant” transactions immediately preceding a CCAA application, such as the creation of “instant debts” or “instant assets” for the purposes of bringing an entity within the scope of the CCAA, has received judicial approval as a legitimate device to bring a debtor within technical requirements of the CCAA.

Global Light, supra at para. 17; Book of Authorities, Tab 2.

Re Cadillac Fairview Inc. (1995), 30 C.B.R. (3d) 29 (Ont. Gen. Div. [Commercial List]) at paras. 5-6; Book of Authorities, Tab 3.

Elan Corporation v. Comiskey (Trustee of) (1990), 1 O.R. (3d) 289 (Ont. C.A.) at paras. 74, 83; Book of Authorities, Tab 4.

(3) The Applicants are insolvent

49. The Applicants are “debtor companies” as defined in the CCAA because they are companies (as set out above) and they are insolvent.

50. The insolvency of the debtor is assessed as of the time of filing the CCAA application. The CCAA does not define insolvency. Accordingly, in interpreting the meaning of “insolvent”, courts have taken guidance from the definition of “insolvent person” in Section 2(1) of the *Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act* (the “BIA”), which defines an “insolvent person” as a person (i) who is not bankrupt; and (ii) who resides, carries on business or has property in Canada; (iii) whose liabilities to creditors provable as claims under the BIA amount to one thousand dollars; and (iv) who is “insolvent” under one of the following tests:

- a. is for any reason unable to meet his obligations as they generally become due;
- b. has ceased paying his current obligations in the ordinary course of business as they generally become due; or
- c. the aggregate of his property is not, at a fair valuation, sufficient, or if disposed of at a fairly conducted sale under legal process, would not be sufficient to enable payment of all his obligations, due and accruing due.

BIA, Section 2 (“insolvent person”).

Re Stelco Inc. (2004), 48 C.B.R. (4th) 299 (Ont. Sup. Ct. J.[Commercial List]); leave to appeal to C.A. refused [2004] O.J. No. 1903; leave to appeal to S.C.C. refused [2004] S.C.C.A. No. 336, at para. 4 [*Stelco*]; Book of Authorities, Tab 5.

51. These tests for insolvency are disjunctive. A company satisfying any one of these tests is considered insolvent for the purposes of the CCAA.

Stelco, supra at paras. 26 and 28; Book of Authorities, Tab 5.

52. A company is also insolvent for the purposes of the CCAA if, at the time of filing, there is a reasonably foreseeable expectation that there is a looming liquidity condition or crisis that would result in the company being unable to pay its debts as they generally become due if a stay of proceedings and ancillary protection are not granted by the court.

Stelco, supra at para. 40; Book of Authorities, Tab 5.

53. The Applicants meet both the traditional test for insolvency under the BIA and the expanded test for insolvency based on a looming liquidity condition as a result of the following:

- a. The Applicants are unable to comply with certain financial covenants under the Credit Agreements and have entered into a series of waivers with their lenders from December 2011 to June 30, 2012.
- b. Were the Lenders to accelerate the amounts owing under the Credit Agreements, the Borrowers and the other Applicants that are Guarantors under the Credit Agreements would be unable to meet their debt obligations. Cinram Fund would be the ultimate parent of an insolvent business.
- d. The Applicants have been unable to repay or refinance the amounts owing under the Credit Agreements or find an out-of-court transaction for the sale of the Cinram Business with proceeds that equal or exceed the amounts owing under the Credit Agreements.

- e. Reduced revenues and EBITDA and increased borrowing costs have significantly impaired Cinram's ability to service its debt obligations. There is no reasonable expectation that Cinram will be able to service its debt load in the short to medium term given forecasted net revenues and EBITDA for the remainder of fiscal 2012 and for fiscal 2013 and 2014.
- f. The decline in revenues and EBITDA generated by the Cinram Business has caused the value of the Cinram Business to decline. As a result, the aggregate value of the Property, taken at fair value, is not sufficient to allow for payment of all of the Applicants' obligations due and accruing due.
- g. The Cash Flow Forecast indicates that without additional funding the Applicants will exhaust their available cash resources and will thus be unable to meet their obligations as they become due.

Bell Affidavit, paras. 23, 179-181, 183, 197-199; Application Record, Tab 2.

(4) The Applicants are affiliated companies with claims outstanding in excess of \$5 million

54. The Applicants are affiliated debtor companies with total claims exceeding 5 million dollars. Therefore, the CCAA applies to the Applicants in accordance with Section 3(1).

55. Affiliated companies are defined in Section 3(2) of the CCAA as follows:

- a. companies are affiliated companies if one of them is the subsidiary of the other or both are subsidiaries of the same company or each is controlled by the same person; and
- b. two companies are affiliated with the same company at the same time are deemed to be affiliated with each other.

CCAA, Section 3(2).

56. CII, CII Trust and all of the entities listed in Schedule “A” hereto are indirect, wholly owned subsidiaries of Cinram Fund; thus, the Applicants are “affiliated companies” for the purpose of the CCAA.

Bell Affidavit, paras. 3, 71; Application Record, Tab 2.

57. All of the CCAA Parties (except for the Fund Entities) are each a Borrower and/or Guarantor under the Credit Agreements. As at March 31, 2012 there was approximately \$252 million of aggregate principal amount outstanding under the First Lien Credit Agreement (plus approximately \$12 million in letter of credit exposure) and approximately \$12 million of aggregate principal amount outstanding under the Second Lien Credit Agreement. The total claims against the Applicants far exceed \$5 million.

Bell Affidavit, paras. 75; Application Record, Tab 2.

B. THE RELIEF IS AVAILABLE UNDER THE CCAA AND CONSISTENT WITH THE PURPOSE AND POLICY OF THE CCAA

(1) The CCAA is Flexible, Remedial Legislation

58. The CCAA is remedial legislation, intended to facilitate compromises and arrangements between companies and their creditors as an alternative to bankruptcy. In particular during periods of financial hardship, debtors turn to the Court so that the Court may apply the CCAA in a flexible manner in order to accomplish the statute’s goals. The Court should give the CCAA a broad and liberal interpretation so as to encourage and facilitate successful restructurings whenever possible.

Elan Corp. v. Comiskey, *supra* at paras. 22 and 56-60; Book of Authorities, Tab 4.
Re Lehndorff General Partners Ltd. (1993), 17 C.B.R. (3d) 24 at para.5 (Ont. Gen. Div. [Commercial List]); Book of Authorities, Tab 6.
Re Chef Ready Foods Ltd; Chef Ready Foods Ltd. v. Hongkong Bank of Canada (1990), 4 C.B.R. (3d) 311 (B.C.C.A.) at pp. 4 and 7; Book of Authorities, Tab 7.

59. On numerous occasions, courts have held that Section 11 of the CCAA provides the courts with a broad and liberal power, which is at their disposal in order to achieve the overall

objective of the CCAA. Accordingly, an interpretation of the CCAA that facilitates restructurings accords with its purpose.

Re Sulphur Corporation of Canada Ltd. (2002), 35 C.B.R. (4th) 304 (Alta Q.B.) (“Sulphur”) at para. 26; Book of Authorities, Tab 8.

60. Given the nature and purpose of the CCAA, this Honourable Court has the authority and jurisdiction to depart from the Model Order as is reasonable and necessary in order to achieve a successful restructuring.

(2) The Stay of Proceedings Against Non-Applicants is Appropriate

61. The relief sought in this application includes a stay of proceedings in favour of Cinram LP and the Applicants’ direct and indirect subsidiaries that are also party to an agreement with an Applicant (whether as surety, guarantor or otherwise) (each, a “Subsidiary Counterparty”), including any contract or credit agreement. It is just and reasonable to grant the requested stay of proceedings because:

- a. the Cinram Business is integrated among the Applicants, Cinram LP and the Subsidiary Counterparties;
- b. if any proceedings were commenced against Cinram LP, or if any of the third parties to such agreements were to commence proceedings or exercise rights and remedies against the Subsidiary Counterparties, this would have a detrimental effect on the Applicants’ ability to restructure and implement the Proposed Transaction and would lead to an erosion of value of the Cinram Business; and
- c. a stay of proceedings that extends to Cinram LP and the Subsidiary Counterparties is necessary in order to maintain stability with respect to the Cinram Business and maintain value for the benefit of the Applicants’ stakeholders.

Bell Affidavit, paras. 185-186; Application Record, Tab 2.

62. The purpose of the CCAA is to preserve the *status quo* to enable a plan of compromise to be prepared, filed and considered by the creditors:

In the interim, a judge has great discretion under the CCAA to make order so as to effectively maintain the status quo in respect of an insolvent company while it attempts to gain the approval of its creditors for the proposed compromise or arrangement which will be to the benefit of both the company and its creditors.

Lehndorff General Partner Ltd., Re, supra at para. 5; Book of Authorities, Tab 6.
Canwest Global, supra at para. 27; Book of Authorities, Tab 1.
CCAA, Section 11.

63. The Court has broad inherent jurisdiction to impose stays of proceedings that supplement the statutory provisions of Section 11 of the CCAA, providing the Court with the power to grant a stay of proceedings where it is just and reasonable to do so, including with respect to non-applicant parties.

Lehndorff, supra at paras. 5 and 16; Book of Authorities, Tab 6.
T. Eaton Co., Re (1997), 46 C.B.R. (3d) 293 (Ont. Gen. Div.) at para. 6; Book of Authorities, Tab 9.

64. The Courts have found it just and reasonable to grant a stay of proceedings against third party non-applicants in a number of circumstances, including:

- a. where it is important to the reorganization process;
- b. where the business operations of the Applicants and the third party non-applicants are intertwined and the third parties are not subject to the jurisdiction of the CCAA, such as partnerships that do not qualify as “companies” within the meaning of the CCAA;
- c. against non-applicant subsidiaries of a debtor company where such subsidiaries were guarantors under the note indentures issued by the debtor company; and

- d. against non-applicant subsidiaries relating to any guarantee, contribution or indemnity obligation, liability or claim in respect of obligations and claims against the debtor companies.

Re Woodward's Ltd. (1993), 17 C.B.R. (3d) 236 (B.C. S.C.) at para. 31; Book of Authorities, Tab 10.

Lehndorff, *supra* at para. 21; Book of Authorities, Tab 6.

Canwest Global, *supra* at paras. 28 and 29; Book of Authorities, Tab 1.

Re Sino-Forest Corp. 2012 ONSC 2063 (Commercial List) at paras. 5, 18, and 31; Book of Authorities, Tab 11.

Re MAAX Corp., Initial Order granted June 12, 2008, Montreal 500-11-033561-081, (Que. Sup. Ct. [Commercial Division]) at para. 7; Book of Authorities, Tab 12.

65. The Applicants submit the balance of convenience favours extending the relief in the proposed Initial Order to Cinram LP and the Subsidiary Counterparties. The business operations of the Applicants, Cinram LP and the Subsidiary Counterparties are intertwined and the stay of proceedings is necessary to maintain stability and value for the benefit of the Applicants' stakeholders, as well as allow an orderly, going-concern sale of the Cinram Business as an important component of its reorganization process.

(3) Entitlement to Make Pre-Filing Payments

66. To ensure the continued operation of the CCAA Parties' business and maximization of value in the interests of Cinram's stakeholders, the Applicants seek authorization (but not a requirement) for the CCAA Parties to make certain pre-filing payments, including: (a) payments to employees in respect of wages, benefits, and related amounts; (b) payments to suppliers and service providers critical to the ongoing operation of the business; (c) payments and the application of credits in connection with certain existing customer programs; and (d) intercompany payments among the Applicants related to intercompany loans and shared services. Payments will be made with the consent of the Monitor and, in certain circumstances, with the consent of the Agent.

67. There is ample authority supporting the Court's general jurisdiction to permit payment of pre-filing obligations to persons whose services are critical to the ongoing operations of the debtor companies. This jurisdiction of the Court is not ousted by Section 11.4 of the CCAA, which became effective as part of the 2009 amendments to the CCAA and codified the Court's

practice of declaring a person to be a critical supplier and granting a charge on the debtor's property in favour of such critical supplier. As noted by Pepall J. in *Re Canwest Global*, the recent amendments, including Section 11.4, do not detract from the inherently flexible nature of the CCAA or the Court's broad and inherent jurisdiction to make such orders that will facilitate the debtor's restructuring of its business as a going concern.

Canwest Global supra, at paras. 41 and 43; Book of Authorities, Tab 1.

68. There are many cases since the 2009 amendments where the Courts have authorized the applicants to pay certain pre-filing amounts where the applicants were not seeking a charge in respect of critical suppliers. In granting this authority, the Courts considered a number of factors, including:

- a. whether the goods and services were integral to the business of the applicants;
- b. the applicants' dependency on the uninterrupted supply of the goods or services;
- c. the fact that no payments would be made without the consent of the Monitor;
- d. the Monitor's support and willingness to work with the applicants to ensure that payments to suppliers in respect of pre-filing liabilities are minimized;
- e. whether the applicants had sufficient inventory of the goods on hand to meet their needs; and
- f. the effect on the debtors' ongoing operations and ability to restructure if they were unable to make pre-filing payments to their critical suppliers.

Canwest Global supra, at para. 43; Book of Authorities, Tab 1.

Re Brainhunter Inc., [2009] O.J. No. 5207 (Sup. Ct. J. [Commercial List]) at para. 21 [*Brainhunter*]; Book of Authorities, Tab 13.

Re Prizm Income Fund (2012), 75 C.B.R. (5th) 213 (Ont. Sup. Ct. J.) at paras. 29-34; Book of Authorities, Tab 14.

69. The CCAA Parties rely on the efficient and expedited supply of products and services from their suppliers and service providers in order to ensure that their operations continue in an

efficient manner so that they can satisfy customer requirements. The CCAA Parties operate in a highly competitive environment where the timely provision of their products and services is essential in order for the company to remain a successful player in the industry and to ensure the continuance of the Cinram Business. The CCAA Parties require flexibility to ensure adequate and timely supply of required products and to attempt to obtain and negotiate credit terms with its suppliers and service providers. In order to accomplish this, the CCAA Parties require the ability to pay certain pre-filing amounts and post-filing payables to those suppliers they consider essential to the Cinram Business, as approved by the Monitor. The Monitor, in determining whether to approve pre-filing payments as critical to the ongoing business operations, will consider various factors, including the above factors derived from the caselaw.

Bell Affidavit, paras. 226, 228, 230; Application Record, Tab 2.

70. In addition, the CCAA Parties' continued compliance with their existing customer programs, as described in the Bell Affidavit, including the payment of certain pre-filing amounts owing under certain customer programs and the application of certain credits granted to customers pre-filing to post-filing receivables, is essential in order for the CCAA Parties to maintain their customer relationships as part of the CCAA Parties' going concern business.

Bell Affidavit, paras. 234; Application Record, Tab 2.

71. Further, due to the operational integration of the businesses of the CCAA Parties, as described above, there is a significant volume of financial transactions between and among the Applicants, including, among others, charges by an Applicant providing shared services to another Applicant of intercompany accounts due from the recipients of those services, and charges by a Applicant that manufactures and furnishes products to another Applicant of inter-company accounts due from the receiving entity.

Bell Affidavit, paras. 225; Application Record, Tab 2.

72. Accordingly, the Applicants submit that it is appropriate in the present circumstances for this Honourable Court to exercise its jurisdiction and grant the CCAA Parties the authority to make the pre-filing payments described in the proposed Initial Order subject to the terms therein.

(4) The Charges Are Appropriate

73. The Applicants seek approval of certain Court-ordered charges over their assets relating to their DIP Financing (defined below), administrative costs, indemnification of their trustees, directors and officers, KERP and Support Agreement. The Lenders and the Administrative Agent under the Credit Agreements, the senior secured facilities that will be primed by the charges, have been provided with notice of the within Application. The proposed Initial Order does not purport to give the Court-ordered charges priority over any other validly perfected security interests.

(A) DIP Lenders' Charge

74. In the proposed Initial Order, the Applicants seek approval of the DIP Credit Agreement providing a debtor-in-possession term facility in the principal amount of \$15 million (the "DIP Financing"), to be secured by a charge over all of the assets and property of the Applicants that are Borrowers and/or Guarantors under the Credit Agreements (the "Charged Property") ranking ahead of all other charges except the Administration Charge.

75. Section 11.2 of the CCAA expressly provides the Court the statutory jurisdiction to grant a debtor-in-possession ("DIP") financing charge:

11.2(1) *Interim financing* - On application by a debtor company and on notice to the secured creditors who are likely to be affected by the security or charge, a court may make an order declaring that all or part of the company's property is subject to a security or charge — in an amount that the court considers appropriate — in favour of a person specified in the order who agrees to lend to the company an amount approved by the court as being required by the company, having regard to its cash-flow statement. The security or charge may not secure an obligation that exists before the order is made.

11.2(2) *Priority* – secured creditors – The court may order that the security or charge rank in priority over the claim of any secured creditor of the company.

Re Timminco Ltd. (2012), 211 A.C.W.S. (3d) 881(Ont. Sup. Ct. J. [Commercial List]) at para. 31; Book of Authorities, Tab 15. CCAA, Section 11.2(1) and (2).

76. Section 11.2 of the CCAA sets out the following factors to be considered by the Court in deciding whether to grant a DIP financing charge:

11.2(4) Factors to be considered – In deciding whether to make an order, the court is to consider, among other things,

- (a) the period during which the company is expected to be subject to proceedings under this Act;
- (b) how the company's business and financial affairs are to be managed during the proceedings;
- (c) whether the company's management has the confidence of its major creditors;
- (d) whether the loan would enhance the prospects of a viable compromise or arrangement being made in respect of the company;
- (e) the nature and value of the company's property;
- (f) whether any creditor would be materially prejudiced as a result of the security or charge; and
- (g) the monitor's report referred to in paragraph 23(1)(b), if any.

CCAA, Section 11.2(4).

77. The above list of factors is not exhaustive, and it may be appropriate for the Court to consider additional factors in determining whether to grant a DIP financing charge. For example, in circumstances where funds to be borrowed pursuant to a DIP facility were not expected to be immediately necessary, but applicants' cash flow statements projected the need for additional liquidity, the Court in granting the requested DIP charge considered the fact that the applicants' ability to borrow funds that would be secured by a charge would help retain the confidence of their trade creditors, employees and suppliers.

Re Canwest Publishing Inc./Publications Canwest Inc. (2010), 63 C.B.R. (5th) 115 (Ont. Sup. Ct. J. [Commercial List]) at paras. 42-43 [*Canwest Publishing*]; Book of Authorities, Tab 16.

78. Courts in recent cross-border cases have exercised their broad power to grant charges to DIP lenders over the assets of foreign applicants. In many of these cases, the debtors have commenced recognition proceedings under Chapter 15.

Re Catalyst Paper Corporation, Initial Order granted on January 31, 2012, Court File No. S-120712 (B.C.S.C.) [*Catalyst Paper*]; Book of Authorities, Tab 17.

Angiotech, supra, Initial Order granted on January 28, 2011, Court File No. S-110587; Book of Authorities, Tab 18

Re Fraser Papers Inc., Initial Order granted on June 18, 2009, Court File No. CV-09-8241-00CL; Book of Authorities, Tab 19.

79. As noted above, pursuant to Section 11.2(1) of the CCAA, a DIP financing charge may not secure an obligation that existed before the order was made. The requested DIP Lenders' Charge will not secure any pre-filing obligations.

80. The following factors support the granting of the DIP Lenders' Charge, many of which incorporate the considerations enumerated in Section 11.2(4) listed above:

- a. the Cash Flow Forecast indicates the Applicants will need additional liquidity afforded by the DIP Financing in order to continue operations through the duration of these proposed CCAA Proceedings;

- b. the Cinram Business is intended to continue to operate on a going concern basis during these CCAA Proceedings under the direction of the current management with the assistance of the Applicants' advisors and the Monitor;
- c. the DIP Financing is expected to provide the Applicants with sufficient liquidity to implement the Proposed Transaction through these CCAA Proceedings and implement certain operational restructuring initiatives, which will materially enhance the likelihood of a going concern outcome for the Cinram Business;
- d. the nature and the value of the Applicants' assets as set out in their consolidated financial statements can support the requested DIP Lenders' Charge;
- e. members of the Steering Committee under the First Lien Credit Agreement, who are senior secured creditors of the Applicants, have agreed to provide the DIP Financing;
- f. the proposed DIP Lenders have indicated that they will not provide the DIP Financing if the DIP Lenders' Charge is not approved;
- g. the DIP Lenders' Charge will not secure any pre-filing obligations;
- h. the senior secured lenders under the Credit Agreements affected by the charge have been provided with notice of these CCAA Proceedings; and
- i. the proposed Monitor is supportive of the DIP Facility, including the DIP Lenders' Charge.

Bell Affidavit, paras. 199-202, 205-208; Application Record, Tab 2.

(B) Administration Charge

81. The Applicants seek a charge over the Charged Property in the amount of CAD\$3.5 million to secure the fees of the Monitor and its counsel, the Applicants' Canadian and U.S. counsel, the Applicants' Investment Banker, the Canadian and U.S. Counsel to the DIP Agent,

the DIP Lenders, the Administrative Agent and the Lenders under the Credit Agreements, and the financial advisor to the DIP Lenders and the Lenders under the Credit Agreements (the “Administration Charge”). This charge is to rank in priority to all of the other charges set out in the proposed Initial Order.

82. Prior to the 2009 amendments, administration charges were granted pursuant to the inherent jurisdiction of the Court. Section 11.52 of the CCAA now expressly provides the court with the jurisdiction to grant an administration charge:

11.52(1) *Court may order security or charge to cover certain costs*

On notice to the secured creditors who are likely to be affected by the security or charge, the court may make an order declaring that all or part of the property of a debtor company is subject to a security or charge -- in an amount that the court considers appropriate -- in respect of the fees and expenses of (a) the monitor, including the fees and expenses of any financial, legal or other experts engaged by the monitor in the performance of the monitor’s duties;

(b) any financial, legal or other experts engaged by the company for the purpose of proceedings under this Act; and

(c) any financial, legal or other experts engaged by any other interested person if the court is satisfied that the security or charge is necessary for their effective participation in proceedings under this Act.

11.52(2) *Priority*

The court may order that the security or charge rank in priority over the claim of any secured creditor of the company.

CCAA, Section 11.52(1) and (2).

82. Administration charges were granted pursuant to Section 11.52 in, among other cases, *Timminco, Canwest Global* and *Canwest Publishing*.

Canwest Global, *supra*; Book of Authorities, Tab 1.

Canwest Publishing, *supra*; Book of Authorities, Tab 16.

Re Timminco Ltd., 2012 ONSC 106 (Commercial List) [*Timminco*]; Book of Authorities, Tab 20.

84. In *Canwest Publishing*, the Court noted Section 11.52 does not contain any specific criteria for a court to consider in granting an administration charge and provided a list of non-exhaustive factors to consider in making such an assessment. These factors were also considered by the Court in *Timminco*. The list of factors to consider in approving an administration charge include:

- a. the size and complexity of the business being restructured;
- b. the proposed role of the beneficiaries of the charge;
- c. whether there is unwarranted duplication of roles;
- d. whether the quantum of the proposed charge appears to be fair and reasonable;
- e. the position of the secured creditors likely to be affected by the charge; and
- f. the position of the Monitor.

Canwest Publishing supra, at para. 54; Book of Authorities, Tab 16.

Timminco, supra, at paras. 26-29; Book of Authorities, Tab 20.

85. The Applicants submit that the Administration Charge is warranted and necessary, and that it is appropriate in the present circumstances for this Honourable Court to exercise its jurisdiction and grant the Administration Charge, given:

- a. the proposed restructuring of the Cinram Business is large and complex, spanning several jurisdictions across North America and Europe, and will require the extensive involvement of professional advisors;
- b. the professionals that are to be beneficiaries of the Administration Charge have each played a critical role in the CCAA Parties' restructuring efforts to date and will continue to be pivotal to the CCAA Parties' ability to pursue a successful restructuring going forward, including the Investment Banker's involvement in the completion of the Proposed Transaction;

- c. there is no unwarranted duplication of roles;
- d. the senior secured creditors affected by the charge have been provided with notice of these CCAA Proceedings; and
- e. the Monitor is in support of the proposed Administration Charge.

Bell Affidavit, paras. 188, 190; Application Record, Tab 2.

(C) Directors' Charge

86. The Applicants seek a Directors' Charge in an amount of CAD\$13 over the Charged Property to secure their respective indemnification obligations for liabilities imposed on the Applicants' trustees, directors and officers (the "Directors and Officers"). The Directors' Charge is to be subordinate to the Administration Charge and the DIP Lenders' Charge but in priority to the KERP Charge and the Consent Consideration Charge.

87. Section 11.51 of the CCAA affords the Court the jurisdiction to grant a charge relating to directors' and officers' indemnification on a priority basis:

11.51(1) Security or charge relating to director's indemnification

On application by a debtor company and on notice to the secured creditors who are likely to be affected by the security or charge -- in an amount that the court considers appropriate -- in favour of any director or officer of the company to indemnify the director or officer against obligations and liabilities that they may incur as a director or officer of the company after the commencement of proceedings under this Act.

11.51(2) Priority

The court may order that the security or charge rank in priority over the claim of any secured creditors of the company

11.51(3) Restriction -- indemnification insurance

The court may not make the order if in its opinion the company could obtain adequate indemnification insurance for the director or officer at a reasonable cost.

11.51(4) Negligence, misconduct or fault

The court shall make an order declaring that the security or charge

does not apply in respect of a specific obligation or liability incurred by a director or officer if in its opinion the obligation or liability was incurred as a result of the director's or officer's gross negligence or wilful misconduct or, in Quebec, the director's or officer's gross or intentional fault.

CCAA, Section 11.51.

88. The Court has granted director and officer charges pursuant to Section 11.51 in a number of cases. In *Canwest Global*, the Court outlined the test for granting such a charge:

I have already addressed the issue of notice to affected secured creditors. I must also be satisfied with the amount and that the charge is for obligations and liabilities the directors and officers may incur after the commencement of proceedings. It is not to extend to coverage of wilful misconduct or gross negligence and no order should be granted if adequate insurance at a reasonable cost could be obtained.

Canwest Global, *supra* at paras 46-48; Book of Authorities, Tab 1.

Canwest Publishing, *supra* at paras. 56-57; Book of Authorities, Tab 16.

Timminco, *supra* at paras. 30-36; Book of Authorities, Tab 20.

89. The Applicants submit that the D&O Charge is warranted and necessary, and that it is appropriate in the present circumstances for this Honourable Court to exercise its jurisdiction and grant the D&O Charge in the amount of CAD\$13 million, given:

- a. the Directors and Officers of the Applicants may be subject to potential liabilities in connection with these CCAA proceedings with respect to which the Directors and Officers have expressed their desire for certainty with respect to potential personal liability if they continue in their current capacities;
- b. renewal of coverage to protect the Directors and Officers is at a significantly increased cost due to the imminent commencement of these CCAA proceedings;
- c. the Directors' Charge would cover obligations and liabilities that the Directors and Officers, as applicable, may incur after the commencement of these CCAA Proceedings and is not intended to cover wilful misconduct or gross negligence;

- d. the Applicants require the continued support and involvement of their Directors and Officers who have been instrumental in the restructuring efforts of the CCAA Parties to date;
- e. the senior secured creditors affected by the charge have been provided with notice of these CCAA proceedings; and
- f. the Monitor is in support of the proposed Directors' Charge.

Bell Affidavit, paras. 249, 250, 254-257 ; Application Record, Tab 2.

(D) KERP Charge

90. The Applicants seek a KERP Charge in an amount of CAD\$3 million over the Charged Property to secure the KERP Retention Payments, KERP Transaction Payments and Aurora KERP Payments payable to certain key employees of the CCAA Parties crucial for the CCAA Parties' successful restructuring.

91. The CCAA is silent with respect to the granting of KERP charges. Approval of a KERP and a KERP charge are matters within the discretion of the Court. The Court in *Re Grant Forest Products Inc.* considered a number of factors in determining whether to grant a KERP and a KERP charge, including:

- a. whether the Monitor supports the KERP agreement and charge (to which great weight was attributed);
- b. whether the employees to which the KERP applies would consider other employment options if the KERP agreement were not secured by the KERP charge;
- c. whether the continued employment of the employees to which the KERP applies is important for the stability of the business and to enhance the effectiveness of the marketing process;

- d. the employees' history with and knowledge of the debtor;
- e. the difficulty in finding a replacement to fulfill the responsibilities of the employees to which the KERP applies;
- f. whether the KERP agreement and charge were approved by the board of directors, including the independent directors, as the business judgment of the board should not be ignored;
- g. whether the KERP agreement and charge are supported or consented to by secured creditors of the debtor; and
- h. whether the payments under the KERP are payable upon the completion of the restructuring process.

Re Grant Forest Products Inc. (2009), 57 C.B.R. (5th) 128 (Ont. Sup. Ct. J [Commercial List]) at para. 8-24 [*Grant Forest*]; Book of Authorities, Tab 21.

Canwest Publishing supra, at paras 59; Book of Authorities, Tab 16.

Canwest Global supra, at para. 49; Book of Authorities, Tab 1.

Re Timminco Ltd. (2012), 95 C.C.P.B. 48 (Ont. Sup. Ct. J [Commercial List]) at paras. 72-75; Book of Authorities, Tab 22.

92. The purpose of a KERP arrangement is to retain key personnel for the duration of the debtor's restructuring process and it is logical for compensation under a KERP arrangement to be deferred until after the restructuring process has been completed, with "staged bonuses" being acceptable. KERP arrangements that do not defer retention payments to completion of the restructuring may also be just and fair in the circumstances.

Grant Forest, supra at para. 22-23; Book of Authorities, Tab 21.

93. The Applicants submit that the KERP Charge is warranted and necessary, and that it is appropriate in the present circumstances for this Honourable Court to exercise its jurisdiction and grant the KERP Charge in the amount of CAD\$3 million, given:

- a. the KERP was developed by Cinram with the principal purpose of providing an incentive to the Eligible Employees, the Eligible Officers, and the Aurora

Employees to remain with the Cinram Group while the company pursued its restructuring efforts;

- b. the Eligible Employees and the Eligible Officers are essential for a restructuring of the Cinram Group and the preservation of Cinram's value during the restructuring process;
- c. the Aurora Employees are essential for an orderly transition of Cinram Distribution's business operations from the Aurora facility to its Nashville facility;
- d. it would be detrimental to the restructuring process if Cinram were required to find replacements for the Eligible Employees, the Eligible Officers and/or the Aurora Employees during this critical period;
- e. the KERP, including the KERP Retention Payments, the KERP Transaction Payments and the Aurora KERP Payments payable thereunder, not only provides appropriate incentives for the Eligible Employees, the Eligible Officers and the Aurora Employees to remain in their current positions, but also ensures that they are properly compensated for their assistance in Cinram's restructuring process;
- f. the senior secured creditors affected by the charge have been provided with notice of these CCAA proceedings; and
- g. the KERP has been reviewed and approved by the board of trustees of Cinram Fund and is supported by the Monitor.

Bell Affidavit, paras. 236-239, 245-247; Application Record, Tab 2.

(E) Consent Consideration Charge

94. The Applicants request the Consent Consideration Charge over the Charged Property to secure the Early Consent Consideration. The Consent Consideration Charge is to be subordinate

in priority to the Administration Charge, the DIP Lenders' Charge, the Directors' Charge and the KERP Charge.

95. The Courts have permitted the opportunity to receive consideration for early consent to a restructuring transaction in the context of CCAA proceedings payable upon implementation of such restructuring transaction. In *Sino-Forest*, the Court ordered that any noteholder wishing to become a consenting noteholder under the support agreement and entitled to early consent consideration was required to execute a joinder agreement to the support agreement prior to the applicable consent deadline. Similarly, in these proceedings, lenders under the First Lien Credit Agreement who execute the Support Agreement (or a joinder thereto) and thereby agree to support the Proposed Transaction on or before July 10, 2012, are entitled to Early Consent Consideration earned on consummation of the Proposed Transaction to be paid from the net sale proceeds.

Sino-Forest, supra, Initial Order granted on March 30, 2012, Court File No. CV-12-9667-00CL at para. 15; Book of Authorities, Tab 23. Bell Affidavit, para. 176; Application Record, Tab 2.

96. The Applicants submit it is appropriate in the present circumstances for this Honourable Court to exercise its jurisdiction and grant the Consent Consideration Charge, given:

- a. the Proposed Transaction will enable the Cinram Business to continue as a going concern and return to a market leader in the industry;
- b. Consenting Lenders are only entitled to the Early Consent Consideration if the Proposed Transaction is consummated; and
- c. the Early Consent Consideration is to be paid from the net sale proceeds upon distribution of same in these proceedings.

Bell Affidavit, para. 176; Application Record, Tab 2.

TAB 8

SUPERIOR COURT OF JUSTICE - ONTARIO

RE: IN THE MATTER OF THE *COMPANIES' CREDITORS ARRANGEMENT ACT*,
R.S.C. 1985, c. C-36, AS AMENDED

AND IN THE MATTER OF A PLAN OF COMPROMISE AND
ARRANGEMENT OF CLINE MINING CORPORATION, NEW ELK COAL
COMPANY LLC AND NORTH CENTRAL ENERGY COMPANY

BEFORE: Regional Senior Justice G.B. Morawetz

COUNSEL: *Robert J. Chadwick and Logan Willis*, for the Applicants

J. Swartz, for the Secured Noteholders

Marc Wasserman and Michael De Lellis, for FTI Consulting Canada Inc.,
Proposed Monitor

HEARD: December 3, 2014

ENDORSEMENT

[1] Cline Mining Corporation ("Cline"), New Elk Coal Company LLC ("New Elk"), North Central Energy Company ("North Central") and, together with Cline and New Elk (the "Applicants") are in the business of locating, exploring and developing mineral resource properties, with a focus on gold and metallurgical coal (the "Cline Business"). The Applicants, along with their wholly-owned subsidiary, Raton Basin Analytical LLC ("Raton Basin") and, together with the Applicants (the "Cline Group") have interests in resource properties in Canada, the United States and Madagascar.

[2] The Applicants apply for an initial order pursuant to the provisions of the *Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act* ("CCAA") and, if granted, the Applicants also seek an order (the "Claims Procedure Order") approving a claims process (the "Claims Procedure") for the identification and determination of claims against the Applicants and their present and former directors and officers. The Applicants also seek an order (the "Meetings Order") *inter alia*: (i) accepting the filing of a plan of compromise and arrangement in respect of the Applicants (the "Plan"); (ii) authorizing the Applicants to call, hold and conduct meetings (the "Meetings") of creditors whose claims are to be affected by the Plan for the purpose of enabling such creditors to consider and vote on a resolution to approve the Plan; and (iii) approving the procedures to be followed with respect to the calling and conduct of the Meetings.

[3] The Cline Group has experienced financial challenges that necessitate a recapitalization of the Applicants under the CCAA. As set out in the affidavit of Mr. Matthew Goldfarb, Chief Restructuring Officer and Acting Chief Executive Officer of Cline, the performance of the Cline Business has been adversely affected by the broader industry wide challenges, particularly the protracted downturn in prevailing prices for metallurgical coal. Operations at the New Elk metallurgical coal mine in Colorado (the “New Elk Mine”) were suspended in July 2012 because the mine could not operate profitably as a result of a decline in the market price of metallurgical coal. The suspension of mining activities was intended to be temporary. However, Mr. Goldfarb contends that market conditions in the coal industry have not sufficiently recovered and the suspension of full scale mining activities is still in effect.

[4] Mr. Goldfarb contends that the Cline Group’s other resource investments remain at the feasibility, exploration and/or development stages and the Cline Group’s current inability to derive profit from the New Elk Mine has rendered the Applicants unable to meet their financial obligations as they become due.

[5] Cline is in default of its 2011 series 10% Senior Secured Notes (the “2011 Notes”) as well as its 2013 series 10% Senior Secured Notes (the “2013 Notes”, and collectively with the 2011 Notes, the “Secured Notes”). As at December 1, 2014, total obligations in excess of \$110 million are owed in respect of the Secured Notes, which matured on June 15, 2014. The Secured Notes were subject to Forbearance Agreements that expired on November 28, 2014 and Mr. Goldfarb contends that the Applicants do not have the ability to repay the Secured Notes.

[6] The Secured Notes are issued by Cline and guaranteed by New Elk and North Central. The indenture trustee in respect of the Secured Notes (the “Trustee”) holds a first ranking security interest over substantially all the assets of Cline, New Elk and North Central. Mr. Goldfarb states that the amounts owing under the Secured Notes exceed the value of the Cline Business and that there would be no recovery for unsecured creditors if the Trustee were to enforce its security against the Applicants in respect of the Secured Notes.

[7] The Secured Notes are held by beneficial owners whose investments are managed by Marret Asset Management Inc. (“Marret”). Marret exercises all discretion and authority in respect of the holders of the Secured Notes (the “Secured Noteholders”). Cline has engaged in discussions with representatives of Marret regarding a consensual recapitalization of the Applicants and these discussions have resulted in a proposed recapitalization transaction that is supported by Marret, on behalf of the Secured Noteholders (the “Recapitalization”).

[8] Mr. Goldfarb states that if implemented, the Recapitalization would:

- a. maintain the Cline Group as a unified corporate enterprise;
- b. reduce the Applicants’ secured indebtedness by more than \$55 million;
- c. reduce the Applicants’ annual interest expense in the near term;
- d. preserve certain tax attributes within the restructured company; and

- e. effectuate a reduced debt structure to enable the Cline Group to better withstand prolonged weakness in the price of metallurgical coal.

[9] Mr. Goldfarb also states that the Recapitalization would also provide a limited recovery for the Applicants' unsecured creditors, who would otherwise receive no recovery in a security enforcement or asset sale scenario. It is contemplated that the Recapitalization would be implemented pursuant to a plan of compromise and arrangement under the CCAA (the "CCAA Plan") that is recognized in the United States under Chapter 15, Title 11 of the United States Bankruptcy Code ("Chapter 15").

[10] Cline and Marret have entered into a Support Agreement dated December 2, 2014 that sets forth the principal terms of the proposed Recapitalization. Based on Marret's agreement to the Recapitalization (on behalf of the Secured Noteholders), the Applicants have achieved support from their senior ranking creditors, which represent in excess of 95% of the Applicants' total indebtedness.

[11] The Applicants seek the Initial Order to stabilize their financial situation and to proceed with the Recapitalization as efficiently as possible, and to this end, the Applicants request that the Court also grant the Claims Procedure Order and the Meetings Order.

[12] Cline is a public company incorporated under the laws of British Columbia, with its registered head office located in Vancouver. Cline commenced business under the laws of Ontario in 2003 and Mr. Goldfarb states that its principal office, which serves as the head office and nerve centre of the Cline Group is located in Toronto.

[13] Cline is the direct or indirect parent company of New Elk, North Central and Raton Basin. Cline also holds minority interests in Iron Ore Corporation in Madagascar SARL, Strike Minerals Inc. and UMC Energy plc, all of which are exploration companies.

[14] Cline is the sole shareholder of New Elk, a limited liability company incorporated pursuant to the laws of Colorado. New Elk holds mining rights in the New Elk Mine and maintains a Canadian bank account with the Bank of Montreal in Toronto.

[15] New Elk is the sole shareholder of North Central and Raton Basin, both of which are incorporated pursuant to the laws of Colorado. North Central holds a fee-simple interest in certain coal parcels on which the New Elk Mine is situated and maintains a Canadian bank account with the Bank of Montreal in Toronto. Raton Basis is inactive and is not an applicant in the proceedings.

[16] Cline Group prepares its financial statements on a consolidated basis. The required financial statements are in the record. As at August 31, 2014, the Cline Group's liabilities were approximately \$99 million. The primary secured liabilities were the 2011 Notes in the principal amount in excess of \$71 million, plus accrued and unpaid interest, and the 2013 Notes in the principal amount of approximately \$12 million, plus accrued and unpaid interest. Both the 2011 Notes and the 2013 Notes matured on June 15, 2014.

[17] Pursuant to an Inter-Creditor Agreement, the 2011 Notes and the 2013 Notes have a first ranking security interest on the property and undertakings of the Applicants and rank *pari passu* as between each other.

[18] Cline and New Elk are defendants in an uncertified class action lawsuit alleging that they violated the *WARN Act* by failing to provide personnel who provided services to New Elk with at least 60 days advance written notice of the suspension of both scale production at the New Elk Mine. These allegations are disputed.

[19] The Applicants are aware of approximately \$3.5 million in other unsecured claims.

[20] On December 16, 2013, Cline was unable to make semi-annual interest payments in respect of both the 2011 and 2013 Notes. A Forbearance Agreement was entered into. During the forbearance period, the Applicants engaged Moelis & Company to conduct a comprehensive sale process in an effort to maximize value for the Applicant and its stakeholders (the "Sales Process"). No offers or expressions of interest were received in the Sale Process.

[21] The forbearance period expired on November 28, 2014 and Mr. Goldfarb has stated that Marret has confirmed that the Secured Noteholders have given instructions to the Trustee to accelerate the Secured Notes.

[22] Accordingly, Cline is immediately required to pay in excess of \$110 million in respect of the Secured Notes. Mr. Goldfarb states that the Cline Group does not have the ability to pay these amounts and consequently the Trustee is in a position to enforce its security over the assets and property of the Applicants.

[23] In light of these financial conditions, Mr. Goldfarb states that the Applicants are insolvent.

[24] Mr. Goldfarb also contends that without the benefit of CCAA protection, there could be an erosion of the value of the Cline Group and that the stay of proceedings under the CCAA is required to preserve the value of the Cline Group.

[25] The Applicants are seeking the appointment of FTI Consulting Canada Inc. ("FTI") as the proposed monitor in these proceedings (the "Monitor").

[26] The proposed Initial Order also provides for a court ordered charge (the "Administration Charge") to be granted in favour of the Monitor, its counsel, counsel to the Applicants, the Chief Restructuring Officer (the "CRO") and counsel to Marret in respect of their fees and disbursements incurred at the standard rates and charges. The proposed Administration Charge is an aggregate amount of \$350,000.

[27] The directors and officers have expressed their desire for certainty with respect to potential personal liability if they continue in their current capacities. Mr. Goldfarb states that in order to continue to carry on business during the CCAA proceedings and in order to conduct the Recapitalization most effectively, the Applicants require the active and committed involvement

of the board and, accordingly, the proposed Initial Order provides for a court ordered charge (the “Directors’ Charge”) in the amount of \$500,000 to secure the Applicants’ indemnification of its directors and officers in respect of liabilities they may incur during the CCAA proceedings. The amount of the Directors’ Charge has been calculated based on the estimated exposure of the directors and officers and has been reviewed with the prospective Monitor. The proposed Directors Charge would only apply to the extent that the directors and officers do not have coverage under the D&O insurance policy with AIG Insurance Company of Canada.

[28] The Applicants seek to complete the Recapitalization as quickly as reasonably possible and they anticipate that their existing cash resources will provide the Cline Group with sufficient liquidity during the CCAA proceedings.

[29] It is also contemplated that foreign recognition proceedings will be sought in Colorado pursuant to Chapter 15. The Applicants seek the authorization for the Monitor to act as the foreign representative of the Applicants in the CCAA proceedings and to seek recognition of these proceedings in the United States pursuant to Chapter 15.

[30] Having reviewed the record, including the affidavit of Mr. Goldfarb and the pre-filing report submitted by FTI, I am satisfied that each of the Applicants is “a debtor company” within the meaning of the defined term in s. 2 of the CCAA.

[31] Cline is a “company” within the meaning of the CCAA. It is incorporated under the laws of British Columbia with gold development assets in Ontario and does business from its head office in Toronto.

[32] New Elk and North Central are incorporated in Colorado, have assets in Canada, namely bank accounts in Toronto and are directed from Cline’s head office in Toronto. In my view, each of New Elk and North Central is a “company” within the meaning of the CCAA because it is an incorporated company having assets in Canada.

[33] I am also satisfied that the Applicants meet both the traditional test for insolvency under the *Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act* and the expanded test for insolvency based on a looming liquidity condition given that Cline has been unable to make interest payments under the Secured Notes, the Secured Notes have matured, the Forbearance Agreement has expired and the Trustee is in a position to enforce its security over the property of the Applicants. Further, I am satisfied that the Applicants are unable to obtain traditional or alternative financing to support the day-to-day operations and there is no reasonable expectation that the Applicants will be able to generate sufficient cash flow from operations to support their existing debt obligations (see: *(Re) Stelco Inc.* (2004), 48 CBR (4th) 299 (Ont. Sup. Ct. (Commercial List)); leave to appeal to CA refused (2004) O.J. No. 1903; leave to appeal to SCC refused (2004) SCC No. 336).

[34] It is also clear that the Applicants’ liabilities far exceed the \$5 million threshold amount under the CCAA.

[35] In my view, the CCAA applies to the Applicants’ as “debtor companies” in accordance with s. 3(1) of the CCAA.

[36] The Applicants have filed the required financial information, including audited financial statements and the cash-flow forecast.

[37] The Applicants in the Initial Order seek authorization (but not a requirement) to make certain pre-filing payments, including, *inter alia*:

- a. payments to employees of effective wages, benefits and related amounts;
- b. the amounts owing to respective individuals working as independent contractors;
- c. the fees and disbursements of any consultants, agents, experts, accountants, counsel or other persons currently retained by the Applicants in respect of the CCAA; and
- d. certain expenses incurred by the Applicants in carrying on the business in the ordinary course, that pertains to the period prior to the date of the Initial Order, if, in the opinion of the Applicants and with the consent of the Monitor, the applicable supplier or service provider is critical to the Cline Business and the ongoing operations of the Cline Group.

[38] The court has jurisdiction to permit payment of pre-filing obligations to persons whose services are critical to the ongoing operations of the debtor's companies (see: *(Re) Canwest Global Communications Corp.* (2009), 59 CBR (5th) 72; *(Re) Cinram International Inc.*, 2012 ONSC 3767 and *(Re) Skylink Aviation Inc.*, 2013 ONSC 1500). In granting such authorization, the courts consider a number of factors, including:

- a. whether the goods and services were integral to the business of the applicants;
- b. the applicants' need for the uninterrupted supply of the goods or services;
- c. the fact that no payments would be made without the consent of the monitor;
- d. the monitor's support and willingness to work with the applicants to ensure that payments to suppliers in respect of pre-filing liabilities were appropriate;
- e. whether the applicants had sufficient inventory of goods on hand to meet their needs; and
- f. the effect on the debtor's ongoing operations and ability to restructure if they were unable to make pre-filing payments to their critical suppliers.

[39] In this case, the Applicants are of the view that their employees and certain of their independent contractors, certain suppliers of goods and services and certain providers of permits and licences are critical to the operation of the Cline Business. Mr. Goldfarb believes that such

persons should be paid in the ordinary course, including in respect of pre-filing amounts, in order to avoid disruption to the Applicants' operations during the CCAA proceedings.

[40] I am satisfied that it is appropriate in the present circumstances to grant the Applicants the authority to pay certain pre and post-filing obligations, subject to the terms and conditions in the proposed Initial Order.

[41] Turning now to the request for the Administration Charge, s. 11.52 of the CCAA expressly provides the court with the jurisdiction to grant the Administration Charge. In *(Re) Canwest Publishing Inc.*, 2010 ONSC 222, the court noted that s. 11.52 does not contain any specific criteria for a court to consider in granting an administration charge and provide a list of non-exhaustive factors to consider in making such an assessment. The list of factors to consider include:

- a. the size and complexity of the business being restructured;
- b. the proposed role of the beneficiaries of the charge;
- c. whether there is unwarranted duplication of roles;
- d. whether the quantum of the proposed charge appears to be fair and reasonable;
- e. the position of the secured creditors likely to be affected by the charge; and
- f. the position of the monitor.

[42] The Applicants submit that the Administration Charge is warranted and necessary for the reasons set forth in Mr. Goldfarb's affidavit at paragraphs 133 – 140.

[43] I am satisfied that in these circumstances, the granting of the Administration Charge is warranted and necessary and that it is appropriate for the court to exercise its jurisdiction to grant the Administration Charge in the amount of \$350,000.

[44] The Applicants also seek a Directors' Charge in the amount of \$500,000.

[45] Section 11.51 of the CCAA affords the court the jurisdiction to grant a charge relating to directors' and officers' indemnification on a priority basis. The court has granted director and officer charges in a number of cases including *Canwest Global, supra*, *Canwest Publishing, supra*, *Cinram, supra* and *Skylink, supra*.

[46] The Applicants submit that the Directors' Charge is warranted and necessary and that it is appropriate in the present circumstances for the court to exercise its jurisdiction and grant the charge in the amount of \$500,000.

[47] For the reasons set out in Mr. Goldfarb's affidavit at paragraphs 134 - 138, I accept these submissions.

[48] The Applicants have also indicated that, with the assistance of the Monitor as foreign representative, they intend to commence Chapter 15 proceedings in the United States Bankruptcy Court for the District of Colorado. Pursuant to s. 56 of the CCAA, the court has the authority to appoint a foreign representative of the Applicants for the purpose of having these proceedings recognized in a jurisdiction outside of Canada.

[49] The Applicants seek authorization for each of the Applicants and the Monitor to apply to any court for recognition of the Initial Order and authorization for the Monitor to act as representative in respect of these CCAA proceedings for the purpose of having the CCAA proceedings recognized outside of Canada.

[50] I am satisfied that it is appropriate to appoint the Monitor as foreign representative of the Applicants with respect to these proceedings.

[51] The Applicants, in their factum, also address the issue of the Applicants' "center of main interest" as being in Ontario. These submissions are set out at paragraphs 77 – 84 of the Applicants' Factum.

[52] Although the submissions are of interest, the determination of the Applicants' "center of main interest" ("COMI") is an issue to be considered by the United States Bankruptcy Court for the District of Colorado, rather than this court.

[53] The Applicants also seek a postponement of the Annual Shareholders Meeting. The previous Annual Meeting of Cline was held on August 15, 2013 and therefore Cline was required by statute to hold an annual general meeting by November 15, 2014.

[54] Mr. Goldfarb states that it would serve no purpose for Cline to call and hold its annual meeting of Shareholders given that the Shareholders of Cline no longer have an economic interest in Cline as a result of the insolvency. The Applicants submit that it is appropriate for the court to exercise its jurisdiction to relieve Cline from its obligation to call and hold its annual meeting of Shareholders until after the termination of the CCAA proceedings or further order of the court. In support of this request, the Applicants reference *Canwest Global, supra* and *Skylink, supra*.

[55] In my view, the request to postpone the annual Shareholders meeting is appropriate in the circumstances and is granted.

[56] In the result, I am satisfied that the Applicants meet all of the qualifications required to obtain the requested relief under the CCAA and the Initial Order is granted in the form presented.

[57] The Applicants also request two additional orders that they believe are necessary to advance the Recapitalization:

- a. an order establishing a process for the identification and determination of claims against the Applicants and their present and former directors and officers (the Claims Procedure Order); and
- b. an order authorizing the Applicants to file the Plan and to convene meetings of their affected creditors to consider and vote on the Plan (the Meetings Order).

[58] The Applicants seek the Claims Procedure Order and the Meetings Order at this stage because they wish to effectuate the recapitalization as efficiently as possible. Further, the Applicants submit that the “comeback clauses” included in the draft Claims Procedure Order and Meetings Order ensure that no party is prejudiced by the granting of such order at this time.

[59] The Applicants have submitted a factum in support of the Claims Procedure Order and Meetings Order. In the factual background to the Recapitalization and proposed Plan, the Claims Procedure and the meeting of creditors is set out at paragraphs 8 – 29 of the factum. For informational purposes, these paragraphs are set out in Appendix “A” to this Endorsement.

[60] The issues to be considered on this motion are whether:

- (a) it is appropriate to proceed with the Claims Procedure;
- (b) it is appropriate to permit the Applicants to file the Plan and call the meetings;
- (c) the proposed classification of creditors is appropriate; and
- (d) a consolidated plan is appropriate in the circumstances.

[61] In *(Re) Skylink, supra* at paragraph 35, I noted that while it is not the usual practice for applicants to request claims procedure and meetings order concurrently with an initial CCAA application, the court has granted such relief in appropriate circumstances. The support for a restructuring proposal from the only creditors with an economic interest, and the existence of a comeback hearing at which any issues in respect of the orders can be addressed, are two factors that militate in favour of granting the Claims Procedure and Meetings Order concurrently with the initial application.

[62] In my view, the foregoing comment is applicable in these proceedings.

[63] I also note that both the Claims Procedure Order and the Meetings Order provide that any interested party that wishes to amend the Claims Procedure Order or the Meetings Order, as applicable, can bring a motion on a comeback date to be set by the court.

[64] I also accept that most of the Applicants’ known creditors are familiar with the Applicants and the Cline Business and the determination of most of the claims against the Applicants would be carried out by the Applicants using the Notice of Claim Procedure. As

such, the Applicants submit that a claims bar date of January 13, 2015 will provide sufficient time for creditors to assert their claims and will not result in any prejudice to said creditors.

[65] Based on the submissions of the Applicants, I accept this submission.

[66] Accordingly, I am satisfied that the court should exercise its discretion and grant the requested Claims Procedure Order at this time.

[67] Turning now to the issue as to whether it is appropriate to permit the Applicants to file the Plan and call the meetings, the court is not required to address the fairness and reasonableness of the Plan at this stage.

[68] In these circumstances, I am satisfied that it is appropriate to grant the Meetings Order at this time in order to allow the Meetings Procedure to proceed concurrently with the Claims Procedure, with a view to completing the Recapitalization as efficiently as possible.

[69] Commencing at paragraph 42 of the factum, the Applicants make submissions with respect to the proposed classification of creditors for voting purposes.

[70] The Applicants submit that the holders of the 2011 Notes and the 2013 Notes have a commonality of interest in respect of their *pro rata* share of the Secured Noteholders Allowed Secured Claim and should be placed in the same class for voting purposes.

[71] For the purposes of the motion today, I am prepared to accept that it is appropriate for the Secured Noteholders to vote in the same class in respect of their Secured Noteholders Allowed Secured Claim.

[72] The Affected Unsecured Creditors' Class includes creditors with unsecured claims against the Applicants, including the Secured Noteholders in respect of their Secured Noteholders Allowed Unsecured Claim and, if applicable, Marret in respect of the Marret Unsecured Claim. The Applicants submit that the affected Unsecured Creditors have a commonality of interest and should be placed in the same class for voting purposes.

[73] It is noted that the determination of the Secured Noteholders Allowed Unsecured Claim has been determined by the Applicants and Marret and, for purposes of voting at the Secured Noteholders Meeting, is set at \$17.5 million.

[74] For the purposes of the motion today, I am prepared to accept the submissions of the Applicants including their determination of the affected Unsecured Creditors class.

[75] The *WARN Act* plaintiffs class consists of potential members of an uncertified class action proceeding. The Applicants submit that the *WARN Act* claims have been asserted by only two *WARN Act* plaintiffs on behalf of other potential members of the class and these claims have not been proven and are contested by the Applicants.

[76] Due to the unique nature and status of these claims, the Applicants have offered the *WARN Act* plaintiffs consideration that is different than the consideration offered to the Affected Unsecured Creditors.

[77] I accept, for the purposes of this motion, that the *WARN Act* plaintiffs should be placed in a separate class for voting purposes.

[78] With respect to holders of “Equity Claims”, the Meetings Order provides that any person with a claim that meets the definition of “equity claim” under s. 2(1) of the CCAA will have no right to, and will not, vote at meetings; and the Plan provides that equity claimants will not receive a distribution under the Plan or otherwise recover anything in respect of their equity claims or equity interest.

[79] For the purposes of this motion, I accept the submission of the Applicants that it is appropriate for equity claimants to be prohibited from voting on the Plan.

[80] The Plan as proposed by the Applicants is a consolidated plan of arrangement that is intended to address the combined claims against all the Applicants. Courts will authorize a consolidated plan of arrangement to be filed for two or more related companies in appropriate circumstances (see, for example: *(Re) Northland Properties Ltd.* (1988), 69 CBR (NS) 226 (BCSC); *(Re) Lehndorff General Partners Ltd.* (1993), 17 CBR (3d) 24).

[81] In this case, the Applicants submit that a consolidated plan is appropriate because:

- a. New Elk is a wholly-owned subsidiary of Cline and North Central is a wholly-owned subsidiary of New Elk;
- b. the Applicants are integrated members of the Cline Group, and there is significant sharing of business functions within the Cline Group;
- c. the Applicants have prepared consolidated financial statements;
- d. all three of the Applicants are obligors in respect of the Secured Notes;
- e. the Secured Noteholders are the only creditors with an economic interest in any of the three Applicants and have a first ranking security interest over all or substantially all of the assets, property and undertakings of each of the Applicants;
- f. the *WARN Act* claims are asserted against both Cline and New Elk under a “single employer” theory of liability;
- g. North Central has no known liabilities other than its obligations in respect of the Secured Notes;

- h. Unsecured Creditors of the Applicants would receive no recovery outside of the Plan; and
- i. the filing of a consolidated plan does not prejudice any affected Unsecured Creditor or *WARN Act* plaintiff, since a consolidated plan will not eliminate any veto position with respect to approval of the plan that such creditors would have if separate plans of arrangement were filed in respect of each of the Applicants.

[82] For the purposes of the motion today, I accept these submissions and consider it appropriate to authorize the filing of a consolidated plan.

[83] In the result, I am satisfied that it is appropriate to grant both the Claims Procedure Order and the Meetings Order at this time.

[84] It is specifically noted that the “comeback clause” that is included in both the Claims Procedure and the Meetings Orders will allow parties to come back before this court to amend or vary the Claims Procedure Order or the Meetings Order. The comeback hearing has been scheduled for Monday, December 22, 2014.

Regional Senior Justice G.B. Morawetz

Date: December 3, 2014

APPENDIX “A”

A. RECAPITALIZATION AND PROPOSED PLAN

(1) Overview of the Recapitalization

8. The Applicants have been actively engaged in discussions with Marret, on behalf of the Secured Noteholders, regarding a possible recapitalization of the Applicants. The Applicants believe that the Recapitalization, in the circumstances, is in the best interests of the Applicants and their stakeholders. The Recapitalization provides for, *inter alia*, the following:
- (a) the Secured Noteholders Allowed Secured Claim will be compromised, released and discharged as against the Applicants upon implementation of the Plan (the “**Plan Implementation Date**”) for new Cline common shares representing 100% of the equity in Cline (the “**New Cline Common Shares**”), and new indebtedness in favour of the Secured Noteholders in the principal amount of \$55 million (the “**New Secured Debt**”);
 - (b) Cline will be the borrower and New Elk and North Central will be the guarantors of the New Secured Debt, which will be evidenced by a credit agreement with a term of seven (7) years, bearing interest at a rate of 0.01% per annum plus an additional variable interest payable only once the Applicants have achieved certain operating revenue targets;
 - (c) the claims of Affected Unsecured Creditors, which exclude the WARN Act Plaintiffs but include the Secured Noteholders in respect of the Secured Noteholders Allowed Unsecured Claim, will be compromised, released and discharged as against the Applicants on the Plan Implementation Date in exchange for an unsecured, subordinated, non-interest bearing entitlement to receive \$225,000 from Cline on the date that is eight (8) years from the Plan Implementation Date (the “**Unsecured Plan Entitlement**”);
 - (d) notwithstanding the Secured Noteholders Allowed Unsecured Claim, the Secured Noteholders will waive their entitlement to the proceeds of the Unsecured Plan Entitlement, and all such proceeds will be available for distribution to the other Affected Unsecured Creditors with valid claims who are entitled to the Unsecured Plan Entitlement, allocated on a *pro rata* basis;
 - (e) all Affected Unsecured Creditors with Affected Unsecured Claims of up to \$10,000 will, instead of receiving their *pro rata* share of the Unsecured Plan Entitlement, be paid in cash for the full value of their claim and will be deemed to vote in favour of the Plan unless they indicate otherwise, provided that this cash payment will not apply to any Secured Noteholder with respect to its Secured Noteholders Allowed Unsecured Claim;

- (f) all WARN Act Claims will be compromised, released and discharged as against the Applicants on the Plan Implementation Date in exchange for an unsecured, subordinated, non-interest bearing entitlement to receive \$100,000 from Cline on the date this is eight (8) years from the Plan Implementation Date (the “**WARN Act Plan Entitlement**”);
- (g) certain claims against the Applicants, including claims covered by insurance, certain prior-ranking secured claims of equipment providers and the secured claim of Bank of Montreal in respect of corporate credit card payables, will remain unaffected by the Plan;
- (h) existing equity interests in Cline will be cancelled for no consideration; and
- (i) the shares of New Elk and North Central will not be affected by the Recapitalization and will remain owned by Cline and New Elk, respectively.

Goldfarb Affidavit at para. 124; Application Record, Tab 4.

9. Any Affected Creditor with a Disputed Distribution Claim will not be entitled to receive any distribution under the Plan with respect to such Disputed Distribution Claim unless and until such Claim becomes an Allowed Affected Claim. A Disputed Distribution Claim will be resolved in the manner set out in the Claims Procedure Order.

Plan, Section 3.6.

10. Unaffected Creditors will not be affected by the Plan and will not receive any consideration or distributions under the Plan in respect of their Unaffected Claims (except to the extent their Unaffected Claims are paid in full on the Plan Implementation Date in accordance with the express terms of the Plan).

Plan, Sections 1.1, 2.3 and 3.5.

11. If implemented, the Recapitalization would result in a reduction of over \$55 million in interest-bearing debt.

Goldfarb Affidavit at para. 126; Application Record, Tab 4.

12. The proposed Recapitalization is supported by Marret, which has the ability to exercise all discretion and authority of the Secured Noteholders. Consequently, the proposed Recapitalization is supported by 100% of the Secured Noteholders, both as secured creditors of the Applicants and as unsecured creditors of the Applicants in respect of the portion of their claims that is unsecured.

Goldfarb Affidavit at paras. 63, 67 and 145; Application Record, Tab 4.

(2) Classification for Purposes of Voting on the Plan

13. The only classes of creditors for the purposes of considering and voting on the Plan will be (i) the Secured Noteholders Class, (ii) the Affected Unsecured Creditors Class, and (iii) the WARN Act Plaintiffs Class.

Plan, Section 3.2.

Goldfarb Affidavit at para. 153; Application Record, Tab 4.

14. The Secured Noteholders Class consists of the Secured Noteholders in respect of the Secured Noteholders Allowed Secured Claim, being the portion of the Secured Noteholders Allowed Claim against the Applicants that is designated as secured. Each Secured Noteholder will be entitled to vote its *pro rata* portion of that amount in the Secured Noteholders Class.

Goldfarb Affidavit at para. 154; Application Record, Tab 4.

15. The Affected Unsecured Creditors Class consists of the unsecured creditors of the Applicants who are to be affected by the Plan, excluding the WARN Act Plaintiffs (who are addressed in a separate class). The Affected Unsecured Creditors Class includes the Secured Noteholders in respect of the Secured Noteholders Allowed Unsecured Claim, being the portion of the Secured Noteholders Allowed Claim that is designated as unsecured. Each Secured Noteholder will be entitled to vote its *pro rata* portion of the Secured Noteholders Allowed Unsecured Claim in the Affected Unsecured Creditors Class.

Goldfarb Affidavit at para. 155; Application Record, Tab 4.

16. Within the Affected Unsecured Creditors Class, unsecured creditors with Affected Unsecured Claims of up to \$10,000 will be paid in full and will be deemed to vote in favour of the Plan, unless they indicate otherwise.

Goldfarb Affidavit at para. 156; Application Record, Tab 4.

17. The WARN Act Plaintiffs Class consists of all WARN Act Plaintiffs in the WARN Act Class Action who may assert WARN Act Claims against the Applicants. Each WARN Act Plaintiff will be entitled to vote its *pro rata* portion of all WARN Act Claims.

Goldfarb Affidavit at para. 157; Application Record, Tab 4.

18. Unaffected Creditors and Equity Claimants are not entitled to vote on the Plan at the Meetings in respect of their Unaffected Claims and Equity Claims, respectively.

Plan, Sections 3.4(3) and 3.5.

19. The Plan provides that, if the Plan is not approved by the required majorities of both the Unsecured Creditors Class and the WARN Act Plaintiffs Class, or the Applicants determine that such approvals are not forthcoming, the Applicants are permitted to withdraw the Plan and file an amended and restated plan with the features described on Schedule "B" to the Plan (the "Alternate Plan"). The Alternate Plan would provide, *inter alia*, that all unsecured claims and all WARN Act Claims against the Applicants would be treated as unaffected claims, the only voting class under the Alternate Plan would be the Secured Noteholders Class, and all assets of the Applicants would be transferred to an entity designated by the Secured Noteholders in exchange for a release of the Secured Noteholders Allowed Secured Claim.

Goldfarb Affidavit at para. 125; Application Record, Tab 4.

B. CLAIMS PROCEDURE

20. The Applicants wish to commence the Claims Procedure as soon as possible to ascertain all of the Claims against the Applicants for the purpose of voting and receiving distributions under the Plan.
21. Liabilities and claims against the Applicants that the Applicants are aware of, include, *inter alia*, secured obligations in respect of the Secured Notes, secured obligations in respect of leased equipment used at the New Elk Mine, contingent claims for damages and other amounts in connection with certain pending litigation claims against the Applicants, and unsecured liabilities in respect of accounts payable relating to ordinary course trade and employee obligations.

Goldfarb Affidavit at paras. 52-57; Application Record, Tab 4.

22. The draft Claims Procedure Order provides a process for identifying and determining claims against the Applicants and their directors and officers, including, *inter alia*, the following:
 - (a) Cline, with the consent of Marret, will determine the aggregate of all amounts owing by the Applicants under the 2011 Indenture and the 2013 Indenture up to the Filing Date, such aggregate amounts being the "**Secured Noteholders Allowed Claim**";
 - (b) the Secured Noteholders Allowed Claim will be apportioned between the Secured Noteholders Allowed Secured Claim and the Secured Noteholders Allowed Unsecured Claim (being the amount of the Secured Noteholders Allowed Claim that is designated as unsecured in the Plan);

- (c) the Monitor will send a Claims Package to all Known Creditors, which Claims Package will include a Notice of Claim specifying the Known Creditor's Claim against the Applicants for voting and distribution purposes, as valued by the Applicants based on their books and records, and specifying whether the Known Creditor's Claim is secured or unsecured;
- (d) the Claims Procedure Order contains provisions allowing a Known Creditor to dispute its Claim as set out in the applicable Notice of Claim for either voting or distribution purposes or with respect to whether such Claim is secured or unsecured, and sets out a procedure for resolving such disputes;
- (e) the Monitor will publish a notice to creditors in The Globe and Mail (National Edition), the Denver Post and the Pueblo Chieftain to solicit Claims against the Applicants by Unknown Creditors who are as yet unknown to the Applicants;
- (f) the Monitor will deliver a Claims Package to any Unknown Creditor who makes a request therefor prior to the Claims Bar Date, containing a Proof of Claim to be completed by such Unknown Creditor and filed with the Monitor prior to the Claims Bar Date;
- (g) the proposed Claims Bar Date for Proofs of Claim for Unknown Creditors and for Notices of Dispute in the case of Known Creditors is January 13, 2015;
- (h) the Claims Procedure Order contains provisions allowing the Applicants to dispute a Proof of Claim as against an Unknown Creditor and provides a procedure for resolving such disputes for either voting or distribution purposes and with respect to whether such claim is secured or unsecured;
- (i) the Claims Procedure Order allows the Applicants to allow a Claim for purposes of voting on the Plan without prejudice to whether that Claim has been accepted for purposes of receiving distributions under the Plan;
- (j) where the Applicants or the Monitor send a notice of disclaimer or resiliation to any Creditor after the Filing Date, such notice will be accompanied by a Claims Package allowing such Creditor to make a claim against the Applicants in respect of a Restructuring Period Claim;
- (k) the Restructuring Period Claims Bar Date, in respect of claims arising on or after the date of the Applicants' CCAA filing, will be seven (7) days after the day such Restructuring Period Claim arises;
- (l) for purposes of the matters set out in the Claims Procedure Order in respect of any WARN Act Claims: (i) the WARN Act Plaintiffs will be treated as Unknown Creditors since the Applicants are not aware of (and have not quantified) any bona fide claims of the WARN Act Plaintiffs; and (ii) Class Action Counsel shall be entitled to file Proofs of Claim, Notices of Dispute of Revision and

Disallowance, receive service and notice of materials and to otherwise deal with the Applicants and the Monitor on behalf of the WARN Act Plaintiffs, provided that Class Action Counsel shall require an executed proxy in order to cast votes on behalf of any WARN Act Plaintiffs at the WARN Act Plaintiffs' Meeting; and

- (m) Creditors may file a Proof of Claim with respect to a Director/Officer Claim.

Goldfarb Affidavit at para. 151; Application Record, Tab 4.

23. As further discussed below, the Applicants may elect to proceed with the Meetings notwithstanding that the resolution of Claims in accordance with the Claims Procedure may not be complete. The Meetings Order provides for the separate tabulation of votes cast in respect of Disputed Voting Claims and provides that the Monitor will report to the Court on whether the outcome of any vote would be affected by votes cast in respect of Disputed Voting Claims.

Goldfarb Affidavit at paras. 161(f)-(h) and 162; Application Record, Tab 4.

24. The Claims Procedure Order includes a comeback provision providing interested parties who wish to amend or vary the Claims Procedure Order with the ability to appear before the Court or bring a motion on a date to be set by this Court.

Goldfarb Affidavit at para 149; Application Record, Tab 4.

C. MEETINGS OF CREDITORS

25. It is proposed that the Meetings to vote on the Plan will be held at Goodmans LLP, 333 Bay Street, Suite 3400, Toronto, Ontario on January 21, 2015 at 10:00 a.m. for the WARN Act Plaintiffs Class, 11:00 a.m. for the Affected Unsecured Creditors Class, and 12:00 p.m. for the Secured Noteholders Class.

Goldfarb Affidavit at para. 160; Application Record, Tab 4.

Meetings Order, Section 20.

26. The draft Meetings Order provides for, *inter alia*, the following in respect of the governance of the Meetings:

- (a) an officer of the Monitor will preside as the chair of the Meetings;
- (b) the only parties entitled to attend the Meetings are the Eligible Voting Creditors (or their proxyholders), representatives of the Monitor, the Applicants, Marret, all such parties' financial and legal advisors, the Chair, the Secretary, the Scrutineers,

and such other parties as may be admitted to a Meeting by invitation of the Applicants or the Chair;

- (c) only Creditors with Voting Claims (or their proxyholders) are entitled to vote at the Meetings; provided that, in the event a Creditor holds a Disputed Voting Claim as at the date of a Meeting, such Disputed Voting Claim may be voted at the Meeting but will be tabulated separately and will not be counted for any purpose unless such Claim is ultimately determined to be a Voting Claim;
- (d) each WARN Act Plaintiff (or its proxyholder) shall be entitled to cast an individual vote on the Plan as part of the WARN Act Plaintiffs Class, and Class Action Counsel shall be permitted to cast votes on behalf of those WARN Act Plaintiffs who have appointed Class Action Counsel as their proxy;
- (e) the quorum for each Meeting is one Creditor with a Voting Claim, provided that if there are no WARN Act Plaintiffs voting in the WARN Act Plaintiffs Class, the Applicants will have the right to combine the WARN Act Plaintiffs Class with the Affected Unsecured Creditors Class and proceed without a vote of the WARN Act Plaintiffs Class, in which case there shall be no WARN Act Plan Entitlement under the Plan;
- (f) the Monitor will keep separate tabulations of votes in respect of:
 - i. Voting Claims; and
 - ii. Disputed Voting Claims, if any;
- (g) the Scrutineers will tabulate the vote(s) taken at each Meeting and will determine whether the Plan has been accepted by the required majorities of each class; and
- (h) the results of the vote conducted at the Meetings will be binding on each creditor of the Applicants whether or not such creditor is present in person or by proxy or voting at a Meeting.

Goldfarb Affidavit at para. 161; Application Record, Tab 4.

27. The Applicants may elect to proceed with the Meetings notwithstanding that the resolution of Claims in accordance with the Claims Procedure may not be complete. The Meetings Order, if approved, authorizes and directs the Scrutineers to tabulate votes in respect of Voting Claims separately from votes in respect of Disputed Voting Claims, if any. If the approval or non-approval of the Plan may be affected by the votes cast in respect of Disputed Voting Claims, then the Monitor will report such matters to the Court and the Applicants and the Monitor may seek advice and directions at that time. This way, the Meetings can proceed concurrently with the Claims Procedure without prejudice to the Applicants' Creditors.

Goldfarb Affidavit at paras. 161(f)-(h) and 162; Application Record, Tab 4.

28. Like the Claims Procedure Order, the Meetings Order includes a comeback provision providing interested parties who wish to amend or vary the Meetings Order with the ability to appear before the Court or bring a motion on a date to be set by the Court.

Meetings Order, Section 68.

29. By seeking the Claims Procedure Order and the Meetings Order concurrently, the Applicants hope to move efficiently and expeditiously towards the implementation of the Recapitalization.

Goldfarb Affidavit at para. 148; Application Record, Tab 4.

TAB 9

Clerk's Stamp:



COURT FILE NUMBER
COURT
JUDICIAL CENTRE OF

2301- 16260
COURT OF KING'S BENCH OF ALBERTA
CALGARY

IN THE MATTER OF THE *COMPANIES'*
CREDITORS ARRANGEMENT ACT, R.S.C. 1985, c.
C-36, as amended

AND IN THE MATTER OF A PLAN OF
COMPROMISE OR ARRANGEMENT OF FREE
REIN RESOURCES LTD.

APPLICANT:

INVICO DIVERSIFIED INCOME LIMITED
PARTNERSHIP, by its general partner INVICO
DIVERSIFIED INCOME MANAGING GP INC.

RESPONDENT(S):

FREE REIN RESOURCES LTD.

DOCUMENT

CCAA INITIAL ORDER

CONTACT INFORMATION OF
PARTY FILING THIS DOCUMENT:

FASKEN MARTINEAU DUMOULIN LLP
#3400 – 350 7th Ave SW
Calgary, AB T2P 3N9

Solicitor: Robyn Gurofsky / Anthony Mersich
Telephone: (403) 261 9469 / (587) 233 4124
Email: rgurofsky@fasken.com / amersich@fasken.com
File Number : 324505.00011

**DATE ON WHICH ORDER WAS
PRONOUNCED:**

December 7, 2023

**NAME OF JUDGE WHO MADE
THIS ORDER:**

The Honourable J.T. Neilson

LOCATION OF HEARING:

Calgary Courts Centre, Calgary, Alberta

UPON the application of Invico Diversified Income Limited Partnership, secured creditor (the “**Applicant**”); **AND UPON** having read the Originating Application, the Affidavit of Chris Wutzke; and the Affidavit of Service of Kim Picard, filed; **AND UPON** reading the consent of FTI Canada Consulting Inc. (“**FTI**”) to act as Monitor (the “**Monitor**”) with enhanced powers;

AND UPON noting that the secured creditor affected by the charges created herein, is the Applicant; **AND UPON** being advised that Free Rein Resources Ltd. ("**Free Rein**") had previously commenced proceedings (the "**NOI Proceedings**") under Part III of the *Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act* (the "**BIA**") having Court File Number 25-2954304 and Estate Number B201954304, with such proceedings scheduled to expire on December 12, 2023; **AND UPON** hearing counsel for the Applicant, counsel for the Proposal Trustee/proposed Monitor and counsel for Free Rein; **AND UPON** reading the Pre-Filing Report of the Monitor, dated December 6, 2023; **IT IS HEREBY ORDERED AND DECLARED THAT:**

SERVICE

1. The time for service of the notice of application for this order (the "**Order**") is hereby abridged and deemed good and sufficient and this application is properly returnable today.

APPLICATION

2. Free Rein is a company to which the *Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act*, RSC 1985, c C-36 (the "**CCAA**") applies.
3. The NOI Proceedings are hereby taken up and continued under the CCAA and the provisions of Part III of the BIA shall have no further application to Free Rein. The NOI Proceedings shall have no further force and effect, and are hereby terminated, save that any and all acts, steps, agreements and procedures validly taken, done or entered into by Free Rein during the NOI Proceedings shall remain valid, binding and actionable within these proceedings. For certainty, approval of the Monitor's and its counsel's fees and disbursements and approval of the Monitor's activities in this proceeding shall be deemed approval of the fees and disbursements and activities of FTI, in its capacity as proposal trustee of Free Rein (in such capacity, the "**Proposal Trustee**") and the fees and disbursements of the Proposal Trustee's counsel in the NOI Proceeding. The Applicant is hereby directed and authorized to file a copy of this Order in the NOI Proceedings.

APPOINTMENT OF MONITOR AND ENHANCED POWERS

4. FTI Consulting Canada Inc. is hereby appointed pursuant to the CCAA as the Monitor, an officer of this Court, to monitor:

(a) the current and future assets, undertakings and properties of every nature and kind whatsoever, and wherever situate including all proceeds thereof (the "**Property**") of Free Rein; and

(b) Free Rein's business (the "**Business**") and financial affairs,

with the powers and obligations set out in the CCAA and the additional powers as set forth herein. Free Rein and its shareholders, officers, directors, employees, consultants, agents, experts, accountants, counsel and such other persons (collectively "**Assistants**") shall advise the Monitor of all material steps taken by Free Rein pursuant to this Order, and shall co-operate fully with the Monitor in the exercise of its powers and discharge of its obligations and provide the Monitor with the assistance that is necessary to enable the Monitor to adequately carry out the Monitor's functions.

5. The Monitor is hereby empowered and authorized, but not obligated, to act at once in respect of the Property and Business and, without in any way limiting the generality of the foregoing, the Monitor is hereby expressly empowered and authorized to do any of the following where the Monitor considers it necessary or desirable:

(a) to take possession of and exercise control over the Property, and any and all proceeds, receipts and disbursements arising out of or from the Property, which shall include the Monitor's ability to abandon, dispose of, or otherwise release any interest in any of the Debtor's real or personal property, or any right in any immovable;

(b) to receive, preserve and protect the Property, or any part or parts thereof, including, but not limited to, the changing of locks and security codes, the relocating of Property to safeguard it, the engaging of independent security personnel, the taking

Clerk's Stamp:



COURT FILE NUMBER
COURT
JUDICIAL CENTRE OF

2301- 16260

COURT OF KING'S BENCH OF ALBERTA
CALGARY

IN THE MATTER OF THE *COMPANIES' CREDITORS
ARRANGEMENT ACT*, R.S.C. 1985, c. C-36, as amended

AND IN THE MATTER OF A PLAN OF
COMPROMISE OR ARRANGEMENT OF FREE REIN
RESOURCES LTD.

APPLICANT:

INVICO DIVERSIFIED INCOME LIMITED
PARTNERSHIP, by its general partner INVICO
DIVERSIFIED INCOME MANAGING GP INC.

RESPONDENT(S):

FREE REIN RESOURCES LTD.

DOCUMENT

AMENDED AND RESTATED INITIAL ORDER

CONTACT INFORMATION OF

FASKEN MARTINEAU DUMOULIN LLP

PARTY FILING THIS DOCUMENT:

#3400 – 350 7th Ave SW
Calgary, AB T2P 3N9

Solicitor: Robyn Gurofsky / Anthony Mersich
Telephone: (403) 261 9469 / (587) 233 4124
Email: rgurofsky@fasken.com / amersich@fasken.com
File Number : 324505.00011

**DATE ON WHICH ORDER WAS
PRONOUNCED:**

December 7, 2023

**NAME OF JUDGE WHO MADE
THIS ORDER:**

The Honourable Justice J.T. Neilson

LOCATION OF HEARING:

Calgary Courts Centre, Calgary, Alberta

UPON the application of Invico Diversified Income Limited Partnership, secured creditor (the “**Applicant**”) pursuant to the *Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act*, RSC 1985, c C-36 (the “**CCAA**”); **AND UPON** having read the Application, the Affidavit of Chris Wutzke; and the Affidavit of Service of Kim Picard, filed; **AND UPON** noting that the secured creditor affected by the charges created herein, is the Applicant; **AND UPON** being advised that Free Rein Resources Ltd. (“**Free Rein**”) had previously commenced proceedings (the “**NOI Proceedings**”) under Part

III of the *Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act* (the “**BIA**”) having Court File Number 25-2954304 and Estate Number B201954304, with such proceedings scheduled to expire on December 12, 2023; **AND UPON** hearing counsel for the Applicant, counsel for the Proposal Trustee/proposed Monitor and counsel for Free Rein; **AND UPON** reading the Pre-Filing Report of the Monitor, dated December 6, 2023;

AND UPON HAVING GRANTED the Initial Order commencing the within CCAA proceedings;

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED AND DECLARED THAT:

SERVICE

1. The time for service of the notice of application for this order (the “**Order**”) is hereby abridged and deemed good and sufficient and this application is properly returnable today.

APPLICATION

2. Free Rein is a company to which the *Companies’ Creditors Arrangement Act*, RSC 1985, c C-36 (the “**CCAA**”) applies.
3. The NOI Proceedings are hereby taken up and continued under the CCAA and the provisions of Part III of the BIA shall have no further application to Free Rein. The NOI Proceedings shall have no further force and effect, and are hereby terminated, save that any and all acts, steps, agreements and procedures validly taken, done or entered into by Free Rein during the NOI Proceedings shall remain valid, binding and actionable within these proceedings. For certainty, approval of the Monitor’s and its counsel’s fees and disbursements and approval of the Monitor’s activities in this proceeding shall be deemed approval of the fees and disbursements and activities of FTI, in its capacity as proposal trustee of Free Rein (in such capacity, the “**Proposal Trustee**”) and the fees and disbursements of the Proposal Trustee’s counsel in the NOI Proceeding. The Applicant is hereby directed and authorized to file a copy of this Order in the NOI Proceedings.

APPOINTMENT OF MONITOR AND ENHANCED POWERS

4. FTI Consulting Canada Inc. is hereby appointed pursuant to the CCAA as the Monitor, an officer of this Court, to monitor:

(a) the current and future assets, undertakings and properties of every nature and kind whatsoever, and wherever situate including all proceeds thereof (the “**Property**”) of Free Rein; and

(b) Free Rein’s business (the “**Business**”) and financial affairs,

with the powers and obligations set out in the CCAA and the additional powers as set forth herein. Free Rein and its shareholders, officers, directors, employees, consultants, agents, experts, accountants, counsel and such other persons (collectively “**Assistants**”) shall advise the Monitor of all material steps taken by Free Rein pursuant to this Order, and shall co-operate fully with the Monitor in the exercise of its powers and discharge of its obligations and provide the Monitor with the assistance that is necessary to enable the Monitor to adequately carry out the Monitor’s functions.

5. The Monitor is hereby empowered and authorized, but not obligated, to act at once in respect of the Property and Business and, without in any way limiting the generality of the foregoing, the Monitor is hereby expressly empowered and authorized to do any of the following where the Monitor considers it necessary or desirable:

(a) to take possession of and exercise control over the Property, and any and all proceeds, receipts and disbursements arising out of or from the Property, which shall include the Monitor’s ability to abandon, dispose of, or otherwise release any interest in any of the Debtor’s real or personal property, or any right in any immovable;

(b) to receive, preserve and protect the Property, or any part or parts thereof, including, but not limited to, the changing of locks and security codes, the relocating of Property to safeguard it, the engaging of independent security personnel, the taking

TAB 10

CITATION: Re iMarketing Solutions Group, 2013 ONSC 2223
COURT FILE NO.: CV-13-10067-00CL
DATE: 20130415

ONTARIO
SUPERIOR COURT OF JUSTICE
COMMERCIAL LIST

IN THE MATTER OF THE COMPANIES' CREDITORS ARRANGEMENT ACT, R.S.C. 1985, c. C-36, AS AMENDED	)	<i>Robert I. Thornton and Danny M. Nunes, for the Applicants</i>
	)	
AND IN THE MATTER OF A PLAN OF COMPROMISE OR ARRANGEMENT OF iMARKETING SOLUTIONS GROUP INC. and the Companies referred to in Schedule "A"(the "Applicants")	)	<i>Matthew P. Gottlieb, for Duff & Phelps Canada Restructuring Inc.</i>
	)	
	)	<i>Virginie Gauthier and Daniel Pearlman, for Shotgun Fund Limited Partnership III</i>
	)	
	)	<i>Clifton P. Prophet, for Canadian Imperial Bank of Commerce</i>
	)	

HEARD: April 12, 2012

NEWBOULD J.

[1] iMarketing Solutions Group Inc. ("IMSG") and a number of subsidiary corporations applied on April 12, 2002 for protection under the CCAA, at which time an Initial Order was granted containing several provisions. These are my reasons for the granting of the order.

[2] Prior to December 3, 2012, IMSG was a publicly traded company listed on the TSX Venture Exchange. On that date, IMSG voluntarily delisted its common shares from the TSX-V and began listing its common shares on the Canadian National Stock Exchange.

[3] IMMSG is the direct or indirect parent company of twenty-two subsidiaries ("IMMSG Group"). Seventeen of the subsidiaries along with IMMSG comprise the Applicants in these proceedings.

[4] The applicants are one of the largest participants in the telemarketing and fundraising industry in North America. The applicants provide direct marketing solutions for not-for-profit organizations, political organizations and professional associations. The IMMSG Group's core businesses include: (i) tele-fundraising and outreach; (ii) data development; (iii) direct mail fundraising and outreach; (iv) data management; (v) publishing; (vi) social media; (vii) secure caging (an industry term for the process or act of collecting donations, processing donor mail and depositing contributions to customer accounts); and (viii) marketing list rentals (the renting of donor lists to third parties in exchange for a fee).

[5] The IMMSG Group's Canadian operations are located in the provinces of Ontario, British Columbia, Alberta, Manitoba, Quebec and New Brunswick. The IMMSG Group's U.S. operations are located in the states of Wisconsin, Colorado, Pennsylvania, Missouri, Virginia, New Mexico and Florida. For the nine months ended September 30, 2012, the IMMSG Group's Canadian operations accounted for approximately 57% of the applicants' gross margin while U.S. operations accounted for the remaining 43%. In 2013, the applicants' Canadian operations were expected to account for 53% of the total gross margin.

[6] As at April 5, 2013, the applicants employed approximately 1,143 employees (662 active employees and 481 on layoff) almost evenly divided between Canada and the U.S. The applicants' employees are not unionized and there are no pension plans in place.

[7] The applicants have a \$2 million loan facility with CIBC made to The Responsive Marketing Group Inc. ("RMG"), which is one of the applicants. That loan has been fully advanced. It is secured against the assets of IRMG and guaranteed by other subsidiaries.

[8] On October 12, 2012, IMSG obtained bridge loan financing in the amount of \$1.5 million. The bridge loan was provided by Shotgun Fund Limited Partnership III (“SF LP III”) controlled by, among others, Michael Davis, a director and officer of IMSG. The purpose of the bridge loan was to address short-term liquidity issues and to improve IMSG’s financial position. The net proceeds from the bridge loan were used for general working capital and operational restructuring purposes.

[9] On December 4, 2012, IMSG completed a private placement offering of a secured convertible promissory note. The gross proceeds from the offering were \$3.5 million and the sole subscriber was SF LP III. The convertible note has a maturity date of December 4, 2015. IMSG granted SF LP III a security interest in all of its assets. The amount owing under the convertible promissory note is approximately \$3.8 million. The proceeds from the offering were used to repay the bridge loan and to fund the applicants’ general working capital requirements.

[10] As at April 5, 2013, the most significant liabilities of the applicants, other than their indebtedness to CIBC, approximately \$2.0 million, and SF LP III, approximately \$3.8 million, are as follows:

	(\$millions)
Unpaid Statutory Withholdings	\$0.2
Tax Authorities	\$1.2
Trade Creditors	\$4.3
Estimated Severance Obligations (as at April 5, 2013)	\$0.9
Estimated Future Obligations Relating to Abandoned Facilities	\$0.8
Rental Arrears	<u>\$0.4</u>
	\$7.8

Insolvency and Stay

[11] The evidentiary record establishes that the IMMSG Group is facing an intense liquidity challenge such that it cannot pay all liabilities as they become due, which liabilities include ongoing operating costs, as well as legacy costs incurred as a result of previous operational restructuring initiatives already undertaken. These initiatives were implemented with a view to returning the business of the IMMSG Group to profitability.

[12] The record also establishes that without an immediate stay of proceedings, the applicants' businesses cannot survive. The applicants are under increasing pressure from their creditors to pay outstanding accounts, including certain suppliers of goods and services that are critical to the ongoing operation of the applicants' businesses, and under constant threat from their landlords and critical suppliers who threaten to take enforcement actions to bar the applicants from their business premises and to discontinue the supply of goods and services necessary for the applicants to operate their businesses.

[13] While the IMMSG Group has historically been profitable, generating positive net income of approximately \$2.3 million and \$232,000 as recently as the fiscal years ending December 31, 2009 and 2010, over the most recent twenty-four month period it has generally incurred significant losses and, at present, the applicants lack sufficient liquidity to continue operating their businesses. For the three months ended September 30, 2012, the IMMSG Group generated a loss of \$3.3 million and negative EBITDA from continuing operations of \$2.4 million. For the nine months ending September 30, 2012, the loss generated was \$4.7 million and the negative EBITDA from continuing operations was \$3.0 million. Although the IMMSG Group has not finalized its audited financial statements for the year ending December 31, 2012, it expects to report continued material losses from ongoing operations as well as additional restructuring costs and losses from discontinued operations. For the first quarter of 2013, it expects that the IMMSG Group will continue to show negative EBITDA and net losses, although the magnitude of such losses is expected to be materially lower than the quarterly results in 2012. It is expected that the

IMSG Group will generate positive cash flow from ongoing operations shortly following the commencement of these proceedings.

[14] Over the past two years, the applicants have taken steps to address the challenges facing them by implementing a number of initiatives to lower operating costs through process efficiencies and higher productivity. They commenced the implementation of a restructuring plan that was intended to transform their business and called for significant changes to the applicants' corporate structure, operations and management to bring these together under a single operating model. The applicants' restructuring plan has taken longer than expected to implement and anticipated operating results have not been achieved, resulting in the applicants' costs being higher than expected and savings being delayed.

[15] I am satisfied from the record, including the report from the proposed Monitor, that an Initial Order and a stay under section 11 of the CCAA should be made. The applicants request that the stay apply as well to limited partnerships which form part of their business in light of the integrated nature of the business. Although the CCAA applies to corporations, there is authority that the stay may in appropriate circumstances be ordered to apply to limited partnership interests, particularly where the business interests of the applicant corporations are intertwined with the limited partnerships. See *Re Lehndorff General Partner Ltd.* (1993), 9 B.L.R. (2d) 275. Such is the case with the applicants, and the stay requested is ordered.

[16] It is to be noted that CIBC is subject to the stay. There is an issue, however, between the applicants and CIBC that needs to be addressed quickly and I understand that the parties are dealing with it. That has to do with whether the CIBC loan, once reduced by payments being made directly to CIBC by customers of one or more of the applicants, is to be increased to \$2 million. I understand that the applicants do not intend to compromise the rights of CIBC, including its security and collateral position, as result the proceedings and that the parties are working towards a mutually acceptable arrangement to the effect that intention. In the

circumstances CIBC has reserved its rights concerning the Initial Order, which it has not opposed based upon this understanding.

DIP financing

[17] The record indicates that the IMMSG Group will require additional emergency funding in order to implement this restructuring. SF LP III has agreed to provide debtor in possession financing to the applicants up to the aggregate amount of \$1.0 million, subject to the applicants obtaining an Initial Order in this proceeding on the terms requested granting the DIP Lender a charge over all of the property, assets and undertaking of the applicants in priority to all creditors except CIBC. The cash flow forecasts for the period April 15, 2013 to August 2, 2013 indicate that in the absence of the DIP financing, the applicants have insufficient cash to continue to operate and operations will cease immediately. This is the view of both the applicants and the proposed Monitor.

[18] After considering the factors set out in section 11.2 (4) of the CCAA, it appears that the DIP financing and charge appears reasonable and they are approved.

Administration Charge

[19] The applicants propose an Administration Charge of \$300,000 to secure payment of the fees and expenses of the applicants' counsel, the Monitor and its counsel and the CRO and its counsel. The proposed Monitor is of the view that the proposed charge is reasonable. It appears to me relatively modest and is approved. This charge will rank after the CIBC security and before the other charges approved in the Initial Order, including the DIP charge.

Director's charge

[20] The applicants also propose a Directors' Charge of \$1.3 million for any liabilities the directors and officers may incur after the commencement of these proceedings. The applicants estimate that the post-filing priority payables in respect of which the directors would have

personal liability are approximately \$1.3 million based on payroll, payroll remittances, vacation pay and sales taxes and determination or severance payments that may be owing. The proposed Monitor has reviewed the calculations and is of the view that the Directors' Charge is reasonable in relation to the quantum of the estimated potential liability. The Directors' Charge is approved.

Chief Restructuring Officer

[21] The applicants propose that Mr. Upkar Arora CA, ICD.D, co-founder and Managing Director of Illumina, be appointed Chief Restructuring Officer. Illumina is an independent financial advisory firm that provides financial, operational and strategic advisory services to mid-sized businesses. IMSG retained Mr. Arora on September 24, 2012 as interim CFO upon the resignation of IMSG's previous CFO. It was expected that Mr. Arora's appointment would last for three months during which time he would, among other things, assist IMSG's board of directors in selecting a new CFO. Mr. Arora has remained in the position of interim CFO and, in that capacity, currently oversees the financial affairs of the applicants both in Canada and the U.S.

[22] Mr. Arora has intimate knowledge of the Applicants' operations, financial status and efforts that have been undertaken by the applicants to restructure their business. The applicants believe that Mr. Arora's knowledge and experience will be an asset to them and will be of great assistance to the proposed Monitor in guiding the applicants through this restructuring process. A fee of \$75,000 per month has been agreed, plus a success fee on terms to be negotiated subject to court approval. The proposed Monitor believes that the monthly fee for Mr. Arora is reasonable and that absent his retention, professional fees would increase by at least the monthly fee payable to him. Mr. Arora is appointed as CRO and as an officer of the Court on the terms agreed between the applicants and Mr. Arora.

Cash management system

[23] The IMMSG Group operates an extensive centralized cash management system integrated among the various entities and centrally managed from IMMSG's head office in Toronto. Cash is transferred daily, as needed, among some 120 bank accounts of the operating entities at multiple financial institutions its uses in Canada and the U.S. as well as customer accounts controlled by the IMMSG Group. The applicants wish to continue this method of financing the various businesses on a daily basis. The proposed Monitor believes that it is necessary that this existing cash management system be continued as doing so would avoid (i) delays in accounts receivable collections and accounts payable payments until new bank and credit card accounts were established; (ii) a distraction of management's limited resources and (iii) payroll payment disruptions. It would also reduce administrative costs and expenses. The proposed Monitor points out that the cash flow projections do not consider the impact of cash flow delays and such delays would result in a need for increased funding which is not presently available.

[24] The Initial Order will contain a provision that subject to the terms of the DIP facility, IMMSG is authorized to make loans, advances or transfers of funds to any of the other IMMSG Group entities in accordance with the cash management system and the DIP facility and the subsidiaries are authorized to repay funds previously advanced to them by IMMSG from time to time in accordance with the cash management system and DIP facility. As well, there shall be an Inter-Company Charge on the property of IMMSG Group.

Critical Suppliers and customers

[25] The applicants have identified certain critical suppliers who provide goods and services critical to the applicants' ongoing operations. As well there are customers who to whom remittances were not made as required. The applicants have proposed in the Initial Order authority to make payments to these customers and critical suppliers for pre-filing indebtedness in consultation with the Monitor as it is believed that without making such payments their businesses cannot survive. The monitor believes the payments are appropriate and necessary for a number of reasons, including the fact that customers regularly engage on a per-contract or per-

service basis and would be expected to terminate or not renew their contracts if payment obligations to them were not honoured. The cash flow projections indicate that the applicants will have sufficient liquidity to make these payments over the next several weeks.

[26] The authorization to pay pre-filing amounts to critical suppliers is codified in section 11.4 of the CCAA. Pursuant to this section, the Court has the discretion to:

(a) declare a person to be a critical supplier, if it is satisfied the person is a supplier of goods or services to the company and the goods or services are critical to the company's continued operations (s. 11.4(1));

(b) make an order requiring the "critical supplier" to supply any goods or services specified by the Court to the company on any terms and conditions that are consistent with the supply relationship or the Court considers appropriate (s. 11.4(2)).

[27] The rationale for the enactment of section 11.4 is explained in the Industry Canada Clause by Clause Briefing Book as follows:

Companies undergoing a restructuring must be able to continue to operate during the period. On the other hand, suppliers will attempt to restrict their exposure to credit risk by denying credit or refusing services to those debtor companies. To balance the conflicting interests, the court will be given the authority to designate certain key suppliers as "critical suppliers". The designation will mean that the supplier will be required to continue its business relationship with the debtor company but, in return, the critical supplier will be given security for payment.

[28] The critical suppliers have been identified in the affidavit material of the applicants.

[29] It is appropriate that the Initial Order contain a provision that the IMMSG Group will be permitted to make such pre-filing payments owing to customers and to suppliers as determined by the IMMSG Group in consultation with the Monitor to be necessary to permit them to proceed with the restructuring.

Chapter 15 proceedings

[30] IMMSG Group intends to commence proceedings under Chapter 15 of the U.S. *Bankruptcy Code* pursuant to which they will seek to have these CCAA proceedings recognized as a foreign main proceeding and the Initial Order enforced in the US. IMMSG will be named as the Foreign Representative in respect of the application. This would appear appropriate in light of the cross-border scope of the business, assets and operations of the applicants. The applicants are of the view that the center of main interests of the IMMSG Group is in Ontario for a number of reasons set out in paragraph 21 of the affidavit of Mr. Langhorne. The proposed Monitor shares that view. They may well be correct, but it must be recognized that it is the function of the receiving court in the United States to make the determination on the location of the COMI and to determine whether this CCAA proceeding is a "foreign main proceeding" for the purposes of Chapter 15. See *Re Cinram* (2012), 91 C.B.R. (5th) 46, per Morawetz J.

[31] The Initial Order signed on April 12, 2013 contains the provisions discussed in this endorsement.

Newbould J.

Released: April 15, 2013

CITATION: Re iMarketing Solutions Group, 2013 ONSC 2223
COURT FILE NO.: CV-13-10067-00CL
DATE: 20130415

ONTARIO

SUPERIOR COURT OF JUSTICE

BETWEEN:

IN THE MATTER OF THE COMPANIES'
CREDITORS ARRANGEMENT ACT, R.S.C. 1985, c.
C-36, AS AMENDED

AND IN THE MATTER OF A PLAN OF
COMPROMISE OR ARRANGEMENT OF
iMARKETING SOLUTIONS GROUP INC. and the
Companies referred to in Schedule "A"(the
"Applicants")

REASONS FOR JUDGMENT

Newbould J.

Released: April 15, 2013

TAB 11

Court of Appeal for Saskatchewan

Citation: *Industrial Properties Regina
Limited v Copper Sands Land Corp.,
2018 SKCA 36*

Date: 2018-05-23

Docket: CACV3176

Between:

Industrial Properties Regina Limited

*Appellant
(Respondent)*

And

**Copper Sands Land Corp., Willow Rush Development Corp., Midtdal
Developments & Investments Corp., Prairie Country Homes Ltd., JJJ
Developments & Investments Corp. and MDI Utility Corp.**

*Respondents
(Applicants)*

Docket: CACV3177

Between:

101297277 Saskatchewan Ltd.

*Appellant
(Respondent)*

And

**Copper Sands Land Corp., Willow Rush Development Corp., Midtdal
Developments & Investments Corp., Prairie Country Homes Ltd., JJJ
Developments & Investments Corp. and MDI Utility Corp.**

*Respondents
(Applicants)*

Docket: CACV3178

Between:

Affinity Credit Union 2013

*Appellant
(Respondent)*

And

**Copper Sands Land Corp., Willow Rush Development Corp., Midtdal
Developments & Investments Corp., Prairie Country Homes Ltd., JJI
Developments & Investments Corp. and MDI Utility Corp.**

*Respondents
(Applicants)*

REVISED JUDGMENT: The text of the original judgment has been corrected with text of the
erratum (released May 23, 2018) appended.

Before: Herauf, Ryan-Froslic and Schwann JJ.A.

Disposition: Appeal allowed in part

Written reasons by: The Honourable Mr. Justice Herauf
In concurrence: The Honourable Madam Justice Ryan-Froslic
The Honourable Madam Justice Schwann

On Appeal From: QBG 1693 of 2017, Saskatoon
Appeal Heard: March 5, 2018

Counsel: Diana K. Lee, Q.C. and Alexander Shalashniy
for Industrial Properties Regina Ltd.
Rick Van Beselaere, Q.C. for 101297277 Saskatchewan Ltd.
Ryan A. Pederson for Affinity Credit Union
Jeffery M. Lee, Q.C. and Paul Olfert for the Respondents

Herauf J.A.

I. INTRODUCTION

[1] The respondents are six corporations, all of which are owned and controlled by one individual. The appellants represent the secured creditors of one or more of the respondents. On December 20, 2017, the respondents were granted an initial order, a sale approval and vesting order and access to interim financing pursuant to the *Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act*, RSC 1985, c C-36 [CCAA]. The appellants appealed those orders to this Court. The appeal was heard on March 5, 2018. On March 9, 2018, the Court allowed the appeal in part with more extensive written reasons to follow. These are those reasons.

II. BACKGROUND FACTS

[2] The assets of the respondents consist of a trailer park (Copper Sands Trailer Park) and an incomplete water treatment and waste water treatment facility located on lands owned by the respondents, and undeveloped lands known as the Willow Rush property. The Copper Sands Trailer Park is the respondents' only functioning business and has two employees.

[3] As of November 2017, the respondents owed the appellants, collectively, in excess of \$10,725,000. When the appellant, Affinity Credit Union, commenced foreclosure proceedings, the respondents applied pursuant to the CCAA, seeking the following relief, *inter alia*:

- (a) an initial order staying creditor enforcement to facilitate the companies' restructurings, including the sale of Willow Rush; and
- (b) an order authorizing interim financing up to \$1.25 million with a priority charge, to enable it to complete the water treatment facility.

[4] On November 15, 2017, the parties argued the matter before a Chambers judge. The appellants firmly opposed the relief sought by the respondents, challenging the appropriateness of CCAA proceedings in the circumstances. The appellants were skeptical of the legitimacy of the Willow Rush sale and questioned whether the water treatment facility was capable of completion and, if so, whether it could produce viable capital. Due to these concerns, amongst

others, the appellants opposed the initial order and the interim financing, stressing the prejudice the creditors would suffer if these orders were granted.

[5] After hearing submissions, the Chambers judge concluded the respondents' application was premature and adjourned the matter to enable the respondents to confirm the validity of the Willow Rush sale and to file additional material relating to completion of the water treatment facility ((21 November 2017) Saskatoon, QBG 1693/2017 (Sask CA) [*November fiat*]).

[6] The matter was returned to the Court of Queen's Bench on December 11, 2017. At that time, in addition to the application for an initial order and interim financing, the respondents asked the Chambers judge to grant sale approval and a vesting order pursuant to s. 36 of the CCAA, to facilitate the sale of the Willow Rush property.

[7] In his fiat ((20 December 2017) Saskatoon, QBG 1693/2017 (Sask CA) [*December fiat*]), the Chambers judge granted the respondents' applications. The Chambers judge granted the initial order, imposing a stay of creditor enforcement for 30 days, authorized \$1.25 million interim financing, \$800,000 of which was to be used to "complete the commissioning of the water treatment utility", \$337,500 for the cost of the CCAA proceedings, and \$112,500 for "ongoing costs", and granted the sale approval and vesting order. The vesting order was set to expire on January 12, 2018, if the proposed sale did not close.

[8] Pursuant to ss. 13 and 14(1) of the CCAA, the appellants sought leave from this Court to appeal the initial order, the interim financing and the sale approval and vesting order. Before leave was granted and before the expiry of the vesting order, the Willow Rush sale closed for the asking price of \$4.2 million. For this reason, leave to appeal relating to the sale and vesting order were denied. Leave was granted on the issue of whether it was appropriate to grant the initial order for CCAA protection and to grant \$1.25 million interim financing.

[9] On March 9, 2018, the Court concluded the Chambers judge had erred in granting the interim financing and the appeal related to that aspect of the matter was allowed. The appeal relating to the appropriateness of the initial order was dismissed.

III. STANDARD OF REVIEW

[10] Decisions made pursuant to the CCAA are highly discretionary and attract deference from this Court. In *Stomp Pork Farm Ltd., Re*, 2008 SKCA 73, 311 Sask R 186 [*Stomp Pork*], Jackson J.A. articulated the Court's general reluctance to intervene in CCAA matters, noting the familiarity CCAA judges have with the different parties involved and the Chambers judge's meaningful understanding of the circumstances:

[25] The Court recognizes that there is a general reluctance on behalf of appellate courts to intervene in decisions taken by restructuring judges in CCAA matters. The mix of business and legal decisions made in real time can make it difficult to say, after the fact and with any degree of precision, that one particular decision would have been better than another. Further, the Court is hesitant to elevate a decision in one restructuring to a principle of law that will hamper the appropriate exercise of discretion in another. ...

[11] Although appellate courts exercise their right of review sparingly, CCAA decisions are not immune from appellate intervention. Judges making CCAA orders must exercise their discretion judiciously, which requires considering relevant factors and reaching a legally correct conclusion: *Stomp Pork* at para 27; *New Skeena Forest Products Inc., Re*, 2005 BCCA 192 at para 26, [2005] 8 WWR 224. As Dr. Janis P. Sara explains, appellate courts will intervene in limited circumstances:

Appellate courts will accord a high degree of deference when asked to interfere with the exercise of authority of a CCAA court. At the same time, discretionary decisions are not immune from review if the appellate court reaches the clear conclusion that there has been a wrongful exercise of authority or there is a fundamental question of the lower court's jurisdiction.

(*Rescue! The Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act*,
2d ed (Toronto: Carswell, 2013) at 181)

[12] In *Century Services Inc. v Canada (Attorney General)*, 2010 SCC 60, [2010] 3 SCR 379 [*Century Services*], the Supreme Court discussed a court's wide discretion in CCAA matters. The Supreme Court explained that this judicial discretion must be exercised in furtherance of the legislation's remedial purposes:

[59] Judicial discretion must of course be exercised in furtherance of the CCAA's purposes. The remedial purpose I referred to in the historical overview of the Act is recognized over and over again in the jurisprudence. To cite one early example:

The legislation is remedial in the purest sense in that it provides a means whereby the devastating social and economic effects of bankruptcy or creditor initiated termination of ongoing business operations can be avoided while a court-supervised attempt to reorganize the financial affairs of the debtor company is made.

(*Elan Corp. v. Comiskey* (1990), 41 O.A.C. 282, at para. 57, *per* Doherty J.A., dissenting)

[13] The standard of review with respect to the exercise of judicial discretion, such as in CCAA matters, is set out in *Rimmer v Adshead*, 2002 SKCA 12 at para 58, 217 Sask R 94:

... [T]he powers in issue are discretionary and therefore fall to be exercised as the judge vested with them thinks fit, having regard for such criteria as bear upon their proper exercise. The discretion is that of the judge of first instance, not ours. Hence, our function, at least at the outset, is one of review only: review to determine if, in light of such criteria, the judge abused his or her discretion. Did the judge err in principle, disregard a material matter of fact, or fail to act judicially? Only if some such failing is present are we free to override the decision of the judge and do as we think fit. Either that, or the result must be so plainly wrong as to amount to an injustice and invite intervention on that basis. ...

[14] Applying this standard of review, we see no merit to the appellants' argument that the Chambers judge erred in granting the initial order. However, we are of the opinion the Chambers judge failed to consider the mandatory factors enumerated in s. 11.2(4) of the CCAA prior to granting the interim financing. This error resulted in a wrongful exercise of discretion given the preliminary nature of the CCAA proceedings.

IV. THE INITIAL ORDER

[15] The first formal step in CCAA proceedings is the debtor company applying to the court for an initial order. The terms of initial orders are provided for in ss. 11.02(1) and (3) of the CCAA:

11.02 (1) A court may, on an initial application in respect of a debtor company, make an order on any terms that it may impose, effective for the period that the court considers necessary, which period may not be more than 30 days,

(a) staying, until otherwise ordered by the court, all proceedings taken or that might be taken in respect of the company under the *Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act* or the *Winding-up and Restructuring Act*;

(b) restraining, until otherwise ordered by the court, further proceedings in any action, suit or proceeding against the company; and

(c) prohibiting, until otherwise ordered by the court, the commencement of any action, suit or proceeding against the company.

...

(3) *The court shall not make the order unless*

(a) *the applicant satisfies the court that circumstances exist that make the order appropriate; and*

(b) in the case of an order under subsection (2), the applicant also satisfies the court that the applicant has acted, and is acting, *in good faith and with due diligence*.

(Emphasis added)

[16] The purpose of the initial order is to stay creditor enforcement in order to maintain the debtor corporation's "status quo" for a specified and limited period so that it may develop a plan to be presented to creditors for their consideration. The initial order staying creditor enforcement provides the debtor corporation some breathing room to allow it to prepare, file and seek approval from creditors and ultimately the courts of its proposed plan: *Rescue! The Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act* at 31.

[17] Pursuant to ss. 11.02(1) and (3), the court may grant an initial order staying creditor enforcement for a term not exceeding 30 days, if the applicant satisfies the court that the appropriate circumstances exist and that it is acting in good faith and with due diligence.

A. Appropriate circumstances

[18] In *Century Services*, the Supreme Court discussed the remedial objectives of the CCAA and explained that "appropriate circumstances" exist when an order advances these remedial objectives by providing the conditions under which the debtor can attempt to reorganize:

[60] Judicial decision making under the CCAA takes many forms. A court must first of all provide the conditions under which the debtor can attempt to reorganize. This can be achieved by staying enforcement actions by creditors to allow the debtor's business to continue, preserving the *status quo* while the debtor plans the compromise or arrangement to be presented to creditors, and supervising the process and advancing it to the point where it can be determined whether it will succeed. ...

...

[70] ... Appropriateness under the CCAA is assessed by inquiring whether the order sought advances the policy objectives underlying the CCAA. *The question is whether the order will usefully further efforts to achieve the remedial purpose of the CCAA* — avoiding the social and economic losses resulting from liquidation of an insolvent company. ...

(Emphasis added)

[19] The evidentiary burden the debtor corporation must satisfy to establish "appropriate circumstances" for the purposes of a 30-day stay order is not exceptionally onerous: *Alberta Treasury Branches v Tallgrass Energy Corp*, 2013 ABQB 432 at para 14, 9 CBR (6th) 161 [*Alberta Treasury*]; *Matco Capital Ltd. v Interex Oilfield Services Ltd.* (1 August 2006)

Docket No. 06108395 (Alta QB) [*Matco*]; *Hush Homes Inc., Re*, 2015 ONSC 370 at paras 51–53, 22 CBR (6th) 67; *Redstone Investment Corp., Re*, 2014 ONSC 2004 at paras 49–50.

[20] As the Supreme Court noted in *Century Services*, initial CCAA orders are made in the “hothouse of real-time litigation” (at para 58). The debtor corporation is often in crisis-mode due to its failure to meet creditor obligations and is seeking CCAA protection to obtain some breathing room to enable it to get its affairs in order without creditors knocking at the door. Therefore, to obtain an initial 30-day order, the applicant is not required to prove it has a “feasible plan” but merely “a germ of a plan”: *Alberta Treasury* at para 14. The court must assess whether the circumstances are such that, with the initial order, the debtor corporation has a “reasonable possibility of restructuring”: *Matco*. To require the applicant corporation to present a fully-developed restructuring plan or have the support of all its creditors at the initial stage of CCAA proceedings, although desirable, is not expected. To impose such a threshold to establish “appropriate circumstances” would unduly hinder the purpose of an initial order which, as the Supreme Court explained in *Century Services*, is to provide the conditions under which the debtor can *attempt* to reorganize.

[21] For the purposes of an initial order, the debtor corporation must convince the court that the initial order will “usefully further” its efforts towards attempted reorganization. If the debtor corporation satisfies this onus, the court may grant the initial application and provide the conditions under which the debtor corporation can attempt to reorganize, namely, staying creditor enforcement to preserve the debtor corporation’s status quo for a limited period of time. If, however, the debtor corporation fails to satisfy this onus and the court determines that the application is merely an effort by the debtor corporation to avoid its obligations to its creditors and postpone an inevitable liquidation, the initial application should be denied: *Rescue! The Companies’ Creditors Arrangement Act* at 53–54.

B. Good faith and due diligence

[22] In addition to proving appropriate circumstances, the applicant corporation must convince the court that it is acting in good faith and with due diligence pursuant to s. 11.02(3)(b). Despite the wording of s. 11.02(3)(b) indicating “good faith and due diligence” applies only to orders under subsection (2), that being orders “other than initial applications”, the Supreme

Court in *Century Services* determined good faith and due diligence applies to initial orders as well:

[69] The CCAA also explicitly provides for certain orders. Both an order made on an initial application and an order on subsequent applications may stay, restrain, or prohibit existing or new proceedings against the debtor. The burden is on the applicant to satisfy the court that the order is appropriate in the circumstances and that the applicant has been acting in good faith and with due diligence (CCAA, ss. 11(3), (4) and (6)).

[70] The general language of the CCAA should not be read as being restricted by the availability of more specific orders. However, the requirements of appropriateness, good faith, and due diligence are baseline considerations that a court should always bear in mind when exercising CCAA authority. ...

[23] Although it is a consideration for granting an initial order, courts generally defer the in-depth analysis of good faith and due diligence to subsequent applications, such as the extension of the initial 30-day order: Rogers, Sieradski & Kanter, “What Does ‘Good Faith’ Mean in Insolvency Proceedings?” Vol 4-4 Insolvency Institute of Canada (Articles) (WL). If, however, the court determines the debtor corporation is not seeking CCAA protection in good faith or there is convincing evidence of a lack of due diligence, the court may deny an initial order on the basis of a failure to satisfy the baseline requirement in s. 11.02(3)(b): see *Alberta Treasury*.

C. Did the Chambers judge err in granting the initial order?

[24] The appellants submit the Chambers judge erred in concluding the respondents had satisfied the “appropriate circumstances” and “good faith and due diligence” requirements contained in ss. 11.02(3)(a) and (b).

[25] In support of this argument, the appellants contend CCAA proceedings are not appropriate as the respondents have only one active business, the Copper Sands Trailer Park, which has only two employees. The appellants argue CCAA proceedings are not needed to “avoid the social and economic costs of liquidating assets” as there are no such consequences given the minimal business activity of the respondents.

[26] In addition, the appellants submit the Chambers judge failed to consider the creditors’ lack of faith and confidence in management when determining whether the initial order was appropriate. The appellants also allege the Chambers judge failed to provide adequate reasons for his conclusion that the respondents were acting in good faith and with due diligence.

[27] The Chambers judge determined the respondents were engaged in active business, which was “facing a looming liquidity condition or crisis” if an initial order and a stay of proceedings were not granted (*November fiat* at para 15). The Chambers judge concluded the “initial stay of proceedings [would] give the applicants the time to restructure and refinance their operations” (*December fiat* at para 14).

[28] The Chambers judge was satisfied the respondents were not seeking CCAA protection merely to postpone inevitable liquidation:

[10] In this case I find that the applicants, or at least MDI Utility Corp. and CSLC, are engaged in an active business rather than being simply real estate developers as alleged by the respondents. CSLC operates a mobile home park. MDI Utility Corp. is completing a water treatment utility to provide wastewater treatment services to both the existing mobile home park and an upcoming Tanglewood development on CSLC lands. This is not a situation where the applicants seek CCAA protection for the purpose of obtaining more time to sell or refinance property as was the situation in *Marine Drive Properties Ltd. (Re)*, 2009 BCSC 145; *Redekop Properties Inc. (Re)*, 2001 BCSC 1892; and *Octagon Properties Group Ltd. (Re)*, 2009 ABQB 500, 486 AR 296.

(*December fiat*)

[29] As for whether there was a reasonable possibility of restructuring, the Chambers judge noted he was “satisfied that the completion of the water treatment utility [would] add to the overall net worth” of the respondents (*December fiat* at para 13). The Chambers judge also noted that the respondents had, at the time of the initial application, secured an interim financier willing to fund the completion of the water treatment utility and the CCAA proceedings.

[30] On this basis, the Chambers judge concluded as follows:

[14] I am satisfied that the applicants have satisfied the onus upon them to establish that they are acting in good faith and with due diligence and that an order for an initial stay of proceedings is appropriate. ...

(*December fiat*)

[31] As discussed, the purpose of the initial order is to stay creditor enforcement to grant the debtor corporation a limited period of time to attempt to devise a viable restructuring plan. To obtain an initial order, the debtor corporation must satisfy the court that the initial order will “usefully further” its efforts towards attempted reorganization. The debtor corporation is not required, at this stage of the proceedings, to provide a full-fledged restructuring plan, but is required to show, at the very least, it has a “germ of a plan”: see *Alberta Treasury*. The court

must be convinced the debtor corporation is not seeking CCAA proceedings simply to delay the inevitable liquidation in order to “buy time”.

[32] It is clear the Chambers judge was cognizant of these purposes and the baseline considerations, which the respondents had to satisfy prior to receiving the initial order. The Chambers judge concluded the initial order would usefully further the remedial purposes of the CCAA by providing the conditions upon which the respondents could attempt to reorganize their affairs. He was satisfied on the evidence before him, that there was at least a “germ of a plan”, given the fact the respondents had secured interim financing to facilitate the commissioning of the water treatment facility.

[33] It is also clear the Chambers judge considered the creditors’ lack of confidence. In his fiat, the Chambers judge stated: “[u]fortunately, and unlike many CCAA applications, all of the respondent secured creditors oppose the application” (*November fiat* at para 21). Despite this, the Chambers judge determined the initial order was appropriate in the circumstances based on the factors discussed above. The Chambers judge was entitled to reach this conclusion. Whether the creditors have lost confidence in the debtor corporation’s management is something the court must consider when assessing whether to grant an initial order. However, the creditors’ lack of faith is not determinative and does not necessarily dictate denying an initial application: *Asset Engineering LP v Forest & Marine Financial Limited Partnership*, 2009 BCCA 319 at para 27, 96 BCLR (4th) 77; *Pacific Shores Resort & Spa Ltd., Re.*, 2011 BCSC 1775 at paras 40–44 and 49(c).

[34] Upon review, although his reasons are not extensive, it is clear the Chambers judge properly considered whether the baseline considerations contained in ss. 11.02(3)(a) and (b) were satisfied. Given the real time nature of CCAA proceedings, Chambers judges are not required to give extensive reasons addressing each and every argument raised by the parties when granting initial applications (*Alberta Treasury Branches v Conserve Oil Corporation*, 2016 ABCA 87 at paras 14–15, 35 CBR (6th) 6). We also note that the Chambers judge was not required to undertake an in-depth analysis to determine good faith and due diligence at this stage of the proceedings as a more in-depth analysis will be taken if the respondents make an application to extend the order or if they seek additional court orders.

[35] Given the deference afforded to a chambers judge making CCAA decisions, this Court will only intervene if the lack of reasons leads to a reasonable belief that the Chambers judge ignored or misconceived the evidence *in a way that affected his conclusion* (*York (Regional Municipality) v Thornhill Green Co-Operative Homes Inc.*, 2010 ONCA 393, 262 OAC 232). This threshold for intervention is not met in this case. Therefore, the appellants' appeal regarding the initial order is dismissed.

V. INTERIM FINANCING

[36] In addition to granting the initial order, the Chambers judge authorized the respondents to obtain interim financing up to \$1.25 million. The interim financing was given a priority charge upon the respondents' assets and over the claims of the appellants. The appellants appealed this order on the grounds the Chambers judge failed to consider the relevant factors pursuant to s. 11.2(4) of the CCAA prior to granting the order with respect to interim financing.

[37] Pursuant to s. 11.2(1) of the CCAA, a debtor corporation may apply to the court at any stage of the proceedings for interim financing. As Dr. Janis Sarra explains, "interim financing" refers primarily to the working capital that the debtor corporation requires in order to continue operating during restructuring proceedings, as well as to finance the costs of the CCAA process (*Rescue! The Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act* at 197). The underlying premise of interim financing is that it is a benefit to all stakeholders "as it allows the debtor to protect going-concern value while it attempts to devise a plan of compromise or arrangement acceptable to creditors" (at 197). Interim financing is generally granted to ensure the debtor corporation can continue its essential operations, such as "keeping the lights on" and paying employees, while it undergoes the CCAA proceedings.

[38] Before an order allowing interim financing to be obtained can be granted, the court must consider, among other things, the factors enumerated in s. 11.2(4). If granted, the court may order the interim financing have a priority charge over the corporation's assets pursuant to s. 11.2(2):

11.2 (1) On application by a debtor company and on notice to the secured creditors who are likely to be affected by the security or charge, a court may make an order declaring that all or part of the company's property is subject to a security or charge — in an amount that the court considers appropriate — in favour of a person specified in the order who agrees to lend to the company an amount approved by the court as being required by

the company, having regard to its cash-flow statement. The security or charge may not secure an obligation that exists before the order is made.

(2) The court may order that the security or charge rank in priority over the claim of any secured creditor of the company.

(3) The court may order that the security or charge rank in priority over any security or charge arising from a previous order made under subsection (1) only with the consent of the person in whose favour the previous order was made.

(4) In deciding whether to make an order, the court is to consider, among other things,

(a) the period during which the company is expected to be subject to proceedings under this Act;

(b) how the company's business and financial affairs are to be managed during the proceedings;

(c) whether the company's management has the confidence of its major creditors;

(d) whether the loan would enhance the prospects of a viable compromise or arrangement being made in respect of the company;

(e) the nature and value of the company's property;

(f) whether any creditor would be materially prejudiced as a result of the security or charge; and

(g) the monitor's report referred to in paragraph 23(1)(b), if any.

[39] If the applicant corporation applies for interim financing at the same time as it applies for an initial order, the court must be diligent in its consideration of the factors enumerated in s. 11.2(4). The court must assess whether it is imperative and appropriate to order interim financing at the very outset of CCAA proceedings. Given that the purpose of seeking and granting an initial order is to provide the conditions upon which the debtor corporation can plan a compromise or reorganization to present to its creditors, the court must be cautious when asked to authorize large sums of interim financing at the initial stage, unless there is evidence that the financing is needed to enable the debtor corporation to undergo this planning process. This is especially important when the applicant is seeking a priority charge on the interim financing.

A. Did the Chambers judge err in allowing interim financing to be obtained?

[40] The appellants submit the Chambers judge erred in granting the respondents \$1.25 million interim financing due to his failure to consider one or more of the factors identified in s. 11.2(4).

[41] The Chambers judge provided the following reasons for authorizing the interim financing at the same time he granted the initial application:

[13] I also approve the interim financing order sought by the applicants. The interim financing lender, Staheli Construction Ltd., has agreed to advance the sum of \$1,250,000 to the applicants subject to obtaining a first charge on the assets of the company. The \$1,250,000 will be allocated \$800,000 to complete the commissioning of the water treatment utility owned by MDI Utility, \$337,500 for the cost of the CCAA proceedings and \$112,500 for the ongoing costs of the applicants according to the proposed monitor's initial report. The respondents say that they will be prejudiced by any priority charge given to the interim lender and suggest that the completion of the water treatment utility adds little to no value to the overall net worth of the applicants. However, I am satisfied that the completion of the water treatment utility will add to the overall net worth of the applicants and the monitor will ensure that the \$800,000 is being appropriately used for the purpose intended.

(December fiat)

[42] This analysis fails to consider multiple factors in s. 11.2(4), namely the period of time the parties were expected to be subject to CCAA proceedings pursuant to s. 11.2(4)(a) and "whether the loan would enhance the prospects of a viable compromise or arrangement" pursuant to s. 11.2(4)(d).

[43] The appellants strongly opposed the use of any funds to complete the commissioning of the water treatment facility. In their view, it is a failed operation that will cost more than the allotted \$800,000 to complete. Even if completed, the appellants are of the opinion the water treatment facility has no reasonable commercial value and therefore, its completion cannot result in a viable restructuring or compromise between it and the respondents. The appellants argued that granting interim financing to complete the water treatment facility would only result in the respondents incurring further debt; debt that will inevitably fall on the creditors' shoulders when the respondents are forced to liquidate, given that there is no chance of a successful restructuring. The appellants stressed that the interim financing would significantly prejudice their position as it has received a priority charge over the respondents' assets.

[44] Although the Chambers judge concluded the completion of the water treatment facility would "add to the overall net worth" of the respondents, he failed to consider whether this added net worth would enhance the prospect of a viable compromise pursuant to s. 11.2(4)(d). Given the creditors steadfast opposition to the interim financing, it was incumbent on the Chambers judge to consider this factor. It is clear the Chambers judge failed to do so. He also failed to

consider the length of time the parties would be subject to CCAA proceedings pursuant to s. 11.2(4)(a).

[45] There was no evidence of urgent circumstances dictating a need to permit the respondents to obtain interim financing with a priority charge at this stage of the proceedings. Given that the respondents' only active business is the Copper Sands Trailer Park, which receives a monthly income that is sufficient to keep the lights on and to pay the only two employees, the interim financing was not needed to preserve the status quo or maintain the respondents' essential operations. Moreover, there was no evidence the interim financing was needed to enable the respondents' *planning* of the compromise or arrangement it would eventually present to the creditors. To the contrary, there was evidence that granting interim financing to complete the water treatment plan would *deter* the parties from reaching a viable compromise at this stage of the proceedings.

[46] Given the preliminary stage the CCAA proceedings were at, there was no detailed plan evidencing how the commissioning of the water treatment facility would contribute to a viable restructuring of the respondents. As discussed above, a detailed plan is not a prerequisite to obtain an initial order. However, something more concrete and justifiable is needed in order to grant interim financing for something that is beyond what is needed to preserve the debtor corporation's status quo.

[47] We note that this is not a situation where there was unanimous creditor support for the interim financing to fund the commissioning of the water treatment facility. The creditors strongly opposed the funds being sought to facilitate the construction of a project they viewed as an inevitable failure. This fact further detracts from the appropriateness of granting the interim financing, with a priority charge, at this preliminary stage of the proceedings.

[48] The Chambers judge erred by failing to properly consider how these facts impacted the likelihood of a viable compromise or arrangement being made with respect to the respondents pursuant to s. 11.2(4)(d).

VI. CONCLUSION

[49] In conclusion, we find no error with the Chambers judge's determination that "appropriate circumstances" existed and that the respondents were acting in good faith and with due diligence so as to merit granting the initial 30-day order. The Chambers judge did, however, err in permitting the respondents to obtain \$1.25 million interim financing when he granted the initial order.

[50] Therefore, the appeal is allowed in relation to the interim financing and the part of the initial order relating to interim financing is set aside. The remaining components of the initial order remain intact and the other grounds of appeal are dismissed. We note that our decision does not prevent the respondents from initiating another application for interim financing at a later date if they so choose.

[51] Since there was divided success, there will be no order as to costs with respect to the appeal or the leave application.

"Herauf J.A."

Herauf J.A.

I concur.

"Ryan-Froslic J.A."

Ryan-Froslic J.A.

I concur.

"Schwann J.A."

Schwann J.A.

TAB 12

CITATION: Jaguar Mining Inc. (Re), 2014 ONSC 494
COURT FILE NO.: CV-13-10383-00CL
DATE: 20140116

**SUPERIOR COURT OF JUSTICE – ONTARIO
(COMMERCIAL LIST)**

**RE: IN THE MATTER OF THE *COMPANIES' CREDITORS ARRANGEMENT*
 ACT, R.S.C. 1985, c. C-36, AS AMENDED**

AND:

**IN THE MATTER OF A PLAN OF COMPROMISE OR ARRANGEMENT
OF JAGUAR MINING INC., Applicant**

BEFORE: MORAWETZ R.S.J.

COUNSEL: Tony Reyes and Evan Cobb, for the Applicant, Jaguar Mining Inc.

**Robert J. Chadwick and Caroline Descours, for the Ad Hoc Committee of
Noteholders**

Joseph Bellissimo, for Global Resource Fund, Secured Lender

Jeremy Dacks, for FTI Consulting Canada Inc., Proposed Monitor

Robin B. Schwill, for the Special Committee of the Board of Directors

**HEARD &
ENDORSED: DECEMBER 23, 2013**

REASONS: JANUARY 16, 2014

ENDORSEMENT

[1] On December 23, 2013, I heard the CCAA application of Jaguar Mining Inc. (“Jaguar”) and made the following three endorsements:

1. CCAA protection granted. Initial Order signed. Reasons will follow. It is expected that parties will utilize the e-Service Protocol which can be

confirmed on comeback motion. Sealing Order of confidential exhibits granted.

2. Meeting Order granted in form submitted.

3. Claims Procedure Order granted in form submitted.

[2] These are my reasons.

[3] Jaguar sought protection from its creditors under the *Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act* ("CCAA") and requested authorization to commence a process for the approval and implementation of a plan of compromise and arrangement affecting its unsecured creditors.

[4] Jaguar also requested certain protections in favour of its wholly-owned subsidiaries that are not applicants (the "Subsidiaries" and, together with the Applicant, the "Jaguar Group").

[5] Counsel to Jaguar submits that the principal objective of these proceedings is to effect a recapitalization and financing transaction (the "Recapitalization") on an expedited basis through a plan of compromise and arrangement (the "Plan") to provide a financial foundation for the Jaguar Group going forward and additional liquidity to allow the Jaguar Group to continue to work towards its operational and financial goals. The Recapitalization, if implemented, is expected to result in a reduction of over \$268 million of debt and new liquidity upon exit of approximately \$50 million.

[6] Jaguar's senior unsecured convertible notes (the "Notes") are the primary liabilities affected by the Recapitalization. Any other affected liabilities of Jaguar, which is a holding company with no active business operations, are limited and identifiable.

[7] The Recapitalization is supported by an Ad Hoc Committee of Noteholders of the Notes (the "Ad Hoc Committee of Noteholders") and other Consenting Noteholders, who collectively represent approximately 93% of the Notes.

[8] The background facts are set out in the affidavit of David M. Petrov sworn December 23, 2013 (the "Petrov Affidavit"), the important points of which are summarized below.

[9] Jaguar is a corporation existing under the *Business Corporations Act*, R.S.O. 1990 c. B.16, with a registered office in Toronto, Ontario. Jaguar has assets in Canada.

[10] Jaguar is the public parent corporation of other corporations in the Jaguar Group that carry on active gold mining and exploration in Brazil, employing in excess of 1,000 people. Jaguar itself does not carry on active gold mining operations.

[11] Jaguar has three wholly-owned Brazilian operating subsidiaries: MCT Mineração Ltda. ("MCT"), Mineração Serras do Oeste Ltda. ("MSOL") and Mineração Turmalina Ltda. ("MTL") (and, together with MCT and MSOL, the "Subsidiaries"), all incorporated in Brazil.

[12] The Subsidiaries' assets include properties in the development stage and in the production stage.

[13] Jaguar has been the main corporate vehicle through which financing has been raised for the operations of the Jaguar Group. The Subsidiaries have guaranteed repayment of certain funds borrowed by Jaguar.

[14] Jaguar has raised debt financing by (a) issuing notes, and (b) borrowing from Renvest Mercantile Bank Corp. Inc., through its global resource fund ("Renvest").

[15] In aggregate, Jaguar has issued a principal amount of \$268.5 million of Notes through two transactions, known as the "2014 Notes" and the "2016 Notes".

[16] Interest is paid semi-annually on the 2014 Notes and the 2016 Notes. Jaguar has not paid the last interest payment due on November 1, 2013. Under the 2014 Notes, the grace period has lapsed and an event of default has occurred.

[17] Jaguar is also the borrower under a fully drawn \$30 million secured facility (the "Renvest Facility") with Renvest. The obligations under the Renvest Facility are secured by a general security agreement from Jaguar as well as guarantees and collateral security granted by each of the Subsidiaries.

[18] Jaguar has identified another potential liability. Mr. Daniel Titcomb, former chief executive officer of Jaguar, and certain other associated parties, have instituted a legal proceeding against Jaguar and certain of its current and former directors that is currently proceeding in the United States Federal Court. Counsel to Jaguar submits that this lawsuit alleges certain employment-related claims and other claims in respect of equity interests in Jaguar that are held by Mr. Titcomb and others. Counsel to Jaguar advises that Jaguar and its board of directors believe this lawsuit to be without merit.

[19] Counsel also advises that, aside from the lawsuit and professional service fees incurred by Jaguar, the unsecured liabilities of Jaguar are not material.

[20] The Jaguar Group's mines are not low-cost gold producers and the recent decline in the price of gold has negatively impacted the Jaguar Group.

[21] Based on current world prices and Jaguar Group's current level of expenditures, the Jaguar Group is expected to cease to have sufficient cash resources to continue operations early in the first quarter of 2014.

[22] Counsel also submits that, as a result of Jaguar's event of default under the 2014 Notes, certain remedies have become available, including the possible acceleration of the principal amount and accrued and unpaid interest on the 2014 Notes. As of November 13, 2013, that principal and accrued interest totalled approximately \$169.3 million.

[23] Jaguar's unaudited consolidated financial statements for the nine months ending September 30, 2013 show that Jaguar had an accumulated deficit of over \$317 million and a net loss of over \$82 million for the nine months ending September 30, 2013. Jaguar's current liabilities (at book value) exceed Jaguar's current assets (at book value) by approximately \$40 million.

[24] I accept that Jaguar faces a liquidity crisis and is insolvent.

[25] Jaguar has been involved in a strategic review over the past two years. Counsel submits that the efforts of Jaguar and its advisors have shown that a comprehensive restructuring plan involving a debt-to-equity exchange and an investment of new money is the best available alternative to address Jaguar's financial issues.

[26] Counsel to Jaguar advises that the board of directors of Jaguar has determined that the Recapitalization is the best available option to Jaguar and, further, that the plan cannot be implemented outside of a CCAA proceeding. Counsel emphasizes that without the protection of the CCAA, Jaguar is exposed to the immediate risk that enforcement steps may be taken under a variety of debt instruments. Further, Jaguar is not in a position to satisfy obligations that may result from such enforcement steps.

[27] Jaguar requests a stay of proceedings in favour of non-applicant Subsidiaries contending that, because of Jaguar's dependence upon its Subsidiaries for their value generating capacity, the commencement of any proceedings or the exercise of rights or remedies against these Subsidiaries would be detrimental to Jaguar's restructuring efforts and would undermine a process that would otherwise benefit Jaguar Group's stakeholders as a whole.

[28] Jaguar also seeks a charge on its current and future assets (the "Property") in the maximum amount of \$5 million (a \$500,000 first-ranking charge (the "Primary Administration Charge") and a \$4.5 million fourth-ranking charge (the "Subordinated Administration Charge") (together, the "Administration Charge")). The purpose of the charge is to secure the fees and disbursements incurred in connection with services rendered both before and after the commencement of the CCAA proceedings by various professionals, as well as Canaccord Genuity and Houlihan Lokey, as financial advisors to the Ad Hoc Committee (collectively, the "Financial Advisors").

[29] Counsel advises that the Financial Advisors' monthly work fees (but not their success fees) will be secured by the Primary Administration Charge, while the Financial Advisors' success fees will be secured solely by the Subordinated Administration Charge.

[30] Counsel further advises that the Proposed Initial Order contemplates the establishment of a charge on Jaguar's Property in the amount of \$150,000 (the "Director's Charge") to protect the directors and officers. Counsel further advises that the benefit of the Director's Charge will only be available to the extent that a liability is not covered by existing directors and officers insurance. The directors and officers have indicated that, due to the potential for personal liability, they may not continue their service in this restructuring unless the Initial Order grants the Director's Charge.

[31] Counsel to Jaguar further advises that the proposed monitor is of the view that the Director's Charge and the Administration Charge are reasonable in these circumstances.

[32] Jaguar is unaware of any secured creditors, other than those who have received notice of the application, who are likely to be affected by the court-ordered charges.

[33] In addition to the Initial Order, Jaguar also seeks a Claims Procedure Order and a Meeting Order, submitting that it must complete the Recapitalization on an expedited timeline.

[34] Each of the Claims Procedure Order and Meeting Order include a comeback provision.

[35] Having reviewed the record and upon hearing submissions, I am satisfied the Applicant is a company to which the CCAA applies. It is insolvent and faces a looming liquidity crisis. The Applicant is subject to claims in excess of \$5 million and has assets in Canada. I am also satisfied that the application is properly before me as the Applicant's registered office and certain of its assets are situated in Toronto, Ontario.

[36] I am also satisfied that the Applicant has complied with the obligations of s. 10(2) of the CCAA.

[37] I am also satisfied that an extension of the stay of proceedings to the Subsidiaries of Jaguar is appropriate in the circumstances. Further, I am also satisfied that it is reasonable and appropriate to grant the Administration Charge and the Director's Charge over the Property of the Applicant. In these circumstances, I am also prepared to approve the Engagement Letters and to seal the terms of the Engagement Letters. In deciding on the sealing provision, I have taken into account that the Engagement Letters contain sensitive commercial information, the disclosure of which could be harmful to the parties at issue. However, as I indicated at the hearing, this issue should be revisited at the comeback hearing.

[38] I am also satisfied that Jaguar should be authorized to comply with the pre-filing obligations to the extent provided in the Initial Order.

[39] In arriving at the foregoing conclusions, I reviewed the argument submitted by counsel to Jaguar that the stay of proceedings against non-applicants is appropriate. The Jaguar Group operates in a fully integrated manner and depends upon its Subsidiaries for their value generating capacity. Absent a stay of proceedings not only in favour of Jaguar but also in favour of the Subsidiaries, various creditors would be in a position to take enforcement steps which could conceivably lead to a failed restructuring, which would not be in the best interests of Jaguar's stakeholders.

[40] The court has jurisdiction to extend the stay in favour of Jaguar's Subsidiaries. See *Lehndorff General Partners Limited (Re)* (1993), 17 C.B.R. (3d) 24 (Ont. Gen. Div.); *Calpine Canada Energy Limited (Re)*, 2006 ABQB 153, 19 C.B.R. (5th) 187; *Skylink Aviation Inc. (Re)*, 2013 ONSC 1500, 3 C.B.R. (6th) 150.

[41] The authority to grant the court-ordered Administration Charge and Director's Charge is contained in ss. 11.51 and 11.52 of the CCAA.

[42] In granting the Administration Charge, I am satisfied that:

- (i) notice has been given to the secured creditors likely to be affected by the charge;
- (ii) the amount is appropriate; and
- (iii) the charges should extend to all of the proposed beneficiaries.

[43] In considering both the amount of the Administration Charge and who should be entitled to its benefit, the following factors can also be considered:

- (a) the size and complexity of the business being restructured; and
- (b) whether there is an unwarranted duplication of roles.

See *Canwest Publishing Inc. (Re)*, 2010 ONSC 222, 63 C.B.R. (5th) 115.

[44] In this case, the proposed restructuring involves the proposed beneficiaries of the charge. I accept that many have played a significant role in the negotiation of the Recapitalization to date and will continue to play a role in the implementation of the Recapitalization. I am satisfied that there is no unwarranted duplication of roles among those who benefit from the proposed Administration Charge.

[45] With respect to the Director's Charge, the court must be satisfied that:

- (i) notice has been given to the secured creditors likely to be affected by the charge;
- (ii) the amount is appropriate;
- (iii) the applicant could not obtain adequate indemnification insurance for the director or officer at a reasonable cost; and
- (iv) the charge does not apply in respect of any obligation incurred by a director or officer as a result of the director's or officer's gross negligence or wilful misconduct.

[46] A review of the evidence satisfies me that it is appropriate to grant the Director's Charge as requested.

[47] Jaguar requested that the Initial Order authorize it to perform certain pre-filing obligations in respect of professional service providers and third parties who provide services in respect of Jaguar's public listing agreement. In the circumstances, I find it to be reasonable that Jaguar be authorized to perform these pre-filing obligations.

[48] In view of Jaguar's desire to move quickly to implement the Recapitalization, I have also been persuaded that it is both necessary and appropriate to grant the Claims Procedure Order and the Meeting Order at this time. These are procedural steps in the CCAA process and do not require any assessment by the court as to the fairness and reasonableness of the Plan at this stage.

[49] Counsel to Jaguar submits that Jaguar's approach to classification of the affected unsecured creditors is appropriate in these circumstances, citing a commonality of interest. Counsel also references s. 22(2) of the CCAA. For the purposes of today's motion, I am prepared to accept this argument. However, this is an issue that can, if raised, be reviewed at the comeback hearing.

[50] In the result, an Initial Order is granted together with a Meeting Order and Claims Procedure Order. All orders have been signed in the form presented.

MORAWETZ R.S.J.

Date: January 16, 2014

TAB 13

CITATION: Laurentian University of Sudbury, 2021 ONSC 659
COURT FILE NO.: CV-21-656040-00CL
DATE: 2021-02-01

SUPERIOR COURT OF JUSTICE - ONTARIO

RE: **IN THE MATTER OF THE *COMPANIES' CREDITORS***
***ARRANGEMENT ACT*, R.S.C. 1985, c. C-36, AS AMENDED**

AND IN THE MATTER OF A PLAN OF COMPROMISE OR
ARRANGEMENT OF LAURENTIAN UNIVERSITY OF
SUDBURY

BEFORE: Chief Justice G.B. Morawetz

COUNSEL: *D.J. Miller, Mitch W. Grossell, Andrew Hanrahan and Derek Harland*, for the
Applicant

Ashley John Taylor and Elizabeth Pillon, for the Monitor

Peter J. Osborne, for the Board of Governors

Natasha MacParland, Lender Counsel to the Applicant

Pamela L.J. Huff and Aryo Shalviri, for Royal Bank of Canada

Stuart Brotman and Dylan Chochla, for Toronto Dominion Bank

Martin R. Kaplan and Vern W. DaRe, for Firm Capital Mortgage Fund Inc., DIP
Lender

Michael Kennedy, Labour Counsel for the Applicant

George Benchetrit, for Bank of Montreal

HEARD: February 1, 2021

ENDORSEMENT

Introduction

[1] Laurentian University of Sudbury (“LU” or the “Applicant”) seeks certain relief pursuant to an order (the “Initial Order”) under the *Companies’ Creditors Arrangement Act* (the “CCAA”).¹

[2] LU is a publicly funded, bilingual and tricultural postsecondary institution in Sudbury, Ontario. Since inception, LU has provided higher education to the community of Sudbury and Northern Ontario at large and is an integral part of the economic fabric of the Northern Ontario community.

[3] As a result of many years of recurring operational deficits in the millions of dollars, and notwithstanding LU’s recent efforts to improve its financial stability, LU is experiencing a liquidity crisis and is insolvent.

[4] LU submits that it requires the protection of the Court and the relief available under the CCAA so that it can financially and operationally restructure itself in order to emerge as a financially sustainable university for the benefit of all its stakeholders.

[5] The facts with respect to this application are briefly summarized below and more fully set out in the Affidavit of Dr. Robert Haché sworn January 30, 2021, filed in support of this application (the “Haché Affidavit”).²

[6] For the following reasons, the Interim Order is granted.

Overview of the Applicant

[7] LU is a non-share capital corporation that was incorporated pursuant to *An Act to Incorporate Laurentian University of Sudbury*, S.O. 1960, c. 151, as amended by S.O. 1961-62, c. 154 (the “LU Act”) and is a registered charity pursuant to the *Income Tax Act*, R.S.C. 1985, c. 1 (5th Supp.).

[8] The governance structure of LU is bicameral. The Board of Governors (the “Board”), the President, and the Vice-Chancellor generally have powers over the operational and financial management of LU, whereas the Senate of LU (the “Senate”) is responsible for the academic policy of LU.

[9] LU primarily focuses on undergraduate programming, with approximately 8,200 total domestic and international undergraduate students (approximately 6,250 full-time equivalents) enrolled in the 2020-21 academic year. LU has five undergraduate faculties, each of which offer

¹ *Companies’ Creditors Arrangement Act*, R.S.C. 1985, c. C-36, as amended.

² Capitalized terms used herein but not otherwise defined have the meanings ascribed to them in the Haché Affidavit. All references to currency in this factum are to Canadian dollars, unless otherwise noted.

programs in both English and French, and students can choose from 132 undergraduate programs to enroll in.

[10] LU also has a graduate program, with approximately 1,098 total domestic and international graduate students enrolled during the 2020-21 academic year. LU offers 43 Masters and PhD programs in a variety of disciplines.

[11] LU has a federated school structure whereby it has formal affiliations with several independent universities under the overall LU umbrella: the University of Sudbury, the University of Thorneloe, and Huntington University. The Federated Universities are integrated into LU, however, each of the Federated Universities are separate legal entities and are governed by Boards that are independent of LU.

[12] LU is one of the largest employers in the Greater Sudbury area. As at December 30, 2020, LU employed approximately 1,751 people, of which approximately 758 are full-time employees. Total salaries and benefits represent the single largest expense item for LU on an annual basis (approximately \$134 million of \$201 million in total expenses during fiscal year 2019-20).

[13] Approximately 612 LU employees are represented by the Laurentian University Faculty Association (“LUFA”). Approximately 268 non-faculty staff are represented by the Laurentian University Staff Union (“LUSU”).

[14] LUFA and the Board of LU are parties to a Collective Agreement (the “LUFA CA”), with a three-year term that expired on June 30, 2020.

[15] Since April 2020, LU and LUFA have been engaged in bargaining with respect to a new collective bargaining agreement.

[16] On July 1, 2018, LUSU and LU entered into a Collective Agreement that was set to expire on June 30, 2021 (the “LUSU CA”).

Assets and Liabilities

[17] LU does not prepare interim financial statements. The most recent audited statements for the year ended April 30, 2020, are attached to the Haché Affidavit.

[18] As at April 30, 2020, LU had assets with a book value totaling approximately \$358 million, of which approximately \$33 million is comprised of current assets such as cash and short-term investments, accounts receivable, and other current assets. The remaining assets of LU consist primarily of investments in LU’s segregated endowment fund (\$53 million) and capital assets (\$272 million), comprising LU’s land and buildings.

[19] As at April 30, 2020, LU had liabilities with a book value totaling approximately \$322 million, comprised of: (i) approximately \$43 million of current liabilities; (ii) approximately \$168 million of deferred contributions; and (iii) approximately \$110 million in long-term liabilities.

LU's Liquidity Crisis and Insolvency

[20] LU has experienced recurring operational deficits in the millions of dollars each year for a significant period of time. These operational deficits have led to the accumulated deficit in the operational fund of LU of approximately \$20 million at the end of 2019-20 fiscal year. In the current 2020-21 fiscal year, LU projects a further operational deficit of \$5.6 million.

[21] LU takes the position that it is insolvent and absent the relief sought in the Initial Order, will run out of cash to meet payroll in February.

[22] LU advises that it has a number of structural issues that are causing financial challenges and that need to be resolved to ensure long-term stability, including:

- (a) The terms of the LUFA CA are above market in several respects, and that issue is exacerbated by the tenuous labour relationship between LU and LUFA;
- (b) Operationally, the structure of the academic programming offered by LU and the distribution of enrollment among the programs offered is flawed and must be addressed; and
- (c) With its current cost structure, it costs more for LU and the Federated Universities to educate each student than the average for all Ontario universities by approximately \$2,000 per student, per year.

[23] LU submits that the financial challenges that LU faces are significant and, absent fundamental change, LU's short-term and long-term financial and operational sustainability are at risk.

Objective of CCAA Filing

[24] As part of its restructuring strategy, LU intends to implement long-term financial stability initiatives including, among other things:

- (a) A review of the breadth of academic programs offered at LU and their enrollment levels;
- (b) A re-evaluation of the Federated Universities model;
- (c) Negotiations with LU's unions regarding what LU must look like in the future and ensuring that a restructured LU can be aligned with collective agreements that will facilitate its future sustainability;
- (d) Identification of opportunities for future revenue generation;
- (e) Refinement of the student experience at LU to continue providing a top-notch education; and
- (f) Consideration of options for addressing current and long-term indebtedness.

Law and Analysis

[25] The CCAA applies to a “debtor company” whose liabilities exceed \$5 million. A “debtor company” is defined, *inter alia*, as a “company” that is “insolvent” or that has committed an act of bankruptcy within the meaning of the *Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act*.³

[26] The CCAA defines “company” to include, among other things, a company incorporated by or under an Act of the legislature of a province.⁴

[27] The Applicant is incorporated under an act of the legislature of the Province of Ontario, the LU Act, and therefore is a “company” for the purposes of the CCAA.⁵ Further, as a not-for-profit, non-share capital corporation, the Applicant falls under the *Corporations Act* (Ontario).⁶

[28] There have been several CCAA proceedings commenced in respect of not-for-profit corporations, such as *Canadian Red Cross Society*⁷ and *The Land Conservancy of British Columbia*.⁸

[29] I am satisfied that the Applicant’s status as a not-for-profit, non-share capital corporation does not impact the applicability of the CCAA to the Applicant.

Insolvency

[30] The insolvency of a debtor is assessed at the time of the filing of the CCAA application. While the CCAA does not define “insolvent”, the definition of “insolvent person” under the BIA is commonly referenced by the Court in assessing whether an applicant is a debtor company in the context of the CCAA.⁹ The BIA defines “insolvent person” as follows:¹⁰

“insolvent person” means a person who is not bankrupt and who resides, carries on business or has property in Canada, whose liabilities to creditors provable as claims under this Act amount to one thousand dollars, and

- (i) who is for any reason unable to meet his obligations as they generally become due,

³ R.S.C. 1985, c. B-3 (“BIA”).

⁴ CCAA, s. 2(1).

⁵ S.O. 1960, c. 151, as amended by S.O. 1961-62, c. 154.

⁶ R.S.O. 1990, c. C.38.

⁷ *Canadian Red Cross Society*, 2000 CarswellOnt 3269 (S.C.).

⁸ *TLC, The Land Conservancy of British Columbia, Re*, 2014 BCSC 97 at paras. 14-18.

⁹ *Stelco Inc. (Re)*, 2004 CarswellOnt 1211 (S.C.) at paras. 21-22 [*Stelco*].

¹⁰ BIA, s. 2.

- (ii) who has ceased paying his current obligations in the ordinary course of business as they generally become due, or
- (iii) the aggregate of whose property is not, at a fair valuation, sufficient, or, if disposed of at a fairly conducted sale under legal process, would not be sufficient to enable payment of all his obligations, due and accruing due.

[31] The tests for “insolvent person” under the BIA are disjunctive. A company satisfying either (i), (ii) or (iii) of the test is considered insolvent for the purposes of the CCAA.¹¹

[32] In addition to the foregoing tests, in *Stelco*, Farley J. held that a financially troubled corporation is insolvent if it is reasonably expected to run out of liquidity within a reasonable proximity of time as compared with the time reasonably required to implement a restructuring.¹²

[33] Based on the evidence set out in the Haché Affidavit and as summarized in the Report of Ernst & Young Inc., the Proposed Monitor, I find that the Applicant is plainly insolvent and faces a severe liquidity crisis.

[34] I also find that the Applicant is a “debtor company” to which the CCAA applies.

Stay of Proceedings

[35] Pursuant to section 11.02(1) of the CCAA, a Court may grant an order staying all proceedings in respect of a debtor company for a period of not more than ten days, provided that the Court is satisfied that circumstances exist to make the order appropriate.

[36] The Applicant submits that it is just and appropriate to grant a stay of proceedings. The Applicant submits that it requires a stay of proceedings in order to provide it with the breathing room necessary to financially and operationally restructure itself in order to emerge as a sustainable and long-term financially viable university to continue providing quality post-secondary education in Northern Ontario.

[37] The Proposed Initial Order provides for a stay of proceedings in favour of the Applicant’s current and future directors and officers who may subsequently be appointed. The Applicant submits that the stay in favour of the current and future directors and officers is critical to retain the involvement of the Board and key officers who have knowledge that will assist the Applicant in negotiating with stakeholders and implementing a restructuring plan. I accept this submission.

[38] The Applicant also seeks a limited stay in respect of the Laurentian University Students General Association (the “Non-Applicant Stay Party” or “the SGA”). The stay in respect of the

¹¹ *Stelco*, *supra* note 9 at para. 28.

¹² *Stelco*, *supra* note 9 at para. 26.

Non-Applicant Stay Party is limited to preventing any person from: (i) commencing proceedings against the Non-Applicant Stay Party, (ii) terminating, repudiating, making any demand or otherwise altering any contractual relationships with the Non-Applicant Stay Party or enforcing any rights or remedies, or (iii) discontinuing or ceasing to perform any obligations under any contractual agreements with the Non-Applicant Stay Party, resulting from the commencement of this CCAA proceeding by the Applicant, the stay of proceedings granted to the Applicant and any default or cross-default arising due to the foregoing.

[39] CCAA courts have, on numerous occasions, extended the initial stay of proceedings to non-applicants.¹³ The Court's authority to grant such an order is derived from its broad jurisdiction under ss. 11 and 11.02(1) of the CCAA to make an initial order on "any terms that [the Court] may impose." It is well-established that it is appropriate for the Court to extend the protection of the stay of proceedings to third party entities where such parties are integrally and closely interrelated to the debtor companies' business or where doing so furthers the primary purpose of the CCAA, being the successful restructuring of an insolvent company.¹⁴

[40] In particular, where the business operations of a group of entities are inextricably intertwined, such as where there are agreements among the entities, guarantees provided by certain entities in the group in respect of the obligations of other entities in the group or shared cash management systems, courts have found it necessary and appropriate to extend a stay in respect of non-applicant parties.¹⁵

[41] In the present circumstances, the Applicant has provided a written guarantee in respect of a credit facility obtained by the Non-Applicant Stay Party. If counterparties were to exercise remedies due to the Applicant's insolvency, it would disrupt the Non-Applicant Stay Party and have financial implications for the Applicant.

[42] In my view, it is desirable to avoid disruption to the Non-Applicant Stay Party which is particularly critical given the Applicant's status as an operating university and its overarching aim in this CCAA proceeding to avoid or minimize any disruption to students resulting from the commencement of this proceeding. In furtherance of this objective, the Non-Applicant Stay Party will be essential to ensuring students are given all of the information and resources they need to stay informed. The Non-Applicant Stay Party will play a crucial role in maintaining an open dialogue between the Applicant and the interests/concerns of all students.

¹³ For example, *Sino-Forest Corporation (Re)*, 2012 ONSC 2063; *Canwest Global Communications Corp, Re*, 2009 CarswellOnt 6184 (S.C.) [*Canwest*]; *Cinram International Inc (Re)*, 2012 ONSC 3767 [*Cinram*].

¹⁴ *Cinram*, *ibid* at paras. 61-65.

¹⁵ *Tamerlane Ventures Inc., Re*, 2013 ONSC 5461 at paras. 20-21; *Cinram*, *ibid* at paras. 61-65.

[43] I am satisfied that extending a limited stay of proceedings to the Non-Applicant Stay Party will allow it to continue fulfilling its intended role and providing the myriad of other key services it provides to the Applicant's students.

Pre-Filing and Post-Filing Payments

[44] The Proposed Initial Order allows the Applicant to continue to make certain pre-filing and post-filing payments, including express authorization to:

- (a) pay all outstanding amounts owing in respect of the current 2020-21 academic year and future amounts owing in respect of rebates, refunds or other amounts that are owing or may be owed to students (directly, or to the student associations of the Applicant on behalf of students), in each case, subject to the policies and procedures of the Applicant; and
- (b) pay all outstanding amounts owing in respect of the current 2020-21 academic year and future amounts payable to students in respect of student scholarship, bursary or grants.

[45] The Applicant intends on operating in the ordinary course during this CCAA proceeding and minimizing the disruption to students as much as possible. To facilitate this, the Applicant must be able to process certain rebates owing to students and continue to provide students with scholarship and bursary money that is critical to their ongoing studies. Some students must pay tuition prior to the receipt of funding from the Ontario Student Assistance Program (OSAP). Upon receipt of OSAP funding, the Applicant reimburses the students who receive such funding. In many instances, scholarship, bursary and grant money has been committed and is critical to students in need of financial aid to fund their education.

[46] If the Applicant is unable to continue to process such payments, vulnerable students may be irreparably harmed. Many of these students are younger than 19 years of age, and therefore particularly vulnerable. In addition, a change to the manner in which these financial aspects are addressed by the Applicant with their students could create immediate emergencies and disruption to their ability to continue their studies.

[47] The proposed Monitor supports the inclusion of this provision and I am satisfied that it is reasonable in the circumstances.

The Administration Charge

[48] The Applicant requests that this Court grant a super-priority Administration Charge on the Property (as defined in the proposed form of the Initial Order) in favour of the Proposed Monitor, counsel to the Proposed Monitor, the Applicant's counsel and advisors, and independent counsel to the Board. At the initial hearing the Administration Charge was requested in the amount of \$400,000, and the Applicant will seek to increase it to \$1.25 million pursuant to a proposed Amended and Restated Initial Order on the Comeback Hearing. Section 11.52 of the CCAA provides the Court with statutory jurisdiction to grant the Administration Charge.

[49] In *Canwest Publishing*, Pepall, J. (as she then was) considered section 11.52 of the CCAA and identified the following non-exhaustive list of factors the Court may consider when granting an administration charge:

- (a) the size and complexity of the business being restructured;
- (b) the proposed role of the beneficiaries of the charge;
- (c) whether there is an unwarranted duplication of roles;
- (d) whether the quantum of the proposed charge appears to be fair and reasonable;
- (e) the position of the secured creditors likely to be affected by the charge; and
- (f) the position of the monitor.¹⁶

[50] The Applicant submits that the Administration Charge is warranted, necessary, and appropriate in the circumstances, given that:

- (a) the proposed restructuring will require the extensive involvement of the professional advisors subject to the Administration Charge;
- (b) the professionals subject to the Administration Charge have contributed, and will continue to contribute, to the restructuring of the Applicant;
- (c) there is no unwarranted duplication of roles so the professional fees associated with these proceedings will be minimized;
- (d) the Administration Charge will rank in priority to the DIP Charge and the Directors' Charge; and
- (e) the Proposed Monitor believes that the proposed quantum of the Administration Charge is reasonable.

[51] Further, the Applicant has limited the quantum of the Administration Charge that it seeks approval of to what is reasonably necessary for the first ten days of the CCAA proceedings.

[52] The proposed Monitor supports the requested relief.

[53] I am satisfied that the Administrative Charge is reasonable in the circumstances.

The Directors' Charge

[54] The Applicant requests that this Court also grant a priority charge in favour of the Applicant's current and future directors and officers in the amount of \$2 million (the "Directors' Charge"). The Applicant will seek to increase the Directors' Charge at the comeback hearing to

¹⁶ *Canwest Publishing Inc./Publications Canwest Inc., Re*, 2010 ONSC 222 at para. 54; *Mountain Equipment Co-Operative (Re)*, 2020 BCSC 2037 at para. 58.

\$5 million, \$3 million of which will rank subordinate to the DIP Charge. The Directors' Charge protects the current and future directors and officers against obligations and liabilities they may incur as directors and officers of the Applicant after the commencement of the CCAA proceedings, except to the extent that any such claims or the obligation or liability is incurred as a result of the director's or officer's gross negligence or wilful misconduct.

[55] The Applicant has certain insurance policies in place (as defined in the Haché Affidavit); however, the Applicant is concerned that the directors and officers may be unwilling to continue in their roles with the Applicant absent the Court granting the Directors' Charge. The Directors' Charge will only be available to the extent that any claim or liability is not covered by any applicable D&O insurance and in the event that the Applicant's D&O insurance does not respond to claims against the directors and officers.

[56] Section 11.51 of the CCAA provides the Court with the express statutory jurisdiction to grant the Directors' Charge in an amount the Court considers appropriate, provided notice is given to the secured creditors who are likely to be affected by it.¹⁷

[57] In approving a similar charge in *Canwest*, Pepall J. applied section 11.51 of the CCAA and noted the Court must be satisfied with the amount of the charge and that it is limited to obligations the directors and officers may incur after the commencement of the proceedings, so long as adequate insurance cannot be obtained at a reasonable cost.¹⁸

[58] The proposed Monitor supports the relief requested.

[59] I am satisfied that the Directors' Charge is reasonable in the circumstances because: (i) the Applicant will benefit from the active and committed involvement of the directors and officers, who have considerable institutional knowledge and valuable experience and whose continued participation will help facilitate an effective restructuring, (ii) the Applicant cannot be certain whether the existing insurance will be applicable or respond to any claims made, and the Applicant does not have sufficient funds available to satisfy any given indemnity should its directors and officers need to call upon such indemnities, (iii) the Directors' Charge does not secure obligations incurred by a director as a result of the directors' gross negligence or wilful misconduct, and (iv) the Proposed Monitor is of the view that the Directors' Charge is reasonable and appropriate in the circumstances.

¹⁷ CCAA, section 11.51.

¹⁸ *Canwest*, *supra* note 17 at paras. 46 and 48.

Sealing Provision

[60] Pursuant to the *Courts of Justice Act* (Ontario), this Court has the discretion to order that any document filed in a civil proceeding be treated as “confidential”, sealed and not form part of the public record.”¹⁹

[61] In *Sierra Club of Canada v. Canada (Minister of Finance)*, Iacobucci J. set out that a sealing order should only be granted when:

- (a) such an order is necessary in order to prevent serious risk to an important interest, including a commercial interest, in the context of litigation because reasonable alternatives measures will not prevent the risk; and
- (b) the salutary effects of the confidentiality order, including the effects on the right of civil litigants to a fair trial, outweigh the deleterious effects, including the effects on the right to free expression, which in this context includes the public interest in open and accessible court proceedings.²⁰

[62] The Applicant requests that, in the Initial Order, this Court seal Confidential Exhibits “FFF” and “GGG” to the Haché Affidavit. These documents relate to correspondence between the Applicant and the Ministry of Colleges and Universities (the “Ministry”). The documents contain information with respect to the Applicant and certain stakeholders of the Applicant, including various rights or positions that stakeholders of the Applicant may take either inside or outside of a CCAA proceeding, which could jeopardize the Applicant’s efforts to restructure.

[63] If the Confidential Exhibits are not sealed, the Applicant submits that stakeholders may react in such a way that jeopardizes the viability of the Applicant’s restructuring. As such, the salutary effects of the sealing order, which provides the Applicant with the best possible chance to effect a restructuring, far outweigh the deleterious effects of not disclosing the correspondence between the Applicant and the Ministry.

[64] I have reviewed the Confidential Exhibits and I accept the submissions of the Applicant and grant the sealing request.

¹⁹ *Courts of Justice Act*, R.S.O. 1990, c C.43, s. 137(2). See also *Target Canada Corp (Re)*, 2015 ONSC 1487 at paras. 28 – 30.

²⁰ *Sierra Club of Canada v. Canada (Minister of Finance)*, 2002 SCC 41, [2002] 2 S.C.R. 522 at para. 53.

The Requested Relief Sought is Reasonably Necessary

[65] Pursuant to s. 11.001, the relief sought on an initial application is to be limited to what is reasonably necessary for the continued operations of the debtor company in the ordinary course of business during the initial stay period.²¹

[66] The stated purpose of s. 11.001 is to “limit the decisions that can be taken at the outset of a CCAA proceeding to measures necessary to avoid the immediate liquidation of an insolvent company, thereby improving participation of all players.”²²

[67] For the purposes of relief sought on this initial hearing, I accept the facts as stated in the Haché affidavit.

[68] The financial information required pursuant to s. 10(2) of the CCAA has been provided.

[69] I am satisfied the Ernst & Young Inc. is qualified to act as Monitor.

Disposition

[70] The requested relief complies with s. 11.001 of the CCAA in that it is limited to relief that is reasonably necessary for the continued operation of the applicant in the ordinary course of business. The Initial Order is granted in the form presented and it has been signed by me.

[71] The comeback hearing is to be held by Zoom on Wednesday, February 10, 2021 at 9:00 a.m.

Court-Appointed Mediator

[72] Finally, LU is also seeking an Order for the appointment of a mediator by the Court (the “Court-Appointed Mediator”) to oversee negotiations with respect to the various restructuring initiatives necessary for the Applicant to achieve a successful restructuring.

[73] If appointed, the Applicant expects the Court-Appointed Mediator to assist with (i) negotiations related to the review and restructuring of the academic programs and (ii) the collective agreement between the Applicant and LUFA.

[74] The Applicant is of the view that the need for the appointment of a mediator by the court is urgent and a high priority item.

²¹ CCAA, s. 11.001, 11.02(1) and (3).

²² *Lydian International Limited (Re)*, 2019 ONSC 7473 at paras. 22-26.

[75] The proposed Monitor is of the view that the appointment of a Court-Appointed Mediator is critical to ensure that LU, LUFA and the other negotiating parties have the best possible opportunity to succeed.

[76] It is the Proposed Monitor's view that it is necessary that the Court-Appointed Mediator be someone who is independent and objective, has experience in both insolvency matters as well as collective agreements and labour negotiations, someone who will appreciate the urgency with which the mediation must be conducted and have the time available to dedicate to it. Finally, in the Proposed Monitor's view, a sitting or recently retired judge meeting these characteristics would be preferable. The Proposed Monitor asks that the appointment be made by the court on an urgent basis.

[77] I appreciate and acknowledge the points put forth by counsel to both the Applicant and the Proposed Monitor. However, prior to determining this issue, in my view it is necessary to provide LUFA with an opportunity to make submissions.

[78] In recognition of the compressed timeline in these proceedings, it is desirable to determine this issue at the earliest opportunity and, in any event, not later than the comeback hearing on February 10, 2021.

[79] If LU, LUFA and the Proposed Monitor wish to address this matter prior to February 10, 2021, a case conference can be scheduled with me through the Commercial List Office.

CHIEF JUSTICE G.B. MORAWETZ

Date: February 1, 2021

TAB 14

CITATION: Lydian International Limited (Re), 2019 ONSC 7473
COURT FILE NO.: CV-19-00633392-00CL
DATE: 2019-12-24

**ONTARIO
SUPERIOR COURT OF JUSTICE
(COMMERCIAL LIST)**

**IN THE MATTER OF THE COMPANIES' CREDITORS ARRANGEMENT ACT,
R.S.C. 1985, c. C-36, AS AMENDED**

**AND IN THE MATTER OF A PLAN OF COMPROMISE OR ARRANGMENT OF
LYDIAN INTERNATIONAL LIMITED, LYDIAN CANADA VENTURES
CORPORATION AND LYDIAN U.K. CORPORATION LIMITED**

Applicants

BEFORE: Chief Justice Geoffrey B. Morawetz

COUNSEL: *Elizabeth Pillon, Sanja Sopic, and Nicholas Avis, for the Applicants*

Pamela Huff, for Resource Capital Fund VI L.P.

Alan Merskey, for OSISKO Bermuda Limited

D.J. Miller, for Alvarez & Marsal Canada Inc. proposed Monitor

David Bish, for ORION Capital Management

Bruce Darlington, for ING Bank N.V./ABS Svensk Exportkredit (publ)

HEARD and DETERMINED: December 23, 2019

REASONS RELEASED: December 24, 2019

ENDORSEMENT

Introduction

[1] Lydian International Limited ("Lydian International"), Lydian Canada Ventures Corporation ("Lydian Canada") and Lydian UK Corporation Limited ("Lydian UK", and collectively, the "Applicants") apply for creditor protection and other relief under the *Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act*, R.S.C. 1985, c. C-36 ("CCAA"). The Applicants seek an initial order, substantially in the form attached to the application record. No party attending on the motion opposed the requested relief.

[2] The Applicants are part of a gold exploration and development business in south central Armenia (the “Amulsar Project”). The Amulsar Project is directly owned and operated by Lydian Armenia CJSC (“Lydian Armenia”), a wholly-owned subsidiary of the Applicants.

[3] As set out in the affidavit of Edward A. Sellers sworn December 22, 2019 (the “Sellers Affidavit”), the Applicants have been experiencing and continue to experience liquidity issues due to blockades of the Amulsar Project and other external factors. The Sellers Affidavit details such activities and Mr. Sellers deposes that these activities have prevented Lydian Armenia and its employees, contractors and suppliers from accessing, constructing and ultimately operating the Amulsar Project.

[4] Mr. Sellers states that the lack of progress at the Amulsar Project has prevented the Lydian Group (as that term is defined below) from generating any positive cash flow and has also triggered defaults on certain of the Lydian Group’s obligations to its lenders which, if enforced, the Lydian Group would be unable to satisfy.

[5] The Lydian Group has operated under forbearance agreements in respect of these defaults since October 2018, but the most recent forbearance agreement expired on December 20, 2019.

[6] The Applicants contend that they now require immediate protection under the CCAA for the breathing room they require to pursue remedial steps on a time sensitive basis.

[7] The Applicants intend to continue discussions with their lenders and other stakeholders, including the Government of Armenia (“GOA”). The Applicants also intend to continue evaluating potential financing and/or sale options, all with a view to achieving a viable path forward.

The Applicants

[8] Lydian International is a corporation continued under the laws of the Bailiwick of Jersey, Channel Islands, from the Province of Alberta pursuant to the *Companies (Jersey) Law 1991*. Lydian International was originally incorporated under the *Business Corporations Act*, R.S.A. 2000, c. B-9 (Alberta) on February 14, 2006 as “Dawson Creek Capital Corp.”, and subsequently became Lydian International on December 12, 2007.

[9] Lydian International’s registered office is located in Jersey. On June 12, 2019, Lydian International shareholders approved its continuance under the *Canada Business Corporations Act*, R.S.C., 1985, c. C-44, but this continuance has yet to be implemented.

[10] Lydian International has two types of securities listed on the Toronto Stock exchange: (1) ordinary shares and (2) warrants that expired in 2017.

[11] Lydian Canada is a direct, wholly owned subsidiary of Lydian International. Lydian Canada is incorporated under the *Business Corporations Act*, S.B.C. 2002, c. 57 (British Columbia) and has a registered head office in Toronto. Its registered and records office is located in British Columbia.

[12] Lydian UK is a corporation incorporated in the United Kingdom and is a direct, wholly-owned subsidiary of Lydian Canada with a head office located in the United Kingdom. Lydian UK has no material assets in the UK.

[13] Lydian International and Lydian UK have assets in Canada in the form of deposits with the Bank of Nova Scotia in Toronto.

[14] The Applicants are part of a corporate group (the “Lydian Group”) with a number of other subsidiaries ultimately owned by Lydian International. Other than the Applicants, certain of the Lydian Group’s subsidiaries are Lydian U.S. Corporation (“Lydian US”), Lydian International Holdings Limited (“Lydian Holdings”), Lydian Resources Armenia Limited (“Lydian Resources”) and Lydian Armenia, a corporation incorporated under the laws of the Republic of Armenia. Together, Lydian U.S., Lydian Holdings, Lydian Resources and Lydian Armenia are the “Non-Applicant” parties.

[15] The Applicants submit that due to the complete integration of the business and operations of the Lydian Group, an extension of the stay of proceedings over the Non-Applicant parties is appropriate.

[16] The Applicants contend that the Lydian Group is highly integrated and its business and affairs are directed primarily out of Canada. Substantially all of its strategic business affairs, including key decision-making, are conducted in Toronto and Vancouver.

[17] Further, all the Applicants and Non-Applicant Parties are borrowers or guarantors of the Lydian Group’s secured indebtedness. The Lydian Group’s loan agreements are governed primarily by the laws of Ontario.

[18] Finally, the Lydian Group’s forbearance and restructuring efforts have been directed out of Toronto.

[19] The Lydian Group is focused on constructing the Amulsar Project, its wholly-owned development stage gold mine in Armenia. The Amulsar Project was funded by a combination of equity and debt capital and stream financing. The debt and stream financing arrangements are secured over substantially all the assets of Lydian Armenia and Lydian International in the shares of various groups of the Lydian Group.

[20] The Applicants contend that time is of the essence given the Applicants’ minimal cash position and negative cash flow.

Issues

[21] The issues for consideration are whether:

- (a) the Applicants meet the criteria for protection under the CCAA;

- (b) the CCAA stay should be extended to the Non-Applicant Parties;
- (c) the proposed monitor, Alvarez & Marsal Canada Inc. (“A&M”) should be appointed as monitor;
- (d) Ontario is the appropriate venue for this proceeding;
- (e) this court should issue a letter of request of the Royal Court of Jersey;
- (f) this Court should exercise its discretion to grant the Administration Charge and the D & O Charge (as defined below); and
- (g) it is appropriate to grant a stay extension immediately following the issuance of the Initial Order.

Law and Analysis

[22] Pursuant to section 11.02(1) of the CCAA, a court may make an order staying all proceedings in respect of a debtor company for a period of not more than 10 days, provided that the court is satisfied that circumstances exist to make the order appropriate.

[23] Section 11.02(1) of the CCAA was recently amended and the maximum stay period permitted in an initial application was reduced from 30 days to 10 days. Section 11.001 which came into force at the same time as the amendment to s. 11.02(1), limits initial orders to “ordinary course” relief.

[24] Section 11.001 provides:

11.001 An order made under section 11 at the same time as an order made under subsection 11.02(1) or during the period referred to in an order made under that subsection with respect to an initial application shall be limited to relief that is reasonably necessary for the continued operations of the debtor company in the ordinary course of business during that period.

[25] The News Release issued by Innovation, Science and Economic Development Canada specifically states that these amendments “limit the decisions that can be taken at the outset of a CCAA proceeding to measures necessary to avoid the immediate liquidation of an insolvent company, thereby improving participation of all players.”

[26] In my view, the intent of s. 11.001 is clear. Absent exceptional circumstances, the relief to be granted in the initial hearing “shall be limited to relief that is reasonably necessary for the continued operations of the debtor company in the ordinary course of business during that

period”. The period being no more than 10 days, and whenever possible, the *status quo* should be maintained during that period.

[27] Following the granting of the initial order, a number of developments can occur, including:

- (a) notification to all stakeholders of the CCAA application;
- (b) stabilization of the operation of debtor companies;
- (c) ongoing negotiations with key stakeholders who were consulted prior to the CCAA filing;
- (d) commencement of negotiations with stakeholders who were not consulted prior to the CCAA filing;
- (e) negotiations of DIP facilities and DIP Charges;
- (f) negotiations of Administration Charges;
- (g) negotiation of Key Employee Incentives Programs;
- (h) negotiation of Key Employee Retention Programs;
- (i) consultation with regulators;
- (j) consultation with tax authorities;
- (k) consideration as to whether representative counsel is required; and
- (l) consultation and negotiation with key suppliers.

[28] This list is not intended to be exhaustive. It is merely illustrative of the many issues that can arise in a CCAA proceeding.

[29] Prior to the recent amendments, it was not uncommon for an initial order to include provisions that would affect some or all of the aforementioned issues and parties. The previous s. 11.02 provided that the initial stay period could be for a period of up to 30 days. After the initial stay, a “comeback” hearing was scheduled and, in theory, parties could request that certain provisions addressed in the initial order could be reconsidered.

[30] The practice of granting wide-sweeping relief at the initial hearing must be altered in light of the recent amendments. The intent of the amendments is to limit the relief granted on the first day. The ensuing 10-day period allows for a stabilization of operations and a negotiating window, followed by a comeback hearing where the request for expanded relief can be considered, on proper notice to all affected parties.

[31] In my view, this is consistent with the objectives of the amendments which include the requirement for “participants in an insolvency proceeding to act in good faith” and “improving participation of all players”. It may also result in more meaningful comeback hearings.

[32] It is against this backdrop that the requested relief at the initial hearing should be scrutinized so as to ensure that it is restricted to what is reasonably necessary for the continued operations of the debtor company during the initial stay period.

[33] For the reasons that follow, I conclude that it is appropriate to grant a s. 11.02 order in respect of the Applicants.

[34] I am satisfied that Lydian Canada meets the CCAA definition of “company” and is eligible for CCAA protection.

[35] I have also considered whether the foreign incorporated companies are “companies” pursuant to the CCAA. Such entities must satisfy the disjunctive test of being an “incorporated company” either “having assets or doing business in Canada”.

[36] In *Cinram International Inc., (Re)*, 2012 ONSC 3767, 91 C.B.R. (5th) 46, I stated that the threshold for having assets in Canada is low and that holding funds in a Canadian bank account brings a foreign corporation within the definition of “company” under the CCAA.

[37] In this case, both Lydian International and Lydian UK meet the definition of “company” because both corporations have assets in and do business in Canada.

[38] In my view the Applicants are each “debtor companies” under the CCAA. The Applicants are insolvent and have liabilities in excess of \$5 million. I am satisfied that the Applicants are eligible for CCAA protection.

[39] The Applicants seek to extend the stay to Lydian Armenia, Lydian Holdings, Lydian Resources Armenia Limited and Lydian US. I am satisfied that, in the circumstances, it is appropriate to grant an order that extends the stay to the Non-Applicant Parties. The stay is intended to stabilize operations in the Lydian Group. This finding is consistent with CCAA jurisprudence: see e.g., *Sino-Forest Corporation (Re)*, 2012 ONSC 2063, at paras. 5, 18, and 31; *Canwest Global Communications Corp. (Re)* (2009), 59 C.B.R. (5th) 72 (Ont. S.C.); and *Target Canada Co. (Re)*, 2015 ONSC 303, 22 C.B.R. (6th) 323, at paras. 49-50.

[40] I am also satisfied that it is appropriate to appoint A & M as monitor pursuant to the provisions of s. 11.7 of the CCAA.

[41] With respect to whether Ontario is the appropriate venue for this proceeding, Lydian Canada’s registered head office is located in Toronto and its registered and records offices are located in Vancouver. In my view, Ontario has jurisdiction over Lydian Canada. The registered head offices for Lydian International and Lydian UK are in Jersey and the UK respectively, however, both entities have assets in Ontario, those being funds on deposit with the Bank of Nova Scotia in Toronto. Further, it seems to me that both Lydian International and Lydian UK

have a strong nexus to Ontario and accordingly I am satisfied that Ontario is the appropriate jurisdiction to hear this application.

[42] I am also satisfied that, in these circumstances, it is appropriate for this court to issue to the Royal Court of Jersey a letter of request as referenced in the application record.

Administration Charge

[43] The Applicants seek a charge on their assets in the maximum amount of US \$350,000 to secure the fees and disbursements incurred in connection with services rendered by counsel to the Applicants, A & M and A & M's counsel, in respect of the CCAA proceedings (the "Administration Charge").

[44] Section 11.52 of the CCAA provides the ability for the court to grant the Administration Charge.

[45] The recently enacted s. 11.001 of the CCAA limits the requested relief on this motion, including the Administration Charge, to what is reasonably necessary for the continued operation of the Applicants during the Initial Stay Period. The Sellers Affidavit outlines the complex issues facing the Applicants.

[46] In *Canwest Publishing Inc.*, (Re), 2010 ONSC 222, 63 C.B.R.(5th) 115, Pepall J. (as she then was) identified six non-exhaustive factors that the court may consider in addition to s. 11.52 of the CCAA when determining whether to grant an administration charge. These factors include:

- (a) the size and complexity of business being restructured;
- (b) the proposed role of the beneficiaries of the charge;
- (c) whether there is an unwarranted duplication of roles;
- (d) whether the quantum of the proposed charge appears to be fair and reasonable;
- (e) the position of the secured creditors likely to be affected by the charge; and
- (f) the position of the monitor.

[47] It seems to me that the proposed restructuring will require extensive input from the professional advisors and there is an immediate need for such advice. The requested relief is supported by A & M.

[48] I am satisfied that the Administration Charge in the limited amount of US \$350,000 is appropriate in the circumstances and is reasonably necessary for the continued operation of the business at this time.

D & O Charge

[49] The Applicants also seek a charge over the property in favour of their former and current directors in the limited amount of \$200,000 (the “D & O Charge”).

[50] The Applicants maintain Directors’ and Officers’ liability insurance (the “D & O Insurance”) which provides a total of \$10 million in coverage.

[51] The D & O Insurance is set to expire on December 31, 2019.

[52] Section 11.51 of the CCAA provides the court with the express statutory jurisdiction to grant the D & O charge in an amount the court considers appropriate, provided notice is given to the secured creditors who are likely to be affected.

[53] In *Jaguar Mining Inc., (Re)*, 2014 ONSC 494, 12 C.B.R. (6th) 290, I set out a number of factors to be considered in determining whether to grant a directors’ and officers’ charge:

- (a) whether notice has been given to the secured creditors likely to be affected by the charge;
- (b) whether the amount is appropriate;
- (c) whether the Applicant could obtain adequate indemnification insurance for the director at a reasonable cost; and
- (d) whether the charge applies in respect of any obligation incurred by a director or officer as a result of the directors’ or officers’ gross negligence or willful misconduct.

[54] Having reviewed the Sellers Affidavit, it seems to me that the granting of the D & O charge is necessary in the circumstances. In arriving at this conclusion, I have also taken into account that the D & O Insurance will lapse shortly; having directors involved in the process is desirable; that the secured creditors likely to be affected do not object; and that A & M has advised that it is supportive of the D & O Charge. Further, the requested amount is one that I consider to be reasonably necessary for the continued operation of the Applicants.

Extension of the Stay of Proceedings

[55] The Applicants have requested that, if the initial order is granted, I should immediately entertain and grant an order extending the Stay Period until and including January 17, 2020 which will provide the Applicants and all stakeholders with enough time to adequately prepare for a comeback hearing.

[56] The Applicants submit that I am authorized to grant a stay extension immediately after granting the initial order because section 11.02(2) of the CCAA does not provide a minimum waiting time before an applicant can seek a stay extension. The Applicants reference recent decisions where courts have scheduled hearings within two or three days after the granting of an initial order. Reference is made to *Clover Leaf Holdings Company (Re)*, 2019 ONSC 6966 and *Re Wayland group Corp. et al.* (2 December 2019), Toronto CV-19-00632079-00CL. In *Clover Leaf*, the stay extension for 36 days and additional relief including authorization for DIP financing was granted three days after the initial order and in *Wayland*, the stay extension was granted two days after the initial order.

[57] I acknowledge that, in this case, it may be challenging for the Applicants to return to court at or near the end of the 10-day initial stay period due to the year-end holidays. I also acknowledge that the offices of many of the parties involved in these proceedings may not be open during the holidays.

[58] However, the statutory maximum 10-day stay as referenced in s. 11.02(1) expires on January 2, 2020 and the courts are open on that day.

[59] As noted above, absent exceptional circumstances, I do not believe that it is desirable to entertain motions for supplementary relief in the period immediately following the granting of an initial order.

[60] It could very well be that circumstances existed in both *Clover Leaf* and *Wayland* that justified the stay extension and the ancillary relief being granted shortly after the initial order.

[61] However, in this case, I have not been persuaded on the evidence that it is necessary for the stay extension to be addressed prior to January 2, 2020 and I decline to do so.

Disposition

[62] The initial order is granted with a Stay Period in effect until January 2, 2020. In view of the holiday schedules of many parties, the following procedures are put in place. The Applicants can file a motion returnable on January 2, 2020, requesting that the stay be extended to January 23, 2020. Any party that wishes to oppose the extension of the stay to January 23, 2020 is required to notify the Applicant, A & M and the Commercial List Office of their intention to do so no later than 2:00 p.m. on December 30, 2019. In the event that the requested stay extension is unopposed, there will be no need for counsel to attend on the return of the motion. I will consider the motion based on the materials filed.

[63] If any objections are received by 2:00 p.m. on December 30, 2019, the hearing on January 2, 2020 will address the opposed extension request. Any further relief will be considered at the Comeback Motion on January 23, 2020.

Chief Justice Geoffrey B. Morawetz

Date: December 24, 2019

TAB 15

SUPERIOR COURT OF JUSTICE – ONTARIO

COMMERCIAL LIST

RE: IN THE MATTER OF A PLAN OF COMPROMISE OR ARRANGEMENT OF
NORTHSTAR AEROSPACE, INC., NORTHSTAR AEROSPACE (CANADA)
INC., 2007775 ONTARIO INC. AND 3024308 NOVA SCOTIA COMPANY,
Applicants

BEFORE: D. M. Brown J.

COUNSEL: M. Konyukhova, for the Applicants

Craig J. Hill, for Ernst & Young Inc., Court-Appointed Monitor

S. Weisz, for Fifth Third Bank as Pre-filing Agent and DIP Lender

C. Prophet, for Boeing Capital Loan Corporation

HEARD: August 7, 2012

REASONS FOR DECISION

I. Motion under the CCAA to authorize payment to critical supplier of pre-filing costs

[1] Northstar Aerospace, Inc. (“Northstar Inc.”), Northstar Aerospace (Canada) Inc. (“Northstar Canada”), 2007775 Ontario Inc. and 3024308 Nova Scotia Company (collectively, the “CCAA Entities”) applied for and were granted protection under the *Companies’ Creditors Arrangement Act* (the “CCAA”) pursuant to an Initial Order of this court dated June 14, 2012 (the “Initial Order”). Ernst & Young Inc. was appointed as Monitor (the “Monitor”) of the CCAA Entities and FTI Consulting Canada Inc. (“FTI Consulting”) was appointed Chief Restructuring Officer (“CRO”) of the CCAA Entities.

[2] Certain of Northstar Canada’s direct and indirect U.S. subsidiaries (the “Chapter 11 Entities”) commenced insolvency proceedings (the “Chapter 11 Proceedings”) pursuant to Chapter 11 of the United States Bankruptcy Code on June 14, 2012 in the United States Bankruptcy Court for the District of Delaware (the “U.S. Court”). The CCAA Entities and the Chapter 11 Entities are sometimes collectively referred to herein as “Northstar”.

[3] Northstar supplies components and assemblies for the commercial and military aerospace markets, and provides related services. Northstar provides goods and services to customers all over the world, including military defence suppliers, as well as the U.S. army. Northstar's products are used in the Boeing CH-47 Chinook helicopters, Boeing AH-64 Apache helicopters, Sikorsky UH-60 Blackhawk helicopters, AgustaWestland Links/Wildcat helicopters, the Boeing F-22 Raptor Fighter aircraft and various other helicopters and aircraft.

[4] The history of this proceeding is set out in previous endorsements of Morawetz J., most recently his Reasons dated July 30, 2012 (2012 ONSC 4423) approving the Heligear Transaction, vesting all of the Canadian Purchased Assets in the Canadian Purchaser free and clear of all restrictions, and authorizing and directing the Monitor, on the closing of the Heligear Transaction, to make distributions to the DIP Agent for the DIP Lenders and to the Lenders in accordance with their legal priorities.

[5] The Heligear Transaction has not yet closed.

[6] Changsha Zhongchuan Transmission Machinery Co., Ltd., a manufacturer of gears located in Hunan, The People's Republic of China, is the exclusive supplier to Northstar Canada of the gears that make up the components in gearboxes sold by Northstar to General Electric Company on an on-going basis. According to Nigel Meakin, a senior managing director of the CRO, the gears provided by Changsha are essential to Northstar's continued supply of gearboxes to GE on a timely basis in accordance with the Revenue Sharing Agreement between Northstar Canada and GE.

[7] Changsha rendered two invoices to Northstar Canada totaling US\$ 135,226.06 prior to the Initial Order. Those invoices remain unpaid. Notwithstanding that paragraph 17 of the Initial Order requires Changsha to continue supplying goods to Northstar Canada, Changsha has informed the CCAA Entities that until the two invoices are paid, it will not supply further materials to Northstar Canada. The evidence discloses that re-sourcing the gears would take approximately 12 months, and the inability of Northstar to deliver gearboxes "may imminently impact GE production lines".

[8] Under the Heligear Transaction the amounts owing under the Changsha invoices might be treated as Cure Costs, making them payable by the CCAA Entities on closing. The CRO deposed, however, that given the urgency of obtaining supply from Changsha, it is necessary for payment of the invoices to be made whether or not the amounts are Cure Costs and, in any event, payment is required earlier than the closing date.

[9] The CCAA Entities therefore move for an order authorizing them to make a payment of US\$ 135,223.06 to Changsha in respect of those amounts owing for supplies delivered prior to the commencement of these CCAA proceedings.

II. Positions of the parties

[10] The Monitor supports the relief requested. Fifth Third Bank does not oppose the relief sought; Boeing Capital supports the motion. All wish to see the Heligear Transaction close

quickly. No interested person appeared to oppose the motion or communicated its opposition to the CCAA Entities or the Monitor.

III. Analysis

[11] In *Cinram International Inc. (Re)*¹ Morawetz J. accepted, as an accurate summary of the applicable law on this issue, the following portions of the applicant's factum in that case:

Entitlement to Make Pre-Filing Payments

67. There is ample authority supporting the Court's general jurisdiction to permit payment of pre-filing obligations to persons whose services are critical to the ongoing operations of the debtor companies. This jurisdiction of the Court is not ousted by Section 11.4 of the CCAA, which became effective as part of the 2009 amendments to the CCAA and codified the Court's practice of declaring a person to be a critical supplier and granting a charge on the debtor's property in favour of such critical supplier. As noted by Pepall J. in *Re Canwest Global*, the recent amendments, including Section 11.4, do not detract from the inherently flexible nature of the CCAA or the Court's broad and inherent jurisdiction to make such orders that will facilitate the debtor's restructuring of its business as a going concern.

Canwest Global supra, at paras. 41 and 43; Book of Authorities, Tab 1.

68. There are many cases since the 2009 amendments where the Courts have authorized the applicants to pay certain pre-filing amounts where the applicants were not seeking a charge in respect of critical suppliers. In granting this authority, the Courts considered a number of factors, including:

- a. whether the goods and services were integral to the business of the applicants;
- b. the applicants' dependency on the uninterrupted supply of the goods or services;
- c. the fact that no payments would be made without the consent of the Monitor;
- d. the Monitor's support and willingness to work with the applicants to ensure that payments to suppliers in respect of pre-filing liabilities are minimized;
- e. whether the applicants had sufficient inventory of the goods on hand to meet their needs; and

¹ 2012 ONSC 3767

f. the effect on the debtors' ongoing operations and ability to restructure if they were unable to make pre-filing payments to their critical suppliers.

Canwest Global supra, at para. 43; Book of Authorities, Tab 1.

Re Brainhunter Inc., [2009] O.J. No. 5207 (Sup. Ct. J. [Commercial List]) at para. 21 [*Brainhunter*]; Book of Authorities, Tab 13.

Re Prizm Income Fund (2012), 75 C.B.R. (5th) 213 (Ont. Sup. Ct. J.) at paras. 29-34; Book of Authorities, Tab 14.

[12] In the present case the evidence disclosed that the materials supplied by Changsha are integral to the business of the CCAA Entities, they depend on the uninterrupted supply of those goods, and they lack a sufficient inventory of the goods on hand to meet their needs, with the potential of imminently affecting the production lines of GE, one of their customers.

[13] The Monitor supports the order sought; no party opposes the motion.

[14] Although Changsha is subject to the critical supplier provisions of the Initial Order, the simple reality of the situation is that Changsha is located outside the jurisdiction of this court and the courts in the parallel U.S. Chapter 11 proceedings. Enforcement of the Initial Order against Changsha could not occur in a timely fashion. In my view, this practical reality weighs heavily in favour of granting the order sought, although granting the order, in a sense, rewards improper conduct by a critical supplier who has ignored an order of this court and has the effect of countenancing a form of hard-ball queue-jumping.

[15] That said, in light of the support by interested parties for the order sought, business realities must prevail in order to ensure the continued operation of Northstar Canada pending closing of the Heligear Transaction. Accordingly, I grant the order requested by the CCAA Entities and authorize them to pay Changsha the amount of US\$ 135,223.06 in satisfaction of the two invoices.

D. M. Brown J.

Date: August 7, 2012

TAB 16

COURT OF APPEAL FOR BRITISH COLUMBIA

Citation: *Port Capital Development (EV) Inc. v.*
1296371 B.C. Ltd.,
2021 BCCA 382

Date: 20211008
Docket: CA47585

**In the Matter of the *Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act*,
R.S.C. 1985, c. C-36, as Amended**

-and-

**In the Matter of the *Business Corporations Act*,
S.B.C. 2002, c. 57, as Amended**

-and-

**In the Matter of the Plan of Compromise and Arrangement of
Port Capital Development (EV) and Evergreen House Development
Limited Partnership**

Between:

**Port Capital Development (EV) Inc. and
Evergreen House Development Limited Partnership**

Respondents
(Petitioners/Applicants)

And

1296371 B.C. Ltd.

Appellant
(Respondent/Applicant)

And

**Centura Building Systems (2013) Ltd. and
Solterra Acquisitions Corp.**

Respondents
(Respondents)

Corrected Judgment: The cover page of the judgment was corrected on
October 18, 2021.

Before: The Honourable Madam Justice Newbury
The Honourable Mr. Justice Willcock
The Honourable Mr. Justice Goepel
The Honourable Madam Justice Dickson
The Honourable Mr. Justice Voith

On appeal from: An order of the Supreme Court of British Columbia, dated
June 30, 2021 (*Port Capital Development (EV) Inc. (Re)*, 2021 BCSC 1272,
Vancouver Docket S205095).

Counsel for the Appellant (via videoconference): J.D. Schultz
E. Watson

Counsel for the Respondents (Petitioners),
Port Capital Development (EV) Inc. and
Evergreen House Development Limited
Partnership
(via videoconference): D.E. Gruber

Counsel for the Respondents, Centura
Building Systems (2013) Ltd. and Solterra
Acquisitions Corp.
(via videoconference): K.M. Jackson
T.A. Posyniak

Counsel for Aviva Insurance Company of
Canada
(via videoconference): W.L. Roberts

Counsel for CMLS Financial Ltd. and
Desjardins Financial Security Life
Assurance Company
(via videoconference): C.D. Brousson
A.L. McCawley

Counsel for Ernst & Young Inc. in its
capacity as Monitor
(via videoconference): P. Bychawski

Place and Date of Hearing: Vancouver, British Columbia
September 21, 2021

Place and Date of Judgment with Written
Reasons to Follow: Vancouver, British Columbia
September 22, 2021

Place and Date of Written Reasons: Vancouver, British Columbia
October 8, 2021

Written Reasons by:

The Honourable Madam Justice Newbury

Concurred in by:

The Honourable Mr. Justice Willcock

The Honourable Mr. Justice Goepel

The Honourable Madam Justice Dickson

The Honourable Mr. Justice Voith

Summary:

Petitioners were constructing a high-rise tower in Vancouver until construction lender ("CMLS") ceased funding. CMLS and "Aviva" have first and second mortgages registered against the project respectively. Various lienholders and unsecured creditors, including respondent "Centura," are also owed money. Petitioners commenced proceeding under CCAA and Supreme Court granted stay of proceedings and appointed monitor, which solicited offers for purchase of Petitioners' assets or other 'investments' of funds.

Court below ultimately had two asset purchase or "liquidation" offers and a proposal made by appellant ("129") from which to choose. Under the latter, 129 would borrow funds and use pre-sale deposits sufficient to pay out interim loan and administrative charge (which had been given "super-priority" by chambers judge), and both secured creditors; CMLS mortgage would be assigned to new lender and its terms would be amended; and various other expenses would be met by 129 and other investors. As against this, the more desirable liquidation offer, made by 'Solterra', would allow Petitioners to pay out most of the CMLS mortgage but likely leave Aviva with a loss of \$8.6 million; half the pre-sale purchasers would lose their rights to purchase; and lienholders would lose their rights of registration against the project.

Chambers judge rejected arguments that 129's offer was effectively a "redemption" or that the arrangement to pay out and assign the CMLS mortgage constituted "interim financing" under s. 11.2 of CCAA. Although she stated 129's proposal made sense "from a business point of view", she was critical of it on other bases including that 'crucially', there was no suggestion the Petitioners or 129 intended to advance a plan of arrangement or compromise under s. 11 of the CCAA. Applying *Cliffs Over Maple Bay Investments Ltd. v. Fisgard Capital Corp.* (2008 BCCA), she ruled that 129's proposal did not meet the 'appropriateness' criterion and declined to exercise her discretion to grant an order approving the proposal. She granted Solterra's "Backup Offer" to purchase Petitioners' assets under s. 36.

Appeal brought by 129 was heard by a division of five justices in order to consider whether 'Maple Bay' should continue to be binding. New evidence was admitted by CA, generally "updating" developments concerning 129's proposal. It was in the interests of justice for the court to have information that was as accurate as possible. This evidence generally reflected improved prospects of success of the 129 proposal.

129 contended that chambers judge had erred in focussing in her appropriateness analysis on the "single factor" of the absence of an intended compromise rather than on the "primary remedial objective" of the CCAA. 129 contended that that objective is to assist debtor companies to avoid the "social and economic losses resulting from liquidation of an insolvent company" (citing *Century Services*.) It also contended that *Maple Bay* is no longer good law and had been overtaken by the broadened objectives of the Act and amendments thereto. Centura and Solterra contended that it was "antithetical" to the CCAA regime and binding authorities to facilitate a

proposal that contained no provision for a compromise or arrangement to be voted on by debtors' creditors. They also emphasized the chambers judge's description of the proposal as "speculative".

CA traced recent developments under the CCAA, under which courts have found they had jurisdiction to appoint monitors, to approve interim financing with "super-priority" and to approve liquidation sales of assets of debtor companies (prior to the enactment of what is now s. 36) without any express provision granting jurisdiction to do so. Section 11 is now very broadly worded and the SCC seems to have approved a broad and liberal interpretation of the statute and various "innovations" by counsel in devising restructuring plans aimed at avoiding the travails of bankruptcy.

CA ruled that Maple Bay should not have been regarded as dispositive as a matter of law (if indeed it was so regarded by the chambers judge); and that the absence of a planned compromise should not have weighed as a "crucial" factor in the judge's discretionary analysis of appropriateness under s. 11. While the absence of a planned compromise might be relevant in some cases, in this case there was a substantive and complex plan that was likely to further the broad objectives of the Act as now understood. On these bases alone, the appeal should be allowed.

Other errors in the chambers judge's reasoning were noted which in principle had led the judge erroneously to prefer the Solterra offer. 129's plan presented the best solution as compared to the liquidation offers and was much more than the "kernel" of a plan.

Appeal allowed; chambers judge's orders set aside and the order sought by 129 was approved, subject to terms.

Reasons for Judgment of the Honourable Madam Justice Newbury:

[1] Shortly after hearing this appeal, we advised counsel by memorandum that the appeal was allowed, for reasons to follow. We did so because of the fast-moving nature of the circumstances and a looming deadline in the proposal made by 1296371 B.C. Ltd. ("129") under the *Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act*, R.S.C. 1985, c. C-36 ("CCAA" or the "Act"), which proposal we ultimately approved. Our reasons follow.

[2] 129 appeals an order of a judge of the Supreme Court of British Columbia who dismissed 129's application for court approval of certain steps and transactions relating to the debt structure of Port Development (EV) Inc. and Evergreen House Development Limited Partnership (collectively, the "Petitioners"). Having rejected

that proposal, the judge approved an offer from the respondent Solterra Acquisitions Corp. (“Solterra”) to purchase the assets of the Petitioners on the terms set forth in Schedule B to the “Approval and Vesting Order” granted on June 15, 2021. A division of this court granted 129 leave to appeal the orders (see 2021 BCCA 319.) The division also ordered that the appeal be heard by a division of five judges given that the appellant intended to ask this court to reconsider and, if necessary, overrule *Cliffs Over Maple Bay Investments Ltd. v. Fisgard Capital Corp.* 2008 BCCA 327 (“*Maple Bay*”).

Factual Background

[3] The Petitioners are the owners of a real estate project, “Terrace House”, in downtown Vancouver. The Project is a proposed 19-storey luxury residential and commercial strata development. It provides for 20 residential units and two commercial retail units above a three-level underground parking facility. Terrace House is unusual in that its primary structural component is timber.

[4] In September 2017, presales of the units began. In late 2018, construction began. The construction lender is CMLS Financial Ltd. (“CMLS”), which holds a first mortgage against the Project. Aviva Insurance Company of Canada (“Aviva”) provided deposit insurance for the presale depositors in order to allow the Petitioners to use the deposit funds for the Project. It holds a second mortgage to secure any claims under the insurance.

[5] As of mid-2020, the parkade and structure for the first level of the building were substantially complete, and approximately 20% of the Project was finished. At that time, approximately \$16 million in presale deposits was in place for 17 residential units and the commercial units. Approximately \$8 million of the deposit funds had been spent on the Project.

[6] In May 2020, CMLS stopped funding construction and demanded payment of its loan. In short order, the Petitioners commenced proceedings under the CCAA. In their pleading, they sought relief of the kind usually sought under the *Act*, including an order authorizing them to file with the Court a “plan or plans of compromise and

arrangement.” They filed affidavit evidence of Mr. Macario Reyes, a director and officer of the corporate Petitioner, who was hopeful a restructuring could be achieved either by means of an equity investment or a liquidation of assets. (Reasons, at para. 11.) At the time, the Petitioners owed approximately \$34.8 million in secured debt and another \$8 million in unsecured and lien debt.

[7] The chambers judge below made an initial order on May 29, 2020, staying proceedings against the Petitioners and appointing Messrs. Ernst and Young Inc. as monitor to assume control of the Petitioners and the Project. The Monitor was given “enhanced powers” over the Petitioners and was to carry out a “dual track” process (referred to as a “sales and investment solicitation plan” or “SISP”) aimed at finding offers for either a sale of the property or an equity investment in the Project as a going concern. The latter could, the order stated, take the form of proposals to restructure, reorganize or refinance the business of the Petitioners.

[8] The initial order was restated by an order of the chambers judge dated June 8, 2020. It authorized interim financing of \$1.25 million (later increased to \$1.8 million) from Desjardins Financial Security Life Assurance Company (“Desjardins”) under s. 11.2(1) of the CCAA. Under the order, this loan was to rank after an administration charge (covering *inter alia* the Monitor’s fees) of up to \$250,000; both were given priority over all existing charges.

[9] The Monitor’s efforts produced a number of offers which the chambers judge below described in her reasons beginning at para. 15. By the time of the hearing before her on June 10, 2021, three active asset purchase or “liquidation” offers under s. 36 of the CCAA were outstanding — one from Landa Global Acquisitions Inc. (“Landa”) referred to as “Offer #3”, and two from Solterra, namely “Solterra Offer #1” and the “Solterra Backup Offer.” (Solterra is a related company to a lienholder, Centura Building Systems (2013) Ltd. (“Centura”), which is owed some \$473,000 by the Petitioners.)

[10] Of the three liquidation proposals, Solterra’s Backup Offer featured the highest purchase price. The purchase proceeds would pay the interim loan and

administration charges in full; the balance would be paid to CMLS, leaving it with a shortfall of about \$576,000. There would be no money remaining for Aviva or the other creditors.

[11] As I read the proposed contract of sale, Solterra would acquire the Project *free and clear* of all financial encumbrances, including all liens filed against the Project under PPSA and builders' lien legislation. The *liability* of the Petitioners thereunder would not be affected, but the liens would no longer be registered against the Project.

[12] In addition to the three liquidation offers, the chambers judge also had before her the so-called "Refinancing Transaction" proposal from 129, which will be described below. It was supported by affidavit evidence of Mr. Reyes, who is the controlling shareholder of 129 as well as of the corporate Petitioner. He has provided personal guarantees of the indebtedness of the Petitioners to CMLS and to Aviva.

[13] Mr. Reyes deposed that the 129 proposal was a "refinancing", intended to provide "breathing room" to secure new construction financing for Terrace House. He hoped this would "provide the opportunity to shift the focus to a long-term restructuring." He said there was "strong interest from lenders to provide new construction financing" but that it could not be secured until the new refinancing was in place and control of the Project was back in the hands of the Petitioners. He continued:

In the interim, working capital will be funded by existing limited partners and new third-party investors. This working capital is expected to be in the range of \$3 million to \$5 million, which will be sourced externally and will not encumber the Lands or other assets.

The most advanced negotiation on a new [construction] loan is with [name omitted]. The parties are close to finalizing a term sheet, however I do not expect negotiations can progress further until the Petitioners have regained control of the Terrace House Project. I estimate, with control of the project and the breathing room provided by the [new refinancing], it will take 30 to 60 days to finalize a term sheet with [name omitted] or another lender.

From this I infer that the proposal is likely to be the first part of a two-part restructuring of the Petitioners' debt, and that the new loan from Domain was regarded in a sense as "interim" as well. Mr. Reyes went on to depose:

The Terrace House Project is an innovative mass timber development. When completed, the Terrace House Project will become one of the tallest hybrid timber structure[s] in the world, constructed from concrete, wood and steel. The existing trades and consultants are specialists in mass timber construction and are essential to moving the Terrace House Project forward. The project has many stakeholders who will benefit from the completion of the Terrace House Project as designed. The Terrace House Project will contribute to the development of the mass timber industry. The City of Vancouver is invested in seeing the Terrace House Project completed, as are investors and other supporters of the project.

[14] 129's proposal was, initially at least, subject to many conditions, including the raising of funds from "private investors". The Monitor reported to the Court that *if 129's proposal completed*, it would result in a materially better outcome for the stakeholders than either the Solterra or Landa offers.

[15] At the hearing below, Aviva consented to the proposal for obvious reasons: it would allow Aviva to recoup its \$8 million, or most of it — as compared to the asset liquidation offers, under which it would likely recover nothing. The proposal was also supported by CMLS, but conditionally on the Court's approving one of the "cash" or liquidation offers "as a backup in case the 129 [Refinancing] did not complete." The Petitioners and the Monitor took no position on the 129 application; Centura opposed it.

The Chambers Judge's Reasons

[16] The judge issued her reasons on June 30, 2021. After describing the court proceedings to that date, she summarized "in broad strokes" the financial consequences of the liquidation offers *as of June 8, 2021 vis-à-vis* the two secured creditors, as compared to the consequences of 129's proposal. In her words:

- a) Under the Solterra and Landa cash offers, the Interim Lending Facility and priority professional fees would be paid. In addition, CMLS would suffer a shortfall to varying degrees: Solterra Offer #1 — \$3.2 million shortfall; Landa Offer #3 — \$1.7 million shortfall; and Solterra Backup Offer — a shortfall in excess of \$500,000;

- b) Under any of the cash offers, the Petitioners would disclaim the \$16 million of pre-sale agreements. Aviva would immediately crystalize its exposure (estimated at \$8.6 million). Both CMLS and Aviva hold security against the \$8 million cash deposits. CMLS/Aviva would then potentially advance arguments that these pre-sale purchasers had forfeited the right to a return of those cash deposits such that CMLS/Aviva could claim those amounts toward satisfaction of their loans; and
- c) Under the 129 Revised Offer, the material benefits, as noted by the Monitor were: 1) the Interim Lending Facility and CMLS would be paid in full; 2) Aviva's security position would be "improved" with the prospect of full or material recovery; and 3) the parties would avoid litigation with respect to the \$8 million in pre-sale cash deposits by converting them into a secured position against the Project. [At para. 42; emphasis added.]

[17] As she explained at para. 51, 129 invoked s. 11 of the CCAA as the basis of the Court's authority to approve its refinancing proposal. Section 11 provides:

Despite anything in the *Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act* or the *Winding-up and Restructuring Act*, if an application is made under this Act in respect of a debtor company, the court, on the application of any person interested in the matter, may, subject to the restrictions set out in this Act, on notice to any other person or without notice as it may see fit, make any order that it considers appropriate in the circumstances. [Emphasis added.]

The very wide discretion conferred by s. 11 (which came into force in its present form in 2009) has been noted by courts on many occasions. In *Century Services Inc. v. Canada (Attorney General)* 2010 SCC 60 at para. 70, the Court stated that the general language of s. 11 "should not be read as being restricted by the availability of more specific orders." More recently, the Supreme Court in *9354-9186 Quebec Inc. v. Callidus Corp.* 2020 SCC 10 observed that s. 11 signals Parliament's endorsement of the "broad reading of CCAA authority developed by the jurisprudence." (At para. 67.) The Court added, however, that the discretion is not unlimited, that it must be exercised "in furtherance of the remedial objectives of the CCAA" and that it is subject to the "baseline considerations" of appropriateness, good faith and due diligence. (At para. 49.)

[18] After emphasizing that 129's offer was not put forward by the Petitioners but by 129 — a new company formed by Mr. Reyes specifically for the proposed transaction — the judge described its terms as follows:

The salient details of the 129 Revised Offer are as follows:

- a) \$24.96 million would be raised, as follows:
 - i. \$14.7 million from Domain [Domain Mortgage Company];
 - ii. \$8 million in pre-sale deposits (including a \$2.8 million deposit held for Ms. Reyes) to be released and advanced to 129;
 - iii. \$2.15 million to be loaned from 126 [1260780 B.C. Ltd., a company controlled by Mr. Reyes' mother] to 129;
 - iv. 129, as the Junior Lender, then loans these amounts to "Newco", a company to be incorporated by Domain to hold the CMLS security;
 - v. Pre-payments to Domain (\$105,000),
- b) \$24.96 million would be used, as follows:
 - i. Payment in full of the Interim Lending Facility (\$1.3 million) and CCAA secured professional fees (\$507,000) [i.e., the Administration Charge];
 - ii. Purchase and assignment of the CMLS loan and security (\$21.3 million) to Newco, thus saving Mr. Reyes from his covenant;
 - iii. Fees and various holdbacks (\$1.5 million), including a six-month interest reserve for Domain (\$851,250); and
 - iv. Payment of Break Fee/Expense Reimbursement to Landa and Solterra (total \$250,000).

It is quite apparent that the 129 Offer has evolved substantially since May 7, 2021 until its current iteration on June 4, 2021 under the 129 Revised Offer (including by an increased consideration amount). The Monitor confirms that most of the conditions relating to the 129 Revised Offer have now been satisfied, save for customary funding conditions. That was not the case as of May 25, 2021 and, indeed, some conditions were only satisfied on the eve of this hearing.

There are some unique features under the 129 Revised Offer relevant to the existing stakeholder interests:

- a) The \$16 million in pre-sale contracts are to remain intact (unlike the Landa and Solterra Offers);
- b) Subordinate security interests after Domain in first ranking position are: second, 129 as the Junior Lender to hold security in respect of the pre-sale deposits in a sharing arrangement with Aviva; third, Aviva for any balance owed; fourth, 126 for the \$2.15 million loan; and fifth, 129 for the balance owed to it. Effectively,

this allows Aviva to maintain some hope of recovery under its secured loan as opposed to an immediate exposure of \$8.6 million (subject to any recovery against the \$8 million cash deposits held) under the Landa/Solterra Offers. Mr. Reyes benefits from this potential reduction or elimination of his personal exposure to Aviva; Ms. Reyes avoids litigation with Aviva over her pre-sale deposit;

- c) The proposed structure will not leave the Petitioners with any excess cash. Accordingly, 129 proposes to have 126 advance a further unsecured convertible loan to the Petitioners of up to \$750,000 as “working capital”, to be converted into some new equity structure of the Petitioners. The Monitor has prepared a cash flow forecast for the next six months to December 2021 indicating funding requirements of approximately \$600,000; and
- d) Mr. Reyes says that this later conversion of 126’s working capital loan will “likely” require the creation of new limited partner units that would have preferential rights over the existing limited partners.

The crux of the issues relating to the 129 Revised Offer lies in the CCAA relief that Mr. Reyes and 129 say they must obtain from the Court. They seek the following Court approval and orders, said to be necessary to implement the 129 Revised Offer:

- a) an extension of the stay of proceedings to December 11, 2021;
- b) Authorization to release the pre-sale deposits to 129 to allow 129 to pay \$8 million to CMLS for the purchase and assignment of the CMLS security, to stand as an advance by 129 to the Petitioners secured by the CMLS security. All of these pre-sale purchasers consent to the release of the deposits;
- c) Authorization to borrow up to \$750,000 from 126 for the “working capital” loan and approval of the terms of the commitment letter. Contrary to Mr. Reyes’ statement that this would “likely” require a restructuring of the partnership interests, the Court is being asked to bless the commitment letter to seemingly grant 126 the “right, in its sole discretion” to convert the debt into limited partnership units that will be preferential to all classes of existing units in the limited partnership;
- d) The “Refinancing Transaction” involves granting Court approval to the Petitioners to borrow money from Domain to fund the Interim Lending Facility and repay CMLS in full and take an assignment of the CMLS security, up to \$25 million. This “Refinancing” or “New Loan Facility” is to be documented in the usual fashion, with the significant proviso that the Petitioners are authorized to agree to amendments so as to provide that the CMLS security would secure all obligations of the Petitioners to both Domain, 126 and 129 (i.e. about \$25 million) and stand as a first secured charge on the Project.

In addition, the proposed order sought by Mr. Reyes and 129 would provide significant controls in this CCAA proceeding to Domain. Domain may act on its secured loan upon default and without Court approval or oversight; Domain is to be unaffected by any plan of arrangement or proposal; no order can be granted approving interim financing in priority to the New Loan Facility (essentially, the CMLS security, as amended); the Monitor's enhanced powers are removed; and:

15. While the New Loan Facility remains outstanding, no further step shall be taken by the Petitioners in these proceedings without the consent of Domain.

[At paras. 45–49; emphasis added.]

(I note parenthetically that the commitment letters relating to Domain's proposed loan contemplate that it will also be fully guaranteed personally by Mr. Reyes.)

[19] The chambers judge noted that, as mentioned above, the Monitor had reported that *if 129's offer completed*, it would "result in a 'materially better' outcome for the stakeholders" than the Solterra and Landa Offers, "when weighing all the factors and continued financial participation by stakeholders." In particular, the Monitor's Confidential Seventh Report, dated June 8, 2021, stated:

In particular, the Revised 129 Offer:

- a) proposes to pay-out the DIP Lender and CMLS in full;
- b) improves the security value of the Aviva charge and provides Aviva with the prospect of a full or material recovery; whereas all other offers will result in no, or minimal, recovery to Aviva leaving it with collateral remedies against the Uninsured Presale Deposits and guarantors; and
- c) avoids likely litigation with respect to the Uninsured Presale Deposits by converting those deposits into a secured position against Terrace House Project.

As the judge stated at para. 109, however, the Monitor did not express any "specific recommendation" to the court below as to which of the offers before the Court should be approved, "choosing to remain agnostic" as among them.

A Redemption?

[20] The judge rejected the argument that 129's offer was effectively a "redemption" of the CMLS mortgage. (At paras. 56–7.) I note parenthetically that she

may have been under the impression (which was not unreasonable given the unclear wording of the proposal) that neither the Petitioners nor Aviva was to pay out the mortgage. We are advised by counsel, however, that it was and is intended that 129 would make funds (to be advanced by the new lender) available *to the Petitioners*, who would in turn pay out CMLS in full. The mortgage would then be assigned to Domain, 129 and 126.

[21] The judge noted *Classic Mortgage Corporation v. 0768723 B.C. Ltd.* 2017 BCSC 1100, a decision of Master Wilson affirmed at 2017 BCSC 1225. In both sets of reasons, the Court cited *Great West Life Assurance Co. v. Rix* (1984) 59 B.C.L.R. 75. There the Court equated ‘redemption’ with the ‘payout’ of a mortgage, noting that “‘Redemption’ and ‘assignment’ are alternatives.” (At para. 26.) Weatherill J. at 2017 BCSC 1225 endorsed the view that a mortgagor who has granted first and second mortgages is entitled to redeem (i.e., pay out) the first, but is not entitled to require an assignment because the equity of redemption has been conveyed by way of a second mortgage. (See paras. 39–44.) In the case at bar, although Aviva was consenting to the payout of the CMLS mortgage, Domain was not only to take an assignment of the first mortgage, but was requiring *inter alia* that the face amount of the mortgage be increased to \$25 million and the interest rate be raised. (At paras. 49, 57 and 63.) In the chambers judge’s opinion, this took the transaction “well beyond a redemption.”

Interim Financing?

[22] This fact was also relevant to the chambers judge’s finding that the proposed restructuring would not constitute “interim financing” within the meaning of s. 11.2 of the CCAA. It provides in subsection 1:

11.2 (1) On application by a debtor company and on notice to the secured creditors who are likely to be affected by the security or charge, a court may make an order declaring that all or part of the company’s property is subject to a security or charge --- in an amount that the court considers appropriate – in favour of a person specified in the order who agrees to lend to the company an amount approved by the court as being required by the company, having regard to its cash-flow statement. The security or charge may not secure an obligation that exists before the order is made. [Emphasis added].

The judge observed:

129 (in place of the Petitioners) seeks to authorize the Petitioners to not just refinance the existing debt with the existing priorities, but increase that secured debt against the Project. The net effect of the “refinancing” is to convert the debt under the Interim Lending Facility and the professional fees into the CMLS secured charge and also add millions of dollars of secured debt on the Project (to be accommodated within the increased limit of \$25 million).

The New Loan Facility also significantly alters the commercial terms of the CMLS debt and security, including by substantially increasing the interest rate on the secured loan. Without a court order, any modifications to the CMLS security have no effect on existing charges: *Land Title Act*, R.S.B.C. 1996, c. 25, ss. 1 (definitions of “charge” and “encumbrance”) and 206(2). [At paras. 63–4; emphasis added.]

[23] The judge found it unnecessary to decide whether 129’s proposal could be said to “compromise” the rights of creditors, thus going “beyond a ‘refinancing’”. Even if it did constitute a “refinancing” for purposes of s. 11.2, it was 129 rather than the Petitioners who had sought the approval of the Court. (Under s. 11.2(1), it is *the debtor company* that must seek the court’s approval.) The judge also found that neither 129 nor the Petitioners had made any effort to “specifically address and provide a proper evidentiary foundation” for the Court to consider the four factors set out in s. 11.2(4); nor had it been shown to her satisfaction that all secured creditors had been given “proper notice” of the proposal in accordance with s. 11.2. She continued:

... Without notice and the opportunity to make submissions, it is difficult to properly assess whether any creditor would be materially prejudiced in consideration of s. 11.2(4)(f). Centura alleges “material” prejudice, noting that despite being presently “out of the money” under its lien, the lien claimants may have a preference that a new developer acquire the Project. Centura argues that, in some instances, suppliers can have leverage aside from their lien claims, including because they are required to sign off on completion for engineering reports and permits, or because their work is sufficiently advanced that hiring a replacement is economically impractical. [At para. 71; emphasis added.]

(As will be seen below, it appears the judge was unaware that all creditors had in fact been notified of 129’s application, in accordance with a “Service List” used by counsel throughout this proceeding.)

[24] Finally under the rubric of “interim financing”, the chambers judge noted 129’s submission that the fact the interests of other creditors were being ‘disregarded’ did not make its proposal inappropriate, given that the lienholders and unsecured creditors (referred to collectively in the documents as the “Other Creditors”) were already “out of the money”. (They would also be in that unfortunate position under the asset purchase offers of Solterra and Landa.) The judge expressed her strong disapproval of this submission:

... I agree with 129’s counsel’s assessment of the likely current monetary value of the other creditor’s interests. However, in my view, that is a very unprincipled basis upon which to argue that this “refinancing” is an “appropriate” outcome in the balancing exercise with regard to all stakeholders. [At para. 73; emphasis added.]

A Sale?

[25] The judge also rejected the proposition that 129’s revised offer was a “sale” akin to what Landa and Solterra had proposed. She reasoned that there would have been nothing objectionable if Mr. Reyes had used 129 as a corporate vehicle to *purchase* the Project assets outright or under a reverse vesting order structure. In doing so, she said, 129 could have implemented the new Domain financing, either by refinancing the CMLS security or simply paying it out and placing new security on title. However, Mr. Reyes had not advanced the 129 offer as a “sale” of the Project, but instead sought a “suite of relief” under the CCAA, including court approval of an increase of the secured debt against the Project which would rank in priority over the claims of Other Creditors. It was, she again noted, also seeking to alter the commercial terms of the CMLS debt and security and to extend the stay — all without any indication that 129 intended to advance a plan of arrangement or compromise on which the Petitioners’ creditors could vote. (At para. 77.)

Appropriateness

[26] Having set forth what the 129 offer was *not*, the chambers judge turned at para. 78 of her reasons to the crux of the application before her — the question of

whether the offer was “appropriate” in the circumstances. In essence, she said, 129’s plan was to:

... use the proposed six-month stay extension to secure construction financing with the intention then of exiting these CCAA proceedings and completing the Project. This makes sense from a business point of view — that way, Mr. Reyes satisfies his obligations to Aviva by allowing the pre-sale purchasers to obtain their units by crediting their deposits, thus avoiding a call on Aviva’s deposit insurance. [At para. 80; emphasis added.]

[27] Centura objected that 129 was seeking to implement this “restructuring” without putting forward a plan of arrangement or compromise on which creditors could vote. In this sense, it submitted, the case was similar to *Maple Bay*. The chambers judge agreed.

[28] Like the Petitioners in this case, the debtor company in *Maple Bay* was the developer of one large project. It had run into difficulties concerning a source of water for irrigation of the golf course that was included in the project. A receiver had been appointed by the mortgage lenders and the company was said to be “dormant” — i.e., it was no longer a going concern. CCAA proceedings were then initiated and a judge of the Supreme Court granted a stay and appointed a monitor. The monitor recommended that the Court authorize interim financing to enable it to pursue a water source, and requested additional powers so that it could pursue a source of water and receive any offers for the purchase of all or part of the development. The monitor suggested that once a water source was obtained, it would make further recommendations with respect to the completion of the project. The Court approved the interim financing and granted expanded powers to the monitor.

[29] On appeal, the creditors argued that the CCAA should not apply to companies “whose sole business is a single land development or to companies whose business is essentially dormant”. This court rejected that argument, noting that the nature and state of the business of a debtor company are simply factors to be taken into account when considering whether a stay should be granted or continued under (then) s. 11(6). (At para. 25.) However, the Court, *per* Mr. Justice Tysoe, found that there was “another, more fundamental factor” that the chambers

judge had failed to consider — the principle that a stay “should only be granted in furtherance of the CCAA’s fundamental purpose.” (At para. 26.) Tysoe J.A. reasoned that (then) s. 11 is “not a free-standing remedy that the court may grant whenever an insolvent company wishes to undertake a ‘restructuring’, a term with a broad meaning including such things as refinancings, capital injections and asset sales and other downsizing.” In his analysis:

The fundamental purpose of the CCAA is expressed in the long title of the statute:

“An Act to facilitate compromises and arrangements between companies and their creditors”.

...

Sections 4 and 5 of the CCAA provide that the court may order meetings of creditors if a debtor company proposes a compromise or an arrangement between it and its unsecured or secured creditors or any class of them. Section 6 authorizes the court to sanction a compromise or arrangement if a majority in number representing two-thirds in value of each class of creditor has voted in favour of it, in which case the compromise or arrangement is binding on all of the creditors.

The filing of a draft plan of arrangement or compromise is not a prerequisite to the granting of a stay under s. 11: see *Re Fairview Industries Ltd.* (1991), 109 N.S.R. (2d) 12, 11 C.B.R. (3d) 43 (S.C.). In my view, however, a stay should not be granted or continued if the debtor company does not intend to propose a compromise or arrangement to its creditors. If it is not clear at the hearing of the initial application whether the debtor company is intending to propose a true arrangement or compromise, a stay might be granted on an interim basis, and the intention of the debtor company can be scrutinized at the comeback hearing. ... [At paras. 27, 30–31; emphasis added.]

[30] Ultimately, he ruled that in the absence of an intention on the part of the debtor company to propose an arrangement or compromise to its creditors “before embarking on its restructuring plan”, it was not appropriate to grant or extend a stay under s. 11. (At para. 35.) The failure of the court below to consider “the fundamental purpose of the CCAA” was also found to have ‘infected’ the exercise of discretion in authorizing interim financing. (At para. 37.)

[31] The chambers judge in the case at bar also noted *Re North American Tungsten Corporation Ltd.* 2015 BCSC 1376, in which the Court suggested that the debtor company must as a “prerequisite” show “that it has at least ‘a kernel of a

plan”’. (At para. 26.) The Court cited the decision of Fitzpatrick J. in *Re Azure Dynamics Corporation* 2012 BCSC 781. In that instance, an initial stay granted under the *Act* was about to expire but the petitioners were in the process of trying to find new or additional financing. They had held discussions with “various interested parties” concerning either refinancing, recapitalization or a sale. In these circumstances, the judge rejected the notion that there was not the “kernel of a plan” or, as she put it, “some sense of what the petitioners intend to do so as to give the court and, obviously, the stakeholders, some comfort that there is some utility in continuing further with these proceedings.” (At para. 13.)

[32] Like the judge in *Tungsten*, the judge in *Azure* made no mention of any requirement for a compromise or arrangement. Although she recognized that the costs of negotiations had to be paid by the debtor company, she observed:

... that prejudice is balanced against what is seen as being a reasonable prospect that there will be a successful restructuring which will ultimately benefit all parties (or conversely, that the restructuring is not doomed to fail). As such, the cost of these professionals and the cost to maintain and protect management during the restructuring are seen simply as a requirement to take advantage of that opportunity.

...

... A lifting of the stay, even as it relates only to JCI, would result in great prejudice to the Azure Group in terms of its ongoing efforts. There are indications that there is enterprise value in this Group; that is part of the germ of the plan and that is the value which the Azure Group is trying to preserve. Any material change to the current situation would cause prejudice to those efforts, a matter that would accrue to all of the stakeholders in this case. ...

The ninth situation set out in *Canwest* [*Canwest Global Communications Corp. (Re)* (2009), 61 C.B.R. (5th) 200 (Ont. Sup Ct. J.)] is whether it is in the interests of justice to lift the stay. This is an overarching consideration and, frankly, subsumes the other factors that I have already discussed above in more detail. I do not think the parties will be surprised to hear that, in my view, it is in the interests of justice that this restructuring be allowed to continue. I am satisfied that it is appropriate in this case and that the concerns of JCI cannot override the interests of all stakeholders in allowing this restructuring to continue at least to some extent to see whether this germ of a plan can be brought to fruition. [At paras. 26–28; emphasis added.]

Having also found that the petitioner company was acting in good faith and with due diligence, she declined to lift the stay. (See also *Re Quest University Canada* 2020

BCSC 318 at paras. 108–9; *Callidus Capital Corp. v. CarCap Inc.* 2012 ONSC 163; *Re Hayes Forest Services Limited*. 2008 BCSC 1256.)

[33] Returning to the case at bar, the chambers judge took a very different view of the situation before her. Although she acknowledged that it was not necessary for a debtor to advance a “fully fleshed out” plan of arrangement in order to justify continuing a stay in CCAA proceedings, she agreed with Centura’s submission that there was no suggestion — let alone “the kernel of a plan” — anywhere in Mr. Reyes’ evidence to support the notion that 129, the Petitioners or any other party intended to “put forward a plan of arrangement *or compromise on which the Petitioners’ creditors may vote.*” In her analysis:

... All Mr. Reyes speaks of is securing the new construction financing and then restructuring the limited partnership interests.

Specifically, there is no evidentiary foundation in Mr. Reyes’ Affidavits to support the statement at para. 34 of 129’s notice of application that 129 will use the “breathing space” under a further stay of proceedings to “permit some, or potentially full, recovery by Aviva and the Other Creditors”.

Centura also points to other issues arising from the feasibility of completing the Project with the pre-sale purchase contracts intact. Centura notes that, even if the “new construction financing” is obtainable, which is speculative at best, Mr. Reyes will also have to solve his liability problems with Aviva in that context. It is anyone’s guess that the completion of the Project is still feasible while also allowing for a full credit of over \$16 million from the pre-sale deposits (which would reduce sale revenues). There is no evidence as to how that might be addressed. [At paras. 87–9; emphasis added.]

[34] The chambers judge was of the view that Mr. Reyes was “only seeking to allow *himself* some ‘breathing space’ by borrowing money against the Project, by satisfying or keeping the secured creditors at bay while he seeks a better overall resolution than an outright sale that would crystallize his exposure [presumably on personal guarantees] to CMLS and Aviva.” She continued:

... He seemingly requires that this Court assist him in freezing the rights of the Petitioners’ creditors while he seeks to do so. There is nothing to suggest that Mr. Reyes is seeking to obtain relief from this Court for the purposes of resolving the current creditor claims against the Petitioners within the context of these CCAA proceedings.

In other words, Mr. Reyes seeks the benefit of these proceedings — including the continuation of a stay against all creditors and with the potential for further

relief, with the consent of Domain – with no true intention to address those creditor claims in the future. [At paras. 90–1; emphasis added.]

In the result, she concluded that the relief sought by 129 — including the stay and various refinancing steps set out in its draft orders — did not meet the ‘appropriateness’ criterion applicable under s. 11. She declined to exercise her discretion to grant the order approving 129’s proposed restructuring.

[35] Having rejected 129’s proposal, the chambers judge turned at para. 93 to the question of which of the three cash or liquidation offers should be accepted. In the end, she found that Solterra’s Backup Offer would garner “significant benefits” to the stakeholders:

The time has come to end the process. I am satisfied that the Monitor has now explored all available options. Those options have been put before the stakeholders and now the Court. I am also satisfied that Solterra Backup Offer should now be approved as reasonable and indicative of the fair market value of the Project. It is unfortunately a result that does not see any immediate recovery for Aviva, although neither did the 129 Revised Offer. In my view, Solterra Backup Offer represents the best outcome for the stakeholders in all the circumstances. [At para. 111; emphasis added.]

The Court dismissed 129’s application by order dated June 15, 2021 and, by separate order, approved Solterra’s Backup Offer under s. 36 of the Act.

[36] As mentioned earlier, a division of this court granted 129 a stay of the chambers judge’s orders and leave to appeal, for reasons indexed as 2021 BCCA 319. The division also ordered that appeal be heard by five judges in order to allow the Court to consider whether *Maple Bay* should continue to be binding on British Columbia courts.

On Appeal

Grounds of Appeal

[37] In this court, 129 submits that the chambers judge erred “in fact and in law” in:

(a) concluding the 129 Refinancing was not a redemption of the CMLS Mortgage, and in turn by failing to balance the equity of redemption in her appropriateness analysis under s. 11 of the CCAA;

- (b) determining that it was not appropriate to grant the 129 Application because there was no evidence of an intention to propose a plan of arrangement or compromise to creditors; and
- (c) approving the Solterra backup Offer in the face of the 129 Refinancing, which [refinancing] results in a materially better outcome for the stakeholders and is more consistent with the remedial purpose of the CCAA.

Standard of Review

[38] Having framed its grounds of appeal as questions of “law and fact”, the appellant 129 notes in its factum that the standard of review on a question of law is correctness and that questions of mixed fact and law “lie on a spectrum” (citing *Housen v. Nikolaisen* 2002 SCC 33). Here, the parties below agreed (see para. 54) that the Court had the “jurisdiction” (usually a question of law) to grant the relief sought by 129, so that as the chambers judge noted, the real issue was whether it was “appropriate” to do so — a matter of discretion.

[39] As for discretionary decisions made by supervising judges under the CCAA, 129 acknowledges these are afforded a “high degree of deference” but that an appellate court should intervene if the supervising judge erred in principle or exercised his or her discretion unreasonably. It is perhaps sufficient to note the comments of the Supreme Court of Canada in *Callidus*:

A high degree of deference is owed to discretionary decisions made by judges supervising CCAA proceedings. As such, appellate intervention will only be justified if the supervising judge erred in principle or exercised their discretion unreasonably (see *Grant Forest Products Inc. v. Toronto-Dominion Bank*, 2015 ONCA 570, 387 D.L.R. (4th) 426, at para. 98; *Bridging Finance Inc. v. Béton Brunet 2001 Inc.*, 2017 QCCA 138, 44 C.B.R. (6th) 175, at para. 23). Appellate courts must be careful not to substitute their own discretion in place of the supervising judge’s (*New Skeena Forest Products Inc., Re*, 2005 BCCA 192, 39 B.C.L.R. (4th) 338, at para. 20).

This deferential standard of review accounts for the fact that supervising judges are steeped in the intricacies of the CCAA proceedings they oversee. In this respect, the comments of Tysoe J.A. in *Canadian Metropolitan Properties Corp. v. Libin Holdings Ltd.*, 2009 BCCA 40, 305 D.L.R. (4th) 339 (“*Re Edgewater Casino Inc.*”), at para. 20, are apt:

. . . one of the principal functions of the judge supervising the CCAA proceeding is to attempt to balance the interests of the various stakeholders during the reorganization process, and it will often be inappropriate to consider an exercise of discretion by the supervising judge in isolation of other exercises of

discretion by the judge in endeavoring to balance the various interests. . . . CCAA proceedings are dynamic in nature and the supervising judge has intimate knowledge of the reorganization process. The nature of the proceedings often requires the supervising judge to make quick decisions in complicated circumstances. [At paras. 53–4; emphasis added.]

[40] Reference may also be made to *Perrier v. Canada (Revenue Agency)* 2021 BCCA 269, where this court stated in a different context:

Discretionary decisions may, of course, be overturned if a judge has materially misconstrued the law or made a palpable and overriding error in respect of the facts underlying the exercise of discretion. Discretionary decisions may also be overturned, however, where the judge has made no manifest error of law or fact, but has failed to apply the discretion in a principled and reasonable manner. In *Penner v. Niagara (Regional Police Services Board)*, 2013 SCC 19 at para. 27, the Court described the standard as follows:

[27] A discretionary decision of a lower court will be reversible where that court misdirected itself or came to a decision that is so clearly wrong that it amounts to an injustice: *Elsom v. Elsom*, [1989] 1 S.C.R. 1367, at p. 1375. Reversing a lower court’s discretionary decision is also appropriate where the lower court gives no or insufficient weight to relevant considerations: *Friends of the Oldman River Society v. Canada (Minister of Transport)*, [1992] 1 S.C.R. 3, at pp. 76–77. [At para. 45.]

[41] It may be that the only true question of law on this appeal is whether the judge erred in concluding that the refinancing sought by 129 did not involve a “redemption” of the CMLS mortgage. As will be seen below, I find it unnecessary to deal with that ground of appeal. I do note, however, that whether a “redemption” is part of 129’s proposal or not, it would be only a part. The nomenclature does not affect the result in this case.

New Evidence

[42] We have before us four motions to adduce new evidence on appeal. These attest to the “dynamic” nature of CCAA proceedings, even at the appellate level. The first motion was filed by the Monitor to adduce the evidence of a legal assistant, Ms. Petrakis. Exhibited to her affidavit was a letter from Mr. Bell of Ernst & Young to all counsel concerning difficulties faced by the Monitor in obtaining property

insurance for the project. The existing insurance was set to expire on September 30, 2021. Mr. Bell advised that the insurance broker for the project had declined to extend the insurance beyond that date and that accordingly, there was a “significant risk” the development would not be insured after that date.

[43] This affidavit also exhibited a letter dated September 13, 2021 from counsel for the Monitor to counsel for 129 and Mr. Reyes advising that the loan that was to have been made by Domain to 129 as part of the 129 refinancing had not closed by September 10 as anticipated. The Monitor requested an update on the status of the financing and 129’s ability to meet its commitments to CMLS and Desjardins in the circumstances. Finally, the Monitor requested that 129 provide stakeholders with a “written update on whether any of the other outstanding conditions to the 129 Refinancing have now been satisfied.”

[44] 129 applied to adduce two affidavits of Mr. Reyes, the first sworn July 30, 2021. Its purpose was to update matters described in evidence that had been before the chambers judge and/or the division of this court that granted leave to appeal. Mr. Reyes deposed that although Domain’s commitment to fund the new loan had lapsed on June 16 as a result of the chambers judges’ dismissal of 129’s application, Domain had committed to extend the condition removal date to September 30, subject to certain payments and the granting of leave to appeal. As well, he confirmed that the solicitors for 129 were holding \$2.5 million in trust for release in connection with the proposed refinancing.

[45] Mr. Reyes’ second affidavit, sworn September 1, 2021, referred to by counsel as “Affidavit #6”, was a further update. He deposed that the pre-sale purchasers of units in the project had provided irrevocable directions authorizing the use of their deposits in the proposed refinancing transaction and extending the termination dates of their directions to December 31, 2021. Domain had also committed to extend the condition removal date in its loan commitment letter to September 30, 2021 and in

that regard had executed an “Amendment to the Third Revised Commitment Letter” dated September 1, 2020. Mr. Reyes continued:

Based on the updated payouts provided by the Monitor, an additional \$900,000 (approximately) is estimated to be required to provide sufficient funding to complete the proposed refinancing as it was originally contemplated on June 8, 2021 (as described in paragraph 12 of my third affidavit).

The additional funding requirements will be satisfied by:

- (a) additional funding from 129 in the amount of at least \$480,000; and
- (b) allocating any additional amounts required from the Convertible Loan (as defined in my fourth affidavit) to be provided by 126.

I am advised by Luz Consuelo Reyes, the sole director and officer of 126, and verily believe that 126 consents to allocating a portion of the Convertible Loan to the refinancing transaction.

129 is raising funds to cover the additional funding requirements. However, at a minimum, 129 has secured \$480,000 from a further loan commitment by Domain. The loan will be in the principal amount of \$1,675,000, is expected to close on or about September 10, 2021, and proceeds from this loan will be paid as follows:

- (a) to repay existing debt in the amount of \$1,117,706;
- (b) to pay certain fees and interest reserves to Domain in the amount of approximately \$75,000; and
- (c) the balance, to be funded to 129 for use in connection with the refinancing transaction. [At paras. 7–10.]

[46] Further, Mr. Reyes deposed that if 129 contributes an additional \$480,000 it would still require approximately \$340,000 for working capital purposes immediately if the 129 refinancing takes place. He expected to raise further funds from partners of the Petitioner partnership and other investors, “after the refinancing transaction completes and certain amendments to the limited partnership agreement can be made.” The solicitors for 129 had been put in funds by 126 and they were now holding a total of \$2.7 million in trust for purposes of the refinancing.

[47] The final item of proposed new evidence was an email dated September 21, 2020 (the date of the hearing in this Court) sent by Mr. Schultz, counsel for 129, to all counsel in this matter in response to the Monitor’s request for an update. With respect to insurance, it confirmed that Aviva had offered to provide general property

insurance for a term of six months commencing September 30, 2021. This amount was to be funded from the working capital funds that would be available under the 129 transaction and would satisfy the insurance condition contained in Domain's commitment letter. With respect to the status of the "additional financing", Mr. Schultz advised:

We are not acting on this financing, but I am advised by both counsel (for borrower and lender) that despite a concerted effort to close the transaction yesterday, a few outstanding conditions remained at close of business that prevented that from occurring. However, I am further advised that both parties anticipate those will be satisfied today, and that funding will occur at some point today. It is now expected that on closing, net proceeds of \$450,000 will be paid to our firm in trust, and held as part of the additional advance by 129 contemplated in Mr. Reyes' 6th affidavit. That amount will still be sufficient to allow 129 to pay CMLS (and the priority creditors) in full. [Emphasis added.]

With respect to other "outstanding conditions" to the refinancing, Mr. Schultz said he was advised by counsel for Domain that the only remaining conditions on the commitment for a loan of \$14.7 million were the execution of a priority agreement between Domain and Aviva, the form of which had been approved; the issuance of the insurance policy which Aviva had agreed to issue; and this court's approval of the proposal.

[48] Counsel for Centura opposed the admission of Mr. Reyes' affidavit #6. New evidence is of course subject to an even stricter test than fresh evidence. Counsel referred to this court's recent decision in *Barendregt v. Grebliunas* 2021 BCCA 11, in which Mr. Justice Voith observed:

New evidence is admitted in "rare" or "exceptional" circumstances: see *Animal Welfare International Inc. v. W3 International Media Ltd.*, 2015 BCCA 148 at para. 10 and *Fotsch* at para. 20, respectively. In *Jens* at para. 29, the Court used "rare" and "exceptional" interchangeably.

This high standard is on account of the importance of certainty and finality in trial judgments: *Fotsch* at para. 21; *Struck* at para. 37. Nevertheless, it is contrary to the "interests of justice" to have a decision that is inconsistent with the known facts: *Jens* at para. 30; *Animal Welfare* at para. 12; *Island Savings Credit Union v. Brunner*, 2014 BCCA 449 at para. 25.

One recognized “exceptional” circumstance, where new evidence may be admitted, was described by the Court in *Fotsch*:

[21] Circumstances which might permit the admission of new evidence include where the judge made assumptions about future events but new evidence establishes those assumptions to be incorrect. See *North Vancouver (District) v. Lunde*, (1998), 60 B.C.L.R. (3d) 201 (C.A.) at paras. 25–26.

In *United States of America v. Wilson*, 2010 BCCA 85 at para. 34, the Court described this “assumption” category as the “main exception” to the general inadmissibility of new evidence on appeal. [At paras. 32–35.]

[49] In my opinion, it is in the interests of justice for this court to admit all the proffered evidence. This was not a trial at which the credibility of witnesses was tested or in which the facts were strongly disputed. Although the evidence does not completely invalidate or ‘falsify’ the assumptions relied on by the chambers judge below, it is important for us to be working on the basis of accurate information in a case in which circumstances are fast-moving, as often occurs in CCAA, receivership or bankruptcy matters. Indeed a reading of appellate CCAA decisions (which are rare given that lower courts’ decisions are usually moot by the time an appeal can be heard) suggests that courts on appeal often admit ‘updating’ evidence without formal application being made. Certainly in this case the admission of the new evidence will not detract from certainty; rather, it will ensure that the assumptions underlying our conclusions are as close to correct as possible.

Financial Comparison of the Offers

[50] Having admitted the new evidence, it may be helpful to summarize here the financial consequences (as I now understand them) of the 129 proposal on the one hand, and Solterra’s Backup Offer on the other.

<u>129's Proposal</u>	<u>Solterra's Backup Offer</u>
Prior charges representing the interim loan and administration charge, and CMLS mortgage to be paid in full.	Interim loan and administration charge to be paid in full; CMLS suffers shortfall of \$1 million.
129 to be secured as to 65% of pre-sale deposits; Aviva to be secured as to 35%, in both cases up to the principal amount of \$8,005,201.	Aviva loses \$8.6 million; little hope of recovery.
Aviva's security will remain for the balance owed to it.	
Pre-sale purchasers retain right to purchase if Petitioners are able to complete construction.	Half of the pre-sale purchasers lose their right to purchase.
Other creditors receive no immediate benefit; but have chance of future recovery if Petitioners are able to complete.	Other creditors receive no funds on sale; lienholders lose rights of registration against the Project.

[51] The summary provided by Aviva in its factum also seems apt:

The financial repercussions of the 129 Refinancing and the Solterra Backup Offer are diametrically opposed. The former will avoid the immediate crystallization of the Petitioners' liability to Aviva, thus freeing up equity for and preserving the prospect of recovery for the remaining creditors, while providing the additional benefit of the possibility of a restructuring. The latter will result in pre-sale contracts being disclaimed and requiring Aviva to pay out \$8.6 million of insured deposits already used in the Project and no longer held in trust, with virtually no prospect of recovery for Aviva and no recovery for any other creditor.

[52] It will be noted that the "materially better outcome" of 129's proposal commented upon by the Monitor has improved since the hearing below: the amount of Domain's new loan has increased; Aviva's prospects for the recovery of its \$8 million are improved; the 'conditionality' of several of the steps has diminished or been removed, with the result that the proposal is less 'speculative'; the prospects of purchasers who have paid deposits for units in the Project have improved to some extent; and adequate working capital seem to be assured for the next few months. As mentioned earlier, Mr. Reyes stated in his Affidavit #6 that he expected to "raise

further funds from the limited partners of the Petitioners, and other investors, after the refinancing transaction completes and certain amendments to the limited partnership agreement can be made.” In this court, counsel for 129 acknowledged that it may become necessary at that later stage to seek a compromise with unsecured creditors, but that that stage had not been reached and may be unnecessary if the new construction financing is successful.

Overview of Parties’ Positions

[53] I propose to deal with the second and third grounds of appeal together, since both turn on issues relating to the objectives of the CCAA and the significance (or lack thereof) of the absence of an intention on the part of 129 or the Petitioners to pursue a plan of compromise or arrangement to be voted on at a meeting of creditors.

[54] In very general terms, 129 submits that the chambers judge below erred by focussing in her appropriateness analysis on the “single factor” of the absence of an intended compromise rather than on the “primary remedial objective” of the CCAA. In 129’s submission, that objective is to avoid the “social and economic losses resulting from liquidation of an insolvent company”: see *Century Services* at para. 70.

[55] The chambers judge’s error is highlighted, 129 contends, by her conclusion that if Mr. Reyes had structured his offer as an outright sale or a reverse vesting order, no one would have quarreled with the “structure” of the transaction (and, I note, no compromise or arrangement would have been required. Instead the Court would have had to consider the factors set out at s. 36(3) of the *Act*.) 129 says she thus preferred form over substance; and that in any event, *Maple Bay* is no longer good law and has been overtaken by amendments made to the CCAA — in particular the broadening of the discretion granted by s. 11 and the enactment of s. 36 — and by pronouncements of the Supreme Court of Canada in cases such as *Century Services* and *Callidus*. 129’s appeal is supported by CMLS and Aviva.

[56] In response, Centura and Solterra contend that it is “antithetical” to the CCAA regime and all relevant binding authorities for the court to facilitate 129’s proposal — which they say will affect the “civil and property rights of secured and unsecured creditors alike” — without any intention of addressing the claims of *all* creditors by means of a compromise to be voted on by them. In the respondents’ submission, the fact that 129’s proposal provides a “potentially better outcome” for the two secured creditors is not the only material consideration. They note that the chambers judge described the proposal as “speculative” at best. (At para. 89.) In her words:

Specifically, there is no evidentiary foundation in Mr. Reyes’ Affidavits to support the statement at para. 34 of 129’s notice of application that 129 will use the “breathing space” under a further stay of proceedings to “permit some, or potentially full, recovery by Aviva and the Other Creditors”.

Centura also points to other issues arising from the feasibility of completing the Project with the pre-sale purchase contracts intact. Centura notes that, even if the “new construction financing” is obtainable, which is speculative at best, Mr. Reyes will also have to solve his liability problems with Aviva in that context. It is anyone’s guess that the completion of the Project is still feasible while also allowing for a full credit of over \$16 million from the pre-sale deposits (which would reduce sale revenues). There is no evidence as to how that might be addressed. [At paras. 88–9.]

[57] Thus while 129 characterizes its proposal as “clearly superior” to the Solterra Backup Offer, the respondents discount it as an attempt by the Petitioners “to avoid a sale of their assets at the conclusion of a sale process on the purported basis of a right of redemption and a faint hope plan to salvage their business.”

Objective(s) of the CCAA

[58] Obviously, one of the matters on which the parties disagree is the objective, or objectives, of the CCAA. 129 submits that these have evolved and broadened since the *Act* was adopted over 80 years ago. At that time the long title of the CCAA was often referred to as reflecting its purpose — to “facilitate compromises and arrangements between companies and their creditors.”

[59] I do not intend to recount at length the history of the *Act*, which has been amended several times after wide-ranging commissions were carried out by parliamentary committees and other experts over the years: see A. Nocilla, “The

History of the Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act and the Future of Restructuring Law in Canada", (2014) 56 *Can. Bus. L. J.* 73 at 77–86. It is well-known that the *Act* was introduced during the Depression to permit Canadian companies to reorganize or restructure their debt in order to avoid the travails of bankruptcy.

Nocilla writes:

The CCAA was modeled on the provisions of the *English Companies Act* of 1929. At the first reading of the CCAA in the House of Commons, the Hon. C.H. Cahan, then Secretary of State, explained that the legislation was intended to allow an insolvent company to avoid bankruptcy and to survive by reorganizing. The Secretary explained that some reorganization mechanism was necessary because so many companies had become insolvent during the Depression:

At the present time, some legal method of making arrangements and compromises between creditors and companies is perhaps more necessary because of the prevailing commercial and industrial depression and it was thought by the government that we should adopt some method whereby compromises might be carried into effect under the supervision of the court without utterly destroying the company or its organization without loss of good will and without forcing the improvident sales of its assets. [At 76–7.]

The fact that the *Act* related to “Bankruptcy and Insolvency” under s. 91(21) of the then *British North America Act, 1867*, 30–31 Vict., c. 3 (U.K.) meant that courts could be given the power by (paramount) federal legislation to affect the rights or priorities of creditors that would normally be regulated by the provinces acting under their jurisdiction over “Property and Civil Rights.” (See generally *Reference re Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act* [1934] S.C.R. 659.)

[60] As noted in *Century Services* (see paras. 17–21), the CCAA fell into disuse after the Depression. However, during the economic downturn of the 1980s, the “broad and flexible authority” given to supervising courts to “facilitate the reorganization of the debtor and achieve the CCAA’s objective” began to be recognized as lawyers invented increasingly creative and complex schemes to enable debtors to avoid bankruptcy. Courts generally gave their blessing to such innovations, while taking care to ensure they were as fair as possible to all stakeholders. In so doing, they relied first on the interpretation of the text of the

CCAA itself and second on their “inherent or equitable” jurisdiction: see *Century* at paras. 64–5.

[61] One example of the exercise by a court of its equitable jurisdiction in the CCAA context was the appointment of monitors, who were likened to interim receivers: see *Re Northland Properties Ltd.* (1988) 69 C.B.R. 266 (B.C.S.C.) at 277. Court approval of interim financing is a more obvious example of the evolution of the court’s jurisdiction under the *Act* in accord with its broadening objectives: even *prior to the enactment of s. 11.2 in 2009*, courts regularly approved such financing as a necessary part of facilitating restructurings aimed at continuing the debtor’s business as a going concern while more permanent solutions were sought. Although there was initially some debate (see, e.g., *Re Fairview Industries Ltd.* (1991) 11 C.B.R. (3rd) 71 (N.S.T.D.)) concerning the jurisdictional basis for the granting of such orders *without an arrangement or compromise*, the practical need for “breathing space” (including the need to obtain professional assistance) usually meant immediate injections of cash were necessary. Responsive interim financing orders became commonplace: see *United Used Auto & Truck Parts Ltd. v. Aziz* 2000 BCCA 146; *Re Hunters Trailer & Marine Ltd.* 2001 ABQB 546; *Re Skydome Corp.* (1998) 16 C.B.R. (4th) 118 (Ont. Gen. Div.); *Re Starcom International Optics Corp.* (1998) 3 C.B.R. (4th) 177 (B.C.S.C.); *Re Royal Oak Mines Inc.* (1999) 7 C.B.R. (4th) 293 (Ont. Gen. Div.); *Re Stelco Inc.* (2004) 48 C.B.R. (4th) 299 (Ont. S.C.J.).

[62] Such financings were usually granted “super-priority” — i.e., priority over existing creditors, including secured creditors. In this sense, the priorities that would normally apply under provincial legislation were altered, without any meeting or votes of all creditors under the CCAA. In the process, of course, the debtor company (and indirectly its creditors) benefitted from the fact that funds were being provided to assist in preserving its business as a going concern. In *Rescue! The Companies’ Creditors Arrangement Act* (2nd ed., 2013), Professor Sara observes:

Prior to 2009, the courts found authority for granting super-priority charges or interim financing under both the CCAA and their inherent jurisdiction. The British Columbia Court of Appeal in *United Used Auto* held that the effective achievement of the CCAA’s objectives requires a broad and flexible exercise

of jurisdiction to facilitate a restructuring and the court's equitable jurisdiction permits orders granting super-priority in some circumstances. Secured creditors may be required to make some sacrifice because of the reasonably anticipated benefits for all stakeholders; and the objective of the CCAA extends beyond protecting assets for eventual realization by creditors. At the same time, the British Columbia Court of Appeal [in *United Used Auto*] cautioned that granting interim financing on a priority basis and the road that security of creditor its and, thus, the court should make such orders only where there is a reasonable prospect of successfully restructuring. [At 208.]

[63] The CCAA now provides expressly in s. 11.2 for interim financing to be approved by the court, but does not (expressly) require a compromise approved at a creditors' meeting as a precondition. The factors to be considered are now set out at s. 11.2(4).

[64] An even more substantive development — again without express statutory authority — occurred in the 1990s when courts began to approve liquidation sales of the assets of debtor companies in certain circumstances — but without presenting a compromise or arrangement to creditors for approval under s. 5 or 6 of the Act. In *Re Canadian Red Cross Society* (1998) 5 C.B.R. 299 (Ont. C.J.), Blair J., as he then was, considered the question of the court's jurisdiction to make such orders. He reasoned in part:

I cannot accept the submission that the Court has no jurisdiction to make the order sought. The source of the authority is twofold: it is to be found in the power of the court to impose terms and conditions on the granting of a stay under section 11; and it may be grounded upon the inherent jurisdiction of the court, not to make orders which contradict a statute, but to "fill in the gaps in legislation so as to give effect to the objects of the CCAA, including the survival program of a debtor until it can present a plan" ...

...

It is very common in CCAA restructurings for the court to approve the sale and disposition of assets during the process and before the Plan if formally tendered and voted upon. There are many examples where this has occurred, the recent Eaton's restructuring being only one of them. The CCAA is designed to be a flexible instrument and it is that very flexibility which gives it its efficacy. ...

In the spirit of that approach, and having regard to the circumstances of this case, I am satisfied not only that the Court has the jurisdiction to make the approval and related orders sought, but also that it should do so. There is no realistic alternative to the sale and transfer that is proposed, and the

alternative is a liquidation/bankruptcy scenario which, on the evidence would yield an average of about 44% of the purchase price which the two agencies will pay. To fore go that purchase price—supported as it is by reliable expert evidence—would in the circumstances be folly, not only for the ordinary creditors but also for the Transfusion Claimants, in my view.

While the authorities as to exactly what considerations a court should have in mind in approving a transaction such as this are scarce, I agree with Mr. Zarnett that an appropriate analogy may be found in cases dealing with the approval of a sale by a court-appointed receiver. In those circumstances, as the Ontario Court of Appeal has indicated in *Royal Bank v. Soundair Corp.* (1991), 7 C.B.R. (3d) 1 (Ont. C.A.), at p. 6, the Court's duties are,

- (i) to consider whether the receiver has made a sufficient effort to get the best price and has not acted improvidently;
- (ii) to consider the interests of the parties;
- (iii) to consider the efficacy and integrity of the process by which offers are obtained; and,
- (iv) to consider whether there has been unfairness in the working out of the process.

I am satisfied on all such counts in the circumstances of this case. [At paras. 43–8; emphasis added.]

[65] In 2009, the “overarching policy” of the CCAA to preserve the going-concern value of a debtor company was invoked by Morawetz J. in *Re Nortel Networks* (2009) 55 C.B.R. (5th) 229 (Ont. S.C.J.). In the course of his reasons approving the sale of the debtor company's assets, he cited various Ontario cases, including *Canadian Red Cross, Re Lehndorff General Partner Ltd.* (1993) 17 C.B.R. (3d) 24 (Ont. Gen. Div.) and *Re Stelco Inc.* (2004) 6 C.B.R. (5th) 316 (Ont. S.C.J.). He then concluded:

Counsel to the Applicants further submits that CCAA courts have repeatedly noted that the purpose of the CCAA is to preserve the benefit of a going concern business for all stakeholders, or “the whole economic community”:

The purpose of the CCAA is to facilitate arrangements that might avoid liquidation of the company and allow it to continue in business to the benefit of the whole economic community, including the shareholders, the creditors (both secured and unsecured) and the employees. *Citibank Canada v. Chase Manhattan Bank of Canada* (1991), 5 C.B.R. (3rd) 167 (Ont. Gen. Div.) at para. 29. *Re Consumers Packaging Inc.* (2001), 27 C.B.R. (4th) 197 (Ont. C.A.) at para. 5.

Counsel to the Applicants further submits that the CCAA should be given a broad and liberal interpretation to facilitate its underlying purpose, including the preservation of the going concern for the benefit of all stakeholders and

further that it should not matter whether the business continues as a going concern under the debtor's stewardship or under new ownership, for as long as the business continues as a going concern, a primary goal of the CCAA will be met.

...

Counsel to the Applicants also referred to decisions from the courts in Quebec, Manitoba and Alberta which have similarly recognized the court's jurisdiction to approve a sale of assets during the course of a CCAA proceeding. *Re Boutique San Francisco Inc.* (2004), 7 C.B.R. (5th) 189 (Quebec S. C.), *Re Winnipeg Motor Express Inc.* (2008), 49 C.B.R. (5th) 302 (Man. Q.B.) at paras. 41, 44, and *Re Calpine Canada Energy Limited* (2007), 35 C.B.R. (5th) (Alta. Q.B.) at para. 75.

...

... The CCAA is intended to be flexible and must be given a broad and liberal interpretation to achieve its objectives and a sale by the debtor which preserves its business as a going concern is, in my view, consistent with those objectives.

I therefore conclude that the court does have the jurisdiction to authorize a sale under the CCAA in the absence of a plan. [At paras. 33–4, 41, and 47–8; emphasis added.]

[66] In *Callidus*, the Supreme Court of Canada discussed the evolution of the CCAA, pointing to the development of liquidation sales as one example of “an array of overarching remedial objectives” intended to avoid the potentially “catastrophic” effects of insolvency. However, the Court referred as well to some *more specific aspects* of that ‘overarching’ objective. In the words of Chief Justice Wagner and Moldaver J., speaking for the Court, these were:

... providing for timely, efficient and impartial resolution of a debtor's insolvency; preserving and maximizing the value of a debtor's assets; ensuring fair and equitable treatment of the claims against a debtor; protecting the public interest; and, in the context of a commercial insolvency, balancing the costs and benefits of restructuring or liquidating the company ... [Authorities omitted].

Among these objectives, the CCAA generally prioritizes “avoiding the social and economic losses resulting from liquidation of an insolvent company” (*Century Services*, at para. 70). ...

That said, the CCAA is fundamentally insolvency legislation, and thus it also “has the simultaneous objectives of maximizing creditor recovery, preservation of going-concern value where possible, preservation of jobs and communities affected by the firm's financial distress ... and enhancement of the credit system generally” (Sarrazin, *Rescue! The Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act*, at p. 14; see also *Ernst & Young Inc. v. Essar Global Fund Ltd.*, 2017 ONCA 1014, 139 O.R. (3d) 1, at para. 103). In pursuit of those

objectives, CCAA proceedings have evolved to permit outcomes that do not result in the emergence of the pre-filing debtor company in a restructured state, but rather involve some form of liquidation of the debtor's assets under the auspices of the Act itself (Sarra, "The Oscillating Pendulum: Canada's Sesquicentennial and Finding the Equilibrium for Insolvency Law", at pp. 19-21). Such scenarios are referred to as "liquidating CCAAs", and they are now commonplace in the CCAA landscape (see *Third Eye Capital Corporation v. Resources Dianor Inc./Dianor Resources Inc.*, 2019 ONCA 508, 435 D.L.R. (4th) 416, at para. 70). [At paras. 40–42; emphasis added.]

[67] Regarding liquidation sales in particular, the Court continued:

Liquidating CCAAs take diverse forms and may involve, among other things: the sale of the debtor company as a going concern; an "*en bloc*" sale of assets that are capable of being operationalized by a buyer; a partial liquidation or downsizing of business operations; or a piecemeal sale of assets (B. Kaplan, "Liquidating CCAAs: Discretion Gone Awry?", in J. P. Sarra, ed., *Annual Review of Insolvency Law* (2008), 79, at pp. 87-89). The ultimate commercial outcomes facilitated by liquidating CCAAs are similarly diverse. ...

CCAA courts first began approving these forms of liquidation pursuant to the broad discretion conferred by the Act. The emergence of this practice was not without criticism, largely on the basis that it appeared to be inconsistent with the CCAA being a "restructuring statute"... [Authorities omitted]

However, since s. 36 of the CCAA came into force in 2009, courts have been using it to effect liquidating CCAAs. Section 36 empowers courts to authorize the sale or disposition of a debtor company's assets outside the ordinary course of business. Significantly, when the Standing Senate Committee on Banking, Trade and Commerce recommended the adoption of s. 36, it observed that liquidation is not necessarily inconsistent with the remedial objectives of the CCAA, and that it may be a means to "raise capital [to facilitate a restructuring], eliminate further loss for creditors or focus on the solvent operations of the business" (p. 147). Other commentators have observed that liquidation can be a "vehicle to restructure a business" by allowing the business to survive, albeit under a different corporate form or ownership (Sarra, *Rescue! The Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act*, at p. 169; see also K. P. McElcheran, *Commercial Insolvency in Canada* (4th ed. 2019), at p. 311). Indeed, in *Indalex*, the company sold its assets under the CCAA in order to preserve the jobs of its employees, despite being unable to survive as their employer (see para. 51).

Ultimately, the relative weight that the different objectives of the CCAA take on in a particular case may vary based on the factual circumstances, the stage of the proceedings, or the proposed solutions that are presented to the court for approval. ... [At paras. 43–46; emphasis added.]

Compromises

[68] As this too-long review has shown, the originally “skeletal” nature of the *Act* and its stated objective of ‘facilitating compromises and arrangements of Canadian companies with their creditors’ have been substantially overtaken, not only by reason of amendments to the *Act* but by reason of court rulings. Judges have interpreted their authority liberally to include jurisdiction to approve interim financing with “super-priority” over secured creditors, to approve the sale or asset liquidation of debtor companies, and to approve various complex proposals that result in debtors “exiting” the CCAA regime — without finding it necessary to require that a compromise be sought and approved at a meeting of creditors. (See *Century Services* at para. 14; *Asset Engineering LP v. Forest & Marine Financial Limited Partnership* 2009 BCCA 319 at para. 26.) The Supreme Court of Canada appears to have approved of this evolution, as has Parliament in codifying conditions that were already being applied by courts in exercising their discretion prior to the legislative amendments.

[69] The result, in my view, is that this court’s focus in *Maple Bay* on the purpose stated in the long title of the *Act* — “*An Act to facilitate compromises and arrangements between companies and their creditors*” — may now be outdated. If compromises and meetings of creditors were not necessary for the granting of super-priority for interim financing, or for liquidation sales, it seems “inappropriate” that they should be seen as a legal ‘prerequisite’ for a refinancing, or the first stage of a refinancing, that (i) is clearly superior, from the point of view of all stakeholders; (ii) was consented to by both primary secured creditors; and (iii) would not affect the *rights* of unsecured creditors.

[70] In emphasizing unsecured creditors’ “*rights*”, I note that one of the issues before the Court in *Callidus* was whether it was open to the supervising judge to approve a litigation funding agreement (“LFA”) that would provide interim financing in the CCAA proceeding. The creditors argued that the proposed LFA was a “plan of arrangement” and therefore had to be put to a creditors’ vote under ss. 4 or 5 prior to receiving court approval. The Supreme Court rejected that argument for reasons set

forth at paras. 100–104. It suggested that although “arrangement” and “compromise” are very broad terms, they do have some limits and require, “at minimum, some compromise of creditors’ rights.” In the Court’s words:

For example, in *Crystallex* the litigation funding agreement at issue (known as the Tenor DIP facility) was held not to be a plan of arrangement because it did not “compromise the terms of [the creditors’] indebtedness or take away ... their legal rights” (para. 93). The Court of Appeal adopted the following reasoning from the lower court’s decision, with which we substantially agree:

A “plan of arrangement” or a “compromise” is not defined in the CCAA. It is, however, to be an arrangement or compromise between a debtor and its creditors. The Tenor DIP facility is not on its face such an arrangement or compromise between Crystallex and its creditors. Importantly the rights of the noteholders are not taken away from them by the Tenor DIP facility. The noteholders are unsecured creditors. Their rights are to sue to judgment and enforce the judgment. If not paid, they have a right to apply for a bankruptcy order under the BIA. Under the CCAA, they have the right to vote on a plan of arrangement or compromise. None of these rights are taken away by the Tenor DIP.

(*Re Crystallex International Corporation*, 2012 ONSC 2125, 91 C.B.R. (5th) 169, at para. 50)

Setting out an exhaustive definition of plan of arrangement or compromise is unnecessary to resolve these appeals. For our purposes, it is sufficient to conclude that plans of arrangement require at least some compromise of creditors’ rights. It follows that a third party litigation funding agreement aimed at extending financing to a debtor company to realize on the value of a litigation asset does not necessarily constitute a plan of arrangement. We would leave it to supervising judges to determine whether, in the particular circumstances of the case before them, a particular third party litigation funding agreement contains terms that effectively convert it into a plan of arrangement. So long as the agreement does not contain such terms, it may be approved as interim financing pursuant to s. 11.2 of the CCAA. [At paras. 101–02; emphasis added.]

[71] The Court concluded that the LFA was not “a plan of arrangement” because the contents of the so-called ‘pot of gold’ constituted by the litigation, if successful, might result in the creditors’ being paid in full. It was only if there was a shortfall that a compromise would be required to determine how the funds would be distributed. The debtor company, “Bluberi”, had committed to proposing such a plan if it became necessary. Thus, the Court said at para. 111, the case was distinguishable from *Maple Bay*.

Maple Bay

[72] I have already described at para. 28 above the facts of *Maple Bay* and quoted from the Court's reasoning; but for convenience, I again reproduce Tysoe J.A.'s most important comments here:

The filing of a draft plan of arrangement or compromise is not a prerequisite to the granting of a stay under s. 11: see *Re Fairview Industries Ltd.* (1991), 109 N.S.R. (2d) 12, 11 C.B.R. (3d) 43 (S.C.). In my view, however, a stay should not be granted or continued if the debtor company does not intend to propose a compromise or arrangement to its creditors. If it is not clear at the hearing of the initial application whether the debtor company is intending to propose a true arrangement or compromise, a stay might be granted on an interim basis, and the intention of the debtor company can be scrutinized at the comeback hearing. The case of *Re Ursel Investments Ltd.* (1990), 2 C.B.R. 2 C.B.R. (3d) 260 (Sask. Q.B.), rev'd on a different point (1991), 89 D.L.R. (4th) 246 (Sask. C.A.) is an example of where the court refused to direct a vote on a reorganization plan under the CCAA because it did not involve an element of mutual accommodation or concession between the insolvent company and its creditors.

... I need not decide the point on this appeal, but I query whether the court should grant a stay under the CCAA to permit a sale, winding up or liquidation without requiring the matter to be voted upon by the creditors if the plan of arrangement intended to be made by the debtor company will simply propose that the net proceeds from the sale, winding up or liquidation be distributed to its creditors. [At paras. 31–2; emphasis added.]

He concluded that in the absence of an intention of the part of the debtor company to propose a compromise to its creditors “before embarking on its restructuring plan”, it was not appropriate for a stay to have been granted or extended under s. 11.

[73] A similar issue arose in *Asset Engineering*. There, the Court was asked whether an order should have been granted under the CCAA in light of the facts that only the refinancing of a loan was proposed, rather than any compromise or arrangement, and in any event, the debtor had “unequivocally” declared it would oppose any arrangement. The case was found to be distinguishable from *Maple Bay*; in the Court's analysis:

The CCAA is appropriate for situations such as this where it is unknown whether the “restructuring” will ultimately take the form of a refinancing or will involve a reorganization of the corporate entity or entities and a true compromise of the rights of one or more parties. The “fundamental purpose” of the Act – to preserve the *status quo* while the debtor prepares a plan that

will enable it to remain in business to the benefit of all concerned – will be furthered by granting a stay so that the *means* contemplated by the Act – a compromise or arrangement – can be developed, negotiated and voted on if necessary. If the Partnership is ultimately able to arrange a refinancing in respect of which creditors need not compromise their rights, so much the better. At this point, however, it seems more likely a compromise will be necessary and the Partnership must move promptly to explore all realistic restructuring alternatives. [At para. 26; emphasis by underlining added.]

(See also *Re Fairmont Resort Properties Ltd.* 2012 ABQB 39 at para. 27–8; *Re Pacific Shores Resort and Spa Ltd.* 2011 BCSC 1775 at paras. 37–39; *Re Quest University Canada* at paras. 108–110.)

[74] Obviously, the facts of the case at bar are also very different from those of *Maple Bay*. 129 has made a complex and substantive proposal to which the two secured creditors have agreed. Evidently they are satisfied that the proposal represents the best outcome realistically available to protect Terrace House as an ongoing project. The proposal will not alter the rights of the Other Creditors; they never had any “right” to block the Petitioners’ granting security that would rank ahead of them; and whichever proposal goes ahead, the result for them will be the same. 129’s proposal was within the parameters of the SISP approved by the chambers judge and would appear now to have a decent chance of achieving the CCAA’s overarching objective and the more specific objectives described in *Callidus*. If the second stage of the proposal does not materialize, it will be open to the Petitioners to seek a compromise at that time. As it is, however, the first stage avoids the adverse effects of the liquidation deals proposed by Solterra and Landa.

[75] As I see it, no “compromise” is taking place that requires the consent of affected creditors beyond the secured parties. As Mr. Reyes deposed, “The 129 Offer does not seek to terminate any pre-sale contracts, or vest of or compromise any other claims against the Petitioners.” (In contrast, lienholders would suffer the loss of their registration under the Solterra Backup Offer.) The *Act* does not — at least expressly — *require* that a debtor seek a compromise and creditors’ meeting as a condition of obtaining an order under s. 11. Thus the approval of 129’s proposal would not contradict the *Act*. Sections 5 and 6 merely state that *where a*

compromise is proposed, the court may order a meeting of creditors or a class thereof; and under s. 6, if the compromise is approved and sanctioned by the court, it is binding on the creditors or class, subject to the conditions described in s. 6.

[76] I conclude that *Maple Bay* was clearly distinguishable from this case *and* that it should not have been regarded as dispositive as a *matter of law* — assuming it was so regarded. (The fact the chambers judge did not take issue with the parties' agreement that the Court had the "jurisdiction" to grant 129's application weighs against this view.) On this point of law, I agree generally with the comments of Suche J. in *Winnipeg Motor Express Inc.* 2008 MBQB 297 about the objectives of the CCAA:

... Everyone agrees the CCAA is intended to be flexible, and must be given a broad and liberal interpretation to achieve its objectives. I consider those objectives to be both more fundamental and broader than the title of the statute, and go beyond the circumstances of a formal plan of arrangement. The world of commercial lending and the complexity of security interests has evolved, and I consider the remedial nature of the CCAA allows it to deal with such changes. [At para. 41; emphasis added.]

The Chambers Judge's Exercise of Discretion

[77] I also find that the absence of a planned compromise in this case should not have weighed as a 'crucial' factor in the chambers judge's exercise of her discretion in determining appropriateness under s. 11. We must of course accord a high degree of deference to the chambers judge's exercise of discretion, but I believe, with respect, that she erred in principle in this regard. Giving primary importance to the statutory purpose stated in the CCAA's long title seems to run contrary to the evolution of the CCAA and its objectives described above, and to the evolution of the complex and innovative 'solutions' that now characterize CCAA applications. Like the Court in *Winnipeg Motor Express*, I consider the objectives of the Act now to be both more fundamental and broader than the title of the Act would suggest and to "go beyond the circumstances of a formal plan of arrangement." I conclude that the chambers judge erred in principle in giving primary importance to this factor.

[78] This is not to suggest that the question of whether a compromise is sought will *never* be relevant to an appropriateness analysis under s. 11. Indeed, I agree with the Court in *Maple Bay* that it was of some relevance *on the facts of that case*. Like Tysoe J.A., I would not welcome the prospect of debtor companies resorting to the statute simply to buy time, without having some proposal in hand — or the kernel of one — that is *likely to further the objectives of the Act*. These may be achieved by various means, of which a compromise may be one, but the seeking of one is not a legal “prerequisite”. It is useful to bear in mind the Court’s comment in *Century Services* that:

... Appropriateness under the CCAA is assessed by inquiring whether the order sought advances the policy objectives underlying the CCAA. The question is whether the order will usefully further efforts to achieve the remedial purpose of the CCAA — avoiding the social and economic losses resulting from liquidation of an insolvent company. I would add that appropriateness extends not only to the purpose of the order, but also to the means it employs. Courts should be mindful that chances for successful reorganizations are enhanced where participants achieve common ground and all stakeholders are treated as advantageously and fairly as the circumstances permit. [At para. 70; emphasis added.]

[79] On the foregoing bases alone, I would allow the appeal. I am also of the view that the chambers judge erred in weighing as a negative factor against 129’s offer, the fact that, in her words:

... Mr. Reyes is only seeking to allow *himself* some “breathing space” by borrowing money against the Project, by satisfying or keeping the secured creditors at bay while he seeks a better overall resolution than an outright sale that would crystallize his exposure to CMLS and Aviva. He seemingly requires that this Court assist him in freezing the rights of the Petitioners’ creditors while he seeks to do so. There is nothing to suggest that Mr. Reyes is seeking to obtain relief from this Court for the purposes of resolving the current creditor claims against the Petitioners within the context of these CCAA proceedings.

In other words, Mr. Reyes seeks the benefit of these proceedings — including the continuation of a stay against all creditors and with the potential for further relief, with the consent of Domain — with no true intention to address those creditor claims in the future. [At paras. 90–1; emphasis added.]

[80] With respect, without an adverse credibility finding it cannot be inferred that Mr. Reyes is only seeking to avoid a liquidation sale because it would “crystallize his exposure to CMLS and Aviva,” that he is not seeking relief in order to resolve “the

current creditor claims against the Petitioners” within the context of the *Act*, or that he is otherwise acting “with no true intention to address those creditor claims in the future.” To the contrary, as I have already indicated, 129’s proposal is clearly superior to the cash purchase offers, viewed from the viewpoint of all the stakeholders. It is true that Mr. Reyes is a guarantor of the CMLS mortgage, but according to the documents in evidence, he will also be guaranteeing the Domain loan. Even if this were not the case, many debtor companies under the CCAA are owned or controlled by persons who have very substantial financial stakes in the restructuring or refinancing, but there is nothing untoward about that fact. Just as creditors act in their own interests, so do controlling shareholders of debtor companies. (Directors are, of course, a different matter.) Mr. Reyes is also a controlling shareholder of 129, which is obviously lending funds as part of the refinancing. Clearly, he is not ridding himself of a burden of debt as a result of this restructuring. The statements I have reproduced from paras. 90 and 91 above are, in my view, simply incorrect and should not in principle have informed the judge’s exercise of her discretion under s. 11.

[81] Another related error lies in the chambers judge’s reasoning at para. 73:

Again, as already stated, 129 does not seek relief under s. 11.2 of the CCAA. 129’s counsel only suggests that its “refinancing” is appropriate in disregarding the interests of the other creditors, including the lienholders, since they are currently “out of the money”. I agree with 129’s counsel’s assessment of the likely current monetary value of the other creditors’ interests. However, in my view, that is a very unprincipled basis upon which to argue that this “refinancing” is an “appropriate” outcome in the balancing exercise with regard to all stakeholders. [Emphasis added.]

[82] This reasoning may be read in two ways. First, it may be intended to suggest that (in the words of Mr. Justice Goepel at para. 18(b) of his reasons in the leave application) that “comparing the 129 refinancing with the outcome if the Solterra or Landa offers were approved would be a ‘very unprincipled basis’ upon which to argue the 129 financing was appropriate”. The case-law is replete with judicial decisions that “balance” and “weigh” the “costs and benefits” of alternative proposals before the courts in CCAA proceedings. Indeed, this kind of weighing or balancing lies at the heart of most substantive CCAA decisions.

[83] The judge's reasons at para. 73 might also be taken to mean that it was "unprincipled" for 129 to proceed on the basis that it did not have to include unsecured creditors in its plan because they were "out of the money" — as they would be under the liquidation offers of Landa and Solterra as well. The fact the Other Creditors are "out of the money" is simply a reality that had to be accepted. The fact that neither 129 nor Solterra had proposed to make some funds available to them is a neutral fact, not a sign of bad faith (which in any event was not argued). It is no doubt part of the respective calculations of the benefits and risks underlying the offers that were before the Court. It would be unrealistic to expect offerors in situations such as this to go any further than was absolutely necessary in formulating those offers.

[84] A fourth error in the chambers judge's reasoning lies in her failing to take into consideration Mr. Reyes' affidavit evidence regarding his intentions in connection with the restructuring. At para. 88 she observed:

Specifically, there is no evidentiary foundation in Mr. Reyes' Affidavits to support the statement at para. 34 of 129's notice of application that 129 will use the "breathing space" under a further stay of proceedings to "permit some, or potentially full, recovery by Aviva and the Other Creditors".

and at para. 90:

... There is nothing to suggest that Mr. Reyes is seeking to obtain relief from this Court for the purposes of resolving the current creditor claims against the Petitioners within the context of these CCAA proceedings. [Emphasis added.]

[85] Earlier in these reasons I quoted at some length from Mr. Reyes' affidavit evidence, including his expression of hope that after some "breathing space" has been obtained, he will be in a position to locate construction financing that will enable the project to go ahead as planned. To say that there is "nothing" to suggest he is attempting to resolve the claims of creditors ignores this for no reason that the judge has provided.

[86] The rights of the secured creditors are "resolved" by 129's plan and in any event, it presents the best solution as compared to the liquidation offers. It is much

more than the “kernel of a plan”. In summary, unless the chambers judge was implying a lack of good faith in describing Mr. Reyes as having “no true intention” to address creditor claims in the future, she erred in ignoring the “evidentiary foundation” for 129’s proposal.

[87] It is not necessary to deal with the remaining ground of appeal concerning the question of “redemption”, which I leave for another day.

Disposition

[88] For the foregoing reasons, this court formed the view that leave should be granted to adduce the new evidence, that this appeal should be allowed, and that it would be impractical to remit this matter at this late stage to the Supreme Court for reconsideration. We also formed the view that we should exercise our discretion to find that 129’s proposal was appropriate and superior, from the point of view of all the stakeholders, to Solterra’s Backup Offer.

[89] Accordingly, we informed counsel that the appeal was allowed on the following terms:

- a. leave is granted to adduce the new evidence tendered at the hearing of the appeal
- b. the chambers judge’s orders dismissing the “129 Application” and approving the “Solterra Backup Offer” are set aside;
- c. the order sought by 129 approving the 129 Refinancing is granted on the same terms as were sought before the chambers judge, except as follows (using capitalized terms as defined in the draft order sought by 129):
 - i. increasing the maximum amount under the New Loan Facility to \$25,900,000;
 - ii. changing the date of the Domain Commitment Letter to July 30, 2021;
 - iii. adding repayment of the CMLS Facility to the permitted uses of the Working Capital Facility; and
 - iv. continuing and extending the stay of proceedings to and including April 30, 2022;

and subject to such non-substantive changes as this court may approve at the suggestion of counsel in order to reflect changes in circumstances that have arisen since the hearing below and are reflected in the new evidence.

[90] We are indebted to all counsel for their able arguments in this difficult case.

“The Honourable Madam Justice Newbury”

I agree:

“The Honourable Mr. Justice Willcock”

I agree:

“The Honourable Mr. Justice Goepel”

I agree:

“The Honourable Madam Justice Dickson”

I agree:

“The Honourable Mr. Justice Voith”

TAB 17

CITATION: Prizm Income Fund (Re), 2011 ONSC 2061
COURT FILE NO.: CV-11-915900CL
DATE: 20110331

SUPERIOR COURT OF JUSTICE - ONTARIO

RE: IN THE MATTER OF THE *COMPANIES' CREDITORS ARRANGEMENT ACT*,
R.S.C. 1985, c. C-36, AS AMENDED

AND:

IN THE MATTER OF A PLAN OF COMPROMISE OR ARRANGEMENT OF
PRIZM INCOME FUND, PRIZM CANADIAN OPERATING TRUST,
PRIZM INC. AND KIT FINANCE INC., Applicants

BEFORE: MORAWETZ J.

COUNSEL: A. J. Taylor and M. Konyukhova, for the Prizm Entities

G. Finlayson, Conflict Counsel for the Prizm Entities

M. Wasserman, for FTI Consulting Canada Inc., Proposed Monitor

P. Shea, for Prudential Insurance

P. Huff, for Directors of Prizm

C. Cosgriffe, for Yum! Restaurants International (Canada) LP

D. Ullmann, for 2279549 Ontario Inc. (Chief Restructuring Officer)

HEARD: MARCH 31, 2011

ENDORSEMENT

[1] Prizm Income Fund ("Prizm Fund"), Prizm Canadian Operating Trust ("Prizm Trust"), Prizm Inc. ("Prizm GP") and KIT Finance Inc. ("KIT Finance") (collectively, the "Applicants") seek relief under the *Companies' Creditors Arrangements Act*, R.S.C. 1985, c. C-36 (the "CCAA"). The Applicants also seek to have the stay of proceedings and other benefits of an initial order under the CCAA extended to Prizm Limited Partnership ("Prizm LP"). Prizm Fund, Prizm Trust, Prizm GP, Prizm LP and KIT Finance are collectively referred to as the "Prizm Entities".

BACKGROUND

[2] The Prizm Entities own and operate 428 KFC, Taco Bell and Pizza Hut restaurants in seven provinces across Canada. As a result of declining sales and the inability to secure additional or alternate financing, the Prizm Entities cannot meet their liabilities as they come due and are therefore insolvent.

[3] The Prizm Entities seek a stay of proceedings under the CCAA to allow them to secure a going concern solution for the business including approximately 6,500 employees and numerous suppliers, landlords and other creditors and to maximize recovery for the Prizm Entities' stakeholders.

[4] On the return of the motion, the only party that took issue with the proposed relief was Yum! Restaurants International (Canada) LP (the "Franchisor"). Counsel to the Franchisor indicated that the Franchisor was not opposing the form of order, but explicitly does not consent to the stated intention of the Prizm Entities not to pay franchise royalties to the Franchisor.

[5] The background facts with respect to this application are set out in the Affidavit of Deborah J. Papernick, sworn March 31, 2011 (the "Papernick Affidavit"). Further details are also contained in a pre-filing report submitted by FTI Consulting Canada Inc. ("FTI") in its capacity as proposed monitor. FTI has been acting as financial advisor to the Prizm Entities since December 13, 2010.

[6] Prizm LP is a franchisee of the Franchisor and is Canada's largest independent quick service restaurant operator. Prizm LP is the largest operator of the KFC concept in Canada, accounting for approximately 60% of all KFC product sales in Canada. In addition, Prizm LP operates a number of multi-branded restaurants that combine a KFC restaurant with either a Taco Bell or a Pizza Hut restaurant.

[7] As of March 25, 2011, the Prizm Entities operated 428 restaurants in seven provinces: British Columbia, Alberta, Manitoba, Ontario, Quebec, Nova Scotia and New Brunswick.

[8] The business of Prizm LP is to develop, acquire, make investments in and conduct the business and ownership, operation and lease of assets and property in connection with the quick service restaurant business in Canada.

[9] Prizm Fund is an income trust indirectly holding approximately 60% of Prizm LP's trust units.

[10] Prizm Trust is an unincorporated, limited purpose trust wholly-owned by Prizm Fund created to acquire and hold 60% of the outstanding partnership units of Prizm LP, as well as approximately 60% of Prizm GP's units, for Prizm Fund.

[11] Prizm GP is a corporation which acts as general partner of Prizm LP.

[12] KIT Finance is a corporation created to act as borrower for the Prudential Loan, described below.

[13] The principal and head offices of Prizm Fund, Prizm LP and Prizm GP are located in Vaughan, Ontario.

[14] As at March 31, 2011, the Prizm Entities had short-term and long-term indebtedness totalling: \$98.8 million pursuant to the following instruments:

- (a) Note purchase and private shelf agreement dated January 12, 2006 (“Note Purchase Agreement”) between KIT Finance, Prizm GP and Prudential Investment Management (“Prudential”) - \$67.3 million;
- (b) Subordinated Debentures issued by Prizm Fund due June 30, 2012 - \$30 million - \$31.5 million.

[15] The indebtedness under the Note Purchase Agreement (the “Prudential Loan”) is guaranteed by and secured by substantially all of the assets of Prizm GP, KIT Finance and Prizm LP and by limited recourse guarantees and pledge agreements granted by Prizm Fund and Prizm Trust.

[16] In addition, the Prizm Entities have approximately \$39.1 million of accrued and unpaid liabilities.

[17] As a result of slower than forecast sales, on September 5, 2010, Prizm Fund breached the Prudential Financial covenant and remains in non-compliance. As a result, the Prudential Loan became callable.

[18] Prizm Fund has also failed to make an interest payment of \$975,000 due on December 31, 2010 in respect to the Subordinated Debentures.

[19] The Prizm Entities have also ceased paying certain obligations to the Franchisor as they come due.

FINDINGS

[20] I am satisfied that Prizm GP and KIT Finance are “companies” within the definition of the CCAA. I am also satisfied that Prizm Fund and Prizm Trust fall within the definition of “income trust” under the CCAA and are “companies” to which the CCAA applies.

[21] I am also satisfied that the Prizm Entities are insolvent. In arriving at this determination, I have considered the definition of “insolvent” in the context of the CCAA as set out in *Re Stelco Inc.* (2004), 48 C.B.R. (4th) 299 (Ont. S.C.J.), leave to appeal refused, 2004 CarswellOnt 2936, leave to appeal to S.C.C. refused 2004 CarswellOnt. 5200. In *Stelco*, Farley J. applied an expanded definition of insolvent in the CCAA context to reflect the “rescue” emphasis of the CCAA, modifying the definition of “insolvent person” within the meaning of s. 2(1) of the

Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act, R.S.C. 1985, c. B-3 (“BIA”) to include a financially troubled corporation that is “reasonably expected to run out of liquidity within reasonable proximity of time as compared with the time reasonably required to implement a restructuring”.

[22] In this case, the Prizm Entities are unable to meet their obligations to creditors and have ceased paying certain obligations as they become due.

[23] Further, the Prizm Entities are affiliated debtor companies with total claims against in excess of \$100 million.

[24] I accept the submission put forth by counsel to the Applicants to the effect that the Applicants are “debtor companies” to which the CCAA applies.

[25] At the present time, the Prizm Entities are in the process of coordinating a sale process for certain assets. In these circumstances, I have been persuaded that a stay of proceedings is appropriate. In arriving at this determination, I have considered *Re Lehndorff General Partner Ltd.* (1993), 17 C.B.R. (3rd) 24 (Ont. Gen. Div.) and *Nortel Networks Corporation (Re)* [2009] O.J. No. 3169 (S.C.J.).

[26] The CCAA definition of an eligible company does not expressly include partnerships. However, CCAA courts have exercised jurisdiction to stay proceedings with respect to partnerships and limited partnerships where it is just and convenient to do so. See *Lehndorff*, *supra*, and *Re Canwest Global Communications Corp.*, 2009 CarswellOnt 6184 (S.C.J.).

[27] The courts have held that this relief is appropriate where the operations of the debtor companies are so intertwined with those of the partnerships or limited partnerships in question, that not extending the stay would significantly impair the effectiveness of a stay in respect of the debtor companies.

[28] Having reviewed the affidavit of Ms. Papernick, I have been persuaded that it is appropriate to extend CCAA protection to Prizm LP.

[29] The Prizm Entities are also seeking an order: (a) declaring certain of their suppliers to be critical suppliers within the meaning of the CCAA; (b) requiring such suppliers to continue to supply on terms and conditions consistent with existing arrangements and past practice as amended by the initial order; (c) granting a charge over the Property as security for payment for goods and services supplied after the date of the Initial Order.

[30] Section 11.4 of the CCAA provides the court jurisdiction to declare a person to be a critical supplier. The CCAA does not contain a definition of “critical supplier” but pursuant to 11.4(1), the court must be satisfied that the person sought to be declared a critical supplier “is a supplier of goods or services to the company and that the goods or services that are supplied are critical to the company’s continued operations”.

[31] Counsel submits that the Prizm Entities’ business is virtually entirely reliant on their ability to prepare, cook and sell their products and that given the perishable nature of their

products, the Prizm Entities maintain very little inventory and rely on an uninterrupted flow of deliveries and continued availability of various products. In addition, the Prizm Entities are highly dependent on continued and timely provision of waste disposal and information technology services and various utilities.

[32] With the assistance of the proposed monitor, the Prizm Entities have identified a number of suppliers which are critical to their ongoing operation and have organized these suppliers into five categories:

- (a) chicken suppliers;
- (b) other food and restaurant consumables;
- (c) utility service providers;
- (d) suppliers of waste disposal services;
- (e) providers of appliance repair and information technology services.

[33] A complete list of the suppliers considered critical by the Prizm Entities (the “Critical Suppliers”) is attached at Schedule “A” to the proposed Initial Order.

[34] Having reviewed the record, I have been satisfied that any interruption of supply by the Critical Suppliers could have an immediate material adverse impact on the Prizm Entities business, operations and cash flow such that it is, in my view, appropriate to declare the Critical Suppliers as “critical suppliers” pursuant to the CCAA.

[35] Further, I accept the submission of counsel to the Prizm Entities that it is appropriate to grant a Critical Suppliers’ Charge to rank behind the Administrative Charge.

[36] The Prizm Entities also seek approval of the DIP Facility in the amount up to \$3 million to be secured by the DIP Lenders’ Charge.

[37] Subsection 11.2(4) of the CCAA sets out the factors to be considered by the court in deciding whether to grant a DIP Financing Charge. These factors include:

- (a) the period during which the company is expected to be subject to proceedings under the CCAA;
- (b) how the company’s business and financial affairs are to be managed during the proceedings;
- (c) whether the company’s management has the confidence of its major creditors;
- (d) whether the loan would enhance the prospects of a viable compromise or arrangement being made in respect of the company;

- (e) the nature and value of the company's property;
- (f) whether any creditor would be materially prejudiced as a result of the security or charge; and
- (g) the monitor's report.

[38] Counsel submits that the following factors support the granting of the DIP Lenders' Charge:

- (a) the Prizm Entities expect to continue daily operations during the proceedings;
- (b) management will be overseen by the monitor who will oversee spending under the DIP Financing;
- (c) while it is not anticipated that the Prizm Entities will require any additional financing prior to June 30, 2011, actual funding requirements may vary;
- (d) the ability to borrow funds from a court-approved DIP Facility will be crucial to retain the confidence of stakeholders;
- (e) secured creditors have either been given notice of the DIP Lenders' Charge or are not affected by it;
- (f) the DIP Lenders' Charge does not secure an obligation that existed before the granting of the Initial Order; and
- (g) the proposed monitor is supportive of the DIP Facility and the DIP Lenders' Charge.

[39] Based on the foregoing, I am of the view that it is appropriate to approve the DIP Facility and grant the DIP Lenders' Charge.

[40] The trustees and directors of the Prizm Entities have stated their intention to resign. In order to ensure ongoing corporate governance, the Prizm Entities seek an order appointing 2279549 Ontario Inc. as the CRO. They have also requested that the Chief Restructuring Officer be afforded the protections outlined in the draft Initial Order.

[41] The Applicants are seeking an Administration Charge over the property in the amount of \$1.5 million to secure the fees of the proposed monitor, its counsel, counsel to the Prizm Entities and the CRO. It is proposed that this charge will rank in priority to all other security interests in the Prizm assets, other than any "secured creditor", as defined in the CCAA, who has not received notice of the application for CCAA protection.

[42] The authority to provide such a charge is set out in s. 11.5(2) of the CCAA.

[43] The Prizm Entities submit that the following factors support the granting of the Administration Charge:

- (a) the Prizm Entities operate an extensive business;
- (b) the beneficiaries will provide essential legal and financial advice and leadership;
- (c) there is no anticipated unwarranted duplication of roles;
- (d) secured creditors likely to be affected by the charge were provided with notice and do not object to the Administration Charge; and
- (e) the proposed monitor, in its pre-filing report, supports the Administration Charge.

[44] I am satisfied that this is an appropriate case in which to grant the Administration Charge in the form requested.

[45] I am also satisfied that it is appropriate to grant a Directors' Charge in the amount of \$9.8 million to protect directors and officers and the CRO from certain potential liabilities. In arriving at this determination, I have considered the provisions of s. 11.5(1) of the CCAA which addresses the issue of directors' and officers' charges. I have also considered that the Prizm Entities maintain directors' and officers' liability insurance ("D&O Insurance"). The current policy provides a total of \$31 million in coverage. It is expected that the D&O Insurance will provide coverage sufficient to protect the directors and officers and the draft Initial Order provides that the Directors' Charge shall only apply to the extent that the D&O Insurance is not adequate.

[46] For the foregoing reasons, I am satisfied that it is appropriate to grant the CCAA Initial Order in the form requested.

[47] Paragraph 14 of the form of order provides for a stay of proceedings up to and including April 29, 2011. Paragraph 59 provides for the standard comeback provision.

[48] The Initial Order was signed 9:30 a.m. Eastern Daylight Time on March 31, 2011.

MORAWETZ J.

Date: March 31, 2011

TAB 18

CITATION: PT Holdco Inc. (Re) 2016 ONSC 495
COURT FILE NO.: CV-16-11257-00CL
DATE: 20160121

SUPERIOR COURT OF JUSTICE – ONTARIO – COMMERCIAL LIST

IN THE MATTER OF THE COMPANIES' CREDITORS ARRANGEMENT ACT, R.S.C. 1985, c. C-36, AS AMENDED

AND IN THE MATTER OF A PLAN OF COMPROMISE OR ARRANGEMENT OF PT HOLDCO, INC., PRIMUS TELECOMMUNICATIONS CANADA, INC., PTUS, INC., PRIMUS TELECOMMUNICATIONS, INC., AND LINGO, INC.

BEFORE: Penny J.

COUNSEL: *Maria Konyukhova and Vlad Calina* for the Applicants

Linc Rogers and Aryo Shalviri for the Monitor

Brendan O'Neill for Birch Telecommunications Inc.

Natasha MacParland for the Bank of Montreal

Greg Azeff and Stephanie DeCaria for Manulife

D. Magisano for Origin Merchant Partners

HEARD: January 19, 2016

REASONS

[1] This is an application for court protection under the *Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act*, R.S.C. 1985, c. C-36, as amended (the "CCAA"), including authorization to apply for recognition in the United States pursuant to Chapter 15 of the United States Bankruptcy Code, 11 U.S. Code § 1501-1532 (the "Code").

[2] I granted the initial order on January 19, 2016 with reasons to follow. These are those reasons.

[3] The applicants (collectively Primus) offer telecommunications services in Canada and the United States. Primus' principal business is the re-selling of residential and commercial telecommunications services within the United States and Canada.

[4] Primus has been experiencing rapidly declining revenues, its customer base is being lost to lower profit margin services and, yet, its capital costs remain high. As a result, Primus does not have the liquidity to meet its payment obligations as they become due. Primus is unable to

satisfy the financial covenants set out in its secured credit agreements and has defaulted under these credit agreements. If these agreements are enforced, Primus would be unable to satisfy its obligations. Primus has operated under forbearance agreements in respect of these defaults since February 4, 2015. Primus has been unable to successfully restructure its business outside of formal insolvency proceedings.

[5] The Primus North American operations are thoroughly integrated. Internally, Primus shares networks, platforms, infrastructure and personnel (including senior management).

[6] Holdco is the principal holding company of Primus with PTUS and Primus Canada the wholly owned subsidiaries of Holdco. Primus Canada is the Canadian operating company. PTUS is the holding company for PTI and Lingo, which are Primus' U.S. operating companies.

[7] Holdco and Primus Canada are private companies incorporated under the Ontario *Business Corporations Act*, with registered head offices in Toronto, Ontario. PTUS, PTI, and Lingo are private companies incorporated under the laws of Delaware, with registered head offices in Wilmington, Delaware.

[8] Primus Canada does not own sufficient telecommunications network infrastructure to provide telecommunications services without the assistance of a major carrier. Primus Canada's business and operations are heavily dependent on the major carriers. The largest vendors are Bell, Allstream, Rogers and Telus, which collectively account for approximately 50% of supplier obligations. Primus Canada purchases services from major carriers at wholesale rates determined by the CRTC or through negotiated arrangements to re-sell to its own residential and commercial consumers. The majority of Primus Canada's gross revenue is earned by providing these resale services.

[9] Primus Canada is also dependent on its credit card processing service provider. Approximately 30% of Primus Canada's customers pay for their services by credit card. Primus Canada could not process credit card transactions without the continued supply of credit card services.

[10] Primus Canada generates 88% of the Primus gross revenues of which 78% is generated in Ontario with 10% in Quebec, 6% in British Columbia, 4% in Alberta, and 2% in other provinces.

[11] Primus Canada has approximately 204,000 residential accounts and 23,000 commercial accounts. In 2014, approximately 56% of Primus Canada's revenue was generated from residential customers and approximately 44% was generated from commercial customers.

[12] Typical residential agreements are for two years or less. Typical commercial agreements range between two to three years.

[13] The U.S. Primus entities' revenues account for approximately 12% of the Primus gross revenue. U.S. Primus primarily offers digital home phone services and long-distance phone services.

[14] U.S. Primus has about 27,000 residential customers, of which approximately 1,100 are located in Puerto Rico. The balance of the U.S. Primus customers are located in the United States.

[15] Primus Canada employs 502 people and U.S. Primus employs 28 people. Certain of the Primus employees provide services to both the U.S. and Canadian operations. The Primus workforce is non-unionized. Primus does not have a pension plan for its employees.

[16] Primus' gross revenue decreased from \$229 million in 2012 to \$199 million in 2013, to \$180 million in 2014. Gross revenue is forecasted to drop to \$166 million in 2015. Since 2012, the Primus consolidated revenue has declined an average of 9% per year. During the same period, the Canadian residential business, representing approximately 56% of gross revenue for 2015, has declined an average of 9% year-over-year. At the same time, revenue has declined 18% in Canada and 25% in the United States. Despite these declining revenues, Primus has not been able to reduce capital expenditures due to the capital-intensive nature of its business. Consequently, Primus reported a net loss of \$830,000 in 2014 and has forecast a net loss of \$13,078,000 for 2015.

[17] As a result of their financial difficulties and resulting defaults with their lenders, the Primus entities are insolvent and unable to meet their obligations as they come due.

[18] Primus elected to pursue a pre-filing sales process out of concern that the extensive period of CCAA protection necessary to implement a post-filing sales process would have a detrimental impact on the Primus business and its customers.

[19] Following a SISP, Primus selected a successful bidder. Subject to obtaining the initial order being sought, Primus intends to return on a motion seeking approval of the asset purchase agreement and associated sale transaction and ancillary relief.

Should the Court grant CCAA Protection to Primus?

[20] Primus Canada and Holdco, as companies incorporated under Ontario legislation meet the CCAA definition of "company" and are therefore eligible for CCAA protection.

[21] PTI, PTUS and Lingo are also "companies" within the definition of the CCAA because they are incorporated companies (under the laws of Delaware) having assets in Canada, being funds held on deposit in Canadian bank accounts, *Re Cinram*, 2012 ONSC 3767 (S.C.J. [Comm. List]).

[22] Although the CCAA does not define the term "insolvent," the definition of "insolvent person" under section 2(1) of the BIA is well-established as the governing definition in applications under the CCAA.

[23] Primus' precarious financial situation, including the defaults under credit agreements, has rendered Primus insolvent within the definition contemplated in both the BIA and the expanded definition set out in *Stelco Inc. (Re)* (2004), 48 C.B.R. (4th) 299 (Ont. S.C.J. [Comm. List]).

None of the Primus entities have sufficient liquidity to satisfy their obligations as they come due. The continued forbearance of Primus' lenders is conditional on the granting of the Initial Order. Without this forbearance, the Primus entities' loans will be immediately due. Primus will not have the funds to satisfy these debts.

[24] Finally, the Primus entities, either individually or as a whole, have debts in excess of \$5 million. I find that the Primus entities are "debtor companies" to which the CCAA applies.

[25] Under s. 11.02(3) of the CCAA, on an initial application in respect of a "debtor company", the Court may make an order on any terms that it considers appropriate where the applicant satisfies the Court that circumstances exist to make the order, including, among other things, staying all proceedings that might be taken in respect of the company under the BIA.

[26] A stay of proceedings is appropriate in liquidating CCAA proceedings such as this one, *Lehndorff General Partner Ltd. (Re)* (1993), 17 C.B.R. (3rd) 24 (Ont. Gen. Div. [Comm. List]), para. 6.

[27] As a result of the financial difficulties and liquidity issues outlined above, Primus requires CCAA protection to maintain operations while allowing it the time necessary to complete the sales process and thereby to maximize recovery for its stakeholders. Without CCAA protection, a shut-down of operations is inevitable. This would be disruptive to Primus' efforts to maximize recovery.

Should the Court grant the Administration Charge?

[28] Primus seeks a charge on its assets in the maximum amount of \$1 million to secure the fees and disbursements incurred in connection with services rendered to Primus both before and after the commencement of the CCAA proceedings by counsel to Primus, the Monitor and the Monitor's counsel (the "Administration Charge").

[29] Primus worked with the proposed monitor to estimate the proposed quantum of the Administration Charge to ensure that it was reasonable and appropriate in the circumstances.

[30] The Administration Charge is proposed to rank in priority to all other security interests, trusts, liens, charges and encumbrances, claims of secured creditors, statutory or otherwise held by persons with notice of this application.

[31] Section 11.52 of the CCAA provides statutory jurisdiction to grant such a charge.

[32] In *Re Canwest Publishing Inc.*, (2010), 63 C.B.R. (5th) 115 (Ont. S.C.J. [Comm. List]), in addition to the considerations enumerated in section 11.52, Justice Pepall considered the following factors:

- (a) the size and complexity of the business being restructured;
- (b) the proposed role of the beneficiaries of the charge;

- (c) whether there is an unwarranted duplication of roles;
- (d) whether the quantum of the proposed charge appears to be fair and reasonable;
- (e) the position of the secured creditors likely to be affected by the charge; and
- (f) the position of the monitor.

[33] In the present matter, the following factors support the granting of the Administration Charge as requested:

- (a) Primus operates a business which is technical in nature, operates across North America, and is subject to regulatory obligations;
- (b) the beneficiaries of the Administration Charge will provide essential legal and financial advice throughout the CCAA proceedings;
- (c) there is no anticipated unwarranted duplication of roles;
- (d) the lenders were advised of the anticipated return date of this application, have or will have received copies of the application materials, and have not indicated opposition to the granting of the Administration Charge; and
- (e) the proposed Monitor, in its pre-filing report, supports the Administration Charge and its proposed quantum and believes it to be fair and reasonable in view of the complexity of Primus' CCAA proceedings and the services to be provided by the beneficiaries of the Administration Charge.

[34] Each of the proposed beneficiaries of this charge will play a critical role in the Primus restructuring and it is unlikely that these advisors will participate in the CCAA proceedings unless the Administration Charge is granted to secure their fees and disbursements. Accordingly, the Administrative Charge is granted.

Should the Court grant the Directors' Charge?

[35] Primus also seeks a charge over its assets in favour of the Primus former and current directors in the amount of \$3.1 million (the "D&O Charge") in order to protect the directors and officers from the risk of significant personal exposure. The D&O Charge is proposed to rank immediately behind the Administration Charge but in priority to all other encumbrances held by persons given notice of this application.

[36] Primus maintains directors' and officers' liability insurance for its directors and officers. The current D&O insurance policies provide a total of \$15 million in coverage. Under the D&O insurance, there are deductibles for certain claims and a large number of exclusions which create a degree of uncertainty. In addition, contractual indemnities which have been given to the directors and officers cannot be satisfied as Primus does not have sufficient funds to satisfy those

indemnities should their directors and officers be found responsible for the full amount of the potential directors' liabilities. Adequate indemnification insurance is not otherwise available for the directors and officers at reasonable cost.

[37] The CCAA has codified the granting of directors' and officers' charges on a priority basis in section 11.51. The Court must be satisfied that the amount of the charge is appropriate in light of obligations and liabilities that may be incurred after the commencement of proceedings, *Re Canwest Global, supra*.

[38] Primus requires the continued involvement of its directors and officers in order to finalize the sales process already in progress. The directors and officers of Primus have indicated that, due to the significant personal exposure associated with Primus' liabilities, they will resign from their positions with Primus unless the Initial Order grants the D&O Charge.

[39] The D&O Charge will allow Primus to continue to benefit from the expertise and knowledge of its directors and officers. The quantum of the requested D&O Charge is reasonable given the complexity of Primus' business and the potential exposure of the directors and officers to personal liability.

[40] Further, the proposed monitor has advised that it is supportive of the D&O Charge, including the amount.

[41] The D&O Charge is therefore granted.

The Proposed Monitor

[42] FTI Consulting Canada Inc. has consented to act as the court-appointed monitor. FTI is a trustee within the meaning of s. 2 of the BIA and is not subject to any of the restrictions on who may be appointed as a monitor. The monitor has filed a pre-filing report indicating that it is supportive of the relief being sought. The appointment of FTI is granted.

Should the Court Authorize FTI Consulting Canada Inc. to Act as Foreign Representative?

[43] Section 56 of the CCAA grants the court the unfettered authority to appoint "any person or body" to act as a representative for the purpose of having these CCAA proceedings recognized in any jurisdiction outside of Canada, including but not limited to the United States.

[44] In order to enforce the stay of proceedings established under the Initial Order in the United States and to facilitate the contemplated restructuring strategy, it is necessary to seek recognition of the Initial Order by the United States Bankruptcy Court. Accordingly, Primus seeks authorization for FTI, as foreign representative of Primus, to seek recognition of these proceedings in the United States under Chapter 15 of the Code.

[45] Courts have consistently encouraged comity and cooperation between courts in cross-border insolvencies to enable enterprises to restructure on a cross-border basis. To authorize FTI

to act as foreign representative and seek recognition of these proceedings in the United States is consistent with and gives full effect to these principles.

[46] The commencement of proceedings in the United States is necessary and appropriate under the circumstances because, among other things, Primus operates a cross-border business that is operationally and functionally integrated in several significant respects. Among other things, Primus has assets and employees in the United States and many affected creditors are located in the United States. As a result, it is possible that one or more parties in the United States will seek to commence proceedings against one or more of the U.S. Primus entities.

[47] The appointment and authorization of FTI as foreign representative is granted.

[48] For all these reasons, I have granted the initial order in the form sought.

Penny J.

Date: January 21, 2016

TAB 19

Court of Queen's Bench of Alberta

Citation: Re Canada North Group Inc, 2017 ABQB 508

Date: 20170817
Docket: 1703 12327
Registry: Edmonton

**In the Matter of the
Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act,
RSC 1985, c C-36, as amended**

**and in the Matter of a Plan of Arrangement of
Canada North Group Inc., Canada North Camps Inc.,
Campcorp Structures Ltd., D.J. Catering Ltd.,
816956 Alberta Ltd. and 1371047 Alberta Ltd.**

**Reasons for Decision
of the
Honourable Mr. Justice S.D. Hillier**

I Introduction

[1] Canada North Camps Inc. (CNC), Campcorp Structures Ltd., D.J. Catering Ltd., 816956 Alberta Ltd. and 1371047 Alberta Ltd. (collectively, the Group) request extension of a Stay under s. 11.02(2) of the *Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act*, RSC 1985, c C-36 (CCAA) until November 3, 2017 and ancillary orders.

[2] The Canadian Western Bank (CWB) cross-applies for an order lifting the Stay and appointing either a full or interim Receiver pursuant to s. 243 (or ss. 47 and 244 of the *Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act*, RSC 1985, c B-3 (BIA)), s. 13(2) of the *Judicature Act*, RSA 2000, c J-2, s. 99(a) of the *Business Corporations Act*, RSA 2000, c B-9, and s. 65(7) of the *Personal Property Security Act*, RSA 2000, c P-7.

II History

[3] The Group operates or provides a number of services including work camps in the natural resource sector, modular construction manufacturing, camp land rentals as well as real estate holdings including a golf course. CWB has been the Group's major secured creditor for a significant period of time.

[4] 1919209 Alberta Ltd. (1919) is an insolvent affiliated debtor holding company of two of the companies in the Group. It was incorporated to lease camp equipment from Weslease Income

Growth Fund LP (Weslease) and provide that camp equipment to Canada North Camps Inc. for its use. 1919's operations are integrated with those of the other applicants.

[5] CNC entered into an agreement to construct a camp on Wandering River. 1371047, and Wandering River Properties Ltd. (owned 2/3 by 1371047) subsequently purchased a parcel for that purpose. CNC joined with the local Heart Lake First Nation and formed Heart Lake CNC LP, Heart Lake Canada North Group GP Ltd., Wandering River Properties Ltd., and Canada North Group LP Holdings Ltd.

[6] An action by Max Fuel Distributors Ltd. as against Shayne McCracken arises from the operation of the camp business. The other creditors of the Group are stayed from enforcing collateral claims against Shayne McCracken.

[7] The Group's operations and profitability have been significantly impacted since 2014 by the downturn in the economy. Earlier attempts by the Group and CWB to deal with the debt and cash flow issues proved to be unsuccessful.

[8] In March 2017, the parties signed a Forbearance Agreement but problems continued. When they were unable to reach a new resolution in a full meeting on June 21, 2017, the Group issued Notices of Intention to make proposals under the *BIA* effective June 26, 2017.

[9] On July 5, 2017, Nielsen J. granted an initial Stay under s. 11.02(1) of the *CCAA*. He imposed numerous terms, including that:

- Ernst & Young be appointed as Monitor;
- R. e. I. Group Inc. be appointed as Chief Restructuring Officer (CRO);
- the Stay continue until August 3, 2017, subject to review;
- Debtor in Possession (DIP) financing from the Business Development Bank of Canada (BDC) be made available, not to exceed \$1M;
- Notice of Intention proceedings under the *BIA* be "taken up" and continued under the *CCAA*.

[10] On July 27, 2017, the Group applied under s. 11.02(2) of the *CCAA* for an extension of the Stay to November 3, 2017. It also applied to add 1919 as an applicant in these proceedings.

[11] As well, it applied to expand the Stay to apply to proceedings against the entities involved in the Wandering River contract, and against Shayne McCracken.

[12] Finally, the Group applied for an increase in the DIP financing to a maximum of \$2,500,000 and an interim lender's charge up to the same amount due to elevated costs associated with a significant short-term increase in work under a camps contract with the British Columbia provincial government for workers on the wildfires.

[13] The CWB cross-applied for an order lifting the Stay and appointing a full or interim Receiver.

[14] The Monitor sought approval of his First Report and activities, a suspension of limitation periods on claims, and the power to examine the parties regarding questioned transactions on lot sales prior to the *CCAA* Order (preferences) under s. 36.2 of the *CCAA*. Other interested parties also made submissions as affecting their interests.

[15] In an oral decision, this Court extended the Stay to September 29, 2017 with a review to be held on September 26, 2017. The cross-application was dismissed. The Court also issued a series of ancillary directions. The parties were advised that written reasons would be issued dealing with the main issue as to extension of the Stay or appointment of a Receiver. These are the written reasons.

III Affidavit Evidence

[16] The Group's stated preliminary plan is to return operations to profitability as demand increases, consider sale of some of its assets, and seek new financing or equity investment as required in order to provide a viable Plan of Arrangement.

[17] The Group has presented extensive affidavits from Ms. Shayne McCracken, Director and Secretary of the applicants, in support of the various applications, containing the following key assertions:

- the Group has acted in good faith and with due diligence, working closely with the CRO and cooperating with the Monitor as they gain an understanding of the business and structure;
- the Group has specifically worked with the CRO and Monitor to improve financial reporting and accounting processes;
- together they have taken initial steps to develop a Plan of Arrangement to present to creditors, including a detailed overview of assets and liabilities;
- the Group has been the subject of unsolicited investment and purchase interest, which the Group, Monitor and CRO are pursuing;
- meetings have taken place with interested parties as well as arrangements related to drawdowns on DIP financing;
- work has included contracts with the Province of British Columbia to address efforts in consequence of raging wildfires in that province.

[18] Ms. McCracken's affidavits purport to meet head on the concerns of CWB with the accounting treatment of certain accounts receivable, particularly in relation to the Grand Rapids Pipeline Project and the margining of custom negotiated deferred revenue. In late 2016, cost estimates were prepared for demobilization of the Grand Rapids camp, including removal of the camp for just over \$2M and reclamation work estimated at roughly \$5.36M based on detailed costing. Ms. McCracken asserted that the practice of clients assuming the costs of setting up and removing camps by advance invoicing is used by others in the camp industry.

[19] The margining of custom negotiated deferred revenue allows the Group access to necessary financing to commence work prior to being paid. Ms. McCracken found support for the accounting practice in question in the custom negotiated deferred revenue term of the margining requirement that was part of the credit agreement with CWB.

[20] Two significant receivables were placed on the books between March and May 2017 (it is unclear when they were actually posted and sent to the client) on Grand Rapids. This ostensibly led to a claim against the financing and increased CWB's exposure significantly at a time when the parties were trying to sort things out following the Forbearance Agreement in mid-March.

[21] Ms. McCracken specifically denied CWB's allegation that these invoices were provided in bad faith to artificially inflate the amount available on the operating line. She deposed that the invoicing for this work was reviewed by the Group's corporate counsel. As well, it was part of the financial reporting to CWB and there were regular conversations with account managers at CWB who were aware of the origin and nature of all significant receivables, including the Grand Rapid receivables. Ms. McCracken maintained the view that the receivables were appropriately margined as deferred revenue.

[22] Ms. McCracken noted that Grand Rapids has now raised issues with respect to payment of some of the invoices and a meeting is scheduled with it in Calgary in early August to discuss payment of those invoices.

[23] Ms. Jessica Taha filed extensive material for CWB challenging the Stay, and supporting the appointment of a Receiver. The following assertions are germane, particularly as concerns margining of receivables:

- the Group had been margining receivables for which work had not yet been done (citing Grand Rapids);
- as a result, the operating line was overdrawn by over \$3.8M for work not yet done which only came to light at the June 21, 2017 meeting; subsequent information reflects that it is overdrawn by \$8M;
- the Group had only performed 10% of required work on one contract and only 40% for another, and none of this was consistent with the margining as represented by the Group, and arranged between the parties dating back to 2012;
- despite representations to the contrary before Nielsen J., CWB was not aware of this prior to the June 21, 2017 meeting.

[24] Ms. Taha attested to her belief that as the level of work dropped dramatically in the economic downturn, the Group changed its approach without advising CWB, and started to render invoices for work which had not yet been done, categorizing those invoices as deferred revenue capable of margining.

[25] In response, Ms. McCracken maintained her position that the Grand Rapids deferred revenue was properly included in the financial statements. She deposed that Ms. Taha's position that deferred revenue was only permitted to be used for margining based on the percentage of the work performed is inconsistent with the supporting material provided by Ms. Taha. The Group kept their branch representatives apprised of the status of the deferred revenue inclusions in the margining calculations and none raised a concern.

[26] In counter response, CWB prepared three affidavits of senior officers at the Edmonton Main Branch deposing that they were unaware of the material amounts that were being margined without the work having been done, and each was unaware of anyone else at CWB having had such knowledge until the meeting on June 21, 2017.

[27] Glenn MacDougall, Manager of ECN Capital Corp. (ECN), also filed an affidavit. ECN is an equipment lessor and creditor of the Group. In short, he opines that the work resulting from the BC wildfires is a temporary salve on the Group's financial circumstances, and it is unlikely that the Group will be able to make a viable Plan of Arrangement. He deposed that ECN would

be materially prejudiced by the continuation of the Stay, as it will erode the value of ECN's security.

[28] With respect to expanding the Stay, Ms. McCracken deposed that direct claims against affiliates have been reviewed. The Group now seeks to expand the stay to specific affiliates where those affiliates are facing claims directly connected to the overall camp operations, in order to preserve the *status quo*, prevent unnecessary expenditures of effort on litigation, maximize recovery for all parties, and allow for an orderly determination of priority and claims.

[29] Regarding inclusion of 1919, Ms. McCracken deposed that 1919 has no revenue other than lease income from Canada North and is completely dependent on such payments to fulfill its obligations under the leases. It is included in the consolidated cash flow projections and financial statements for the Group, as it is treated as a flow through entity. The equipment it leases is essential to the uninterrupted operations of the Group.

[30] Finally, Ms. McCracken explained that the increased work for the B.C. government, although welcome, creates a cash flow issue as the work is invoiced approximately a week after completion and receipt of payment typically takes approximately four weeks from invoicing. Consequently, the Group anticipates a cash flow shortage in August 2017 that will not be met by the present DIP facility. On July 21, 2017, the interim lender approved an increase to the DIP financing to a maximum of \$2,500,000.

IV Monitor's First Report

[31] The Monitor has provided a First Report, advising of various steps taken in conjunction with the CRO, highlights of which include:

General

- a new cash management procedure has been initiated to ensure efficient control of cash and cash reporting, with a review of cash flow projections;
- the Group's management and staff have been making significant efforts in all respects and are cooperating fully with the efforts of the CRO;
- based on the Monitor's own work with Group management, the Group appears to have acted in good faith and with due diligence;
- the actual end cash balance for the two weeks ending July 15, 2017 was higher than projected by over \$400K and collections higher than projected by nearly \$350K;
- while cash disbursements were lower, this was largely due to temporary deferrals;
- the contracts relating to the B.C. wildfires will have a significant positive impact on future cash inflows and receivables.

Accounts Receivable

- the Group has used atypical accounting practices as reflected in four areas;

- the steps being adopted in response to CWB’s concerns include removing Grand Rapids and Heart Lake related receivables as a conservative strategy while quantum is reviewed;
- some but not all of the room guarantees or reservations have been reversed out.

Status of Restructuring Efforts and Related Plan

- the Group’s business and operations are very complex;
- the CRO believes, based on preliminary work to date and co-operation of the management team, that there is certainly potential for a going concern plan that could provide significantly greater value to stakeholders as compared to a liquidation;
- the CRO is of the initial view that several profit and gross margin improvements have been realized by the Group due to changes to operations, staffing and other operational matters.

1919

- the leasing arrangement with Weslease has been extended for use by the Group valued at approximately \$6M and listed as: three Jack+Jill dorms, two power distribution centres and one waste water treatment plant;
- expansion of the Stay to include 1919 is reasonable.

[32] As well, the Monitor and the Group have been in contact with various parties who have expressed interest in participating in a restructuring through refinancing, purchasing assets or investing in the Group.

V Law

[33] An initial Stay under s. 11.02(1) of the CCAA may be imposed for a maximum period of 30 days. The role of this Court on a subsequent application under s. 11.02(2) is not to re-evaluate the initial decision, but rather to consider whether the applicant has established that the current circumstances support an extension as being appropriate and that the applicant has acted, and is acting, in good faith and with due diligence, as required under s. 11.02(3).

[34] The purpose of the CCAA is to permit the debtor to continue to carry on business and, where possible, avoid the social and economic costs of liquidating its assets. Appropriateness of an extension under the CCAA is assessed by inquiring into whether the order sought advances the policy objectives underlying the CCAA. A stay can be lifted if the reorganization is doomed to failure, but where the order sought realistically advances those objectives, a CCAA court has the discretion to grant it: **Century Services Inc v Canada (Attorney General)**, 2010 SCC 60 at paras 15, 70, 71, [2010] 3 SCR 62.

[35] In applying for an extension, the applicant must provide evidence of at least “a kernel of a plan” which will advance the CCAA objectives: **North American Tungsten Corp, Re**, 2015 BCSC 1376, 2015 CarswellBC 2232 at para 26, citing **Azure Dynamics Corp, Re**, 2012 BCSC 781, 91 CBR (5th) 310.

[36] Pursuant to s. 11.02(3), the applicant is required to demonstrate that it has acted, and continues to act, in good faith. Honesty is at the core of “good faith”: ***San Francisco Gifts Ltd., Re***, 2005 ABQB 91 at para 16, 10 CBR (5th) 275.

[37] Section 11.02(3) refers to consideration of good faith and due diligence in both the past and present tense. Romaine J. in ***Alberta Treasury Branches v Tallgrass Energy Corp***, 2013 ABQB 432 at para 13, 9 CBR (6th) 161 confirmed the language of s. 11.02(3), to the effect that the court needs to be satisfied that the applicant has acted in the past, and is acting, in good faith. See also ***Alexis Paragon Limited Partnership (Re)***, 2014 ABQB 65 at para 16, 9 CBR (6th) 43.

[38] By contrast, in ***Muscletech Research and Development Inc (Re)***, [2006] OJ No 462 at para 4, 19 CBR (5th) 57 (Sup Ct Just), Farley J. held that the question of good faith relates to how the parties are conducting themselves in the context of the CCAA proceedings. Courts in subsequent cases adopted this view: ***Pacific Shores Resort & Spa Ltd (Re)***, 2011 BCSC 1775 at para 31-32, [2011] BCJ No 2482, and ***4519922 Canada Inc.(Re)***, 2015 ONSC 124 in paras 44-46, 22 CBR (6th) 44.

[39] In ***Guestlogix Inc, Re***, 2016 ONSC 1348, [2016] OJ No 1129, the Court expanded the stay to proceedings against a guarantor, noting that it was insolvent and in default of its obligations, highly integrated with the debtor company, and the debtor company would be able to include all the assets of the guarantor in a potential transaction if the guarantor were added.

[40] The Court has broad equitable jurisdiction to determine appropriate allocation among assets of administration, interim financing and directors’ charges: ***Hunters Trailer & Marine, Re***, 2001 ABQB 1094, 30 CBR (4th) 206. The Court in ***Canwest Publishing Inc (Re)***, 2010 ONSC 222 at para 54, 63 CBR (5th) 115 set out factors to be considered in determining priority of charges under s. 11.52 of the CCAA which are critical to the successful restructuring of the business:

- (a) the size and complexity of the businesses being restructured;
- (b) the proposed role of the beneficiaries of the charge;
- (c) whether there is an unwarranted duplication of roles;
- (d) whether the quantum of the proposed charge appears to be fair and reasonable;
- (e) the position of the secured creditors likely to be affected by the charge; and
- (f) the position of the Monitor.

[41] Section 11.2(4) of the CCAA provides that in deciding whether to make an order allowing DIP financing, the Court must consider:

- (a) the period during which the company is expected to be subject to CCAA proceedings;
- (b) how the company’s business and financial affairs are to be managed during the proceedings;
- (c) whether the company’s management has the confidence of its major creditors;

- (d) whether the loan would enhance the prospects of a viable compromise or arrangement being made in respect of the company;
- (e) the nature and value of the company's property;
- (f) whether any creditor would be materially prejudiced as a result of the security or charge; and
- (g) the monitor's report.

[42] In *US Steel Canada Inc (Re)*, 2014 ONSC 6145 at paras 12-18, 20 CBR (6th) 116 the Court discussed the authority under s. 11.2 to grant priority to the DIP lender's charge to secure the DIP loan. In addition to the factors set out in s. 11.2(4), it considered the following in granting priority:

- (a) notice had been given to all of the secured parties likely to be affected and broadly to all *PPSA* registrants, and other interested entities;
- (b) the maximum amount of the DIP loan was appropriate based on the anticipated cash flow requirements of the applicant as reflected in its cash flow projections for the entire restructuring period, in order to continue to carry on its business during the restructuring period;
- (c) the cash flows were the subject of a favourable report of the Monitor in its First Report;
- (d) the Applicant's business would continue to be managed by the applicant's management with the assistance of the CRO during the restructuring period;
- (e) the existing operational relationships between the applicant and its largest creditor would continue; and
- (f) the DIP loan would assist in, and enhance, the restructuring process.

VI Analysis

Extension of Order

[43] Various factors were profiled by Ms. Wanke before Nielsen J. to support the Group's position that a restructuring under the *CCAA* is possible; if the objective is liquidation, then appointment of a Receiver is appropriate. Nielsen J. recognized the possibility of a successful restructuring in rejecting the application to appoint a Receiver and granting the application to impose a Stay under the *CCAA* with a Monitor and CRO. In recognizing that a lot of work had been done, he found that those supporting the steps to restructure should be given that opportunity in the collective best interest despite the prejudice of deferral and risk as regards repayment of CWB and other creditors.

[44] I now have the responsibility to measure the progress in the period leading up to expiry of the initial Stay. Without second-guessing the initial decision, I must assess the current circumstances, including the good faith and due diligence of the parties in light of steps taken to date.

[45] The legislative objective of a CCAA order is to provide the Court considerable scope to maintain the *status quo* for a company to make proposal arrangements to facilitate remaining in operation for a collective benefit. One may have preferred to see some further advancement on the “germ of a Plan” but I am satisfied that the CRO has begun consultations with unsolicited parties who have expressed an interest and that a structure for such a Plan is now an important priority.

[46] I am mindful that the Monitor was obliged to report on just under three weeks of activity in rendering a First Report by July 24, 2017. Various factors have impacted the lack of concrete progress on a Plan at this point, including the value of the Group as a going concern estimated at \$97M (equipment, manufacturing and real estate) with diverse activities, assets and work product, the complexity of restructuring, and the need to modernize the sophistication of a family operation that is unable to operate as it has done historically.

[47] Professional advisors are now in place assisting in this required modernization. Potential investors have and continue to express interest in the Group. It appears that DIP funding has been used prudently to cover operational expenses including higher than expected professional expenses. Cash flows are quite healthy and the Group owns a number of assets of marketable value.

[48] CWB notes that Nielsen J. indicated on the initial Stay application that the Group would have to show more than a germ of a plan at the next hearing. It is not entirely surprising that three weeks did not prove long enough to complete the steps necessary to create a Plan of Arrangement. There is no allegation of delay or inertia by the Monitor or the CRO in performance of significant responsibilities undertaken since confirmation of their appointment July 5, 2017. The Monitor reported that the Group has been working with due diligence and in full cooperation. A number of competing interests require the attention of the Monitor. Having considered all of the circumstances before the Court, I am satisfied that the Group has established due diligence.

[49] It bears noting that CWB is not the only party who would be affected by receivership. Employees, other creditors, clients, and the public would also be affected. Changes have already been implemented by the CRO, as observed and reported by the Monitor.

[50] The Group has had the recent opportunity to enter into contracts with the Province of B.C. in relation to the wildfires. It appears that despite the Group’s liquidity crisis – impacted by various factors, including market conditions – the business of the Group may well be salvageable. This assessment appears to be supported by: the cash flow projections, recoveries on receivables, and changes begun by the CRO in consultation with the Monitor with particular regard to increased work potential and to increase the sophistication of accounting.

[51] However, CWB takes the position that the Group has been in default of its obligations to CWB for many months. CWB extended time for the Group to find refinancing and continued to make available to the Group the operating line facility in the amount of \$12,000,000, margined on accounts receivable of the Group. CWB asserts that the Group took advantage of CWB by falsely including one or more multi-million dollar accounts receivable for which the work had not yet been done.

[52] The parties disagree as to whether the law supports serious consideration of past bad faith if it is relevant to the viability of the CCAA proposal or its continuation.

[53] The language of s. 11.02(3) of the CCAA does not temporally restrict the consideration of bad faith. The wording of that provision is captured broadly in **Tallgrass**. It would appear that **Muscletech** and the cases which followed it stand for the proposition that courts should look only to conduct in the context of the CCAA process. This represents a restrictive reading of s. 11.02(3) and the purpose of such a narrow interpretation is unclear.

[54] It is logical that past due diligence will usually have minimal relevance as a factor. However, past bad faith illuminated after CCAA proceedings have been initiated may undermine the confidence of creditors and the Court in the viability of CCAA proceedings. In my view, past bad faith may well be a relevant factor in the Court's assessment under s. 11.02(3). This is in keeping with the approach taken in **Alexis Paragon**, 2014 ABQB 65 at paras 37-38.

[55] I note that the facts in this case are distinguishable from those in **San Francisco** where the alleged deception appeared to be aimed at deriving an advantage from customers through knock off products and counterfeit safety labels, rather than deriving an advantage from a financing secured creditor through accounting practices as alleged here by CWB.

[56] Again, the major issue in this regard is, and has been profiled as, the status of accounts receivable in terms of the margining of contracts for work not yet performed or not fully performed.

[57] CWB takes the position that, upon consultation with her client and corporate counsel, Ms. Wanke misrepresented the situation to Nielsen J. in her oral submissions on July 5, 2017. While this Court is not reviewing the basis for Nielsen J.'s order, the issue of margining was raised at that time and the allegation of bad faith remains a live issue. I understand the interpretation placed by CWB on the representations made in front of Nielsen J. both from Affidavits and then information provided to legal counsel. Ms. Wanke summarized her understanding as being that this was part of the camp business on the books of the Group and not a lack of good faith. I accept her expression on this review to the effect that she would have preferred to have been more familiar with the Grand Rapids contract at the time but that this issue only surfaced latterly. She said she would have stated the client's position somewhat differently, but that the net effect remains that the margining was consistent with the Group's understanding of its entitlement.

[58] CWB's concerns regarding the margining are understandable. It takes the position that while margining on deferred revenue was permissible, the Grand Rapids contracts do not qualify for that treatment according to the terms as agreed to between the parties notwithstanding the assertions advanced by the Group. CWB says there was an understanding as relates to the formula to be applied to these receivables that was violated, especially as to the two major Grand Rapids accounts issued between the end of March 2017 and beginning of May 2017. Counsel for CWB took the Court through a number of documents relating to the credit agreement between CWB and the Group to explain what the Group's reasonable understanding should have been in relation to contracts qualifying for special treatment of the accounts receivable for margining purposes.

[59] The Monitor has reviewed and discounted a number of entries as inappropriate; it will likely have to further endorse commitment to revise other receivables. The Court agrees that a commitment to revise other receivables may be appropriate. However, there are a number of priorities competing for the attention of the CRO. It is difficult to measure whether any breaches of the protocol were intentionally deceptive as distinct from aggressive and misguided. That distinction is harder to make based on duelling affidavits as distinct from oral testimony,

questioning or at minimum some objective detailed analysis by the Monitor to assist the Court's interpretation of events.

[60] I have struggled to understand the treatment of invoicing as to the records of accounts receivable, particularly as the idea of charging for work not done is rather foreign to my experience as to the entitlement to collect. So too, the deferral of the time for payment extending from 45 days to 120 days obfuscates the idea of entitlement. The matter is complicated by the risk and relative reliability of these receivables as assets, distinct from a bad or at least tainted debt that needs to be monitored for collection procedures. All of these aspects appear to arise in far greater sums for 2016 than in any previous year which, understandably, is further troubling to principals at CWB.

[61] I endorse the concerns of CWB as legitimate. Even in the absence of a finding of bad faith, the practice employed as reflected in treatment of the Grand Rapids receivables raises legitimate concerns regarding the future viability of the Group. I accept that the practice in question has resulted in margining which has led to overall debt to CWB which is incongruent with the Group's receivables as they would be represented in the normal course, as confirmed in the Monitor's First Report.

[62] I also note CWB's concern that the cash flow projection relied on by the Monitor did not take into account unpaid professional fees relating to the work toward reorganization, and the projected loss to the end of October 2017 is considerably offset only by the fortuitous and uncertain wildfire camp work. CWB's receivables, to the extent they are collectible, are being used up by payment of the professional fees and interim financing.

[63] Nevertheless, I am not prepared to conclude on the basis of the material as presented to me that the Group has failed to act in good faith to the extent of disentitling the extension sought.

[64] Clearly, the parties now disagree on the interpretation of the arrangement between them as regards margining based on deferred revenue. The issue before this Court is not the correct interpretation of the various document referred to by CWB's counsel, but rather whether the Group's reliance on its understanding amounted to bad faith. There has been no trial of the latter issue. While raising questions, the evidence adduced on this application falls short of supporting a finding of bad faith in the sense of knowing reliance on an unsupportable interpretation of the documents, or intentional concealing of the practice or any relevant financial information. This is particularly so in light of the evidence of the Group's understanding that the arrangement between CWB and the Group expressly contemplated that the Group was permitted to margin deferred revenue when no work had been done.

[65] If the CWB was not aware of the effect or extent of this type of margining, it is not clear from the evidence that the Group understood it was acting other than consistently with the intention of the parties in this regard. This view of the matter is generally supported by the Monitor's information that the sophistication of all facets of the accounting system in place has not kept up with the sophistication of its business. The CRO is working to address accounting practices which require improvement.

[66] There is undeniably a considerable difference in the parties' interpretations of the conduct and reporting. Obviously, a debtor may be motivated to maximize access to funding. The past practice here is somewhat unclear, but even if the Group exceeded the terms or protocol as generally agreed, I do not ascribe bad faith to its actions.

[67] Overall, I find that extension of the Stay is in the best interest. However, a further vigorous review must take place within a reasonable period of time.

[68] The November 3, 2017 date targeted by the Group is not reasonable in the circumstances.

[69] As such, the next hearing is set for September 26, 2017. The Court will require a Report from the Monitor at least 7 business days prior to that date.

Increase in DIP Financing

[70] Ms. McCracken suggests in her affidavit that they only need a small increase in the DIP loan to cover operations in light of healthy cash flows and significant assets.

[71] While the creditors may rightly take issue with the characterization of the increase as “small”, I approve the request to increase the DIP financing from \$1M to \$2.5M in the form of order proposed by counsel for the Group to address the anticipated cash flow shortage resulting from welcome work during what is typically a slower season for the Group. Counsel for CWB took no issue with the form of order.

[72] At the close of submissions, counsel for CRA alerted the Court, as well as BDC in particular, that it took issue with the increase in DIP financing and that it would be applying for priority with respect to \$1.14M owing to the Minister by the Group for unremitted source deductions and GST. It was seeking an order to vary so as to put the administrative charge, director’s charge and interim lender charges in second place behind the CRA. In light of that information, BDC counsel indicated that the CRA’s position would not impair BDC’s ability to advance the DIP financing, noting that the matter would be argued at a later date.

1919

[73] The application to add 1919 was not opposed. As was the case in *Guestlogix*, the operations of 1919 are inextricably linked to those of the Group, as it leases important equipment and provides it Canada North.

[74] I order that 1919 be added as a party included in the Group. Counsel for the Group agreed to include in the order a clause restating the allocation provision in the initial Stay Order to recognize that Welease has made this concern known at this point. Counsel for CWB did not take issue with such a provision in the order.

Approval of Monitor’s First Report

[75] And at the request of the Monitor, I approve:

- his First Report and activities;
- suspend the limitation periods on claims;
- confer power to examine parties on questioned transactions regarding lot sales prior to CCAA.

[76] The further Report of the Monitor is required at least 7 days before the next hearing.

Expansion of Stay

[77] The Stay is expanded to apply to proceedings against Heart Lake and associated parties involved in the Grand Rapids contracts, and proceedings by Max Fuel against Ms. McCracken.

Counsel for CWB did not take issue with this. In the result, the applications for appointment of a Receiver, interim or otherwise, are dismissed.

Sealing of Confidential Information

[78] I order that the confidential information identified as such on the Court file be sealed.

Service Protocol to Reduce Costs

[79] The Monitor is to maintain a service list of parties who provide the Monitor with email addresses. Those parties may be served by email effective the date of the email. All others are to be served by the Monitor posting its and others' materials on its website, effective as at the date of posting.

VII Conclusion

[80] I have determined that it is in the collective interest to extend the CCAA Stay to September 29, 2017. The Order will be subject to review by me on September 26, 2017 in usual consultation with the Court Coordinator.

Heard on the 27th day of July, 2017.

Dated at the City of Edmonton, Alberta this 17th day of August, 2017.

S.D. Hillier
J.C.Q.B.A.

Appearances:

S.A. Wanke and S. Norris
DLA Piper (Canada) LLP
for the Applicants/Cross-Respondents

C.P. Russell, Q.C.
McLennan Ross LLP
for the Respondent/Cross-Applicant

D.R. Bieganeck, Q.C.
Duncan Craig LLP
for the Monitor, Ernst &Young LLP

J. Oliver
Cassels Brock
for Business Development Bank of Canada

T.M. Warner
Miller Thompson
for ECN Capital Corp.

M.J. McCabe, Q.C.
Reynolds Mirth Richards & Farmer LLP
for PricewaterhouseCoopers

R.J. Wasylyshyn
Ogilvie LLP
for Weslease Income Growth Fund LP

H.M.B.Ferris
Lawson Lundell LLP
for First Island Financial Services Ltd.

G.F. Body
Justice Canada
for Canada Revenue Agency

TAB 20

**SUPERIOR COURT OF JUSTICE – ONTARIO
(Commercial List)**

RE: IN THE MATTER OF THE *COMPANIES' CREDITORS ARRANGEMENT ACT*,
R.S.C. 1985, c. C-36, AS AMENDED

AND IN THE MATTER OF A PROPOSED PLAN OF COMPROMISE OR
ARRANGEMENT WITH RESPECT TO STELCO INC. AND THE OTHER
APPLICANTS LISTED IN SCHEDULE "A"

APPLICATION UNDER THE *COMPANIES' CREDITORS ARRANGEMENT
ACT*, R.S.C. 1985, c. C-36, AS AMENDED

BEFORE: FARLEY J.

COUNSEL: *Michael E. Barrack, James D. Gage and Geoff R. Hall*, for the Applicants
David Jacobs and Michael McCreary, for Locals 1005, 5328 and 8782 of the
United Steel Workers of America
Ken Rosenberg, Lily Harmer and Rob Centa, for United Steelworkers of America
Bob Thornton and Kyla Mahar, for Ernst & Young Inc., Monitor of the
Applicants
Kevin J. Zych, for the Informal Committee of Stelco Bondholders
David R. Byers, for CIT
Kevin McElcheran, for GE
Murray Gold and Andrew Hatnay, for Retired Salaried Beneficiaries
Lewis Gottheil, for CAW Canada and its Local 523
Virginie Gauthier, for Fleet
H. Whiteley, for CIBC
Gail Rubenstein, for FSCO
Kenneth D. Kraft, for EDS Canada Inc.

HEARD: March 5, 2004

ENDORSEMENT

[1] As argued this motion by Locals 1005, 5328 and 8782 United Steel Workers of America (collectively "Union") to rescind the initial order and dismiss the application of Stelco Inc. ("Stelco") and various of its subsidiaries (collectively "Sub Applicants") for access to the protection and process of the *Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act* ("CCAA") was that this access should be denied on the basis that Stelco was not a "debtor company" as defined in s. 2 of the CCAA because it was not insolvent.

[2] Allow me to observe that there was a great deal of debate in the materials and submissions as to the reason(s) that Stelco found itself in with respect to what Michael Locker (indicating he was "an expert in the area of corporate restructuring and a leading steel industry analyst") swore to at paragraph 12 of his affidavit was the "current crisis":

12. Contending with weak operating results and resulting tight cash flow, management has deliberately chosen not to fund its employee benefits. By contrast, Dofasco and certain other steel companies have consistently funded both their employee benefit obligations as well as debt service. If Stelco's management had chosen to fund pension obligations, presumably with borrowed money, *the current crisis* and related restructuring plans would focus on debt restructuring as opposed to the reduction of employee benefits and related liabilities. [Emphasis added.]

[3] For the purpose of determining whether Stelco is insolvent and therefore could be considered to be a debtor company, it matters not what the cause or who caused the financial difficulty that Stelco is in as admitted by Locker on behalf of the Union. The management of a corporation could be completely incompetent, inadvertently or advertently; the corporation could be in the grip of ruthless, hard hearted and hard nosed outside financiers; the corporation could be the innocent victim of uncaring policy of a level of government; the employees (unionized or non-unionized) could be completely incompetent, inadvertently or advertently; the relationship of labour and management could be absolutely poisonous; the corporation could be the victim of unforeseen events affecting its viability such as a fire destroying an essential area of its plant and equipment or of rampaging dumping. One or more or all of these factors (without being exhaustive), whether or not of varying degree and whether or not in combination of some may well have been the cause of a corporation's difficulty. The point here is that Stelco's difficulty exists; the only question is whether Stelco is insolvent within the meaning of that in the "debtor company" definition of the CCAA. However, I would point out, as I did in closing, that no matter how this motion turns out, Stelco does have a problem which has to be addressed – addressed within the CCAA process if Stelco is insolvent or addressed outside that process if Stelco is determined not to be insolvent. The status quo will lead to ruination of Stelco (and its Sub Applicants) and as a result will very badly affect its stakeholder, including pensioners, employees (unionized and non-unionized), management, creditors, suppliers, customers, local and other governments and the local communities. In such situations, time is a precious commodity; it cannot be wasted; no matter how much some would like to take time outs, the clock cannot be stopped. The watchwords of the Commercial List are equally applicable in such circumstances. They are communication, cooperation and common sense. I appreciate that these cases frequently invoke emotions running high and wild; that is understandable on a human basis but it is the considered, rational approach which will solve the problem.

[4] The time to determine whether a corporation is insolvent for the purpose of it being a "debtor company" and thus able to make an application to proceed under the CCAA is the date of filing, in this case January 29, 2004.

[5] The Monitor did not file a report as to this question of insolvency as it properly advised that it wished to take a neutral role. I understand however, that it did provide some assistance in the preparation of Exhibit C to Hap Steven's affidavit.

[6] If I determine in this motion that Stelco is not insolvent, then the initial order would be set aside. See *Montreal Trust Co. of Canada v. Timber Lodge Ltd.* (1992), 15 C.B.R. (3d) 14 (P.E.I.C.A.). The onus is on Stelco as I indicated in my January 29, 2004 endorsement.

[7] S. 2 of the CCAA defines "debtor company" as:

"debtor company" means any company that:

(a) is bankrupt or insolvent;

(b) has committed an act of bankruptcy within the meaning of *Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act* ["BIA"] or deemed insolvent within the meaning of the *Winding-Up and Restructuring Act*, whether or not proceedings in respect of the company have been taken under either of those Acts;

(c) has made an authorized assignment against which a receiving order has been made under the *Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act*; or

(d) is in the course of being wound-up under the *Winding-Up and Restructuring Act* because the company is insolvent.

[8] Counsel for the Existing Stelco Lenders and the DIP Lenders posited that Stelco would be able to qualify under (b) in light of the fact that as of January 29, 2004 whether or not it was entitled to receive the CCAA protection under (a) as being insolvent, it had ceased to pay its pre-filing debts. I would merely observe as I did at the time of the hearing that I do not find this argument attractive in the least. The most that could be said for that is that such game playing would be ill advised and in my view would not be rewarded by the exercise of judicial discretion to allow such an applicant the benefit of a CCAA stay and other advantages of the procedure for if it were capriciously done where there is not reasonable need, then such ought not to be granted. However, I would point out that if a corporation did capriciously do so, then one might well expect a creditor-initiated application so as to take control of the process (including likely the ouster of management including directors who authorized such unnecessary stoppage); in such a case, while the corporation would not likely be successful in a corporation application, it is likely that a creditor application would find favour of judicial discretion.

[9] This judicial discretion would be exercised in the same way generally as is the case where s. 43(7) of the BIA comes into play whereby a bankruptcy receiving order which otherwise meets the test may be refused. See *Re Kenwood Hills Development Inc.* (1995), 30 C.B.R. (3d) 44 (Ont. Gen. Div.) where at p. 45 I observed:

The discretion must be exercised judicially based on credible evidence; it should be used according to common sense and justice and in a manner which does not result in an injustice: See *Re Churchill Forest Industries (Manitoba) Ltd.* (1971), 16 C.B.R. (NS) 158 (Man. Q.B.).

[10] Anderson J. in *Re MGM Electric Co. Ltd.* (1982), 42 C.B.R. (N.S.) 29 (Ont. S.C.) at p. 30 declined to grant a bankruptcy receiving order for the eminently good sense reason that it would be counterproductive: "Having regard for the value of the enterprise and having regard to the evidence before me, I think it far from clear that a receiving order would confer a benefit on anyone." This

common sense approach to the judicial exercise of discretion may be contrasted by the rather more puzzling approach in *Re TDM Software Systems Inc.* (1986), 60 C.B.R. (N.S.) 92 (Ont. S.C.).

[11] The Union, supported by the International United Steel Workers of America ("International"), indicated that if certain of the obligations of Stelco were taken into account in the determination of insolvency, then a very good number of large Canadian corporations would be able to make an application under the CCAA. I am of the view that this concern can be addressed as follows. The test of insolvency is to be determined on its own merits, not on the basis that an otherwise technically insolvent corporation should not be allowed to apply. However, if a technically insolvent corporation were to apply and there was no material advantage to the corporation and its stakeholders (in other words, a pressing need to restructure), then one would expect that the court's discretion would be judicially exercised against granting CCAA protection and ancillary relief. In the case of Stelco, it is recognized, as discussed above, that it is in crisis and in need of restructuring – which restructuring, if it is insolvent, would be best accomplished within a CCAA proceeding. Further, I am of the view that the track record of CCAA proceedings in this country demonstrates a healthy respect for the fundamental concerns of interested parties and stakeholders. I have consistently observed that much more can be achieved by negotiations outside the courtroom where there is a reasonable exchange of information, views and the exploration of possible solutions and negotiations held on a without prejudice basis than likely can be achieved by resorting to the legal combative atmosphere of the courtroom. A mutual problem requires a mutual solution. The basic interest of the CCAA is to rehabilitate insolvent corporations for the benefit of all stakeholders. To do this, the cause(s) of the insolvency must be fixed on a long term viable basis so that the corporation may be turned around. It is not achieved by positional bargaining in a tug of war between two parties, each trying for a larger slice of a defined size pie; it may be achieved by taking steps involving shorter term equitable sacrifices and implementing sensible approaches to improve productivity to ensure that the pie grows sufficiently for the long term to accommodate the reasonable needs of the parties.

[12] It appears that it is a given that the Sub Applicants are in fact insolvent. The question then is whether Stelco is insolvent.

[13] There was a question as to whether Stelco should be restricted to the material in its application as presented to the Court on January 29, 2004. I would observe that CCAA proceedings are not in the nature of the traditional adversarial lawsuit usually found in our courtrooms. It seems to me that it would be doing a disservice to the interest of the CCAA to artificially keep the Court in the dark on such a question. Presumably an otherwise deserving "debtor company" would not be allowed access to a continuing CCAA proceeding that it would be entitled to merely because some potential evidence were excluded for traditional adversarial technical reasons. I would point out that in such a case, there would be no prohibition against such a corporation reapplying (with the additional material) subsequently. In such a case, what would be the advantage for anyone of a "pause" before being able to proceed under the rehabilitative process under the CCAA. On a practical basis, I would note that all too often corporations will wait too long before applying, at least this was a significant problem in the early 1990s. In *Re Inducon Development Corp.* (1991), 8 C.B.R. (3d) 306 (Ont. Gen. Div.), I observed:

Secondly, CCAA is designed to be remedial; it is not, however, designed to be preventative. CCAA should not be the *last* gasp of a dying company; it should be implemented, if it is to be implemented, at a stage prior to the death throe.

[14] It seems to me that the phrase "death throe" could be reasonably replaced with "death spiral". In *Re Cumberland Trading Inc.* (1994), 23 C.B.R. (3d) 225 (Ont. Gen. Div.), I went on to expand on this at p. 228:

I would also observe that all too frequently debtors wait until virtually the last moment, the last moment, or in some cases, beyond the last moment before even beginning to think about reorganizational (and the attendant support that any successful reorganization requires from the creditors). I noted the lamentable tendency of debtors to deal with these situations as "last gasp" desperation moves in *Re Inducon Development Corp.* (1992), 8 C.B.R. (3d) 308 (Ont. Gen. Div.). To deal with matters on this basis minimizes the chances of success, even if "success" may have been available with earlier spade work.

[15] I have not been able to find in the CCAA reported cases any instance where there has been an objection to a corporation availing itself of the facilities of the CCAA on the basis of whether the corporation was insolvent. Indeed, as indicated above, the major concern here has been that an applicant leaves it so late that the timetable of necessary steps may get impossibly compressed. That is not to say that there have not been objections by parties opposing the application on various other grounds. Prior to the 1992 amendments, there had to be debentures (plural) issued pursuant to a trust deed; I recall that in *Nova Metal Products Inc. v. Comiskey (Trustee of)* (1990), 1 C.B.R. (3d) 101; 1 O.R. (3d) 280 (C.A.), the initial application was rejected in the morning because there had only been one debenture issued but another one was issued prior to the return to court that afternoon. This case stands for the general proposition that the CCAA should be given a large and liberal interpretation. I should note that there was in *Enterprise Capital Management Inc. v. Semi-Tech Corp.* (1999), 10 C.B.R. (4th) 133 (Ont. S.C.J.) a determination that in a creditor application, the corporation was found not to be insolvent, but see below as to BIA test (c) my views as to the correctness of this decision.

[16] In *Re Lehndorff General Partner Ltd.* (1993), 17 C.B.R. (3d) 24 (Ont. Gen. Div.) I observed at p. 32:

One of the purposes of the CCAA is to facilitate ongoing operations of a business where its assets have a greater value as part of an integrated system than individually. The CCAA facilitates reorganization of a company where the alternative, sale of the property piecemeal, is likely to yield far less satisfaction to the creditors.

[17] In *Re Anvil Range Mining Corp.* (2002), 34 C.B.R. (4th) 157 (Ont. C.A.), the court stated to the same effect:

The second submission is that the plan is contrary to the purposes of the CCAA. Courts have recognized that the purpose of the CCAA is to enable compromises to be made for the common benefit of the creditors and the company and to keep the company alive and out of the hands of liquidators.

[18] Encompassed in this is the concept of saving employment if a restructuring will result in a viable enterprise. See *Diemaster Tool Inc. v. Skvortsoff (Trustee of)* (1991), 3 C.B.R. (3d) 133 (Ont. Gen. Div.). This concept has been a continuing thread in CCAA cases in this jurisdiction stretching back for at least the past 15 years, if not before.

[19] I would also note that the jurisprudence and practical application of the bankruptcy and insolvency regime in place in Canada has been constantly evolving. The early jails of what became Canada were populated to the extent of almost half their capacity by bankrupts. Rehabilitation and a fresh start for the honest but unfortunate debtor came afterwards. Most recently, the *Bankruptcy Act* was revised to the BIA in 1992 to better facilitate the rehabilitative aspect of making a proposal to creditors. At the same time, the CCAA was amended to eliminate the threshold criterion of there having to be debentures issued under a trust deed (this concept was embodied in the CCAA upon its enactment in 1933 with a view that it would only be large companies with public issues of debt securities which could apply). The size restriction was continued as there was now a threshold criterion of at least \$5 million of claims against the applicant. While this restriction may appear discriminatory, it does have the practical advantage of taking into account that the costs (administrative costs including professional fees to the applicant, and indeed to the other parties who retain professionals) is a significant amount, even when viewed from the perspective of \$5 million. These costs would be prohibitive in a smaller situation. Parliament was mindful of the time horizons involved in proposals under BIA where the maximum length of a proceeding including a stay is six months (including all possible extensions) whereas under CCAA, the length is in the discretion of the court judicially exercised in accordance with the facts and the circumstances of the case. Certainly sooner is better than later. However, it is fair to observe that virtually all CCAA cases which proceed go on for over six months and those with complexity frequently exceed a year.

[20] Restructurings are not now limited in practical terms to corporations merely compromising their debts with their creditors in a balance sheet exercise. Rather there has been quite an emphasis recently on operational restructuring as well so that the emerging company will have the benefit of a long term viable fix, all for the benefit of stakeholders. See *Sklar-Pepplar Furniture Corp. v. Bank of Nova Scotia* (1991), 8 C.B.R. (3d) 312 (Ont. Gen. Div.) at p. 314 where Borins J. states:

The proposed plan exemplifies the policy and objectives of the Act as it proposes a regime for the court-supervised re-organization for the Applicant company intended to avoid the devastating social and economic effects of a creditor-initiated termination of its ongoing business operations and enabling the company to carry on its business in a manner in which it is intended to cause the least possible harm to the company, its creditors, its employees and former employees and the communities in which its carries on and carried on its business operations.

[21] The CCAA does not define "insolvent" or "insolvency". Houlden & Morawetz, *The 2004 Annotated Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act* (Toronto, Carswell; 2003) at p. 1107 (N5) states:

In interpreting "debtor company", reference must be had to the definition of "insolvent person" in s. 2(1) of the *Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act* ...

To be able to use the Act, a company must be bankrupt or insolvent: *Reference re Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act (Canada)*, 16 C.B.R. 1 [1934] S.C.R. 659, [1934] 4 D.L.R. 75. The company must, in its application, admit its insolvency.

[22] It appears to have become fairly common practice for applicants and others when reference is made to insolvency in the context of the CCAA to refer to the definition of "insolvent person" in the BIA. That definition is as follows:

s. 2(1)...

"insolvent person" means a person who is not bankrupt and who resides, carries on business or has property in Canada, and whose liability to creditors provable as claims under this Act amount to one thousand dollars, and

(a) who is for any reason unable to meet his obligations as they generally become due,

(b) who has ceased paying his current obligations in the ordinary course of business as they generally become due, or

(c) the aggregate of whose property is not, at a fair valuation, sufficient, or, if disposed of at a fairly conducted sale under legal process, would not be sufficient to enable payment of all his obligations, due and accruing due.

[23] Stelco acknowledges that it does not meet the test of (b); however, it does assert that it meets the test of both (a) and (c). In addition, however, Stelco also indicates that since the CCAA does not have a reference over to the BIA in relation to the (a) definition of "debtor company" as being a company that is "(a) bankrupt or insolvent", then this term of "insolvent" should be given the meaning that the overall context of the CCAA requires. See the modern rule of statutory interpretation which directs the court to take a contextual and purposive approach to the language of the provision at issue as illustrated by *Bell ExpressVu Limited Partnership v. Rex*, [2002] 2 S.C.R. 559 at p. 580:

Today there is only one principle or approach, namely the words of an Act are to be read in their entire context and in their grammatical and ordinary sense harmoniously with the scheme of the Act, the object of the Act, and the intention of Parliament.

[24] I note in particular that the (b), (c) and (d) aspects of the definition of "debtor company" all refer to other statutes, including the BIA; (a) does not. S. 12 of the CCAA defines "claims" with reference over to the BIA (and otherwise refers to the BIA and the *Winding-Up and Restructuring Act*). It seems to me that there is merit in considering that the test for insolvency under the CCAA may differ somewhat from that under the BIA, so as to meet the special circumstances of the CCAA and those corporations which would apply under it. In that respect, I am mindful of the above discussion regarding the time that is usually and necessarily (in the circumstances) taken in a CCAA reorganization restructuring which is engaged in coming up with a plan of compromise and arrangement. The BIA definition would appear to have been historically focussed on the question of bankruptcy – and not reorganization of a corporation under a proposal since before 1992, secured creditors could not be forced to compromise their claims, so that in practice there were no reorganizations under the former *Bankruptcy Act* unless all secured creditors voluntarily agreed to have their secured claims compromised. The BIA definition then was essentially useful for being a pre-condition to the "end" situation of a bankruptcy petition or voluntary receiving order where the upshot would be a realization on the bankrupt's assets (not likely involving the business carried on – and certainly not by the bankrupt). Insolvency under the BIA is also important as to the Paulian action events (eg., fraudulent preferences, settlements) as to the conduct of the debtor *prior* to the bankruptcy; similarly as to the question of provincial preference legislation. Reorganization under a plan or proposal, on the contrary, is with a general objective of the applicant continuing to exist,

albeit that the CCAA may also be used to have an orderly disposition of the assets and undertaking in whole or in part.

[25] It seems to me that given the time and steps involved in a reorganization, and the condition of insolvency perforce requires an expanded meaning under the CCAA. Query whether the definition under the BIA is now sufficient in that light for the allowance of sufficient time to carry through with a realistically viable proposal within the maximum of six months allowed under the BIA? I think it sufficient to note that there would not be much sense in providing for a rehabilitation program of restructuring/reorganization under either statute if the entry test was that the applicant could not apply until a rather late stage of its financial difficulties with the rather automatic result that in situations of complexity of any material degree, the applicant would not have the financial resources sufficient to carry through to hopefully a successful end. This would indeed be contrary to the renewed emphasis of Parliament on "rescues" as exhibited by the 1992 and 1997 amendments to the CCAA and the BIA.

[26] Allow me now to examine whether Stelco has been successful in meeting the onus of demonstrating with credible evidence on a common sense basis that it is insolvent within the meaning required by the CCAA in regard to the interpretation of "debtor company" in the context and within the purpose of that legislation. To a similar effect, see *PWA Corp. v. Gemini Group Automated Distribution Systems Inc.* (1993), 103 D.L.R. (4th) 609 (Ont. C.A.), leave to appeal to S.C.C. dismissed wherein it was determined that the trial judge was correct in holding that a party was not insolvent and that the statutory definition of insolvency pursuant to the BIA definition was irrelevant to determine that issue, since the agreement in question effectively provided its own definition by implication. It seems to me that the CCAA test of insolvency advocated by Stelco and which I have determined is a proper interpretation is that the BIA definition of (a), (b) or (c) of insolvent person is acceptable with the caveat that as to (a), a financially troubled corporation is insolvent if it is reasonably expected to run out of liquidity within reasonable proximity of time as compared with the time reasonably required to implement a restructuring. That is, there should be a reasonable cushion, which cushion may be adjusted and indeed become in effect an encroachment depending upon reasonable access to DIP between financing. In the present case, Stelco accepts the view of the Union's affiant, Michael Mackey of Deloitte and Touche that it will otherwise run out of funding by November 2004.

[27] On that basis, allow me to determine whether Stelco is insolvent on the basis of (i) what I would refer to as the CCAA test as described immediately above, (ii) BIA test (a) or (iii) BIA test (c). In doing so, I will have to take into account the fact that Stephen, albeit a very experienced and skilled person in the field of restructurings under the CCAA, unfortunately did not appreciate that the material which was given to him in Exhibit E to his affidavit was modified by the caveats in the source material that in effect indicated that based on appraisals, the fair value of the real assets acquired was in excess of the purchase price for two of the U.S. comparators. Therefore the evidence as to these comparators is significantly weakened. In addition at Q. 175-177 in his cross examination, Stephen acknowledged that it was reasonable to assume that a purchaser would "take over some liabilities, some pension liabilities and OPEB liabilities, for workers who remain with the plant." The extent of that assumption was not explored; however, I do note that there was acknowledgement on the part of the Union that such an assumption would also have a reciprocal negative effect on the purchase price.

[28] The BIA tests are disjunctive so that anyone meeting any of these tests is determined to be insolvent: see *Re Optical Recording Laboratories Inc.* (1990), 75 D.L.R. (4th) 747 (Ont. C.A.) at p. 756; *Re Viteway Natural Foods Ltd.* (1986), 63 C.B.R. (N.S.) 157 (B.C.S.C.) at p. 161. Thus, if I determine that Stelco is insolvent on *any one* of these tests, then it would be a "debtor company" entitled to apply for protection under the CCAA.

[29] In my view, the Union's position that Stelco is not insolvent under BIA (a) because it has not entirely used up its cash and cash facilities (including its credit line), that is, it is not yet as of January 29, 2004 run out of liquidity conflates inappropriately the (a) test with the (b) test. The Union's view would render the (a) test necessarily as being redundant. See *R. v. Proulx*, [2000] 1 S.C.R. 61 at p. 85 for the principle that no legislative provision ought to be interpreted in a manner which would "render it mere surplusage." Indeed the plain meaning of the phrase "unable to meet his obligations as they generally become due" requires a construction of test (a) which permits the court to take a purposive assessment of a debtor's ability to meet his future obligations. See *Re King Petroleum Ltd.* (1978), 29 C.B.R. (N.S.) 76 (Ont. S.C.) where Steele J. stated at p. 80:

With respect to cl. (a), it was argued that at the time the disputed payments were made the company was able to meet its obligations as they generally became due because no major debts were in fact due at that time. This was premised on the fact that the moneys owed to Imperial Oil were not due until 10 days after the receipt of the statements and that the statements had not then been received. I am of the opinion that this is not a proper interpretation of cl. (a). *Clause (a) speaks in the present and future tenses and not in the past.* I am of the opinion that the company was an "insolvent person" within the meaning of cl. (a) because by the very payment-out of the money in question it placed itself in a position that it was unable to meet its obligations as they would generally become due. In other words, it had placed itself in a position that it would not be able to pay the obligations that it knew it had incurred and which it knew would become due in the immediate future. [Emphasis added.]

[30] *King* was a case involving the question in a bankruptcy scenario of whether there was a fraudulent preference during a period when the corporation was insolvent. Under those circumstances, the "immediate future" does not have the same expansive meaning that one would attribute to a time period in a restructuring forward looking situation.

[31] Stephen at paragraphs 40-49 addressed the restructuring question in general and its applicability to the Stelco situation. At paragraph 41, he outlined the significant stages as follows:

The process of restructuring under the CCAA entails a number of different stages, the most significant of which are as follows:

- (a) identification of the debtor's stakeholders and their interests;
- (b) arranging for a process of meaningful communication;
- (c) dealing with immediate relationship issues arising from a CCAA filing;
- (d) sharing information about the issues giving rise to the debtor's need to restructure;

- (e) developing restructuring alternatives; and
- (f) building a consensus around a plan of restructuring.

[32] I note that January 29, 2004 is just 9-10 months away from November 2004. I accept as correct his conclusion based on his experience (and this is in accord with my own objective experience in large and complicated CCAA proceedings) that Stelco would have the liquidity problem within the time horizon indicated. In that regard, I also think it fair to observe that Stelco realistically cannot expect any increase in its credit line with its lenders or access further outside funding. To bridge the gap it must rely upon the stay to give it the uplift as to pre-filing liabilities (which the Union misinterpreted as a general turnaround in its cash position without taking into account this uplift). As well, the Union was of the view that recent price increases would relieve Stelco's liquidity problems; however, the answers to undertaking in this respect indicated:

With respect to the Business Plan, the average spot market sales price per ton was \$514, and the average contract business sales price per ton was \$599. The Forecast reflects an average spot market sales price per ton of \$575, and average contract business sales price per ton of \$611. The average spot price used in the forecast considers further announced price increases, recognizing, among other things, the timing and the extent such increases are expected to become effective. The benefit of the increase in sales prices from the Business Plan is essentially offset by the substantial increase in production costs, and in particular in raw material costs, primarily scrap and coke, as well as higher working capital levels and a higher loan balance outstanding on the CIT credit facility as of January 2004.

I accept that this is generally a cancel out or wash in all material respects.

[33] I note that \$145 million of cash resources had been used from January 1, 2003 to the date of filing. Use of the credit facility of \$350 million had increased from \$241 million on November 30, 2003 to \$293 million on the date of filing. There must be a reasonable reserve of liquidity to take into account day to day, week to week or month to month variances and also provide for unforeseen circumstances such as the breakdown of a piece of vital equipment which would significantly affect production until remedied. Trade credit had been contracting as a result of appreciation by suppliers of Stelco's financial difficulties. The DIP financing of \$75 million is only available if Stelco is under CCAA protection. I also note that a shut down as a result of running out of liquidity would be complicated in the case of Stelco and that even if conditions turned around more than reasonably expected, start-up costs would be heavy and quite importantly, there would be a significant erosion of the customer base (reference should be had to the Slater Hamilton plant in this regard). One does not liquidate assets which one would not sell in the ordinary course of business to thereby artificially salvage some liquidity for the purpose of the test: see *Re Pacific Mobile Corporation; Robitaille v. Les Industries l'Islet Inc. and Banque Canadienne Nationale* (1979), 32 C.B.R. (N.S.) 209 (Que. S.C.) at p. 220. As a rough test, I note that Stelco (albeit on a consolidated basis with all subsidiaries) running significantly behind plan in 2003 from its budget of a profit of \$80 million now to a projected loss of \$192 million and cash has gone from a positive \$209 million to a negative \$114 million.

[34] Locker made the observation at paragraph 8 of his affidavit that:

8. Stelco has performed poorly for the past few years primarily due to an inadequate business strategy, poor utilization of assets, inefficient operations and generally weak management leadership and decision-making. This point is best supported by the fact that Stelco's local competitor, Dofasco, has generated outstanding results in the same period.

Table 1 to his affidavit would demonstrate that Dofasco has had superior profitability and cashflow performance than its "neighbour" Stelco. He went on to observe at paragraphs 36-37:

36. Stelco can achieve significant cost reductions through means other than cutting wages, pensions and benefits for employees and retirees. Stelco could bring its cost levels down to those of restructured U.S. mills, with the potential for lowering them below those of many U.S. mills.

37. Stelco could achieve substantial savings through productivity improvements within the mechanisms of the current collective agreements. More importantly, a major portion of this cost reduction could be achieved through constructive negotiations with the USWA in an out-of-court restructuring that does not require intervention of the courts through the vehicle of CCAA protection.

I accept his constructive comments that there is room for cost reductions and that there are substantial savings to be achieved through productivity improvements. However, I do not see anything detrimental to these discussions and negotiations by having them conducted within the umbrella of a CCAA proceeding. See my comments above regarding the CCAA in practice.

[35] But I would observe and I am mystified by Locker's observations at paragraph 12 (quoted above), that Stelco should have borrowed to fund pension obligations to avoid its current financial crisis. This presumes that the borrowed funds would not constitute an obligation to be paid back as to principal and interest, but rather that it would assume the character of a cost-free "gift".

[36] I note that Mackey, without the "laundry list" he indicates at paragraph 17 of his second affidavit, is unable to determine at paragraph 19 (for himself) whether Stelco was insolvent. Mackey was unable to avail himself of all available information in light of the Union's refusal to enter into a confidentiality agreement. He does not closely adhere to the BIA tests as they are defined. In the face of positive evidence about an applicant's financial position by an experienced person with expertise, it is not sufficient to displace this evidence by filing evidence which goes no further than raising questions: see *Anvil*, *supra* at p. 162.

[37] The Union referred me to one of my decisions *Standard Trustco Ltd. (Trustee of) v. Standard Trust Co.* (1993), 13 O.R. (3d) 7 (Gen. Div.) where I stated as to the MacGirr affidavit:

The Trustee's cause of action is premised on MacGirr's opinion that STC was insolvent as at August 3, 1990 and therefore the STC common shares and promissory note received by Trustco in return for the Injection had no value at the time the Injection was made. Further, MacGirr ascribed no value to the opportunity which the Injection gave to Trustco to restore STC and salvage its thought to be existing \$74 million investment. In stating his opinion MacGirr defined solvency as:

- (a) the ability to meet liabilities as they fall due; and
- (b) that assets exceed liabilities.

On cross-examination MacGirr testified that in his opinion on either test STC was insolvent as at August 3, 1990 since as to (a) STC was experiencing then a negative cash flow and as to (b) the STC financial statements incorrectly reflected values. As far as (a) is concerned, I would comment that while I concur with MacGirr that at some time in the long run a company that is experiencing a negative cash flow will eventually not be able to meet liabilities as they fall due but that is not the test (which is a "present exercise"). On that current basis STC was meeting its liabilities on a timely basis.

[38] As will be seen from that expanded quote, MacGirr gave his own definitions of insolvency which are not the same as the s. 2 BIA tests (a), (b) and (c) but only a very loose paraphrase of (a) and (c) and an omission of (b). Nor was I referred to the *King* or *Proulx* cases *supra*. Further, it is obvious from the context that "*sometime in the long run...eventually*" is not a finite time in the foreseeable future.

[39] I have not given any benefit to the \$313 - \$363 million of improvements referred to in the affidavit of William Vaughan at paragraph 115 as those appear to be capital expenditures which will have to be accommodated within a plan of arrangement or after emergence.

[40] It seems to me that if the BIA (a) test is restrictively dealt with (as per my question to Union counsel as to how far in the future should one look on a prospective basis being answered "24 hours") then Stelco would not be insolvent under that test. However, I am of the view that that would be unduly restrictive and a proper contextual and purposive interpretation to be given when it is being used for a restructuring purpose even under BIA would be to see whether there is a reasonably foreseeable (at the time of filing) expectation that there is a looming liquidity condition or crisis which will result in the applicant running out of "cash" to pay its debts as they generally become due in the future without the benefit of the stay and ancillary protection and procedure by court authorization pursuant to an order. I think this is the more appropriate interpretation of BIA (a) test in the context of a reorganization or "rescue" as opposed to a threshold to bankruptcy consideration or a fraudulent preferences proceeding. On that basis, I would find Stelco insolvent from the date of filing. Even if one were not to give the latter interpretation to the BIA (a) test, clearly for the above reasons and analysis, if one looks at the meaning of "insolvent" within the context of a CCAA reorganization or rescue solely, then of necessity, the time horizon must be such that the liquidity crisis would occur in the sense of running out of "cash" but for the grant of the CCAA order. On that basis Stelco is certainly insolvent given its limited cash resources unused, its need for a cushion, its rate of cash burn recently experienced and anticipated.

[41] What about the BIA (c) test which may be roughly referred to as an assets compared with obligations test. See *New Quebec Reglan Mines Ltd. v. Blok-Andersen*, [1993] O.J. No. 727 (Gen. Div.) as to fair value and fair market valuation. The Union observed that there was no intention by Stelco to wind itself up or proceed with a sale of some or all of its assets and undertaking and therefore some of the liabilities which Stelco and Stephen took into account would not crystallize. However, as I discussed at the time of the hearing, the (c) test is what one might reasonably call or describe as an "artificial" or notional/hypothetical test. It presumes certain things which are in fact not necessarily contemplated to take place or to be involved. In that respect, I appreciate that it may

be difficult to get one's mind around that concept and down the right avenue of that (c) test. See my views at trial in *Olympia & York Developments Ltd. (Trustee of) v. Olympia & York Realty Corp.*, [2001] O.J. No. 3394 (S.C.J.) at paragraphs 13, 21 and 33; affirmed [2003] O.J. No. 5242 (C.A.). At paragraph 33, I observed in closing:

33...They (and their expert witnesses) all had to contend with dealing with rambling and complicated facts and, in Section 100 BIA, a section which is difficult to administer when fmv [fair market value] in a notational or hypothetical market involves ignoring what would often be regarded as self evidence truths but at the same time appreciating that this notational or hypothetical market requires that the objects being sold have to have realistic true to life attributes recognized.

[42] The Court of Appeal stated at paragraphs 24-25 as follows:

24. Nor are the appellants correct to argue that the trial judge also assumed an imprudent vendor in arriving at his conclusion about the fair market value of the OYSF note would have to know that in order to realize value from the note any purchaser would immediately put OYSF and thus OYDL itself into bankruptcy to pre-empt a subsequent triggering event in favour of EIB. While this was so, and the trial judge clearly understood it, the error in this submission is that it seeks to inject into the analysis factors subjected to the circumstances of OYDL as vendor and not intrinsic to the value of the OYSF note. The calculation of fair market value does not permit this but rather must assume an unconstrained vendor.

25. The Applicants further argue that the trial judge eroded in determining the fair market value of the OYSF note by reference to a transaction which was entirely speculative because it was never considered by OYDL nor would have it been since it would have resulted in OYDL's own bankruptcy. I disagree. The transaction hypothesized by the trial judge was one between a notational, willing, prudent and informed vendor and purchaser based on factors relevant to the OYSF note itself rather than the particular circumstances of OYDL as the seller of the note. This is an entirely appropriate way to determine the fair market value of the OYSF note.

[43] Test (c) deems a person to be insolvent if "the aggregate of [its] property is not, at a fair valuation, sufficient, or of disposed at a fairly conducted sale under legal process would not be sufficient to enable payment of all [its] obligations, due and accruing due." The origins of this legislative test appear to be the decision of Spragge V-C in *Davidson v. Douglas* (1868), 15 Gr. 347 at p. 351 where he stated with respect to the solvency or insolvency of a debtor, the proper course is:

to see and examine whether all his property, real and personal, be sufficient if presently realized for the payment of his debts, and in this view we must estimate his land, as well as his chattel property, not at what his neighbours or others may consider to be its value, but at what it would bring in the market at a forced sale, or a sale where the seller cannot await his opportunities, but must sell.

[44] In *Clarkson v. Sterling* (1887), 14 O.R. 460 (Div Ct.) at p. 463, Rose J. indicted that the sale must be fair and reasonable, but that the determination of fairness and reasonableness would depend on the facts of each case.

[45] The Union essentially relied on garnishment cases. Because of the provisions relating as to which debts may or may not be garnished, these authorities are of somewhat limited value when dealing with the test (c) question. However I would refer to one of the Union's cases *Bank of Montreal v. I. M. Krisp Foods Ltd.*, [1996] S.J. No. 655 (C.A.) where it is stated at paragraph 11:

"11. Few phrases have been as problematic to define as "debt due or accruing due". The Shorter Oxford English Dictionary, 3rd ed. defines "accruing" as "arising in due course", but an examination of English and Canadian authority reveals that not all debts "arising in due course" are permitted to be garnisheed. (See Professor Dunlop's extensive research for his British Columbia Law Reform Commission's Report on Attachment of Debts Act, 1978 at 17 to 29 and its text *Creditor-Debtor Law in Canada*, 2nd ed. at 374 to 385.)

[46] In *Barsi v. Farcas*, [1924] 1 D.L.R. 1154 (Sask. C.A.), Lamont J.A. was cited for his statement at p. 522 of *Webb v. Stanton* (1883), 11 Q.B.D. 518 that: "an accruing debt, therefore, is a debt not yet actually payable, but a debt which is represented by an existing obligation."

[47] Saunders J. noted in *633746 Ont. Inc. (Trustee of) v. Salvati* (1990), 79 C.B.R. (N.S.) 72 (Ont. S.C.) at p. 81 that a sale out of the ordinary course of business would have an adverse effect on that actually realized.

[48] There was no suggestion by any of the parties that any of the assets and undertaking would have any enhanced value from that shown on the financial statements prepared according to GAAP.

[49] In *King, supra* at p. 81 Steele J. observed:

To consider the question of insolvency under cl. (c) I must look to the aggregate property of the company and come to a conclusion as to whether or not it would be sufficient to enable payment of all obligations due and accruing due. There are two tests to be applied: First, its fair value and, secondly, its value if disposed of at a fairly conducted sale under legal process. The balance sheet is a starting point, but the evidence relating to the fair value of the assets and what they might realize if disposed of at a fairly conducted sale under legal process must be reviewed in interpreting it. In this case, I find no difficulty in accepting the obligations shown as liabilities because they are known. I have more difficulty with respect to the assets.

[50] To my view the preferable interpretation to be given to "sufficient to enable payment of all his obligations, due and accruing due" is to be determined in the context of this test as a whole. What is being put up to satisfy those obligations is the debtor's assets and undertaking *in total*; in other words, the debtor in essence is taken as having sold everything. There would be no residual assets and undertaking to pay off any obligations which would not be encompassed by the phrase "all of his obligations, due and accruing due". Surely, there cannot be "orphan" obligations which are left hanging unsatisfied. It seems to me that the intention of "due and accruing due" was to cover off all obligations of whatever nature or kind and leave nothing in limbo.

[51] S. 121(1) and (2) of the BIA, which are incorporated by reference in s. 12 of the CCAA, provide in respect to provable claims:

S. 121(1) All debts and liabilities, present or future, to which the bankrupt is subject on the day on which the bankrupt becomes bankrupt or to which bankrupt may become subject before the bankrupt's discharge by reason of any obligation incurred before the day on which the bankrupt becomes bankrupt shall be deemed to be claims provable in proceedings under this Act.

(2) The determination whether a contingent or unliquidated claim is a provable claim and the valuation of such claim shall be made in accordance with s. 135.

[52] *Houlden and Morawetz 2004 Annotated supra* at p. 537 (G28(3)) indicates:

The word "liability" is a very broad one. It includes all obligations to which the bankrupt is subject on the day on which he becomes bankrupt except for contingent and unliquidated claims which are dealt with in s. 121(2).

However contingent and unliquidated claims would be encompassed by the term "obligations".

[53] In *Garden v. Newton* (1916), 29 D.L.R. 276 (Man. K.B.), Mathers C.J.K.B. observed at p. 281 that "contingent claim, that is, a claim which may or may not ripen into a debt, according as some future event does or does not happen." See *In re A Debtor* (No. 64 of 1992), [1993] 1 W.L.R. 264 (Ch. D) at p. 268 for the definition of a "liquidated sum" which is an amount which can be readily ascertained and hence by corollary an "unliquidated claim" would be one which is not easily ascertained, but will have to be valued. In *Re Leo Gagnier* (1950), 30 C.B.R. 74 (Ont. S.C.), there appears to be a conflation of not only the (a) test with the (c) test, but also the invocation of the judicial discretion not to grant the receiving order pursuant to a bankruptcy petition, notwithstanding that "[the judge was] unable to find the debtor is bankrupt". The debtor was able to survive the (a) test as he had the practice (accepted by all his suppliers) of providing them with post dated cheques. The (c) test was not a problem since the judge found that his assets should be valued at considerably more than his obligations. However, this case does illustrate that the application of the tests present some difficulties. These difficulties are magnified when one is dealing with something more significantly complex and a great deal larger than a haberdashery store – in the case before us, a giant corporation in which, amongst other things, is engaged in a very competitive history including competition from foreign sources which have recently restructured into more cost efficient structures, having shed certain of their obligations. As well, that is without taking into account that a sale would entail significant transaction costs. Even of greater significance would be the severance and termination payments to employees not continued by the new purchaser. Lastly, it was recognized by everyone at the hearing that Stelco's plants, especially the Hamilton-Hilton works, have extremely high environmental liabilities lurking in the woodwork. Stephen observed that these obligations would be substantial, although not quantified.

[54] It is true that there are no appraisals of the plant and equipment nor of the assets and undertaking of Stelco. Given the circumstances of this case and the complexities of the market, one may realistically question whether or not the appraisals would be all that helpful or accurate.

[55] I would further observe that in the notional or hypothetical exercise of a sale, then all the obligations which would be triggered by such sale would have to be taken into account.

[56] All liabilities, contingent or unliquidated would have to be taken into account. See *King*, *supra* p. 81; *Salvati*, *supra* pp. 80-1; *Maybank Foods Inc. (Trustee of) v. Provisuers Maritimes Ltd.* (1989), 45 B.L.R. 14 (N.S.S.C.) at p. 29; *Re Challmie* (1976), 22 C.B.R. (N.S.) 78 (B.C.S.C.) at pp. 81-2. In *Challmie* the debtor ought to have known that his guarantee was very much exposed given the perilous state of his company whose liabilities he had guaranteed. It is interesting to note what was stated in *Maybank*, even if it is rather patently obvious. Tidman J. said in respect of the branch of the company at p. 29:

Mr. MacAdam argues also that the \$4.8 million employees' severance obligation was not a liability on January 20, 1986. The *Bankruptcy Act* includes as obligations both those due and accruing due. Although the employees' severance obligation was not due and payable on January 20, 1986 it was an obligation "accruing due". The Toronto facility had experienced severe financial difficulties for some time; in fact, it was the major, if not the sole cause, of Maybank's financial difficulties. I believe it is reasonable to conclude that a reasonably astute perspective buyer of the company has a going concern would have considered that obligation on January 20, 1986 and that it would have substantially reduced the price offered by that perspective buyer. Therefore that obligation must be considered as an obligation of the company on January 20, 1986.

[57] With the greatest of respect for my colleague, I disagree with the conclusion of Ground J. in *Enterprise Capital*, *supra* as to the approach to be taken to "due and accruing due" when he observed at pp. 139-140:

It therefore becomes necessary to determine whether the principle amount of the Notes constitutes an obligation "due or accruing due" as of the date of this application.

There is a paucity of helpful authority on the meaning of "accruing due" for purposes of a definition of insolvency. Historically, in 1933, in *P. Lyall & Sons Construction Co. v. Baker*, [1933] O.R. 286 (Ont. C.A.), the Ontario Court of Appeal, in determining a question of set-off under the *Dominion Winding-Up Act* had to determine whether the amount claimed as set-off was a debt due or accruing due to the company in liquidation for purposes of that Act. Marsten J. at pp. 292-293 quoted from Moss J.A. in *Mail Printing Co. v. Clarkson* (1898), 25 O.R. 1 (Ont. C.A.) at p. 8:

A debt is defined to be a sum of money which is certainly, and at all event, payable without regard to the fact whether it be payable now or at a future time. And an accruing debt is a debt not yet actually payable, but a debt which is represented by an existing obligation: Per Lindley L.J. in *Webb v. Stenton* (1883), 11 Q.D.D. at p. 529.

Whatever relevance such definition may have had for purposes of dealing with claims by and against companies in liquidation under the old winding-up legislation, it is apparent to me that it should not be applied to definitions of insolvency. To include every debt payable at some future date in "accruing due"

for the purposes of insolvency tests would render numerous corporations, with long term debt due over a period of years in the future and anticipated to be paid out of future income, "insolvent" for the purposes of the BIA and therefore the CCAA. For the same reason, I do not accept the statement quoted in the Enterprise factum from the decision of the Bankruptcy Court for the Southern District of New York in *Centennial Textiles Inc., Re* 220 B.R. 165 (U.S.N.Y.D.C. 1998) that "if the present saleable value of assets are less than the amount required to pay existing debt as they mature, the debtor is insolvent". In my view, the obligations, which are to be measured against the fair valuation of a company's property as being obligations due and accruing due, must be limited to obligations currently payable or properly chargeable to the accounting period during which the test is being applied as, for example, a sinking fund payment due within the current year. Black's Law Dictionary defines "accrued liability" as "an obligation or debt which is properly chargeable in a given accounting period, but which is not yet paid or payable". The principal amount of the Notes is neither due nor accruing due in this sense.

[58] There appears to be some confusion in this analysis as to "debts" and "obligations", the latter being much broader than debts. Please see above as to my views concerning the floodgates argument under the BIA and CCAA being addressed by judicially exercised discretion even if "otherwise warranted" applications were made. I pause to note that an insolvency test under general corporate litigation need not be and likely is not identical, or indeed similar to that under these insolvency statutes. As well, it is curious to note that the cut off date is the end of the current fiscal period which could have radically different results if there were a calendar fiscal year and the application was variously made in the first week of January, mid-summer or the last day of December. Lastly, see above and below as to my views concerning the proper interpretation of this question of "accruing due".

[59] It seems to me that the phrase "accruing due" has been interpreted by the courts as broadly identifying obligations that will "become due". See *Viteway* below at pp. 163-4 – at least at some point in the future. Again, I would refer to my conclusion above that *every obligation* of the corporation in the hypothetical or notional sale must be treated as "accruing due" to avoid orphan obligations. In that context, it matters not that a wind-up pension liability may be discharged over 15 years; in a test (c) situation, it is crystallized on the date of the test. See *Optical supra* at pp. 756-7; *Re Viteway Natural Foods Ltd.* (1986), 63 C.B.R. (N.S.) 157 (B.C.S.C.) at pp. 164-63-4; *Re Consolidated Seed Exports Ltd.* (1986), 62 C.B.R. (N.S.) 156 (B.C.S.C.) at p. 163. In *Consolidated Seed*, Spencer J. at pp. 162-3 stated:

In my opinion, a futures broker is not in that special position. The third definition of "insolvency" may apply to a futures trader at any time even though he has open long positions in the market. Even though Consolidated's long positions were not required to be closed on 10th December, the chance that they might show a profit by March 1981 or even on the following day and thus wipe out Consolidated's cash deficit cannot save it from a condition of insolvency on that day. The circumstances fit precisely within the third definition; if all Consolidated's assets had been sold on that day at a fair value, the proceeds would not have covered its obligations due and accruing due, including its

obligations to pay in March 1981 for its long positions in rapeseed. The market prices from day to day establish a fair valuation. ...

The contract to buy grain at a fixed price at a future time imposes a present obligation upon a trader taking a long position in the futures market to take delivery in exchange for payment at that future time. It is true that in the practice of the market, that obligation is nearly always washed out by buying an offsetting short contract, but until that is done the obligation stands. The trader does not know who will eventually be on the opposite side of his transaction if it is not offset but all transactions are treated as if the clearing house is on the other side. It is a present obligation due at a future time. It is therefore an obligation accruing due within the meaning of the third definition of "insolvency".

[60] The possibility of an expectancy of future profits or a change in the market is not sufficient; *Consolidated Seed* at p. 162 emphasizes that the test is to be done on that day, the day of filing in the case of an application for reorganization.

[61] I see no objection to using Exhibit C to Stephen's affidavit as an aid to review the balance sheet approach to test (c). While Stephen may not have known who prepared Exhibit C, he addressed each of its components in the text of his affidavit and as such he could have mechanically prepared the exhibit himself. He was comfortable with and agreed with each of its components. Stelco's factum at paragraphs 70-1 submits as follows:

70. In Exhibit C to his Affidavit, Mr. Stephen addresses a variety of adjustments to the Shareholder's Equity of Stelco necessary to reflect the values of assets and liabilities as would be required to determine whether Stelco met the test of insolvency under Clause C. In cross examination of both Mr. Vaughan and Mr. Stephen only one of these adjustments was challenged – the "Possible Reductions in Capital Assets."

71. The basis of the challenge was that the comparative sales analysis was flawed. In the submission of Stelco, none of these challenges has any merit. Even if the entire adjustment relating to the value in capital assets is ignored, the remaining adjustments leave Stelco with assets worth over \$600 million less than the value of its obligations due and accruing due. This fundamental fact is not challenged.

[62] Stelco went on at paragraphs 74-5 of its factum to submit:

74. The values relied upon by Mr. Stephen if anything, understate the extent of Stelco's insolvency. As Mr. Stephen has stated, and no one has challenged by affidavit evidence or on cross examination, in a fairly conducted sale under legal process, the value of Stelco's working capital and other assets would be further impaired by: (i) increased environmental liabilities not reflected on the financial statements, (ii) increased pension deficiencies that would be generated on a wind up of the pension plans, (iii) severance and termination claims and (iv) substantial liquidation costs that would be incurred in connection with such a sale.

75. No one on behalf of the USWA has presented any evidence that the capital assets of Stelco are in excess of book value on a stand alone basis. Certainly no one has suggested that these assets would be in excess of book value if the related environmental legacy costs and collective agreements could not be separated from the assets.

[63] Before turning to that exercise, I would also observe that test (c) is also disjunctive. There is an insolvency condition if the total obligation of the debtor exceed either (i) a fair valuation of its assets or (ii) the proceeds of a sale fairly conducted under legal process of its assets.

[64] As discussed above and confirmed by Stephen, if there were a sale under legal process, then it would be unlikely, especially in this circumstance that values would be enhanced; in all probability they would be depressed from book value. Stephen took the balance sheet GAAP calculated figure of equity at November 30, 2003 as \$804.2 million. From that, he deducted the loss for December 2003 – January 2004 of \$17 million to arrive at an equity position of \$787.2 million as at the date of filing.

[65] From that, he deducted, reasonably in my view, those "booked" assets that would have no value in a test (c) sale namely: (a) \$294 million of future income tax recourse which would need taxable income in the future to realize; (b) \$57 million for a write-off of the Platemill which is presently hot idled (while Locker observed that it would not be prohibitive in cost to restart production, I note that neither Stephen nor Vaughn were cross examined as to the decision not to do so); and (c) the capitalized deferred debt issue expense of \$3.2 million which is being written off over time and therefore, truly is a "nothing". This totals \$354.2 million so that the excess of value over liabilities before reflecting obligations not included in the financials directly, but which are, substantiated as to category in the notes would be \$433 million.

[66] On a windup basis, there would be a pension deficiency of \$1252 million; however, Stephen conservatively in my view looked at the Mercer actuary calculations on the basis of a going concern finding deficiency of \$656 million. If the \$1252 million windup figure had been taken, then the picture would have been even bleaker than it is as Stephen has calculated it for test (c) purposes. In addition, there are deferred pension costs of \$198.7 million which under GAAP accounting calculations is allowed so as to defer recognition of past bad investment experience, but this has no realizable value. Then there is the question of Employee Future Benefits. These have been calculated as at December 31, 2003 by the Mercer actuary as \$909.3 million but only \$684 million has been accrued and booked on the financial statements so that there has to be an increased provision of \$225.3 million. These off balance sheet adjustments total \$1080 million.

[67] Taking that last adjustment into account would result in a *negative* equity of (\$433 million minus \$1080 million) or *negative* \$647 million. On that basis without taking into account possible reductions in capital assets as dealt with in the somewhat flawed Exhibit E nor environmental and other costs discussed above, Stelco is insolvent according to the test (c). With respect to Exhibit E, I have not relied on it in any way, but it is entirely likely that a properly calculated Exhibit E would provide comparators (also being sold in the U.S. under legal process in a fairly conducted process) which tend to require a further downward adjustment. Based on test (c), Stelco is significantly, not marginally, under water.

[68] In reaching my conclusion as to the negative equity (and I find that Stephen approached that exercise fairly and constructively), please note my comments above regarding the possible

assumption of pension obligations by the purchaser being offset by a reduction of the purchase price. The 35% adjustment advocated as to pension and employee benefits in this regard is speculation by the Union. Secondly, the Union emphasized cash flow as being important in evaluation, but it must be remembered that Stelco has been negative cash flow for some time which would make that analysis unreliable and to the detriment of the Union's position. The Union treated the \$773 million estimated contribution to the shortfall in the pension deficiency by the Pension Benefits Guarantee Fund as eliminating that as a Stelco obligation. That is not the case however as that Fund would be subrogated to the claims of the employees in that respect with a result that Stelco would remain liable for that \$773 million. Lastly, the Union indicated that there should be a \$155 million adjustment as to the negative equity in Sub Applicants when calculating Stelco's equity. While Stephen at Q. 181-2 acknowledged that there was no adjustment for that, I agree with him that there ought not to be since Stelco was being examined (and the calculations were based) on an unconsolidated basis, not on a consolidated basis.

[69] In the end result, I have concluded on the balance of probabilities that Stelco is insolvent and therefore it is a "debtor company" as at the date of filing and entitled to apply for the CCAA initial order. My conclusion is that (i) BIA test (c) strongly shows Stelco is insolvent; (ii) BIA test (a) demonstrates, to a less certain but sufficient basis, an insolvency and (iii) the "new" CCAA test again strongly supports the conclusion of insolvency. I am further of the opinion that I properly exercised my discretion in granting Stelco and the Sub Applicants the initial order on January 29, 2004 and I would confirm that as of the present date with effect on the date of filing. The Union's motion is therefore dismissed.

[70] I appreciate that all the employees (union and non-union alike) and the Union and the International have a justifiable pride in their work and their workplace – and a human concern about what the future holds for them. The pensioners are in the same position. Their respective positions can only be improved by engaging in discussion, an exchange of views and information reasonably advanced and conscientiously listened to and digested, leading to mutual problem solving, ideas and negotiations. Negative attitudes can only lead to the detriment to all stakeholders. Unfortunately there has been some finger pointing on various sides; that should be put behind everyone so that participants in this process can concentrate on the future and not inappropriately dwell on the past. I understand that there have been some discussions and interchange over the past two weeks since the hearing and that is a positive start.

J.M. Farley

Released: March 22, 20004

TAB 21

**ONTARIO
SUPERIOR COURT OF JUSTICE
COMMERCIAL LIST**

THE HONOURABLE MR.

)

MONDAY, THE 2nd

JUSTICE HAINEY

)

DAY OF DECEMBER, 2019

)

IN THE MATTER OF THE *COMPANIES' CREDITORS
ARRANGEMENT ACT*, R.S.C. 1985, c. C-36, AS AMENDED

AND IN THE MATTER OF A PLAN OF COMPROMISE OR
ARRANGEMENT OF WAYLAND GROUP CORP.,
MARICANN INC. AND NANOLEAF TECHNOLOGIES INC.



(collectively, the “**Applicants**” and each an “**Applicant**”)

INITIAL ORDER

THIS APPLICATION, made by the Applicants, pursuant to the *Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act*, R.S.C. 1985, c. C-36, as amended (the “**CCAA**”), was heard this day at 330 University Avenue, Toronto, Ontario.

ON READING the affidavit of Matthew McLeod sworn December 2, 2019 and the Exhibits thereto (the “**McLeod Affidavit**”), and on being advised that TSX Trust Company, in its capacity as trustee under the Secured Trust Indenture dated as of October 27, 2017, and Cryptologic Corp. (“**Cryptologic**”), as lender under the Amended and Restated Loan Agreement and LOI Amendment Agreement dated as of September 17, 2019, and the other secured creditors of the Applicants who are likely to be affected by the charges created herein were given notice, and on hearing the submissions of counsel for the Applicants, PricewaterhouseCoopers Inc. (“**PwC**”), in its capacity as proposed monitor of the Applicants, and Cryptologic, and on reading the consent of PwC to act as the monitor (the “**Monitor**”),

SERVICE

1. **THIS COURT ORDERS** that the time for service of the Notice of Application and the Application Record is hereby abridged and validated so that this Application is properly returnable today and hereby dispenses with further service thereof.

APPLICATION

2. **THIS COURT ORDERS AND DECLARES** that the Applicants are companies to which the CCAA applies.

POSSESSION OF PROPERTY AND OPERATIONS

3. **THIS COURT ORDERS** that the Applicants shall remain in possession and control of their current and future assets, licenses, undertakings and properties of every nature and kind whatsoever, and wherever situate including all proceeds thereof (the “**Property**”). Subject to further Order of this Court, the Applicants shall continue to carry on business in a manner consistent with the preservation of their business (the “**Business**”) and Property. The Applicants are authorized and empowered to continue to retain and employ the employees, consultants, agents, experts, accountants, counsel and such other persons (collectively “**Assistants**”) currently retained or employed by them, with liberty to retain such further Assistants as the Applicants deem reasonably necessary or desirable in the ordinary course of business or for the carrying out of the terms of this Order.

4. **THIS COURT ORDERS** that, except as specifically permitted herein, the Applicants are hereby directed, until further Order of this Court: (a) to make no payments of principal, interest thereon or otherwise on account of amounts owing by the Applicants to any of their creditors as of this date; (b) to grant no security interests, trust, liens, charges or encumbrances upon or in respect of any of their Property; and (c) to not grant credit or incur liabilities except in the ordinary course of the Business.

5. **THIS COURT ORDERS** that the Applicants shall be entitled but not required to pay the following expenses whether incurred prior to, on or after the date of this Order:

- (a) all outstanding and future wages, salaries, employee and pension benefits, vacation pay and expenses payable on or after the date of this Order, in each case incurred in the ordinary course of Business and consistent with existing compensation policies and arrangements, and all other payroll and benefits processing expenses; and
- (b) the fees and disbursements of any Assistants retained or employed by the Applicants in respect of these proceedings at their standard rates and charges.

6. **THIS COURT ORDERS** that, except as otherwise provided to the contrary herein, the Applicants shall be entitled but not required to pay all reasonable expenses incurred by any of the Applicants in carrying on the Business in the ordinary course after this Order, and in carrying out the provisions of this Order which expenses shall include, without limitation:

- (a) all expenses and capital expenditures reasonably necessary for the preservation of the Property or the Business including, without limitation, payments on account of insurance (including directors and officers insurance), maintenance and security services; and
- (b) payment for goods or services actually supplied to the Applicants following the date of this Order.

7. **THIS COURT ORDERS** that the Applicants shall remit, in accordance with legal requirements, or pay:

- (a) any statutory deemed trust amounts in favour of the Crown in right of Canada or of any Province thereof or any other taxation authority which are required to be deducted from employees' wages, including, without limitation, amounts in respect of (i) employment insurance, (ii) Canada Pension Plan, (iii) Quebec Pension Plan, and (iv) income taxes;
- (b) all goods and services or other applicable sales taxes (collectively, "**Sales Taxes**") required to be remitted by the Applicants in connection with the sale of goods and services by the Applicants, but only where such Sales Taxes are accrued or collected after the date of this Order, or where such Sales Taxes were accrued or collected prior

**ONTARIO
SUPERIOR COURT OF JUSTICE
COMMERCIAL LIST**

THE HONOURABLE MR.

)

MONDAY, THE 2nd

JUSTICE HAINEY

)

DAY OF DECEMBER, 2019

)



IN THE MATTER OF THE *COMPANIES' CREDITORS*
ARRANGEMENT ACT, R.S.C. 1985, c. C-36, AS AMENDED

AND IN THE MATTER OF A PLAN OF COMPROMISE OR
ARRANGEMENT OF WAYLAND GROUP CORP.,
MARICANN INC. AND NANOLEAF TECHNOLOGIES INC.

(collectively, the “**Applicants**” and each an “**Applicant**”)

AMENDED AND RESTATED INITIAL ORDER

THIS APPLICATION, made by the Applicants, pursuant to the *Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act*, R.S.C. 1985, c. C-36, as amended (the “**CCAA**”), was heard this day at 330 University Avenue, Toronto, Ontario.

ON READING the affidavits of Matthew McLeod sworn December 2, 2019 (the “**First Affidavit**”) and December 4, 2019 and the Exhibits thereto, and on being advised that TSX Trust Company, in its capacity as trustee under the Secured Trust Indenture dated as of October 27, 2017, and Cryptologic Corp., as lender under the Amended and Restated Loan Agreement and LOI Amendment Agreement dated as of September 17, 2019, and the other secured creditors of the Applicants who are likely to be affected by the charges created herein were given notice, and on hearing the submissions of counsel for the Applicants, PricewaterhouseCoopers Inc. (“**PwC**”), in its capacity as proposed monitor of the Applicants and the DIP Lender (as defined below), and on reading the consent of PwC to act as the monitor (the “**Monitor**”),

SERVICE

1. **THIS COURT ORDERS** that the time for service of the Notice of Application and the Application Record is hereby abridged and validated so that this Application is properly returnable today and hereby dispenses with further service thereof.

APPLICATION

2. **THIS COURT ORDERS AND DECLARES** that the Applicants are companies to which the CCAA applies.

POSSESSION OF PROPERTY AND OPERATIONS

3. **THIS COURT ORDERS** that the Applicants shall remain in possession and control of their current and future assets, licenses, undertakings and properties of every nature and kind whatsoever, and wherever situate including all proceeds thereof (the "**Property**"). Subject to further Order of this Court, the Applicants shall continue to carry on business in a manner consistent with the preservation of their business (the "**Business**") and Property. The Applicants are authorized and empowered to continue to retain and employ the employees, consultants, agents, experts, accountants, counsel and such other persons (collectively "**Assistants**") currently retained or employed by them, with liberty to retain such further Assistants as the Applicants deem reasonably necessary or desirable in the ordinary course of business or for the carrying out of the terms of this Order.

4. **THIS COURT ORDERS** that, except as specifically permitted herein, the Applicants are hereby directed, until further Order of this Court: (a) to make no payments of principal, interest thereon or otherwise on account of amounts owing by the Applicants to any of their creditors as of this date; (b) to grant no security interests, trust, liens, charges or encumbrances upon or in respect of any of their Property; and (c) to not grant credit or incur liabilities except in the ordinary course of the Business.

5. **THIS COURT ORDERS** that the Applicants shall be entitled but not required to pay the following expenses whether incurred prior to, on or after the date of this Order:

- (a) all outstanding and future wages, salaries, employee and pension benefits, vacation pay and expenses payable on or after the date of this Order, in each case incurred in the ordinary course of Business and consistent with existing compensation policies and arrangements, and all other payroll and benefits processing expenses;
- (b) the fees and disbursements of any Assistants retained or employed by the Applicants in respect of these proceedings at their standard rates and charges; and
- (c) with the consent of the Monitor, amounts owing for goods or services actually supplied to the Applicants prior to the date of this Order by third party suppliers up to a maximum aggregate amount of \$100,000 if in the opinion of the Applicants the supplier is critical.

6. **THIS COURT ORDERS** that, except as otherwise provided to the contrary herein, the Applicants shall be entitled but not required to pay all reasonable expenses incurred by any of the Applicants in carrying on the Business in the ordinary course after this Order, and in carrying out the provisions of this Order which expenses shall include, without limitation:

- (a) all expenses and capital expenditures reasonably necessary for the preservation of the Property or the Business including, without limitation, payments on account of insurance (including directors and officers insurance), maintenance and security services; and
- (b) payment for goods or services actually supplied to the Applicants following the date of this Order.

7. **THIS COURT ORDERS** that the Applicants shall remit, in accordance with legal requirements, or pay:

- (a) any statutory deemed trust amounts in favour of the Crown in right of Canada or of any Province thereof or any other taxation authority which are required to be deducted from employees' wages, including, without limitation, amounts in respect of (i) employment insurance, (ii) Canada Pension Plan, (iii) Quebec Pension Plan, and (iv) income taxes;

TAB 22

CITATION: SkyLink Aviation Inc. (Re), 2013 ONSC 1500
COURT FILE NO.: CV-13-1003300CL
DATE: 20130312

**SUPERIOR COURT OF JUSTICE – ONTARIO
(COMMERCIAL LIST)**

RE: IN THE MATTER OF THE *COMPANIES’ CREDITORS ARRANGEMENT ACT*, R.S.C. 1985, c. C-36, AS AMENDED

**AND IN THE MATTER OF A PLAN OF COMPROMISE AND
ARRANGEMENT OF SKYLINK AVIATION INC., Applicant**

BEFORE: MORAWETZ J.

COUNSEL: Robert Chadwick and Logan Willis, for the Applicant

S. R. Orzy and Sean H. Zweig, for the Noteholders

**M. P. Gottlieb, for the Proposed Monitor, Duff & Phelps Canada
Restructuring Inc.**

C. Prophet, for the Royal Bank of Canada

R. S. Kukulowicz , for the Directors and Officers

HEARD &

ENDORSED: MARCH 8, 2013

REASONS: MARCH 12, 2013

ENDORSEMENT

[1] SkyLink Aviation Inc. (“SkyLink Aviation”, the “Company” or the “Applicant”), together with the SkyLink Subsidiaries (collectively, “SkyLink”), is a provider of global aviation transportation and logistics services (the “SkyLink Business”). SkyLink specializes in providing non-combatant aviation services and supporting activities in conflict-associated regions around the world. The customers who rely on SkyLink’s services include governmental agencies, inter-governmental agencies, commercial organizations and humanitarian relief organizations.

[2] SkyLink is responsible for providing non-combat life-supporting functions to both its own personnel and those of its suppliers and clients in high-risk areas. Any disruption to SkyLink's ability to provide either its core services or its ancillary life-supporting functions to deployed personnel, could put the safety and security of those personnel at risk, including by potentially leaving them without life-supporting services in conflict zones.

[3] As set out in the affidavit of Jan Ottens and, as summarized in the comprehensive factum filed by the Applicant, it is apparent that SkyLink Aviation has experienced financial challenges that have necessitated a recapitalization of the company. SkyLink has chosen to do this under the *Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act* ("CCAA").

[4] At this time, SkyLink Aviation's secured debts significantly exceed the value of the SkyLink Business. SkyLink is in default of its first lien secured credit facility (the "Credit Facility") in favour of the first lien lenders (the "First Lien Lenders") and the Indenture in respect of its senior secured second lien notes (the "Secured Notes"). The indenture trustee in respect of the Secured Notes (the "Trustee") has accelerated all amounts owing under the Secured Notes and has issued a demand for payment by SkyLink Aviation and SkyLink Aviation USA II.

[5] After an extended period of extensive negotiations with representatives of the Company's secured creditors regarding a recapitalization of the Company, a consensual going-concern recapitalization transaction (the "Recapitalization") has been developed for implementation pursuant to a plan of compromise and arrangement under the CCAA (the "Plan").

[6] The Applicant takes the position that the Recapitalization is a positive development for the Company and its stakeholders. The Recapitalization involves:

- (i) the refinancing of the Company's first lien debt;
- (ii) the cancellation of the Secured Notes in exchange for the issuance by the Company of consideration that includes new common shares and new debt; and
- (iii) the compromise of certain unsecured liabilities, including the portion of the Noteholders' claims that is to be treated as unsecured under the Plan.

[7] The Company also contends that if implemented, the Recapitalization would result in SkyLink Aviation having an improved capital structure, stable working capital liquidity and enhanced flexibility to respond to volatility in the industry.

[8] The terms of the Recapitalization are supported by a significant majority of the creditors who have an economic interest in the Company. In particular, the First Lien Lenders have affirmed their support, and the holders of approximately 64% of the value of the outstanding Secured Notes (the "Initial Consenting Noteholders") have signed the Support Agreement pursuant to which they have agreed to support the Recapitalization and to vote in favour of the Plan.

[9] The remaining Noteholders will be entitled to sign a joinder to the Support Agreement following the commencement of these proceedings. SkyLink Aviation anticipates that additional Noteholders will execute a joinder to the Support Agreement.

[10] It is noted that support of the First Lien Lenders and the Initial Consenting Noteholders is conditional upon the completion of the Recapitalization under the CCAA prior to April 23, 2013.

[11] A detailed summary of the salient facts is set out at paragraphs 11-42 of the factum.

[12] SkyLink Aviation is a privately held corporation under the laws of Ontario, with a registered head office located in Toronto, Ontario. Its central administrative functions are carried out at its Toronto headquarters.

[13] SkyLink Aviation is the direct or indirect parent company of a number of subsidiaries as detailed in the organization chart attached to Mr. Ottens' affidavit.

[14] The SkyLink Subsidiaries are non-applicants. However, SkyLink Aviation seeks to have a stay of proceedings under the Initial Order and certain other relief extended to those SkyLink Subsidiaries that are also party to contracts with SkyLink Aviation (the "Subsidiary Counterparties") so as to maintain the stability of the enterprise.

[15] SkyLink Aviation's liabilities amount to approximately \$149.42 million which includes the First Lien Indebtedness of \$14.749 million, Secured Notes in the aggregate principal amount of \$110 million, together with accrued but unpaid interest of approximately \$6.4 million, and amounts owing to Noteholders under the Interest Payment Support Agreement totalling approximately \$6.6 million.

[16] Material claims against the Company of which SkyLink Aviation is aware of include:

- (i) approximately \$3.45 million in respect of the exercise of various warrants and options issued to several members of the senior management team in May 2012; and
- (ii) six pending litigation claims against the Company that collectively allege approximately \$16.6 million in contingent claims or damages.

[17] As of March 6, 2013, SkyLink Aviation owed approximately \$7.7 million in accounts payable relating to ordinary course trade and employee obligations.

[18] As a result of the existing Events of Default, the First Lien Lenders are now in a position to terminate the Credit Facility and proceed to enforce their rights and remedies against SkyLink Aviation and Loan Guarantors, including the acceleration of all amounts owing under the Credit Facility. In addition, the Company does not have the funds required to make payments now due to the Participating Noteholders under the Interest Payment Support Agreement.

[19] In light of its financial circumstances, SkyLink Aviation contends that it is not able to obtain additional or alternative financing and there is no reasonable expectation that the Company, in the near term, will be able to generate sufficient cash flow through its operations to support its existing debt obligations. In addition, the Company contends that as further evidenced by the valuation performed by Duff & Phelps Valuations, the aggregate value of the Company's assets, property and undertaking, taken at fair value, is not sufficient to enable payment of all of its obligations, due and accruing due. Consequently, the Applicant takes the position that it is insolvent.

[20] The Applicant requests a stay of proceedings.

[21] The Applicant also requests authorization to make payments in the ordinary course in respect of employee compensation, rent, procurement, utility services and other supplier obligations, all with a view to maintaining operations.

[22] The Company has also negotiated for a DIP Loan and the concurrent granting of a DIP Lenders' Charge. Details in respect of the DIP Loan and the DIP Lenders' Charge are set out at paragraphs 29-32 of the factum. A proposed Monitor and Administration Charge as well as a Directors' and Officers' Charge is also requested. These requests are set out at paragraphs 33-37 of the factum. A KERP and a KERP Charge is also contemplated and the reasons for this are detailed at paragraphs 38 and 39 of the factum. There is no opposition to this requested relief.

[23] The Applicant also seeks the appointment of the Monitor as the Foreign Representative, should recognition of these proceedings in the United States pursuant to Chapter 15 of the United States Bankruptcy Code, become necessary.

[24] Having reviewed the record and hearing submissions, I am satisfied that the Applicant is a "debtor company" to which the CCAA applies. The basis for this finding is set out at paragraphs 43-52 of the factum.

[25] For the reasons set out at paragraphs 56-60 of the factum, I have been persuaded that it is appropriate in this application to include a stay of proceedings in favour of the Subsidiary Companies.

[26] I am also satisfied for the reasons set forth at paragraphs 61-65 of the factum that it is appropriate to authorize certain pre-filing payments to be made.

[27] The basis for the granting of the DIP Lenders' Charge, the Administration Charge, Directors' Charge and KERP Charge is set out at paragraphs 66-84 of the factum. I have been persuaded that, in the circumstances, the granting of these charges on the terms set out is appropriate.

[28] I have also been satisfied that it is appropriate to the appoint the Monitor as the Foreign Representative of the Applicant, for the reasons set out at paragraphs 85-87.

[29] The Applicant also requests a postponement of the Annual Shareholders' Meeting. For the reasons set out at paragraphs 88-91 of the factum, I am in agreement that this request is reasonable in the circumstances.

[30] The Applicant has requested that the "Confidential Supplement" to the Monitor's Pre-filing Report be sealed. This Confidential Supplement contains copies of:

- (i) the financial statements of SkyLink containing the confidential financial information of SkyLink;
- (ii) the Duff & Phelps Valuation Report (the "Valuation Report") which the Company contends contains sensitive competitive and confidential information of the Applicant; and
- (iii) the KERP letters containing individually identifiable information and confidential information of eligible employees.

[31] With respect to the financial information, I am satisfied that adequate information is contained in the public record that would enable the affected parties to make an informed decision as to the financial circumstances facing the Company.

[32] For the reasons set out at paragraphs 92-100 of the factum, I have been persuaded that it is appropriate to issue a sealing order at this time. In arriving at this determination, I have taken into account the principals set out in *Sierra Club of Canada v. Canada (Minister of Finance)*, 2002 S.C.C. 41.

[33] For the above reasons, I have been persuaded that an Initial Order should be granted in respect of the Applicant.

[34] SkyLink also brought a motion for the Claims Procedure Order and Meetings Order. The Company is seeking these orders at this time because it wishes to effectuate the Recapitalization on an expeditious basis. The basis for the request for these two orders is set out in the second factum submitted by the Applicant. The basis for the requested relief is set out at paragraphs 11-34 of the factum.

[35] The legal basis for proceeding with the motion for the Claims Procedure Order and the Meetings Order is set out at the factum commencing at paragraph 43. I recognize that it is unusual to request such relief at this stage of the proceeding. However, in the circumstances of this case, and considering the significant support that the proposed restructuring appears to have achieved, I accept the submissions and grant the requested relief. In doing so, I am mindful that a full come-back hearing has been scheduled for March 20, 2013, at which time these issues can be revisited.

[36] The motions for the Claims Procedure Order and Meetings Order are granted and the orders have been signed.

MORAWETZ J.

Date: March 12, 2013

TAB 23

CITATION: Victorian Order of Nurses for Canada (Re), 2015 ONSC 7371
COURT FILE NO.: CV-15-11192-00CL
DATE: 20151127

SUPERIOR COURT OF JUSTICE – ONTARIO

IN THE MATTER OF THE *COMPANIES' CREDITORS ARRANGEMENT ACT*, R.S.C. 1985,
c. C-36 AS AMENDED

AND IN THE MATTER OF SECTION 101 OF THE *COURTS OF JUSTICE ACT*, R.S.O. 1990
c. C-43 AS AMENDED

AND IN THE MATTER OF A PLAN OF COMPROMISE OR ARRANGEMENT OF
VICTORIAN ORDER OF NURSES FOR CANADA, VICTORIAN ORDER OF NURSES FOR
CANADA - EASTERN REGION, AND VICTORIAN ORDER OF NURSES FOR CANADA -
WESTERN REGION

BEFORE: Penny J.

COUNSEL: *Evan Cobb and Matthew Halpin* for the Applicants

Joseph Bellissimo for the Bank of Nova Scotia

Mark Laugesen for Collins Barrow Toronto Limited (Proposed Monitor)

Kenneth Kraft for the Board of Directors of the Applicants

HEARD: November 25, 2015

ENDORSEMENT

Overview

[1] On November 25, 2015 I heard an application for an initial order under the *Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act* for court protection of certain Victorian Order of Nurses entities. I treated the application as essentially *ex parte*. In a brief handwritten endorsement, I granted the application and signed an initial order under the CCAA and an order appointing a receiver of certain of the VON group's assets, with written reasons to follow. These are those reasons.

Background

[2] The Victorian Order of Nurses for Canada and the other entities in the VON group have, for over 100 years, provided home and community care services which address the healthcare needs of Canadians in various locations across the country on a not-for-profit basis.

[3] The VON group delivers its programs through four regional entities:

- (1) VON – Eastern Region
- (2) VON – Western Region
- (3) VON – Ontario and
- (4) VON – Nova Scotia.

VON Canada does not itself provide direct patient service but functions as the “head office” infrastructure supporting the operations of the regional entities.

[4] The VON group has, for a number of years, suffered liquidity problems. Current liabilities have consistently exceeded current assets by a significant margin; current net losses from 2012 to 2015 total over \$13 million; and cash flows from operations from 2012 to 2015 were similarly negative in the amount of over \$8 million. The VON group faces a significant working capital shortfall. A number of less drastic restructuring efforts have been ongoing since 2006 but these efforts have not turned the tide. Current forecasts suggest that the VON group will face a liquidity crisis in the near future if restructuring steps are not taken.

[5] Financial analysis of the VON group reveals that VON Canada, VON East and VON West account for a disproportionately high share of the VON group’s overall losses and operating cash shortfalls relative to the revenues generated from these entities.

[6] As a result of these circumstances, VON Canada, VON East and VON West seek protection from their creditors under the *Companies’ Creditors Arrangement Act*. The applicants also seek certain limited protections for VON Ontario and VON Nova Scotia, which carry on a core aspect of the VON group’s business but are not applicants in these proceedings. The applicants also seek the appointment of a receiver of certain of the VON group’s assets.

[7] The goal of the contemplated restructuring is to modify the scope of the VON group’s operations and focus on its core business and regions. This will involve winding down the non-viable operations of VON East and VON West in an orderly fashion and restructuring and downsizing the management services provided by VON Canada in order to have a more efficient and cost-effective operating structure.

Jurisdiction

[8] The CCAA applies to a “debtor company” with total claims against it of more than \$5 million. A debtor company is “any company that is bankrupt or insolvent.” “Insolvent” is not defined in the CCAA but has been found to include a corporation that is reasonably expected to run out of liquidity within the period of time reasonably required to implement a restructuring.

[9] In any event, based on the affidavit evidence of the VON group’s CEO, Jo-Anne Poirier, the applicants are each unable to meet their obligations that have become due and the aggregate fair value of their property is not sufficient to enable them to pay all of their obligations.

[10] The corporate structure of the applicants does not conform to the parent/subsidiary structure that would be typically found in the business corporation context. I am satisfied, however, that VON East and VON West are under the control of VON Canada from a practical perspective. They are all affiliated companies with the same board of directors. Accordingly, while VON East and VON West do not, on a standalone basis, face claims in excess of \$5 million, the applicants, as a group, clearly do. The applicants have complied with s. 10(2) of the CCAA. The application for an initial order is accompanied by a statement indicating on a weekly basis the projected cash flow of the applicants, a report containing the prescribed representations of the applicants regarding the preparation of the cash flow statement and copies of all financial statements prepared during the year before the application.

[11] I am therefore satisfied that I have the jurisdiction to make the order sought.

Notice

[12] The VON group is a large organization with over 4,000 employees operating from coast to coast. I accept that prior notice to all creditors, or potential creditors, is neither feasible nor practical in the circumstances. The application is made on notice to the VON group, the proposed monitor/receiver, the proposed chief restructuring officer and to the VON group's most significant secured creditor, the Bank of Nova Scotia.

[13] There shall be a comeback hearing within two weeks of my initial order which will enable any creditor which had no notice of the application to raise any issues of concern.

Stay

[14] Under s. 11.02 of the CCAA, the court may in its initial order make an order staying proceedings, restraining further proceedings or prohibiting the commencement of proceedings against the debtor provided that the stay is no longer than 30 days.

[15] The CCAA's broad remedial purpose is to allow a debtor the opportunity to emerge from financial difficulty with a view to allowing the business to continue, to maximize returns to creditors and other stakeholders and to preserve employment and economic activity. The remedy of a stay is usually essential to achieve this purpose. I am satisfied that the stay of proceedings against the applicants should be granted.

[16] Slightly more unusual is the request for a stay of proceedings against VON Ontario and VON Nova Scotia, neither of which are applicants in these proceedings. However, the evidence of Ms. Poirier establishes that VON Canada is a cost, not a revenue, center and that VON Canada is entirely reliant upon revenues generated by VON Ontario and VON Nova Scotia for its own day-to-day operations. There is a concern that VON Canada's filing of this application could trigger termination or other rights with respect to funding relationships VON Ontario and VON Nova Scotia have with various third party entities which purchase their services. Such actions would create material prejudice to VON Canada's potential restructuring by interrupting its most important revenue stream.

[17] In the circumstances, I am satisfied that the stay requested in respect of VON Ontario and VON Nova Scotia, which is limited only to those steps that third party entities might otherwise take against VON Ontario and VON Nova Scotia *due to the applicants being parties to this proceeding*, is appropriate.

Payment of Pre-filing and Other Obligations

[18] The initial order authorizes, but does not require, payment of outstanding and future wages as well as fees and disbursements for any restructuring assistance, fees and disbursements of the monitor, counsel to the monitor, the chief restructuring officer, the applicants' counsel and counsel to the boards of directors. These are all payments necessary to operate the business on an ongoing basis or to facilitate the restructuring.

[19] The initial order also contemplates payment of liabilities for pre-filing charges incurred on VON group credit cards issued by the Bank of Nova Scotia. The Bank is a secured creditor. It is funding the restructuring (there is no DIP financing or DIP charge). It has agreed to extend credit by continuing to make these cards available on a go forward basis, but conditioned on payment of the pre-filing credit card liabilities. I am satisfied that these measures are necessary for the conduct of the restructuring.

Modified Cash Management System

[20] Historically, net cash flows were not uniform across the VON group entities. This resulted in significant timing differences between inflows and outflows for any particular VON organization. To assist with this lack of uniformity, the VON group entered into an agreement with the Bank of Nova Scotia whereby funds could be effectively pooled among the VON group, outflows and inflows netted out and a net overall cash position for the VON group determined and maintained. At the date of the commencement of these proceedings, the cash balance in the VON Canada pooled account was approximately \$1.8 million. These funds will remain available to the applicants during the CCAA proceedings.

[21] Immediately upon the granting of the initial order, however, the cash management system will be replaced with a new, modified cash management arrangement. Under the new arrangement, the VON Ontario and VON Nova Scotia cash inflows and outflows will take place in a segregated pooling arrangement pursuant to which the consolidated cash position of only those two entities will be maintained.

[22] The applicants will establish their own arrangement under which a consolidated cash position of the applicants will be maintained. Thus, VON Canada, VON East and VON West will continue to utilize their own consolidated cash balance held by those entities collectively.

[23] The segregation of the VON Ontario and VON Nova Scotia cash management is necessary because they are not applicants.

[24] A consolidated cash management arrangement is, however, necessary for the applicants, *inter se*, in order to ensure that the applicants continue to have sufficient liquidity to cover their

costs during these proceedings. Without this arrangement, during the proposed CCAA proceedings VON East and VON West would face periodic cash deficiencies to the detriment of the group as a whole and which would put the orderly wind down of the critical services offered by VON East and VON West at risk.

[25] I am satisfied that the introduction of the new cash management is both necessary and appropriate in order to:

- (a) segregate the cash operations of the VON group entities which are subject to the CCAA proceedings from the VON group entities which are not; and
- (b) allow the applicants in the CCAA proceedings to pool their cash inputs and outputs, which is necessary in order to avoid liquidity crises in respect of VON East and VON West operations during the wind down period.

Proposed Monitor

[26] Under s. 11.7 of the CCAA, the court is required to appoint a monitor. The applicants have proposed Collins Barrow Toronto Limited, which has consented to act as the court-appointed monitor. I accept Collins Barrow as the court appointed monitor.

Chief Restructuring Officer (CRO)

[27] Section 11 of the CCAA provides the court with authority to allow the applicants to enter into arrangements to facilitate restructuring. This includes the retention of expert advisors where necessary to help with the restructuring efforts. March Advisory Services Inc. has worked extensively with VON Canada to date with its pre-court endorsed restructuring efforts and has extensive background knowledge of the VON group's structure and business operations. The VON group lacks internal business transformation and restructuring expertise. VON Canada's "head office" personnel will be fully engaged simply running the business and implementing necessary changes. I am satisfied that March Advisory Services Inc.'s engagement is both appropriate and essential to a successful restructuring effort and that its appointment as CRO should be approved.

[28] Both the VON group and the monitor believe that the quantum and nature of the remuneration to be paid to the CRO is fair and reasonable. I am therefore satisfied that the court should approve the CRO's engagement letter. I am also satisfied that the CRO's engagement letter should be sealed. This sealing order meets the test under the SCC decision in *Sierra Club*. The information is commercially sensitive, in that it could impair the CRO's ability to obtain market rates in other engagements, and the salutary effects of granting the sealing order (enabling March Advisory Services Inc. to accept this assignment) outweigh the minimal impact on the principle of open courts.

Administration Charge

[29] Section 11.52 of the CCAA enables the court to grant an administration charge. In order to grant this charge, the court must be satisfied that notice has been given to the secured creditors likely to be affected by the charge, the amount is appropriate, and the charge extends to all of the proposed beneficiaries.

[30] Due to the confidential nature of this application and the operational issues that would have arisen had prior disclosure of these proceedings been given to all secured creditors, all known secured creditors were not been provided with notice of the initial application. The only secured creditor of the applicants provided with notice is the Bank of Nova Scotia.

[31] For this reason, the proposed initial order provides that the administration charge shall initially rank subordinate to the security interests of all other secured creditors of the applicants with the exception of the Bank of Nova Scotia. The applicants will seek an order providing for the subordination of all other security interests to the administration charge in the near future following notice to all potentially affected secured creditors.

[32] The amount of the administration charge is \$250,000. In the scheme of things, this is a relatively modest amount. The proposed monitor has reviewed the administration charge and has found it reasonable. The beneficiaries of the administrative charge are the monitor and its counsel, counsel to the applicants, the CRO, and counsel to the boards of directors.

[33] The evidence is that the applicants and the proposed monitor believe that the above noted professionals have played and will continue to play a necessary and integral role in the restructuring activities of the applicants.

[34] I am satisfied that the administration charge is required and reasonable in the circumstances to allow the debtor to have access to necessary professional advice to carry out the proposed restructuring.

Directors' Charge

[35] In order to secure indemnities granted by the applicants to their directors and officers and to the CRO for obligations that may be incurred in connection with the restructuring efforts after the commencement of the CCAA proceedings, the applicants seek a directors' charge in favor of the directors and officers and the CRO in the amount of \$750,000.

[36] Section 11.51 of the CCAA allows the court to approve a directors' charge on a priority basis. In order to grant a directors' charge the court must be satisfied that notice has been given to the secured creditors, the amount is appropriate, the applicant could not obtain adequate indemnification for the directors or officers otherwise and the charge does not apply in respect of any obligation incurred by a director or officer as a result of gross negligence or willful misconduct.

[37] As noted above, all known secured creditors have not been provided with notice. For this reason, the applicants propose that the priority of the directors' charge be handled in the same manner as the administration charge.

[38] The evidence of Ms. Poirier shows that there is already a considerable level of directors' and officers' insurance. There is no evidence that this insurance is likely to be discontinued or that the VON group can not or will not be able to continue to pay the premiums. However, given the size of the VON group's operations, the number of employees, the diverse geographic scope in which the group operates, the potential for coverage disputes which always attends on insurance arrangements and the important fact that this board is composed entirely of volunteers, additional protection for the directors to remain involved post-filing is warranted, *Prism Income Fund (Re)*, 2011 ONSC 2061 at para. 45.

[39] The amount of the charge was estimated by taking into consideration the existing directors' and officers' insurance and potential liabilities which may attach including employee related obligations such as outstanding payroll obligations, outstanding vacation pay and liability for remittances to government authorities. This charge only relates to matters arising after the commencement of these proceedings. It also covers the CRO.

[40] The proposed monitor has reviewed and has raised no concerns about the proposed directors' charge.

[41] The director's charge contemplated by the initial order expressly excludes claims that arise as a result of gross negligence or willful misconduct.

[42] For these reasons, I am satisfied that the directors' charge is appropriate in all the circumstances.

Key Employee Retention Plan

[43] The applicants seek approval of a key employee retention plan in the amount of up to \$240,000, payable to key employees during 2016.

[44] This is a specialized business. The experience and knowledge of critical employees is highly valuable to the applicants. These employees have extensive knowledge of and experience with the applicants. The applicants are unlikely to be able to replace critical employees post-filing. Under the contemplated restructuring, the employee ranks of the applicants will be significantly downsized. As a result, there is a strong possibility that certain critical employees will consider other employment options in the absence of retention compensation.

[45] The KERP was approved by the board of directors of the applicants. Provided the arrangements are reasonable, decisions of this kind fall within the business judgment rule as a result of which they are not second-guessed by the courts.

[46] The amount is relatively modest given the size of the operation and the number of employees. I am satisfied that the KERP is reasonable in all the circumstances. I am also

satisfied that the specific allocation of the KERP is reasonably left to the business judgment of the board.

[47] Because the KERP involves sensitive personal compensation information about identifiable individuals, disclosure of this information could be harmful to the beneficiaries of the KERP. I am satisfied that the *Sierra Club* test is met in connection with the sealing of this limited information.

Receivership Order

[48] The *Wage Earner Protection Program Act* was established to make payments to individuals in respect of wages owed to them by employers who are bankrupt or subject to a receivership. The amounts that may be paid under WEPPA to an individual include severance and termination pay as well as vacation pay accrued.

[49] In aggregate, over 300 employees are expected to be terminated at the commencement of these proceedings. These employees will be paid their ordinary course salary and wages up to the date of their terminations. However, the applicants do not have sufficient liquidity to pay these employees' termination or severance pay or accrued vacation pay.

[50] The terminated employees would not be able to enjoy the benefit of the WEPPA in the current circumstances. This is because the WEPPA does not specifically contemplate the effect of proceedings under the CCAA.

[51] A receiver under the WEPPA includes a receiver within the meaning of s. 243(2) of the *Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act*. A receiver under the BIA includes a receiver appointed under the *Courts of Justice Act* if appointed to take control over the debtor's property. Under the WEPPA, an employer is subject to receivership if any property of the employer is in the possession or control of the receiver.

[52] In this case, the applicants seek the appointment of a receiver under s. 101 of the *Courts of Justice Act* to enable the receiver to take possession and control of the applicants' goodwill and intellectual property (i.e., substantially all of the debtor's property *other than* accounts receivable and inventory, which must necessarily remain with the debtors during restructuring).

[53] In *Cinram (Re)* (October 19, 2012), Toronto CV-12-9767-00CL, Morawetz R.S.J. found it was just and convenient to appoint a receiver under s. 101 over certain property of a CCAA debtor within a concurrent CCAA proceeding where the purpose of the receivership was to clarify the position of employees with respect to the WEPPA.

[54] In this case, the evidence is that no stakeholder will be prejudiced by the proposed receivership order. To the contrary, there could be significant prejudice to the terminated employees if there is no receivership and former employees are not able to avail themselves of benefits under the WEPPA.

[55] In the circumstances, I find it is just and convenient to appoint a receiver under s. 101 over the goodwill and intellectual property of the applicants.

Further Notice

[56] I am satisfied that the proposed notice procedure is reasonable and appropriate in the circumstances and it is approved.

Comeback Hearing

[57] In summary, I am satisfied that it is necessary and appropriate to grant CCAA protection to VON Canada, VON East and VON West. There shall be a comeback hearing at 10 a.m. before me on Wednesday, December 9, 2015.

Penny J.

Date: November 27, 2015