

**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
ARRANGEMENT OF THE CASH STORE FINANCIAL
SERVICES INC., THE CASH STORE INC., TCS CASH STORE
INC., INSTALOANS INC., 7252331 CANADA IN., 5515433
MANITOBA INC., 1693926 ALBERTA LTD DOING
BUSINESS AS "THE TITLE STORE"

APPLICANTS

BOOK OF AUTHORITIES

May 11, 2014

OSLER, HOSKIN & HARCOURT LLP
P.O. Box 50, 1 First Canadian Place
Toronto, ON M5X 1B8

Marc Wasserman (LSUC#44066M)
Tel: 416.862.4908
Email: mwasserman@osler.com

Jeremy Dacks (LSUC#41851R)
Tel: 416.862.4923
Email: jdacks@osler.com

Counsel for the Chief Restructuring Officer to
the Applicants

SERVICE LIST

<i>Party/Counsel</i>	<i>Telephone</i>	<i>Facsimile</i>	<i>Party Represented</i>
Rothschild 1251 Avenue of the Americas, 33 rd Floor New York, NY 10020 Neil Augustine Email: nycprojectoilers@rothschild.com Bernard Douton Email: nycprojectoilers@rothschild.com	212.403.3500 212.403.5411 212.403.5254	212.403.3501	Financial Advisors to the CRO
Cassels Brock & Blackwell LLP 2100 Scotia Plaza 40 King Street West Toronto ON M5H 3C2 Wendy Berman Email: wberman@casselsbrock.com Ryan C. Jacobs Email: rjacobs@casselsbrock.com Lara Jackson Email: ljackson@casselsbrock.com	416.869.5300 416.860.2926 416.860.6465 416.860.2907	416.640.3107 416.640.3189 416.640.3108	Counsel to the Applicants
FTI Consulting Canada Inc. TD Waterhouse Tower 79 Wellington Street West Suite 2010, P.O. Box 104 Toronto ON M4K 1G8 Greg Watson Email: greg.watson@fticonsulting.com Jeff Rosenberg Email: jeffrey.rosenberg@fticonsulting.com	416.649.8077	416.649.8101	Monitor
McCarthy Tétrault Suite 5300, TD Bank Tower Box 48, 66 Wellington Street West Toronto ON M5K 1E6 James Gage Email: jgage@mccarthy.ca Heather Meredith Email: hmeredith@mccarthy.ca	416.362.1812 416.601.7539 416.601.8342	416.868.0673	Counsel for the Monitor

<i>Party/Counsel</i>	<i>Telephone</i>	<i>Facsimile</i>	<i>Party Represented</i>
<p>Goodmans LLP Bay Adelaide Centre 333 Bay Street, Suite 3400 Toronto ON M5H 2S7</p> <p>Robert J. Chadwick Email: rchadwick@goodmans.ca</p> <p>Brendan O’Neill Email: boneill@goodmans.ca</p>	<p>416. 979.2211</p> <p>416.597.4285</p> <p>416.849.6017</p>	<p>416. 979.1234</p>	<p>Counsel for <i>Ad Hoc</i> Noteholders</p>
<p>Norton Rose Fulbright Canada LLP Suite 3800, Royal Bank Plaza, South Tower 200 Bay Street, P.O. Box 84 Toronto, ON M5J 2Z4</p> <p>Orestes Pasparakis Email: orestes.pasparakis@nortonrosefulbright.com</p> <p>Alan Merskey Email: Alan.Merskey@nortonrosefulbright.com</p> <p>Virginie Gauthier Email: virginie.gauthier@nortonrosefulbright.com</p> <p>Alex Schmitt Email: alexander.schmitt@nortonrosefulbright.com</p>	<p>416.216.4000</p> <p>416.216.4815</p> <p>416.216.4805</p> <p>416.216.4853</p> <p>416.216.2419</p>	<p>416.216.3930</p>	<p>Counsel for Coliseum Capital Management</p>
<p>Bennett Jones LLP 4500 Bankers Hall East 855 2nd Street SW Calgary, AB T2P 4K7</p> <p>Grant Stapon Email: stapong@bennettjones.com</p> <p>Kenneth Lenz Email: lenzk@bennettjones.com</p> <p>Robert W. Staley Email: staleyr@bennettjones.com</p> <p>Raj S. Sahni sahnir@bennettjones.com</p> <p>Jonathan G. Bell bellj@bennettjones.com</p>	<p>403.298.3100</p> <p>403.298.3204</p> <p>403.298.3317</p> <p>416.777.4857</p> <p>416.777.4804</p> <p>416.777.6511</p>	<p>403.265.7219</p> <p>416.863.1716</p>	<p>Counsel for McCann Family Holding Corporation</p>

<i>Party/Counsel</i>	<i>Telephone</i>	<i>Facsimile</i>	<i>Party Represented</i>
<p>McMillan LLP Brookfield Place 181 Bay Street, Suite 4400 Toronto, ON M5J 2T3</p> <p>Adam C. Maerov Email: adam.maerov@mcmillan.ca</p> <p>Brett Harrison Email: brett.harrison@mcmillan.ca</p>	<p>403.531.4700</p> <p>403.215.2752</p> <p>416.865.7932</p>	<p>416.865.7048</p>	<p>Counsel for Trimor Annuity Focus LP #5</p>
<p>Computershare Trust Company of Canada and Computershare Trust Company, NA 100 University Avenue 11th Floor, North Tower Toronto, ON M5J 2Y1</p> <p>Patricia Wakelin, Corporate Trust Officer Email: patricia.wakelin@computershare.com</p> <p>Shelley Bloomberg, Manager, Corporate Trust Email: Shelley.Bloomberg@computershare.com</p> <p>Mohanie Shivprasad, Associate Trust Officer Email: mohanie.shivprasad@computershare.com</p> <p>Tina Vitale, Manager Email: tina.vitale@computershare.com</p> <p>John Wahl, Corporate Trust Officer Email: john.wahl@computershare.com</p>	<p>416.263.9317</p> <p>416.263.9322</p> <p>303.262.0707</p>	<p>416.981.9777</p> <p>514.981.7677</p>	<p>Collateral Trustee under the Collateral Trust and Intercreditor Agreement</p>
<p>Dickinson Wright LLP 199 Bay Street, Suite 2200, P.O. Box 447 Commerce Court Postal Station Toronto, ON M5L 1G4</p> <p>Michael A. Weinczok Email: mweinczok@dickinsonwright.com</p> <p>David P. Preger Email: Dpreger@dickinsonwright.com</p>	<p>416.777.4026</p> <p>416.646.4606</p>	<p>416.865.1398</p>	<p>Lawyers for Computershare and agents for Perkins Coie LLP, US counsel to Computershare</p>

<i>Party/Counsel</i>	<i>Telephone</i>	<i>Facsimile</i>	<i>Party Represented</i>
<p>Perkins Coie LLP 30 Rockefeller Plaza 22nd Floor New York, New York 10112-0085</p> <p>Tina Moss Email: tmoss@perkinscoie.com</p> <p>Ronald Sarubbi Email: rsarubbi@perkinscoie.com</p>	<p>212.262.6910</p> <p>212.262.6914</p>	<p>212.977.1648</p> <p>212.977.1644</p>	<p>Counsel to Computershare Trust Company</p>
<p>Borden Ladner Gervais Centennial Place, East Tower 1900, 520 – 3rd Ave SW Calgary, AB, T2P 0R3</p> <p>Josef G.A. Kruger Email: jkruger@blg.com</p> <p>Patrick T. McCarthy Email: PMcCarthy@blg.com</p>	<p>403.232.9500</p> <p>403.232.9563</p> <p>403.232.9441</p>	<p>403.266.1395</p>	<p>Counsel to the Trustee in Bankruptcy for Assistive Financial Corp.</p>
<p>Harrison Pensa LLP 450 Talbot St. London, ON N6A 5J6</p> <p>Jonathan Foreman Email: jforeman@harrisonpensa.com</p> <p>Genevieve Meisenheimer gmeisenheimer@harrisonpensa.com</p>	<p>519.679.9660</p> <p>519.661.6775</p> <p>519.850.5558</p>	<p>519.667.3362</p>	<p>Counsel to the Plaintiff and the proposed class members in a proposed Ontario class action against Cash Store</p>
<p>Koskie Minsky LLP 20 Queen Street West, Suite 900 Toronto, Ontario M5H 3R3</p> <p>Andrew J. Hatnay Email: ahatnay@kmlaw.ca</p> <p>James Harnum Email: jharnum@kmlaw.ca</p> <p>Adrian Scotchmer Email: ascotchmer@kmlaw.ca</p>	<p>416.977.8353</p> <p>416.595.2083</p> <p>416.542.6285</p> <p>416.542.6292</p>	<p>416.977.3316</p> <p>416.204.2872</p> <p>416.204.2819</p> <p>416.204.4926</p>	<p>Agent to Plaintiff's Counsel in the class action (Harrison Pensa LLP)</p>

<i>Party/Counsel</i>	<i>Telephone</i>	<i>Facsimile</i>	<i>Party Represented</i>
<p>Duncan Craig LLP 2800 Scotia Place, 10060 Jasper Ave Edmonton, AB T5J 3V9</p> <p>Darren Bieganek, Q.C. Email: dbieganek@dcllp.com</p>	<p>780.428.6036</p> <p>780.441.4386</p>	<p>780.428.9683</p> <p>780.969.6381</p>	<p>Counsel for Cameron Schiffner, former Senior Vice- President, Operations, The Cash Store Financial Services Inc.</p>
<p>Siskinds LLP 100 Lombard Street Suite 302 Toronto, ON M5C 1M3</p> <p>Charles M. Wright Email: charles.wright@siskinds.com</p> <p>Serge Kalloghlian Email: serge.kalloghlian@siskinds.com</p> <p>Alex Dimson Email: alex.dimson@siskinds.com</p>	<p>416.362.8334</p> <p>416.362.8334 Ext. 226</p>	<p>416.362.2610</p> <p>416.362.2610</p>	<p>Counsel to Ad Hoc Committee of Purchasers of the Applicant's Securities, including the Representative Plaintiff in the Ontario Class</p>
<p>Lax O'Sullivan Scott Lisus LLP Suite 2750, 145 King Street West Toronto, ON M5H 1J8</p> <p>Eric R. Hoaken Email: ehoaken@counsel-toronto.com</p> <p>JJS Barristers Suite 800, The Lancaster Building 304 - 8 Avenue SW Calgary, AB T2P 1C2</p> <p>Robert Hawkes, Q.C. Email: hawkesr@jssbarristers.ca</p>	<p>416.598.1744</p> <p>416.645.5075</p> <p>403.571.1544</p>	<p>416.598.3730</p> <p>403.571.1528</p>	<p>Counsel for DirectCash Bank, DirectCash ATM Processing Partnership, DirectCash ATM Management Partnership, DirectCash Payments Inc., DirectCash Management Inc. and DirectCash Canada Limited Partnership ("DirectCash") who are codefendants with The Cash Store Financial Services Inc. and The Cash Store Inc. (the</p>

<i>Party/Counsel</i>	<i>Telephone</i>	<i>Facsimile</i>	<i>Party Represented</i>
			“Cash Store”) in class action (Court File No. 7908/12CP)
Dentons Canada LLP 850 - 2nd Street SW 15th Floor, Bankers Court Calgary, AB T2P 0R8 David Mann Email: david.mann@dentons.com	403.268.7000 403.268.7097	403.268.3100	Counsel to Direct Cash in all matters pertaining to this restructuring other than the class action (Court File No. 7908/12CP)
Omini Ventures Ltd. Bruce Cormie Email: muskytoe@hotmail.com			Third Party Lender
L-Gen Management Inc. Vernon Nelson Email: vmnelson7@hotmail.com			Third Party Lender
1396309 Alberta Ltd. Bruce Hull Email: bruce.hull@hotmail.com			Third Party Lender
Hewlett-Packard Financial Services Canada Company 5150 Spectrum Way Mississauga, ON L4W 5G1			
CIT Financial Ltd. 5035 South Service Road Burlington, ON L7R 4C8			
National Leasing Group Inc. 1525 Buffalo Place Winnipeg, MB R3T 1L9			
De Lage Landen Financial Services Canada Inc. 3450 Superior Court, Unit 1 Oakville, ON L6L 0C4			

<i>Party/Counsel</i>	<i>Telephone</i>	<i>Facsimile</i>	<i>Party Represented</i>
GE VFS CANADA LIMITED PARTNERSHIP 2300 Meadowdale Blvd. Suite 200 Mississauga, ON L5N 5P9			
Roynat Inc. Suite 1500, 4710 Kingsway St. Burnaby, BC V5H 4M2			
Pattison Sign Group A Division of Jim Pattison Industries Ltd. 555 Ellesmere Rd. Toronto, ON M1R 4E8			
Mercedes-Benz Financial Services Canada Corporation 2680 Matheson Blvd. E., Ste. 500 Mississauga, ON L4W 0A5			
National Neon Displays Limited #12, 1115-48th Avenue SE Calgary, AB T2G 2A7			
Maximum Financial Services Inc. 30 Vogell Road, Unit 1 Richmond Hill, ON L4B 3K6			
Honda Canada Financial Ltd. 110 13711 International Place, Richmond BC V6V 2Z8			
Hordo Bennett Mounteer LLP 1400-128 West Pender Vancouver, BC V6B 1R8 Paul R. Bennett Email: pb@hbmlaw.com Mark W. Mounteer Email: mm@hbmlaw.com	604.639.3680 604.639.3668 604.639.3667	604.639.3681	Counsel for the Plaintiffs in 8 class proceedings commenced against Cash Store.

Book of Authorities

Case Law

1. *Re Air Canada* (2004), 47 C.B.R. (4th) 169, 2004 CarswellOnt 469 (Ont. S.C.J. [Commercial List])
2. *Re Biltrite Rubber (1984) Inc.* (2009), 176 A.C.W.S. (3d) 24, 2009 CarswellOnt 1541 (Ont. S.C.J. [Commercial List])
3. *Re Comstock Canada Ltd.*, 2013 ONSC 6043, 2013 CarswellOnt 13598 (Ont. S.C.J. [Commercial List])
4. *Re Grant Forest Products Inc.* (2009), 57 C.B.R. (5th) 128, 2009 CarswellOnt 4699 (Ont. S.C.J. [Commercial List])
5. *Re Nortel Networks Corp.* (2009), 175 A.C.W.S. (3d), 2009 CarswellOnt 1330 (Ont. S.C.J. [Commercial List])
6. *Re Nortel Networks Corp.*, (2009), 176 A.C.W.S. (3d) 19, 2009 CarswellOnt 1519 (Ont. S.C.J. [Commercial List])
7. *Re Northland Properties Ltd.* (1988), 73 C.B.R. (N.S.) 141, 1988 CarswellBC 553 (B.C. S.C.)
8. *Re Rio Nevada Energy Inc.*, 2000 CarswellAlta 1584, [2000] A.J. No. 1596 (A.B. Q.B.)
9. *Re Sharp-Rite Technologies Ltd.* (2000), 19 C.B.R. (4th) 130, 2000 CarswellBC 1365 (B.C. S.C.)
10. *Re Ted Leroy Trucking [Century Services] Ltd.*, 2010 SCC 60, 2010 CarswellBC 3419 (S.C.C.)
11. *Re Timminco Ltd.*, 2012 ONSC 2515, 2012 CarswellOnt 5390 (Ont. S.C.J. [Commercial List])

TAB 1

2004 CarswellOnt 469
Ontario Superior Court of Justice [Commercial List]

Air Canada, Re

2004 CarswellOnt 469, 47 C.B.R. (4th) 169

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

AND IN THE MATTER OF SECTION 191 OF THE CANADA
BUSINESS CORPORATIONS ACT, R.S.C. 1985, c. C-44, AS AMENDED

AND IN THE MATTER OF A PLAN OF COMPROMISE OR ARRANGEMENT
OF AIR CANADA AND THOSE SUBSIDIARIES LISTED ON SCHEDULE "A"

APPLICATION UNDER THE COMPANIES' CREDITORS
ARRANGEMENT ACT, R.S.C. 1985, c. C-36, AS AMENDED

Farley J.

Heard: January 16, 2004
Judgment: January 16, 2004
Docket: 03-CL-4932

Counsel: Sean F. Dunphy, Ashley John Taylor for Air Canada
Peter J. Osborne, Peter H. Griffin for Monitor
Howard Gorman for Ad Hoc Unsecured Creditors Committee
Aubrey Kauffman for Ad Hoc Committee of Various Creditors
Jay Swartz for Deutsche Bank
Mark Gelowitz for Trinity Time Investments
Robert Thornton, Gregory Azeff for GE Capital Aviation Services Inc.
J. Porter for Cerberus
Kevin McElcheran for CIBC
Murray Gold for CUPE
Ian Dick for AG Canada
James Tory for Air Canada Board
Joseph J. Bellissimo for Aircraft Lessor/Lender Group
Terri Hilborn for Unionized Retiree Committee
William Sasso, Sharon Strosberg for Mizuho International, PLC
Jim Dube for Deutsche Lufthansa A.G.

Subject: Insolvency; Corporate and Commercial

Related Abridgment Classifications

For all relevant Canadian Abridgment Classifications refer to highest level of case via History.

Headnote

**Bankruptcy and insolvency --- Proposal --- Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act --- Arrangements --- Approval
by court --- "Fair and reasonable"**

Debtor applied for approval of indemnity, amendments to equity plan, and global restructuring agreements — Application granted — Indemnity was customary and not opposed — Amendments were recommended by monitor and opposed by only one interested party — Board, in exercising its fiduciary duties, properly considered alternative proposal before choosing equity programme sponsor — Restructuring agreement was fair and reasonable and on balance beneficial to debtor and interested parties generally — Court must look at interests of creditors generally and objecting creditors specifically — Rights may be compromised but not confiscated in attempt to balance interests — Agreement had to be either taken as package or rejected — Delay and uncertainty resulting from rejection of agreement would likely be devastating for debtor.

Table of Authorities

Cases considered by *Farley J.*:

Canadian Red Cross Society / Société Canadienne de la Croix-Rouge, Re (1998), 72 O.T.C. 99, 1998 CarswellOnt 3346, 5 C.B.R. (4th) 299 (Ont. Gen. Div. [Commercial List]) — referred to

Northland Properties Ltd., Re (1989), (sub nom. *Northland Properties Ltd. v. Excelsior Life Insurance Co. of Canada*) 34 B.C.L.R. (2d) 122, (sub nom. *Northland Properties Ltd. v. Excelsior Life Insurance Co. of Canada*) 73 C.B.R. (N.S.) 195, (sub nom. *Northland Properties Ltd. v. Excelsior Life Insurance Co. of Canada*) [1989] 3 W.W.R. 363, 1989 CarswellBC 334 (B.C. C.A.) — referred to

Royal Bank v. Soundair Corp. (1991), 7 C.B.R. (3d) 1, 83 D.L.R. (4th) 76, 46 O.A.C. 321, 4 O.R. (3d) 1, 1991 CarswellOnt 205 (Ont. C.A.) — referred to

Sammi Atlas Inc., Re (1998), 1998 CarswellOnt 1145, 3 C.B.R. (4th) 171 (Ont. Gen. Div. [Commercial List]) — followed

820099 Ontario Inc. v. Harold E. Ballard Ltd. (1991), 3 B.L.R. (2d) 123, 1991 CarswellOnt 142 (Ont. Gen. Div.) — referred to

820099 Ontario Inc. v. Harold E. Ballard Ltd. (1991), 3 B.L.R. (2d) 113, 1991 CarswellOnt 141 (Ont. Div. Ct.) — referred to

Statutes considered:

Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act, R.S.C. 1985, c. C-36

Generally — considered

APPLICATION for approval of various agreements under *Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act*.

Farley J.:

1 These reasons deal with three matters which the court was asked to approve Air Canada (AC) entering into various agreements; simply put they were as follows:

- (1) the Merrill Lynch (ML) indemnity;
- (2) the entering into the amendments to the Trinity Agreement; and
- (3) the Global Restructuring Agreements (GRA).

ML Indemnity

2 There was no opposition to this. The court was advised that such an indemnity was customarily given and that the terms of this particular one were such as is normally given. I therefore approve AC granting such an indemnity to ML.

Trinity Amendments

3 As I understood the submissions this morning, Mizuho a member of the Unsecured Creditors Committee (UCC) was the only interested party which spoke out against the Trinity amendments. It continues to be dissatisfied with the process by which Trinity was selected as the equity plan sponsor. I merely point out, once again, that this process was not of the Court's choosing but rather one which AC commenced on notice to the service list and as to which there were no objections before Trinity was selected on November 8, 2003 (together with the "fiduciary out" provision contained in its proposal). Aside from the court approvals envisaged by that process, the court only became involved when it was appreciated that there were some difficulties with the practical implementation of the process.

4 I further understand that the Ad Hoc Committee of Various Creditors (CVC) withdrew its opposition yesterday along with its cross motion. The UCC (one assumes on some majority basis) supported the Trinity Amendments but indicated that, as a sounding board, it wished to continue sounding that it still had concerns about aspects of corporate governance and management incentives.

5 I have no doubt, if adjustments in any particular area make sense between the signatories (AC and Trinity) and to the extent that any beneficiaries are involved, that such adjustments will be made for everyone's overall benefit (everyone in the sense of AC including all of its stakeholders including creditors, labour, management, pensioners, etc.) not only for the short term interests but the long term interests of AC emerging from these CCAA proceedings as an ongoing viable enterprise on into the future, well able to serve the public (both Canadian and foreign). A harmonious relationship with trust and respect flowing in all directions amongst the stakeholders will be to everyone's long term advantage. With respect to corporate governance though, I am able to make a more direct observation. A director, no matter who nominates that person, owes duties and obligations to the corporation, not the nominator: see *820099 Ontario Inc. v. Harold E. Ballard Ltd.* (1991), 3 B.L.R. (2d) 113 (Ont. Div. Ct.), at 123, aff'd (1991), 3 B.L.R. (2d) 123 (Ont. Gen. Div.).

6 There was no evidence to show that the Board of AC in exercising its fiduciary duties did not properly consider on a quantitative and qualitative basis the factors (on a pro and con basis) relating to whether Cerberus had provided a Superior Proposal (as that was defined in section 9 of the Trinity Agreement approved earlier by this Court). Indeed there was no complaint from Cerberus in this respect. The Board's letter to me of December 22, 2003 carefully reviewed the considerations which the Board (with the assistance of Seabury and ML, together with the general oversight and views of the Monitor) gave in their deliberations with their ultimate decision that the Cerberus December 10, 2003 proposal was not a Superior Proposal with the result that the Board has selected Trinity to be the equity program sponsor in accordance with the Trinity amended deal. I approve AC executing the Trinity amended deal and implementing same, with the recognition and proviso that there may be further amendments/adjustments which may be entered into subject to the guidelines of my discussion above. I note in particular that the UCC helpfully pointed out that section 7.3 still needs to be modified, and that is being worked on. The Air Canada Pilots Association observed that there still needed to be some fine-tuning at para. 22 of its factum noting that: "These matters of the detailed implementation of the Amended Trinity Investment Agreement can all be resolved by good faith negotiations between Air Canada, Trinity and affected stakeholders, with the assistance and support of the Monitor"; I did not have the benefit of any submissions in this regard (para.22) nor was any expected to either be given or taken as the parties all appreciated that this was not to be an exercise in "nitpicking".

7 At paragraph 71 of its 19th report, the Monitor stated:

71. The Monitor is of the continuing view that the Equity Solicitation Process must be completed as soon as possible. The restructuring process and many other restructuring initiatives have been delayed by approximately two months as a

result of the continued uncertainty concerning the selection of the equity plan sponsor. The equity solicitation process must be concluded so that the balance of the restructuring process can be completed before the expiry on April 30, 2004 of the financing commitments from each of Trinity, GECC and DB pursuant to the Standby Agreement. The Monitor recommends that this Honourable Court approve the Company's motion seeking approval of the Amended Trinity Investment Agreement.

8 I would therefore approve the Trinity amendments so that AC can proceed to enter into and implement the Amended Trinity Investment Agreement. I note that this approval is not intended to determine any rights which third parties may have.

GRA

9 As with the previous approvals, I take the requirement under the CCAA is that approval of the Court may be given where there is consistency with the purpose and spirit of that legislation, a conclusion by the Court that as a primary consideration, the transaction is fair and reasonable and will be beneficial to the debtor and its stakeholders generally: see *Northland Properties Ltd., Re* (1989), 73 C.B.R. (N.S.) 195 (B.C. C.A.), at 201. In *Canadian Red Cross Society / Société Canadienne de la Croix-Rouge, Re* (1998), 5 C.B.R. (4th) 299 (Ont. Gen. Div. [Commercial List]), Blair J. at p. 316 adopted the principles in *Royal Bank v. Soundair Corp.* (1991), 7 C.B.R. (3d) 1 (Ont. C.A.) as an appropriate guideline for determining when an agreement or transaction should be approved during a CCAA restructuring but prior to the actual plan of reorganization being in place. In *Sammi Atlas Inc., Re* (1998), 3 C.B.R. (4th) 171 (Ont. Gen. Div. [Commercial List]), I observed at p. 173 that in considering what is fair and reasonable treatment, one must look at the creditors as a whole (i.e. generally) and to the objecting creditors (specifically) and see if rights are compromised in an attempt to balance interests (and have the pain of the compromise equitably shared) as opposed to the confiscation of rights. I think that philosophy should be applicable to the circumstances here involving the various stakeholders. As I noted immediately above in *Sammi Atlas Inc.*, equitable treatment is not necessarily equal treatment.

10 The Monitor's 19th report at paragraphs 20-21 indicates that:

20. The GRA provides the following benefits for Air Canada:

- The retention of a significant portion of its fleet of core aircraft, spare engines and flight simulators, which are critical to its ongoing operations;
- The restructuring of obligations with respect to 106 of 107 Air Canada and Jazz air operating, parked and undelivered aircraft (effective immediately for 12 GECC-managed aircraft and upon exit from CCAA for the remaining 94 GECC-owned aircraft, except as indicated below), including lease rate reductions on 51 aircraft (of which 3 aircraft have been returned as of the current date), cash flow relief for 29 aircraft, termination of the Applicants' obligations with respect to 20 parked aircraft (effective immediately), the cancellation of 4 future aircraft lease commitments and the restructuring of the overall obligations with respect to 2 aircraft. Obligations with respect to the last remaining aircraft remain unaffected as it is management's view that this lease was already at market;
- Exit financing of approximately US\$585 million (the "Exit Facility") to be provided by GECC upon the Company's emergence from CCAA;
- Aircraft financing up to a maximum of US\$950 million (the "RJ Aircraft Financing") to be provided by GECC and to be used by Air Canada to finance the future purchase of approximately 43 regional jet aircraft; and
- The surrender of any distribution on account of any deficiency claims under the CCAA Plan with respect to GECC-owned aircraft only, without in any way affecting GECC's right to vote on the Plan in respect of any deficiency claim.

21. In return for these restructuring and financing commitments, the GRA provides for the following:

- Payment of all current aircraft rent by Air Canada to GECC, during the interim period until emergence from CCAA proceedings, at contractual lease rates for GECC-owned aircraft and at revised lease rates for GECC-managed aircraft;
- The delivery of notes refinancing existing obligations to GECC in connection with 2 B747-400 cross-collateralized leases (the "B747 Restructuring") including one note convertible into equity of the restructured Air Canada at GECC's option;
- The delivery of stock purchase warrants (the "Warrants") for the purchase of an additional 4% of the common stock of the Company at a strike price equal to the price paid by any equity plan sponsor; and
- The cross-collateralization of all GECC and affiliate obligations (the "Interfacility Collateralization Agreement") on Air Canada's emergence from CCAA proceedings for a certain period of time.

The Monitor concluded at paragraph 70:

70. The Monitor notes that, if considered on their own, the lease concessions provided to Air Canada by GECC pursuant to the GRA differ substantially from those being provided by other aircraft lessors. In addition, the Monitor notes that GECC has benefitted from the cross collateralization on 22 aircraft pursuant to the CCAA Credit Facility and Interfacility Collateralization Agreement, particularly as it relates to the settlement of Air Canada's obligations to GECC under the B747 Restructuring. However, the Monitor also notes that the substantial benefits provided to Air Canada under the GRA including the availability of US \$585 million of exit financing and US\$950 million of regional jet aircraft financing are significant and critical to the Company's emergence from CCAA proceedings in an expedited manner. In the Monitor's view the financial benefits provided to Air Canada under the GRA outweigh the costs to the Applicants' estate arising as a result of the cross collateralization benefit provided to GECC under the CCAA Credit Facility and Interfacility Collateralization Agreement. Accordingly, the Monitor recommends to this Honourable Court that the GRA be approved.

11 The GRA was opposed by the UCC (again apparently on some majority basis as one of its members, Cara, was indicated as being in favour and I also understand that Lufthansa was also supportive); the UCC's position was supplemented by separate submissions by another of its members, CIBC. I agree with the position of the UCC that the concern of the court is not with respect to the past elements of the DIP financing by GE and the cross-collateralization of 22 aircraft that agreement provided for. I also note the position of the UCC that it recognizes that the GRA is a package deal which cannot be cherry picked by any stakeholder nor modified by the Court; the UCC accepts that the GRA must be either taken as a package deal or rejected. It suggested that GE, if the court rejects the GRA as advocated by the UCC, will not abandon the field but rather it will stay and negotiate terms which the UCC feels would be more appropriate. That may be true but I would observe that in my view the delay and uncertainty involved would likely be devastating for AC. Would AC be able to meet the April 30, 2004 deadline for the Trinity deal which requires that the GRA be in place? What would the effect be upon the booking public?

12 I note that the UCC complains that other creditors are not being given equal treatment. However, counsel for another large group of aircraft lessors and financiers indicated that they had no difficulty with the GRA. Indeed, it seems to me that GE is in a somewhat significantly different position than the other creditors given the aforesaid commitment to provide an Exit Facility and an RJ facility. Trinity and Deutsche Bank (DB) with respect to their proposed inflow of \$1 billion in equity would be subordinate to GE; this new money (as opposed to sunk old money of the UCC and as well as that of the other creditors) supports the GRA. I note as well although it is "past history" that GE has compromised a significant portion of its \$2 billion claim for existing commitments down to \$1.4 billion, while at the same time committing to funding of large amounts for future purposes, all at a time when the airline industry generally does not have ready access to such.

13 With respect to the two 747 LILOs (lease in, lease out), there is the concession that AC will enjoy any upside potential in an after marketing while being shielded from any further downside. GE has also provided AC with some liquidity funding assistance by deferring some of its charges to a latter period post emergence. Further it has been calculated that as to post filing arrears, there will be a true up on emergence and assuming that would be March 31, 2004, it is expected that there would be a wash as between AC and GE, with a slight "advantage" to AC if emergence were later. I pause to note here that emergence

sooner rather than later is in my view in everyone's best interests - and that everyone should focus on that and give every reasonable assistance and cooperation.

14 With respect to the snapback rights, I note that AC would be able to eliminate same by repaying the LILO notes and the Tranche Loans and AC would be legally permitted to eliminate this concern 180 days post emergence. I recognize that AC would be in a much stronger functional and psychological bargaining position to obtain replacement funding post emergence than it is now able to do while in CCAA protection proceedings. I would assume that such a project would be a financial priority for AC post emergence and that timing should not prevent AC from starting to explore that possibility in the near future (even before emergence). I also note that GE anticipates that the snapback rights would not likely come into play, given, I take it, its analysis of the present and future condition of AC and its experience and expertise in the field. I take it *as a side note* that GE from this observation by it will not have a quick trigger finger notwithstanding the specific elements in the definition of Events of Default; that of course may only be commercial reality - and that could of course change, but one would think that GE would have to be concerned about its ongoing business reputation and thus have to justify such action. Snapback rights only come into existence upon emergence, not on the entry into the GRA.

15 I conclude that on balance the GRA is beneficial to AC and its stakeholders; in my view it is fair and reasonable and in the best interests of AC. It will permit AC to get on with the remaining and significant steps its needs to accomplish before it can emerge. The same goes for the Trinity deal. I therefore approve AC's entering into and implementing the GRA, subject to the same considerations as to completing the documentation and making amendments/adjustments as I discussed above in *Trinity Amendments*.

16 Orders accordingly.

Application granted.

TAB 4

2009 CarswellOnt 1541
Ontario Superior Court of Justice [Commercial List]

Bilrite Rubber (1984) Inc., Re

2009 CarswellOnt 1541, 176 A.C.W.S. (3d) 24

**IN THE MATTER OF THE COMPANIES' CREDITORS ARRANGEMENT ACT,
R.S.C., c. C-36, AS AMENDED AND IN THE MATTER OF A PLAN OF
COMPROMISE OR ARRANGEMENT OF BILRITE RUBBER (1984) INC. AND
BILRITE RUBBER, INC. (Applicants)**

Morawetz J.

Heard: March 12, 2009
Judgment: March 20, 2009
Docket: CV-09-0867-00CL

Counsel: Jason Wadden, Logan Willis for Applicants
Jay Swartz for Monitor, RSM Richter, Inc.
Jessica Caplan, Mario Forte for Royal Bank of Canada

Subject: Insolvency

Related Abridgment Classifications

For all relevant Canadian Abridgment Classifications refer to highest level of case via History.

Headnote

Bankruptcy and insolvency --- Proposal — Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act — Miscellaneous issues

Table of Authorities

Statutes considered:

Bankruptcy Code, 11 U.S.C. 1982
Chapter 15 — referred to

Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act, R.S.C. 1985, c. C-36

Generally — referred to

s. 2 “debtor company” — referred to

s. 11(2) — referred to

Morawetz J.:

1 The Applicants move for an Initial Order under the CCAA with the objective of ensuring that they can operate as a going concern while seeking to effectuate a restructuring or a sale of assets.

2 Bilrite Rubber (1984) Inc. (“Bilrite”) and Bilrite Rubber, Inc. (“Bilrite US”) collectively do business under the trade name “Bilrite Industries”, and are collectively referred to as “Bilrite Group”.

3 Bilrite is an Ontario company with a head office located in Toronto. Bilrite owns or controls all of the Bilrite Group’s operating assets and liabilities situated in Canada.

4 Bilrite owns all of the shares of Bilrite US. Bilrite is a co-borrower with Bilrite US of the Bilrite Group’s secured bank debt.

5 Bilrite US is a company incorporated under the laws of Ohio with its business headquarters in the same premises as Bilrite in Toronto. Bilrite has no material assets in Canada; however it has a bank account in Toronto, which contained approximately US \$100 as of March 6, 2009.

6 The Bilrite Group has acknowledged that it is insolvent. Each of Bilrite and Bilrite US have liabilities well in excess of \$5 million. The total amount owing to the secured creditor, Royal Bank of Canada (“RBC”), as of March 6, 2009 is \$17.2 million. Bilrite Group’s lending facility with RBC is in default. Bilrite Group has been operating under various Forbearance Agreements since March 2008.

7 Bilrite Group has recently been attempting to recapitalize through either a sale/leaseback agreement or through a refinancing. Attempts to recapitalize have been unsuccessful.

8 Bilrite Group submits that a filing under the CCAA is necessary in order to maintain existing customers and thereby preserve the value of the business.

9 I am satisfied that the Applicants are “debtor companies” within the meaning of section 2 of the CCAA. In this respect, I accept the submission of counsel for the Applicants that Biltrite US has met the threshold statutory requirements of the CCAA, albeit on a technical basis.

10 The Applicants’ required statement of projected cash flow and other financial documents required under subsection 11(2) of the CCAA have been filed.

11 RBC has indicated that it is only willing to provide further funding in the context of a restructuring or sale of the Biltrite Group pursuant to the CCAA Proceedings on a first priority basis (“DIP Financing”). It is expected that, without RBC’s continuing support, the Biltrite Group would have to cease operations.

12 RBC has also made its support for the CCAA Proceedings conditional upon the Monitor carrying out a sale process. The Initial Order contemplates that the Monitor will carry out the Sales Process and that such Sales Process will be carried out in parallel to the restructuring efforts.

13 RSM Richter Inc. is the proposed Monitor and a Report of the Proposed Monitor has been filed.

14 The Proposed Monitor has commented that it believes that the terms of the DIP Facility are reasonable and, as well, that the Sales Process is appropriate in this situation given the Company’s liquidity issues and the size of its business.

15 Biltrite has also proposed that the Initial Order provide for an Administrative Charge to a maximum of \$750,000 and a Director’s Charge to a maximum of \$450,000. These charges are in addition to the DIP Lenders’ Charge. It seems to me that, in the circumstances, these charges are necessary.

16 Biltrite has also proposed a Key Employee Retention Program (“KERP”) for certain critical employees. Based on discussions with management, it is the Proposed Monitors’ view that these employees are critical to the performance of the business and further that the payments contemplated by the KERP are reasonable in the circumstances.

17 In my view, the granting of an Initial Order is appropriate. The Order shall incorporate the charges referenced above in order of the priority described in the draft order. Approval is also provided for the DIP Facility, the Sales Process and the Key Employee Retention Program.

18 RSM Richter Inc. is appointed Monitor and the Stay Termination Date is established as April 13, 2009. The Order shall issue in the form presented.

19 Counsel to the Applicants advised that the Biltrite Group, with the support of RBC and the assistance of the Monitor as foreign representative, intend to concurrently commence proceedings in respect of the Biltrite Group under Chapter 15 of the

TAB 5

2013 ONSC 6043
Ontario Superior Court of Justice [Commercial List]

Comstock Canada Ltd., Re

2013 CarswellOnt 13598, 2013 ONSC 6043, 235 A.C.W.S. (3d) 878, 8 C.B.R. (6th) 142

**In the Matter of the Companies' Creditors
Arrangement Act, R.S.C. 1985, c. C-36, as Amended**

In the Matter of a Plan of Compromise or Arrangement of Comstock
Canada Ltd., CCL Equities Inc., and CCL Realty Inc. Applicant

Morawetz J.

Heard: September 16, 2013
Judgment: September 26, 2013
Docket: CV-13-10181-00CL

Counsel: Alex MacFarlane, Frank Lamie for Applicants, Comstock Canada Ltd., CCL Equities
Inc., and CCL Realty Inc.

Aubrey Kauffman for Honeywell Limited

Robin Schwill for PricewaterhouseCoopers Inc., in its capacity as Monitor

Harvey Chaiton for Bank of Montreal

M. Kanter for CNRL

Karen Groulx for Cofely Adelt Ltd.

Michael McGraw for EllisDon Corporation

Subject: Insolvency; Civil Practice and Procedure

Related Abridgment Classifications

For all relevant Canadian Abridgment Classifications refer to highest level of case via History.

Headnote

**Bankruptcy and insolvency --- Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act — Initial
application — Lifting of stay**

H. Ltd. had subcontract with CC Ltd. with respect to construction project — CC Ltd. had failed to pay H. Ltd. monthly progress draws, while in receipt of monies from contractor on account of those draws — Shortly after receiving notice from H. Ltd. of its breach of subcontract, CC Ltd. filed Notice of Intention pursuant to Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act and obtained order containing broad stays of proceedings which affected H. Ltd. — H. Ltd.

wished to enter into new contract for completion of scope of work under subcontract, but did not want to have two contracts operating at same time — H. Ltd. brought motion for order directing CC Ltd. to disclaim subcontract with H. Ltd. or in alternative, order lifting stay of proceedings in order to permit H. Ltd. to terminate subcontract — Motion granted — Stay of proceedings solely with respect to H. Ltd. was lifted and H. Ltd. was to be free to take actions it deemed appropriate in circumstances — Purpose of stay of proceedings was to maintain status quo for period of time so that proceedings could be taken for wellbeing of debtor company and creditors — CC Ltd. acknowledged that it was unable to continue with its performance in respect of project and that project would not form part of restructured or reorganized CC Ltd. — With CC Ltd. no longer being actively involved with project, many aspects of CCAA proceedings would no longer involve project — There was no principled basis on which stay of proceedings, insofar as it affected H. Ltd. and was prejudicial to H. Ltd., should be maintained — Insofar as project was concerned, there was no reorganization or liquidation process, and only outstanding issue was quantum of claims by H. Ltd. as against CC Ltd. and claims by CC Ltd. as against H. Ltd. — Where debtor company did not wish to disclaim contract, there was no mechanism for disclaimer to be imposed upon it.

Table of Authorities

Cases considered by *Morawetz J.*:

Northland Properties Ltd., Re (1988), 73 C.B.R. (N.S.) 141, 1988 CarswellBC 553 (B.C. S.C. [In Chambers]) — referred to

Statutes considered:

Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act, R.S.C. 1985, c. B-3

Generally — referred to

Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act, R.S.C. 1985, c. C-36

Generally — referred to

s. 11 — considered

s. 32 — considered

MOTION by debtor for order directing bankrupt to disclaim subcontract or to lift stay of proceedings.

Morawetz J.:

1 Honeywell Limited ("Honeywell") brings this motion for:

(i) an order directing Comstock Canada Ltd. ("Comstock") to disclaim the subcontract between Comstock and Honeywell made on June 1, 2010 (the "Honeywell Subcontract") with respect to the Sick Kids Research Tower Project (the "Project");

(ii) or, in the alternative, an order lifting the stay of proceedings contained in paragraphs 22, 23 and 24 of the Amended and Restated Initial Order dated July 9, 2013 in order to permit Honeywell to terminate the Honeywell Subcontract, in accordance with its terms based on the default of Comstock.

2 Comstock has failed to pay Honeywell monthly progress draws in accordance with the Honeywell Subcontract since November 2012. Honeywell contends that EllisDon, the contractor, has paid approximately \$831,000 to Comstock on account of Honeywell's monthly progress draws for the period of November 2012 to March 2013. Honeywell alleges that these amounts have not been paid down to Honeywell.

3 On June 21, 2013, Honeywell gave notice to Comstock of its breach of the Honeywell Subcontract. The cure of the breach was requested by June 27, 2011.

4 On June 28, 2013, Comstock filed a Notice of Intention to make a proposal pursuant to the provisions of the *Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act (Canada)* ("BIA").

5 On July 9, 2013, the BIA proceedings were continued under the provisions of the *Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act* ("CCAA") pursuant to an Initial Order dated July 9, 2013. On July 26, 2013 the Initial Order was subsequently amended pursuant to an Amended and Restated Initial Order.

6 Paragraphs 22, 23 and 24 of the Amended and Restated Initial Order contain broad stays of proceedings which affect Honeywell.

7 As of August 16, 2013, Comstock alleges that the amount owing by EllisDon to Comstock in respect of the Project is approximately \$9.6 million.

8 Comstock further alleges that EllisDon has (a) refused to make payment to Comstock, its subtrades, and suppliers for the supply of materials, goods and services pursuant to the subcontract agreement dated June 4, 2010 made between Comstock and EllisDon in respect of the Project; and (b) without Comstock's authorization and consent, transferred to another contractor for completion, specific items which were to be performed by Comstock on the Project.

9 Comstock further alleges that on account of EllisDon's refusal to honour its agreement with Comstock, Comstock was rendered unable to continue with its performance in respect of the Project.

10 Honeywell takes the position that contracts for abandoned projects should be disclaimed forthwith. In this case, as a result of Comstock's failure to provide a disclaimer, Honeywell submits that it is being prejudiced and that it should be put in a position where it can mitigate its damages by entering into a new contract for the completion of the scope of work under the Honeywell Subcontract. Honeywell does not want to be involved in two contracts at the same time.

11 Comstock takes the position that it has not confirmed that it would disclaim the Honeywell Subcontract, nor could it, as neither the Monitor nor BMO, the major secured creditor and DIP Lender has approved such action by Comstock.

12 Comstock submits that its estate, stakeholders, creditors, and BMO would suffer substantial prejudice if Honeywell were permitted to cause Comstock to disclaim or it were permitted to terminate the Honeywell Subcontract.

13 Comstock further submits that its primary concern is that the warranty and indemnity obligations of Honeywell under the Honeywell Subcontract remain in place. This could possibly give Comstock and its creditors recourse against Honeywell for any claims that EllisDon is likely to advance against Comstock on the Project for which Honeywell could be liable under the Honeywell Subcontract with Comstock. This would include any claim for deficiencies. Consequently, Comstock submits that in the event that it is unable to advance a claim under the warranty and indemnification provisions of the Honeywell Subcontract, Comstock and its creditors will suffer substantial prejudice.

14 Comstock takes the position that it has no issue with Honeywell entering into a new contract with the replacement contractor to Comstock in respect of the Project.

15 The Monitor and BMO support Comstock's position.

16 This motion underscores the inherent difficulty which surrounds the attempted reorganization of certain entities, in particular, real estate companies and construction companies. By definition real estate companies and construction companies operate on a project by project basis. In many cases, each project is the subject of specific-purpose financing. In the case of real estate companies, secured creditors vary on a project-by-project basis. With respect to construction companies, creditors, including construction lien trust claimants, vary on a project-by-project basis and the assets or trust funds will also vary on a project-by-project basis. The legal rights of these creditors vary to such a degree that quite often they cannot be grouped in one class. The community of interest is often lacking, resulting in fragmented interests.

17 The purpose of any stay of proceedings issued pursuant to section 11 of the CCAA is to maintain the *status quo* for a period of time so that proceedings can be taken under the CCAA for the wellbeing of the debtor company and of the creditors. See *Northland Properties Ltd., Re* (1988), 73 C.B.R. (N.S.) 141 (B.C. S.C. [In Chambers]). The stay order is intended to prevent any creditor from obtaining an advantage over other creditors while the company is attempting to reorganize its affairs.

18 Comstock has acknowledged that it is unable to continue with its performance in respect of the Project. It has also acknowledged that it has no issue with Honeywell entering into a new contract with the replacement contractor to Comstock in respect of the Project. In short, the Project will not form part of a restructured or reorganized Comstock. Comstock has acknowledged that a replacement contractor will be involved.

19 With Comstock no longer being actively involved with the Project, many aspects of the CCAA proceedings will no longer involve the Project. The Sale and Investor Solicitation Process (the "SISP"), is intended to provide a platform by which the Monitor, in consultation with Comstock, is authorized to (i) market the assets of the Comstock Group for sale, and/or (ii) attract new investors. In these circumstances, it is apparent that the Project is not an asset that will form part of the SISP.

20 Further, the Lien Regularization Order which is intended to re-establish the cash flow on Comstock projects is no longer relevant to the Project.

21 Consequently, it seems to me that there is no principled basis on which a stay of proceedings, insofar as it affects Honeywell, should be maintained. Put another way, maintaining the stay could be prejudicial to Honeywell. At this time, Honeywell should not be precluded from considering its options. Insofar as the Project is concerned, there is no reorganization or liquidation process. The only outstanding issue is the quantum of Honeywell's claims as against Comstock and Comstock's claims as against Honeywell. These issues do not have to be resolved at this time. Rather, they can be resolved in the claims process.

22 With respect to the specific relief sought by Honeywell, I accept the submission of Comstock to the effect that where the debtor company does not wish to disclaim a contract, there is no mechanism for such a disclaimer to be imposed upon it. Section 32 of the CCAA provides that the company may not give such notice unless the monitor approves the proposed disclaimer. In this case, the Monitor does not approve the disclaimer of the Honeywell Subcontract.

23 With respect to the alternative relief, in my view, there is no principled basis upon which the CCAA stay of proceedings should continue to affect Honeywell. Comstock has acknowledged that it is unable to continue with its performance of the Project. Honeywell has indicated that it

wishes to enter into a new contract for the completion of the scope of work under the Honeywell Subcontract.

24 In view of the stated position of the parties, it seems to me to be appropriate to lift the stay of proceedings solely with respect to Honeywell. Honeywell is free to take actions it deems appropriate in the circumstances. However, I do not think it necessary or appropriate to give specific direction with respect to any purported termination of the Honeywell Subcontract.

25 An order shall issue to give effect to the foregoing.

Motion granted in part.

End of Document

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

TAB 4

2009 CarswellOnt 4699
Ontario Superior Court of Justice [Commercial List]

Grant Forest Products Inc., Re

2009 CarswellOnt 4699, [2009] O.J. No. 3344, 179 A.C.W.S. (3d) 517, 57 C.B.R. (5th) 128

**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 GRANT FOREST PRODUCTS
INC., GRANT ALBERTA INC., GRANT FOREST PRODUCTS SALES INC. and GRANT U.S. HOLDINGS GP
(Applicants)

Newbould J.

Heard: August 6, 2009

Judgment: August 11, 2009

Docket: CV-09-8247-00CL

Counsel: A. Duncan Grace for GE Canada Leasing Services Company
Daniel R. Dowdall, Jane O. Dietrich for Grant Forest Products Inc., Grant Alberta Inc., Grant Forest Products Sales Inc.,
Grant U.S. Holdings GP
Sean Dunphy, Katherine Mah for Monitor, Ernst & Young Inc.
Kevin McElcheran for Toronto-Dominion Bank
Stuart Brotman for Independent Directors

Subject: Insolvency

Related Abridgment Classifications

For all relevant Canadian Abridgment Classifications refer to highest level of case via History.

Headnote

**Bankruptcy and insolvency --- Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act — Arrangements — Approval by court
— Miscellaneous**

Applicant companies were leading manufacturer of oriented strand board — Parent company was G Inc — L was executive vice-president of G Inc — He owned no shares in G Inc — Employee retention plan ("ERP") agreement between G Inc. and L provided that if at any time before L turned 65 years of age, termination event occurred, and he was to be paid three times his then base salary — Agreement provided that obligation was to be secured by letter of credit and that if company made application under Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act, it would seek order creating charge on assets of company with priority satisfactory to L — In initial order, ERP agreement was approved and ERP charge on all of property of applicants as security for amounts that could be owing to L under ERP agreement was granted to L, ranking after administrative charge and investment offering advisory charge — Initial order was made

without prejudice to G Co. to move to oppose ERP provisions — G Co. brought motion for order to delete ERP provisions in initial order on basis that provisions had effect of preferring interest of L over interest of other creditors, including G Co. — Motion dismissed — ERP agreement and charge contained in initial order were appropriate and were to be maintained — To require key employee to have already received offer of employment from someone else before ERP agreement could be justified would not be something that is necessary or desirable — ERP agreement and charge were approved by board of directors of G Inc., including approval by independent directors — Once could not assume without more that these people did not have experience in these matters or know what was reasonable — Three-year severance payment was not so large on face of it to be unreasonable or unfair to other stakeholders — Though ERP agreement did not provide that payment should not be made before restructuring was complete, that was clearly its present intent, which was sufficient.

Table of Authorities

Cases considered by *Newbould J.*:

MEI Computer Technology Group Inc., Re (2005), 19 C.B.R. (5th) 257, 2005 CarswellQue 3675, [2005] R.J.Q. 1558 (Que. S.C.) — distinguished

Nortel Networks Corp., Re (2009), 2009 CarswellOnt 1519 (Ont. S.C.J. [Commercial List]) — considered

Royal Bank v. Soundair Corp. (1991), 7 C.B.R. (3d) 1, 83 D.L.R. (4th) 76, 46 O.A.C. 321, 4 O.R. (3d) 1, 1991 CarswellOnt 205 (Ont. C.A.) — followed

Textron Financial Canada Ltd. v. Beta Ltée/Beta Brands Ltd. (2007), 2007 CarswellOnt 5799, 36 C.B.R. (5th) 296 (Ont. S.C.J.) — considered

Warehouse Drug Store Ltd., Re (2006), 24 C.B.R. (5th) 275, 2006 CarswellOnt 5128 (Ont. S.C.J.) — considered

Statutes considered:

Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act, R.S.C. 1985, c. C-36
Generally — referred to

MOTION by creditor for order to delete employee retention plan provisions in initial order.

Newbould J.:

1 KERP is an acronym for key employee retention plan. In the Initial Order of June 25, 2009, a KERP agreement between Grant Forest Products Inc. and Mr. Peter Lynch was approved and a KERP charge on all of the property of the applicants as security for the amounts that could be owing to Mr. Lynch under the KERP agreement was granted to Mr. Lynch ranking after the Administration Charge and the Investment Offering Advisory Charge. The Initial Order was made without prejudice

to the right of GE Canada Leasing Services Company ("GE Canada") to move to oppose the KERP provisions.

2 GE Canada has now moved for an order to delete the KERP provisions in the Initial Order. GE Canada takes the position that these KERP provisions have the effect of preferring the interest of Mr. Lynch over the interest of the other creditors, including GE Canada.

KERP Agreement and Charge

3 The applicant companies have been a leading manufacturer of oriented strand board and have interests in three mills in Canada and two mills in the United States. The parent company is Grant Forest Products Inc. Grant Forest was founded by Peter Grant Sr. in 1980 and is privately owned by the Grant family. Peter Grant Sr. is the CEO, his son, Peter Grant Jr., is the president, having worked in the business for approximately fourteen years. Peter Lynch is 58 years old. He practised corporate commercial law from 1976 to 1993 during which time he acted on occasion for members of the Grant family. In 1993 he joined the business and became executive vice-president of Grant Forest. Mr. Lynch owns no shares in the business.

4 The only KERP agreement made was between Grant Forest and Mr. Lynch. It provides that if at any time before Mr. Lynch turns 65 years of age a termination event occurs, he shall be paid three times his then base salary. A termination event is defined as the termination of his employment for any reason other than just cause or resignation, constructive dismissal, the sale of the business or a material part of the assets, or a change of control of the company. The agreement provided that the obligation was to be secured by a letter of credit and that if the company made an application under the CCAA it would seek an order creating a charge on the assets of the company with priority satisfactory to Mr. Lynch. That provision led to the KERP charge in the Initial Order.

Creditors of the Applicants

5 Grant Forest has total funded debt obligations of approximately \$550 million in two levels of primary secured debt. The first lien lenders, for whom TD Bank is the agent, are owed approximately \$400 million. The second lien lenders are owed approximately \$150 million.

6 Grant Forest has unsecured trade creditors of over \$4 million as well as other unsecured debt obligations. GE Canada is an unsecured creditor of Grant Forest pursuant to a master aircraft leasing agreement with respect to three aircraft which have now been returned to GE Canada. GE Canada expects that after the aircraft have been sold, it will have a deficiency claim of approximately U.S. \$6.5 million.

7 The largest unsecured creditor is a numbered company owned by the Grant family interests which is owed approximately \$50 million for debt financing provided to the business.

Analysis

8 Whether KERP provisions such as the ones in this case should be ordered in a CCAA proceeding is a matter of

discretion. While there are a small number of cases under the CCAA dealing with this issue, it certainly cannot be said that there is any established body of case law settling the principles to be considered. In *Houlden & Morawetz Bankruptcy and Insolvency Analysis*, West Law, 2009, it is stated:

In some instances, the court supervising the CCAA proceeding will authorize a key employee retention plan or key employee incentive plan. Such plans are aimed at retaining employees that are important to the management or operations of the debtor company in order to keep their skills within the company at a time when they are likely to look for other employment because of the company's financial distress. (Underlining added)

9 In *Canadian Insolvency in Canada* by Kevin P. McElcheran (LexisNexis - Butterworths) at p. 231, it is stated:

KERPs and special director compensation arrangements are heavily negotiated and controversial arrangements. ... Because of the controversial nature of KERP arrangements, it is important that any proposed KERP be scrutinized carefully by the monitor with a view to insisting that only true key employees are covered by the plan and that the KERP will not do more harm than good by failing to include the truly key employees and failing to treat them fairly. (Underlining added)

10 I accept these statements as generally applicable. In my view it is quite clear on the basis of the record before me that the KERP agreement and charge contained in the Initial Order are appropriate and should be maintained. There are a number of reasons for this.

11 The Monitor supports the KERP agreement and charge. Mr. Morrison has stated in the third report of the Monitor that as Mr. Lynch is a very seasoned executive, the Monitor would expect that he would consider other employment options if the KERP agreement were not secured by the KERP charge, and that his doing so could only distract from the marketing process that is underway with respect to the assets of the applicants. The Monitor has expressed the view that Mr. Lynch continuing role as a senior executive is important for the stability of the business and to enhance the effectiveness of the marketing process.

12 Mr. Hap Stephen, the Chairman and CEO of Stonecrest Capital Inc., appointed as the Chief Restructuring Advisor of the applicants in the Initial Order, pointed out in his affidavit that Mr. Lynch is the only senior officer of the applicants who is not a member of the Grant family and who works from Grant Forest's executive office in Toronto. He has sworn that the history, knowledge and stability that Mr. Lynch provides the applicants is crucial not only in dealing with potential investors during the restructuring to provide them with information regarding the applicants' operations, but also in making decisions regarding operations and management on a day-to-day basis during this period. He states that it would be extremely difficult at this stage of the restructuring to find a replacement to fulfill Mr. Lynch's current responsibilities and he has concern that if the KERP provisions in the Initial Order are removed, Mr. Lynch may begin to search for other professional opportunities given the uncertainty of his present position with the applicants. Mr. Stephen strongly supports the inclusion of the KERP provisions in the Initial Order.

13 It is contended on behalf of GE Canada that there is little evidence that Mr. Lynch has or will be foregoing other employment opportunities. Reliance is placed upon a statement of Leitch R.S.J. in *Textron Financial Canada Ltd. v. Beta Ltée/Beta Brands Ltd.* (2007), 36 C.B.R. (5th) 296 (Ont. S.C.J.). In that case Leitch J. refused to approve a KERP arrangement for a number of reasons, including the fact that there was no contract for the proposed payment and it had not been reviewed by the court appointed receiver who was applying to the court for directions. Leitch J. stated in distinguishing

the case before her from *Warehouse Drug Store Ltd., Re*, [2006] O.J. No. 3416 (Ont. S.C.J.), that there was no suggestion that any of the key employees in the case before her had alternative employment opportunities that they chose to forego.

14 I do not read the decision of Leitch J. in *Textron* to state that there must be an alternative job that an employee chose to forego in order for a KERP arrangement to be approved. It was only a distinguishing fact in the case before her from the *Warehouse Drug Store* case. Moreover, I do not think that a court should be hamstrung by any such rule in a matter that is one of discretion depending upon the circumstances of each case. The statement in *Houlden Morawetz* to which I have earlier referred that a KERP plan is aimed at retaining important employees when they are likely to look for other employment indicates a much broader intent, i.e. for a key employee who is likely to look for other employment rather than a key employee who has been offered another job but turned it down. In *Nortel Networks Corp., Re*, [2009] O.J. No. 1188 (Ont. S.C.J. [Commercial List]), Morawetz J. approved a KERP agreement in circumstances in which there was a “potential” loss of management at the time who were sought after by competitors. To require a key employee to have already received an offer of employment from someone else before a KERP agreement could be justified would not in my view be something that is necessary or desirable.

15 In this case, the concern of the Monitor and of Mr. Stephen that Mr. Lynch may consider other employment opportunities if the KERP provisions are not kept in place is not an idle concern. On his cross-examination on July 28, 2009, Mr. Lynch disclosed that recently he was approached on an unsolicited basis to submit to an interview for a position of CEO of another company in a different sector. He declined to be interviewed for the position. He stated that the KERP provisions played a role in his decision which might well have been different if the KERP provisions did not exist. This evidence is not surprising and quite understandable for a person of Mr. Lynch’s age in the uncertain circumstances that exist with the applicants’ business.

16 It is also contended by GE Canada that Mr. Lynch shares responsibilities with Mr. Grant Jr., the implication being that Mr. Lynch is not indispensable. This contention is contrary to the views of the Monitor and Mr. Stephen and is not supported by any cogent evidence. It also does not take into account the different status of Mr. Lynch and Mr. Grant Jr. Mr. Lynch is not a shareholder. One can readily understand that a prospective bidder in the marketing process that is now underway might want to hear from an experienced executive of the company who is not a shareholder and thus not conflicted. Mr. Dunphy on behalf of the Monitor submitted that Mr. Lynch is the only senior executive independent of the shareholders and that it is the Monitor’s view that an unconflicted non-family executive is critical to the marketing process. The KERP agreement providing Mr. Lynch with a substantial termination payment in the event that the business is sold can be viewed as adding to his independence insofar as his dealing with respective bidders are concerned.

17 It is also contended on behalf of GE Canada that there is no material before the court to establish that the quantum of the termination payment, three times Mr. Lynch’s salary at the time he is terminated, is reasonable. I do not accept that. The KERP agreement and charge were approved by the board of directors of Grant Forest, including approval by the independent directors. These independent directors included Mr. William Stinson, the former CEO of Canadian Pacific Limited and the lead director of Sun Life, Mr. Michael Harris, a former premier of Ontario, and Mr. Wallace, the president of a construction company and a director of Inco. The independent directors were advised by Mr. Levin, a very senior corporate counsel. One cannot assume without more that these people did not have experience in these matters or know what was reasonable.

18 A three year severance payment is not so large on the face of it to be unreasonable, or in this case, unfair to the other stakeholders. The business acumen of the board of directors of Grant Forest, including the independent directors, is one that a court should not ignore unless there is good reason on the record to ignore it. This is particularly so in light of the support of the Monitor and Mr. Stephens for the KERP provisions. Their business judgment cannot be ignored.

19 The Monitor is, of course, an officer of the court. The Chief Restructuring Advisor is not but has been appointed in the Initial Order. Their views deserve great weight and I would be reluctant to second guess them. The following statement of Gallagan J.A., in *Royal Bank v. Soundair Corp.* (1991), 4 O.R. (3d) 1 (Ont. C.A.), while made in the context of the approval by a court appointed receiver of the sale of a business, is instructive in my view in considering the views of a Monitor, including the Monitor in this case and the views of the Chief Restructuring Advisor:

When a court appoints a receiver to use its commercial expertise to sell an airline, it is inescapable that it intends to rely upon the receiver's expertise and not upon its own. Therefore, the court must place a great deal of confidence in the actions taken and in the opinions formed by the receiver. It should also assume that the receiver is acting properly unless the contrary is clearly shown. The second observation is that the court should be reluctant to second-guess, with the benefit of hindsight, the considered business decisions made by its receiver.

20 The first lien security holders owed approximately \$400 million also support the KERP agreement and charge for Mr. Lynch. They too take the position that it is important to have Mr. Lynch involved in the restructuring process. Not only did they support the KERP provisions in the Initial Order, they negotiated section 10(l) of the Initial Order that provides that the applicants could not without the prior written approval of their agent, TD Bank, and the Monitor, make any changes to the officers or senior management. That is, without the consent of the TD Bank as agent for the first lien creditors, Mr. Lynch could not be terminated unless the Initial Order were later amended by court order to permit that to occur.

21 With respect to the fairness of the KERP provisions for Mr. Lynch and whether they unduly interfere with the rights of the creditors of the applicants, it appears that the potential cost of the KERP agreement, if it in fact occurs, will be borne by the secured creditors who either consent to the provisions or do not oppose them. The first lien lenders owed approximately \$400 million are consenting and the second lien lenders owed approximately \$150 million have not taken any steps to oppose the KERP provisions. It appears from marketing information provided by the Monitor and Mr. Stephen to the Court on a confidential basis that the secured creditors will likely incur substantial shortfalls and that there likely will be no recovery for the unsecured creditors. Mr. Grace fairly acknowledged in argument that it is highly unlikely that there will be any recovery for the unsecured creditors. Even if that were not the case, and there was a reasonable prospect for some recovery by the unsecured creditors, the largest unsecured creditor, being the numbered company owned by the Grant family that is owed approximately \$50 million, supports the KERP provisions for Mr. Lynch.

22 In his work, *Canadian Insolvency in Canada, supra*, Mr. McElcheran states that because a KERP arrangement is intended to keep key personnel for the duration of the restructuring process, the compensation covered by the agreement should be deferred until after the restructuring or sale of the business has been completed, although he acknowledges that there may be stated "staged bonuses". While I agree that the logic of a KERP agreement leads to it reflecting these principles, I would be reluctant to hold that they are necessarily a code limiting the discretion of a CCAA court in making an order that is just and fair in the circumstances of the particular case.

23 In this case, the KERP agreement does not expressly provide that the payments are to await the completion of the restructuring. It proves that they are to be made within five days of termination of Mr. Lynch. There would be nothing on the face of the agreement to prevent Mr. Lynch being terminated before the restructuring was completed. However, it is clear that the company wants Mr. Lynch to stay through the restructuring. The intent is not to dismiss him before then. Mr. Dunphy submitted, which I accept, that the provision to pay the termination pay upon termination is to protect Mr. Lynch. Thus while the agreement does not provide that the payment should not be made before the restructuring is complete, that is clearly its present intent, which in my view is sufficient.

24 I have been referred to the case of *MEI Computer Technology Group Inc., Re* (2005), 19 C.B.R. (5th) 257 (Que. S.C.), a decision of Gascon J. in the Quebec Superior Court. In that case, Gascon J. refused to approve a charge for an employee retention plan in a CCAA proceeding. In doing so, Justice Gascon concluded there were guidelines to be followed, which included statements that the remedy was extraordinary that should be used sparingly, that the debtor should normally establish that there was an urgent need for the creation of the charge and that there must be a reasonable prospect of a successful restructuring. I do not agree that such guidelines are necessarily appropriate for a KERP agreement. Why, for example, refuse a KERP agreement if there was no reasonable prospect of a successful restructuring if the agreement provided for a payment on the restructuring? Justice Gascon accepted the submission of the debtor's counsel that the charge was the same as a charge for DIP financing, and took guidelines from DIP financing cases and commentary. I do not think that helpful. DIP financing and a KERP agreement are two different things. I decline to follow the case.

25 The motion by GE Canada to strike the KERP provisions from the Initial Order is denied. The applicants are entitled to their costs from GE Canada. If the quantum cannot be agreed, brief written submissions may be made.

Motion dismissed.

End of Document

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

TAB 5

2009 CarswellOnt 1330
Ontario Superior Court of Justice [Commercial List]

Nortel Networks Corp., Re

2009 CarswellOnt 1330, [2009] O.J. No. 1044, 175 A.C.W.S. (3d) 965

**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 Nortel Networks Corporation, Nortel Networks Limited, Nortel Networks Global Corporation, Nortel Networks International Corporation and Nortel Networks Technology Corporation (the "Applicants")

Application under the Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act, R.S.C. 1985, c. C-36, as amended

Morawetz J.

Heard: March 6, 2009

Judgment: March 12, 2009

Docket: 09-CL-7950, 09-CL-7951

Counsel: Derrick Tay, Jennifer Stam for Nortel Networks Corporation, et al
J. Pasquariello for Monitor, Ernst & Young Inc.
Jonathan Bell for Informal Group of Nortel Networks Noteholders
R. Moncur, M. Barrack for Flextronics
M. Starnino for Pension Benefits Guarantee Fund
Harvey Chaiton for IBM
D. Ullman for Verizon Communications Inc.
Harvey Garman for U.K. Protection Fund, Nortel Networks UK Pension Trust Limited
Demtrios iokaris for Certain Former Salaried Employees of Nortel Networks
Alex MacFarlane for U.S. Unsecured Creditors' Committee

Subject: Insolvency; Corporate and Commercial

Related Abridgment Classifications

For all relevant Canadian Abridgment Classifications refer to highest level of case via History.

Headnote

Bankruptcy and insolvency --- Proposal — Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act — Arrangements — Approval by court — "Fair and reasonable"

Table of Authorities

Cases considered by *Morawetz J.*:

Sierra Club of Canada v. Canada (Minister of Finance) (2002), 287 N.R. 203, (sub nom. *Atomic Energy of Canada Ltd. v. Sierra Club of Canada*) 18 C.P.R. (4th) 1, 44 C.E.L.R. (N.S.) 161, (sub nom. *Atomic Energy of Canada Ltd. v. Sierra Club of Canada*) 211 D.L.R. (4th) 193, 223 F.T.R. 137 (note), 20 C.P.C. (5th) 1, 40 Admin. L.R. (3d) 1, 2002 SCC 41, 2002 CarswellNat 822, 2002 CarswellNat 823, (sub nom. *Atomic Energy of Canada Ltd. v. Sierra Club of Canada*) 93 C.R.R. (2d) 219, [2002] 2 S.C.R. 522 (S.C.C.) — followed

Statutes considered:

Bankruptcy Code, 11 U.S.C.
Generally — referred to

Morawetz J.:

1 This motion was heard on March 6, 2009 and the requested relief was granted, with brief reasons to follow.

2 At the outset of the Nortel proceedings on January 14, 2009, Mr. Tay, on behalf of Nortel Networks Corporation (the “Applicants or Nortel”), indicated that the Applicants would be seeking approval of a Key Employee Incentive Plan (“KEIP”) and a Key Employee Retention Plan (“KERP”). Such approval was sought on this motion, together with a request to approve the Calgary Retention Plan (the “Calgary Retention Plan”) providing for retention bonus payments promised to employees in connection with the closing of the Westwinds facility.

3 This motion was not opposed.

4 The record establishes that the commitment and retention of key employees will be essential to the execution of a restructuring of Nortel and the completion of a plan of arrangement.

5 The KEIP applies to certain executives of the Senior Leadership Team (“SLTs”) and the Executive Leadership Team (“ELTs”) and the KERP applies to certain other key employees.

6 The Monitor reports that these plans have been developed to incent those employees who are:

(i) absolutely key to the success of the restructuring; and

(ii) to remain with the Applicants and U.S. Debtors through to the completion of the Canadian and U.S. proceedings

7 In designing the plans, Nortel obtained independent advice from Mercer (U.S.) Inc. ("Mercer") which included benchmarking total direct compensation levels against industry standards in comparing other key employee incentive plans approved by the courts in recent comparable North American restructurings. In addition, the Monitor reports that Nortel's financial advisor, Lezard Frères & Co., as well as the Monitor were consulted by Nortel throughout the development process with respect to the plans and have provided Nortel with appropriate input.

8 A total of 972 employees are eligible for the plans. This represents approximately 5% of Nortel's global workforce (excluding employees of the EMEA Filed Entities and the joint venturers). The KEIP covers 92 participants, of which, 29 are employed by the Applicants. The potential dollar value to be paid out under the KEIP is approximately \$23 million, of which \$6.8 million is allocated to the Canadian Applicants. With respect to the KERP, this plan covers 880 participants, of which 294 are employed by the Canadian Applicants. The total potential dollar value to be paid out under the KERP is approximately \$22 million, of which \$6.2 million is allocated to the Canadian Applicants.

9 The awards under both the KEIP and the KERP will vest based on the achievement of three milestones, namely, achievement of North American objectives; achievement of certain parameters that will result in a leaner and more focussed organization; and court-approved confirmation of a plan of restructuring.

10 The Unsecured Creditors' Committee ("UCC") in the Chapter 11 proceedings has indicated that it supports the plans, although such support with respect to the KEIP for the SLTs is conditional upon the delivery to the UCC of Nortel's 2009 financial projections.

11 Counsel to the Applicants advised that the U.S. Bankruptcy Court has approved the KEIP (except as it relates to the SLTs) and the KERP.

12 In order to maintain consistency between Canada and the U.S., the Applicants' motion to approve the KEIP excludes the SLTs. The Monitor reports that the Applicants have advised that they intend to request approval of the KEIP for the SLTs at a future date.

13 With respect to the Calgary Retention Plan, a decision was made in July 2008 to close the Westwinds facility and transfer R & D and global operations to other facilities over a period of 12 months. In July 2008, Nortel developed the Calgary Retention Plan that provided for retention payments to be made to those Westwinds facility employees who Nortel determined were critical to the successful shutdown of the facility. The Applicants have indicated that the maximum cost of the Calgary Retention Plan is estimated to be approximately \$727,000 to be paid to 45 employees at the time the employees have completed their portion of the project.

14 I am satisfied that the record establishes that the employees who are covered by the KEIP, the KERP and the Calgary Retention Plan are key to the operations of Nortel and are sought after by competitors, even given current market conditions.

TAB 8

2009 CarswellOnt 1519
Ontario Superior Court of Justice [Commercial List]

Nortel Networks Corp., Re

2009 CarswellOnt 1519, [2009] O.J. No. 1188, 176 A.C.W.S. (3d) 19

**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 NORTEL NETWORKS CORPORATION, NORTEL NETWORKS LIMITED, NORTEL NETWORKS GLOBAL CORPORATION, NORTEL NETWORKS INTERNATIONAL CORPORATION AND NORTEL NETWORKS TECHNOLOGY CORPORATION
(Applicants)

Morawetz J.

Heard: March 20, 2009
Judgment: March 20, 2009
Docket: 09-CL-7950

Counsel: Derrick Tay, Jennifer Stam for Nortel Networks Corporation, et al
Mark Zigler, Demetrios Yiokaris for Former Employees of Nortel Networks
Eliezer Karp for Committee for the Nortel Canadian Terminated Employees Owed Termination and Severance Pay
Kevin Zych for Informal Nortel Noteholder Group
Lyndon Barnes for Boards of Directors of Nortel Networks Corporation and Nortel Networks Limited
Rachelle Moncur for Flextronics Telecom Systems Ltd.
Harvey Garman for UK Pension Protection Fund, Nortel Networks UK Pension Trust Limited
Max Starnino for Superintendent of Financial Services as Administrator of the Pension Benefits Guarantee Fund
Alex MacFarlane for Official Committee of Unsecured Creditors
J. Pasquariello for Monitor, Ernst & Young Inc.
Edmond Lamek for Export Development Canada

Subject: Insolvency

Related Abridgment Classifications

For all relevant Canadian Abridgment Classifications refer to highest level of case via History.

Headnote

Bankruptcy and insolvency --- Proposal — Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act — Arrangements — Approval by court — "Fair and reasonable"

Table of Authorities

Cases considered by *Morawetz J.*:

Nortel Networks Corp., Re (2009), 2009 CarswellOnt 1330 (Ont. S.C.J. [Commercial List]) — referred to

Statutes considered:

Bankruptcy Code, 11 U.S.C.
Chapter 11 — referred to

Morawetz J.:

1 The Applicants move for approval of the key executive incentive plan ("KEIP") as it relates to the Applicants' senior leadership team ("SLT").

2 Counsel to the Applicants pointed out that the issues surrounding the KEIP have already been the subject of a previous motion. Mr. Tay made extensive references to my endorsement released March 12, 2009 [2009 CarswellOnt 1330 (Ont. S.C.J. [Commercial List])], which provided the reasons for the granting of the order of March 6, 2009, which order approved the KEIP, except as it related to the SLTs and which order also approved the key employee retention plan ("KERP").

3 The issue for today is whether it is appropriate to approve the KEIP as it relates to the SLTs.

4 Counsel advised that this issue is also being considered in the Chapter 11 proceedings today, and that the Chapter 11 application on this point is proceeding without opposition from the Unsecured Creditors' Committee.

5 Counsel also advised that the KEIP applies to 29 employees of the Applicants of which 8 are members of the SLT and that of the potential \$23 million to be paid out under the KEIP, the amount allocated to the Canadian Applicants is \$6.8 million.

6 Although the amounts involved are not insignificant, it is necessary, in my view, to consider the KEIP in the context of the overall restructuring. In this respect, the endorsement should be read in conjunction with my reasons relating to the KERP and KEIP approval motion, (reasons of March 12, 2009) in which certain findings were made that supported the relief granted at that time.

7 The submissions of Mr. Tay were supported by Mr. Barnes on behalf of the Board of Directors. Mr. Barnes added that the Board could not function without an experienced leadership team and that the potential loss of management at this time

could be very detrimental. Mr. Barnes also reiterated the complexity of the Nortel restructuring.

8 The Monitor also expressed its support of the Applicants' motion.

9 Mr. Zigler, on behalf of 2000 former employees noted, with some reluctance, that his clients do not object to the relief sought, but in so doing he made it clear that both he and counsel to the Applicants have represented to the Court that none of the milestones which would result in payments under the KEIP program are tied to a reduction of any pension funding payments or benefits currently being paid to or in respect of former employees or pensioners.

10 I note that the same representation was made to the Court during submissions at the March 6, 2009 hearing.

11 The only party who opposed the relief sought on the KEIP issue was Mr. Karp, on behalf of 60 severed employees. This group, according to Mr. Karp, could expand to 1,100 and his status is expected to be the subject of an upcoming motion in which he will be seeking Representative Counsel status. Mr. Karp objects to the proposed payments under the KEIP noting that his clients are not receiving severance payments.

12 Mr. Karp also advised that he has not taken any steps to appeal my decision of March 6, 2009.

13 Having considered the foregoing submissions, the approval sought today in respect of the KEIP is, in my view, consistent with prior approval of the KEIP and that the reasons applicable to the approval and implementation of both the KERP and the KEIP as they relate to the Applicants' employees (other than SLTs) are equally applicable to the Applicants' SLTs. An order shall issue granting the requested relief relating to the KEIP.

14 The Applicants also seek relief relating to the Termination of Change in Control Plan and the treatment of certain personal information of employees. The relief sought in both areas was not opposed and the record establishes that the requested relief is appropriate and it is granted.

15 An order shall issue in the form presented.

TAB 9

1988 CarswellBC 553
British Columbia Supreme Court

Northland Properties Ltd., Re

1988 CarswellBC 553, 73 C.B.R. (N.S.) 141

Re NORTHLAND PROPERTIES LIMITED et al.

Trainor J. [in Chambers]

Judgment: June 20, 1988

Docket: Vancouver No. A880966

Counsel: *A. Czepil*, for Guardian Trust.

A.G. Sandilands, for petitioners.

R. Ellis and *D. Tysoe*, for B.C. Telephone.

S. R. Stark, for Co-op Trust Co.

G. Thompson, for Bank of Montreal.

Subject: Corporate and Commercial; Insolvency

Headnote

Secured creditors — Mortgages — Court allowing debtors time to make proposal under Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act — Court ordering no proceedings to be taken by creditors without leave — Court denying leave to commence mortgage foreclosure proceedings but allowing collection of rent under assignment of rents.

Secured creditors — Specific assignments — Assignment of rents — Court allowing debtors time to make proposal under Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act — Court ordering no proceedings to be taken by creditors without leave — Court denying leave to commence mortgage foreclosure proceedings but allowing collection of rent under assignment of rents.

The company had granted a mortgage and executed an assignment of rents which was registered as security for a loan from the trust company. The assignment provided that, upon default under the mortgage, the trust company was entitled to all rents falling due from the date of service of notice to the tenants. The land involved was the only asset of the company.

The company and several related companies ran into financial difficulty and applied under the Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act for approval to attempt a reorganization plan. An ex parte order was made on 7th April granting the application and providing that any creditor wishing to take proceedings to commence or continue any action or realize upon any security must obtain leave of the court.

The company had not made its 1st April mortgage payment and, following this order, the company informed the trust company that no further payments would be made. At this time the property was worth approximately \$340,000 and the value of the mortgage and outstanding taxes was about \$450,000.

An application was brought by the trust company for leave to realize on the mortgage and assignment of rents.

Held:

Application granted in part.

The intention of the Act (and the ex parte order) was to allow a judge to make orders which will maintain the status quo for a period of time while an insolvent company attempts to gain the approval of its creditors for an arrangement which would allow the company to remain in operation for the future benefit of both the company and its creditors.

The term "proceedings" should be broadly interpreted to also include non-judicial proceedings which might prejudice other creditors and make an effective arrangement impossible.

The ex parte order generally envisioned that the company was to make a proposal to its creditors by the end of the summer. With regard to this time frame, leave should not be presently granted to the trust company to take any steps with respect to a foreclosure of the mortgage.

As of 1st April the trust company had become vested with the right to take an assignment of rents. The only step which had to be taken was notification of the tenants. That right was in existence prior to the ex parte order being made and should be recognized. This would not prejudice the other creditors as the recognition of the assignment of rents simply put the trust company in a position to receive moneys which it ordinarily would have received if matters had continued on the basis existing prior to 1st April.

Table of Authorities

Cases considered:

Meridian Dev. Inc. v. T.D. Bank; Meridian Dev. Inc. v. Nu-West Ltd., [1984] 5 W.W.R. 215, 52 C.B.R. (N.S.) 109, 32 Alta. L.R. (2d) 150, 53 A.R. 39 (Q.B.) — *applied*

Statutes considered:

Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act, R.S.C. 1970, c. C-25 [now R.S.C. 1985, c. C-346]

Application for leave to realize on mortgage and assignment of rents.

Trainor J. (orally):

1 In these proceedings I made an order on 7th April 1988 which contains a provision that all proceedings taken or that might be taken by any of the petitioners' creditors:

2 ... shall be stayed until further order of this Court upon notice to the Petitioners and that further proceedings in any action, suit or proceeding commenced by any person against any of the Petitioners be stayed until further order of this Court, upon notice to the Petitioners, that no action, suit or other proceeding may be proceeded with or commenced against any of the Petitioners by any person except with leave of this Court, upon notice to the Petitioners, and subject to such terms as this Court may impose, and that the right of any person to realize upon or otherwise deal with any security held by that person on the undertaking, property and assets of any of the Petitioners be and the same is postponed on such terms and conditions as this Court may deem proper ...

3 The motion before me today is by counsel on behalf of Guardian Trust Company. He asks for an order that Guardian Trust have leave to realize on an indenture of mortgage and an assignment of rents both made between Unity Investment Company Limited and Guardian Trust Company. The affidavit of the principal of the petitioner companies, Mr. Gaglardi, filed on 30th May of this year contains this paragraph:

4 Unity is a wholly-owned subsidiary of Northland and is the registered owner of a single parcel of property situate in Nelson, British Columbia. Northland acquired all of the issued and outstanding shares of Unity in or about December, 1980 for the sole purpose of acquiring the Nelson property, Unity's sole asset. The vendors had insisted on a share rather than asset purchase at the time.

5 Margaret Anderson, who is an assistant vice-president of Guardian Trust Company, in her affidavit filed on 27th May said:

6 That on or about July 16 1983, Unity Investment Company, Limited, granted a mortgage to Guardian Trust Company which was guaranteed by Robert John Phillip Gaglardi to secure payment of a loan in the principal sum of \$500,000.00.

7 I am advised in the course of these proceedings, and I think it is disclosed by the affidavit material which is here, that the present assessed value of the property is about \$340,000, that there is currently owing in respect to that mortgage about \$400,000, and I believe the taxes are payable in addition to that amount, in the sum of about another \$50,000.

8 The Anderson affidavit contains this paragraph:

9 That in addition to obtaining a mortgage from Unity Investment Company, Limited as security for the loan, Guardian Trust Company obtained an Assignment of Rents dated July 13, 1983, which was registered in the Nelson Land Title Office on August 3, 1983, under No. S19466 charging the land and premises described herein.

She further avers:

10 That the Assignment of Rents provides that the Assignor, Unity Investment Company, Limited is entitled to receive all rents until default is made under the mortgage at which time the Assignee, upon notice to the tenants, is entitled to all rents falling due from the date of service of notice.

And further:

11 That prior to April 1, 1988, monthly mortgage payments due pursuant to the mortgage between Guardian Trust Company and Unity Investment Company, Limited had been regularly paid.

And:

12 That following pronouncement of the Ex Parte Order of The Honourable Mr. Justice Trainor in these proceedings on April 7, 1988, we were advised by a representative of the "Northland Group" that no further payments would be made pursuant to the mortgage and none have been received.

13 It is in those circumstances that the motion has been made for leave to realize on the indenture of mortgage and assignment of rents.

14 With respect to this particular legislation, I would like to refer to what is said by the court in *Meridian Dev. Inc. v. T.D. Bank; Meridian Dev. Inc. v. Nu-West Ltd.*, [1984] 5 W.W.R. 215, 52 C.B.R. (N.S.) 109, 32 Alta. L.R. (2d) 150, 53 A.R. 39 (Q.B.). At p. 113, Mr. Justice Wachowich said:

15 This Act, though little used, is one of a number of federal statutes dealing with insolvency. In common with the various other statutes, it envisages the protection of creditors and the orderly administration of the debtor's affairs or assets.

Then he cites authority for that proposition and continues [pp. 113-14]:

16 In the words of Duff C.J.C. who spoke for the court in *A.G. Can. v. A.G. Que.*, [1934] S.C.R. 659, 16 C.B.R. 1 at 2, [1934] 4 D.L.R. 75:

17 ... the aim of the Act is to deal with the existing condition of insolvency in itself to enable arrangements to be made in view of the insolvent condition of the company under judicial authority which, otherwise, might not be valid prior to the initiation of proceedings in bankruptcy. *Ex facie* it would appear that such a scheme in principle does not radically depart from the normal character of bankruptcy legislation.

18 The legislation is intended to have wide scope and allow a judge to make orders which will effectively maintain the status quo for a period while the insolvent company attempts to gain the approval of its creditors for a proposed arrangement which will enable the company to remain in operation for what is, hopefully, the future benefit of both the company and its creditors.

19 I adopt that as a statement of the purpose of this legislation and the underlying purpose behind the order which was made on 7th April last. The particular problem that was dealt with in the *Meridian* case had to do with letters of credit, and there was consideration as to whether or not action upon that letter of credit demanding that it be honoured would amount to a proceeding. There was some discussion of that at p. 117 where he said:

20 ... I am mindful of the wide scope of action which Parliament intended for this section of the Act. To narrow the interpretation of "proceeding" could lessen the ability of a court to restrain a creditor from acting to prejudice an eventual arrangement in the interim when other creditors are being consulted. As I indicated earlier, it is necessary to give this section a wide interpretation in order to ensure its effectiveness. I hesitate therefore to restrict the term "proceedings" to those necessarily involving a court or court official because there are situations in which to do so would allow non-judicial proceedings to go against the creditor which would effectively prejudice other creditors and make effective arrangement impossible. The restriction could thus defeat the purpose of the Act.

21 It is true insofar as that particular case is concerned what he said there is obiter dicta, but it underlines again the general purpose of the Act and the intent to put things in a position for a period of time so that action can be taken for the general welfare and well-being of the company and of the creditors of the company.

22 On that basis it would seem to me that the leave to act on the indenture of mortgage as is requested would be going too far and that that should not be permitted at this time. The time that I am talking about is the time period involved in the implementation of the order that was made in April. There are a number of applications with respect to the procedures which should be followed which are pending before me at this time, but the proposal generally is that by the end of this summer the proposal should be made to the creditors and an opportunity to have their response to that proposal given to them so that the next steps can be taken.

23 In those circumstances and in that time frame I would not think that it would be appropriate to grant leave to Guardian to take any steps with respect to a foreclosure of the mortgage.

24 That leaves consideration of the assignment of rents. It seems to me that in the circumstances here Guardian was in a position as of 1st April, when there was default under the mortgage, that they then became vested with the right to take an assignment of the rents. The only step which had to be taken was notification of the tenants. There is in the affidavit material some indication that the petitioners in these proceedings generally were aware of the legislation by that time and were giving consideration to the steps which might be taken and which in fact were taken, resulting in the order of 7th April.

25 In those circumstances, it seems to me that Guardian's right to take action on the assignment of rents should be recognized. I cannot, in the circumstances, see that that would prejudice the other creditors. It was a right which was in existence prior to the order being made, and it seems to me as well, on the basis of what I have heard, that it would be in keeping with what has taken place concerning other mortgages. So in essence the recognition of the assignment of rents really simply puts Guardian in the position where they can receive moneys which they ordinarily would have received if matters had continued on the basis that had existed prior to 1st April. In those circumstances the assignment of rents should be recognized, but the application is dismissed with respect to taking any other proceedings or any proceedings in respect to the mortgage.

26 In those circumstances, since the success is divided, I think probably I should just leave the question of costs and make no order concerning costs.

Application allowed in part.

End of Document

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

TAB :

2000 CarswellAlta 1584
Alberta Court of Queen's Bench

Rio Nevada Energy Inc., Re

2000 CarswellAlta 1584, [2000] A.J. No. 1596, 283 A.R. 146

**In the Matter of the Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act, R.S.C. 1985, c.C-36,
As Amended**

In the Matter of Rio Nevada Energy Inc.

Romaine J.

Judgment: December 18, 2000

Docket: Calgary 0001-17463

Counsel: *Brian P. O'Leary, Alison Z.A. Campbell*, for Westcoast Capital Corporation
Peter Pastewka, James Eamon, for Rio Nevada Energy Inc.
Larry Boyd Robinson, for Joseph Dow and Ronald Antonio

Subject: Corporate and Commercial; Insolvency

Related Abridgment Classifications

For all relevant Canadian Abridgment Classifications refer to highest level of case via History.

Headnote

Corporations --- Arrangements and compromises — Under Companies' Creditors Arrangements Act — Arrangements — Effect of arrangement — Stay of proceedings

Table of Authorities

Cases considered by Romaine J.:

Bargain Harold's Discount Ltd. v. Paribas Bank of Canada (1992), 10 C.B.R. (3d) 23, 4 B.L.R. (2d) 306, 7 O.R. (3d) 362 (Ont. Gen. Div.) — applied

First Treasury Financial Inc. v. Congo Petroleums Inc. (1991), 3 C.B.R. (3d) 232, 78 D.L.R. (4th) 585, [1991] O.J.

No. 429 (Ont. Gen. Div.) — distinguished

Meridian Development Inc. v. Toronto Dominion Bank, [1984] 5 W.W.R. 215, 52 C.B.R. (N.S.) 109, 32 Alta. L.R. (2d) 150, 53 A.R. 39, 11 D.L.R. (4th) 576 (Alta. Q.B.) — considered

Nova Metal Products Inc. v. Comiskey (Trustee of) (1990), 1 C.B.R. (3d) 101, (sub nom. *Elan Corp. v. Comiskey*) 1 O.R. (3d) 289, (sub nom. *Elan Corp. v. Comiskey*) 41 O.A.C. 282 (Ont. C.A.) — considered

Pacific National Lease Holding Corp., Re (August 17, 1992), Doc. A922870 (B.C. S.C.) — considered

Philip's Manufacturing Ltd., Re (1992), 9 C.B.R. (3d) 25, 67 B.C.L.R. (2d) 84, 4 B.L.R. (2d) 142 (B.C. C.A.) — applied

Sharp-Rite Technologies Ltd., Re, 2000 BCSC 122, [2000] B.C.J. No. 135 (B.C. S.C.) — considered

Starcom International Optics Corp., Re (1998), 3 C.B.R. (4th) 177 (B.C. S.C. [In Chambers]) — considered

Statutes considered:

Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act, R.S.C. 1985, c. C-36

Generally — considered

s. 11(3) — considered

s. 11(6) — considered

APPLICATION by creditor for order terminating stay of proceedings; CROSS-APPLICATION by debtor for order extending stay of proceedings.

Romaine J.:

Introduction

1 Rio Nevada Energy Inc. sought, and obtained, protection under the *Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act*, R.S.C. 1985, c.C-36 on October 31, 2000. Rio Nevada's principal creditor, Westcoast Capital Corporation, declared its intention at that time to bring an application for an order terminating the stay of proceedings granted under the CCAA order on the basis that any plan of arrangement proposed by Rio Nevada would be "doomed to failure". The stay of proceedings under the order was initially extended to November 17, 2000. On that date, Westcoast applied for an order terminating the stay and appointing a receiver-manager of the assets of Rio Nevada pursuant to Westcoast's security. Rio Nevada applied for an order extending the stay to December 17, 2000, and amending certain provisions of the initial order. I dismissed Westcoast's application and extended the stay under the initial order to December 15, 2000. These are the reasons for my decision.

Facts

2 Rio Nevada is a publicly listed oil and gas company incorporated under the laws of Canada. In September, 1999, Rio Nevada entered into a prepaid gas purchase contract with Westcoast pursuant to which Rio Nevada was to deliver certain daily volumes of natural gas commencing in September, 1999 and ending on October 31, 2004. Westcoast prepaid \$3,118,000 plus GST to Rio Nevada in accordance with the terms of the gas purchase contract.

3 As security under the gas purchase contract, Rio Nevada granted Westcoast a first ranking security interest and charge over all its assets. Upon default by Rio Nevada, Westcoast becomes able to appoint, or apply to the court to appoint, a receiver.

4 Rio Nevada had some difficulty with two new wells drilled to meet the gas production requirements of the gas purchase contract in that it has not been able to complete remedial work that would put these wells into production. Currently, the completion of remedial work on these wells awaits sufficient cold weather to allow access to them.

5 Rio Nevada had gas production shortfalls from time to time during the term of the gas purchase contract, which it cured by purchasing gas from a gas marketer and delivering it to Westcoast to satisfy its contractual obligations. Rio Nevada also acquired the shares of a manufacturing and research and development firm, Concorde Technologies Inc. (which included the acquisition of the shares of Tierra Industries Ltd.) and granted security on its assets as part of the financing of this acquisition. Westcoast considers this acquisition without its consent to be a breach of its security interest over the assets of Rio Nevada. On October 23, 2000, Westcoast terminated the gas purchase contract and claimed liquidated damages. Westcoast indicated its intention to take steps to appoint a receiver of the assets of Rio Nevada in the event payment was not received within 10 days.

6 Westcoast claims approximately \$5,530,832 in liquidated damages under the gas purchase contract against Rio Nevada. Rio Nevada's liabilities to Westcoast and other secured, unsecured and statutory creditors aggregate approximately \$10.6 million.

7 Outtrim Szaba Associates Ltd., a petroleum engineering evaluations firm, has estimated the fair market value of Rio Nevada's oil and natural gas assets at \$9,427,000 as at November 13, 2000. This estimate is based on an evaluation of Rio Nevada's reserves and cash flow as of the same date.

8 Rio Nevada's aggregate liabilities of \$10.6 million include debt from its acquisition of the shares of Concorde and Tierra. No evidence of the value of these shares is before the Court, but their purchase price in August, 2000 was approximately \$5.25 million. Rio Nevada has additional miscellaneous assets worth approximately \$250,000.

Issues

9

1) Should the stay of proceedings granted in the initial order be terminated because any plan of arrangement put forward by Rio Nevada is "deemed to failure"?

2) Should the stay granted under the initial order be extended?

Analysis

10 There is some disagreement between the parties as to the appropriate process to be followed in deciding these issues. Rio Nevada takes the position that the appropriate test is set out in Section 11(6) of the CCAA¹, and that the case law relating to the appropriate test in a “doomed to failure” application is merely a factor in applying Section 11(6): *Starcom International Optics Corp., Re* (1998), 3 C.B.R. (4th) 177 (B.C. S.C. [In Chambers]) at paragraph 22. Westcoast submits that, while Section 11(6) sets out the correct test for Rio Nevada’s application to extend the stay, the correct test for deciding whether its application to terminate the stay should succeed is the test set out in the case law.

11 The problem arises in part because much of the case law relating to applications to set aside a stay pre-dates the addition of Section 11(6) to the CCAA in 1997. However, although Section 11(6) applications to implement or extend a stay may often be met with opposition asserting that such a stay is doomed to failure, it is not necessary for these cross-applications to co-exist in every case. It is preferable to consider these issues separately in order to ensure the burden of proof on each applicant is applied appropriately, and the “doomed to failure” application should be considered first.

12 The burden of proof in setting aside a CCAA stay by establishing that any plan of arrangement is “doomed to failure” rests on the applicant wishing to have CCAA proceedings terminated, in this case, Westcoast: *Bargain Harold’s Discount Ltd. v. Paribas Bank of Canada*²; *Philip’s Manufacturing Ltd., Re*³

13 Rio Nevada does not have the burden of proving that a plan of arrangement put forward by it is not “doomed to failure”. As commented by Doherty, J.A. in *Nova Metal Products Inc. v. Comiskey (Trustee of)*⁴, the nature of CCAA proceedings is such that many plans of arrangement will involve “variables and contingencies which will make the plan’s ultimate acceptability to the creditors and the Court very uncertain at the time the initial application is made”. As a result, the debtor company does not bear the burden of establishing the likelihood of success from the outset. Although this is not Rio Nevada’s initial application, it is only seventeen days into CCAA proceedings, and Rio Nevada has not yet proposed any firm or specific plan of arrangement.

14 To meet the test set out in Section 11(6) for extension of a stay, Rio Nevada has the onus of proof and must satisfy the Court that circumstances exist that make such an order appropriate and that it has acted in good faith and diligently.

15 *Should the stay of proceedings granted in the initial order be terminated because any plan of arrangement put forward by Rio Nevada is “doomed to failure”?*

16 There appear to be at least two standards applied by courts in previous cases in deciding whether a stay under the CCAA should be set aside on a “doomed to failure” basis.

17 One standard, adopted by the courts in British Columbia, requires the applicant creditor to lead evidence to establish that a debtor company’s attempt at a plan of arrangement is indeed doomed to failure: *Philip’s Manufacturing Ltd., Re* (*supra*) at page 28; *Sharp-Rite Technologies Ltd., Re*⁵. As pointed out by Douglas Knowles and Alec Zimmerman in “Further

Developments and Trends in the Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act: 1992" (Insolvency Institute of Canada), this standard is extremely difficult for a creditor to satisfy, particularly in the early stages of CCAA proceedings. I prefer, and adopt, the test that appears to have been applied by Austin, J. in *Bargain Harold's Discount Ltd. (supra)*, that to succeed, the applicant creditor must show that there is no reasonable chance that any plan would be accepted.

18 In this case, there is no issue that Westcoast is a secured creditor of Rio Nevada. Although there is some dispute over the amount of liquidated damages owing under the gas purchase contract, this amounts to a difference of about \$125,000. There is an issue of whether GST can be claimed as part of contractual damages that may affect the amount of the claim. However, it appears from the evidence that Westcoast's claim is at least \$4,922,936, plus a September gas payment of \$113,069.59 plus GST and an October gas payment for the period to termination of the contract in an approximate amount of \$63,000 plus GST.

19 Even taking into account the disputed amount of liquidated damages and the GST issue, Westcoast's claim is approximately \$5,043,000, and accrues interest at between \$55 - 57,000 per month.

20 Westcoast submits that the market value of \$9.4 million assigned to Rio Nevada's oil and gas assets by Outtrim Szabo is too high, and questions the qualifications of Outtrim Szabo to give this valuation opinion. Westcoast estimates the value of Rio Nevada's assets at \$5,667,000, which it apparently arrived at by adding the value of Rio Nevada's Proved Developed Producing and Proved Developed Non-Producing reserves as set out in Outtrim Szabo's report and discounting at 15%. Westcoast ascribes no value to Rio Nevada's Proved Undeveloped or Probable Additional reserves, nor any value to the Concorde and Tierra shares or Rio Nevada's other miscellaneous assets. There is no independent evidence before me that this is an appropriate evaluation methodology for this company or that Outtrim Szabo's opinion is not appropriate in the circumstances.

21 In support of its application to terminate the stay, Westcoast submits that its security position is being eroded on a daily basis, as Rio Nevada's reserves are being developed at a value of between \$7,000 and \$10,000 a day. Westcoast submits that this is a situation of depleting resources, that interest is accruing and that professional fees will be incurred as part of the CCAA proceedings. If there is a real risk that a creditor's loan will become unsecured during the stay period, this is a factor to be taken into account in determining whether there should be a termination of the stay: *Nova Metal Products Inc. (supra)*. In this case, however, I am not satisfied on the valuation evidence that is before me that there is a substantial risk of encroachment on Westcoast's security. I am not satisfied that Westcoast's estimate of the value of Rio Nevada's assets should be preferred over the Outtrim Szabo opinion, nor that I should conclude at this point that no value should be ascribed to Rio Nevada's other assets. Assuming the market value of Rio Nevada's assets to be somewhere in a range between \$5.6 million and \$9.5 million, there is sufficient value and more to cover Westcoast's claim for the relatively brief period of the stay requested by Rio Nevada.

22 Westcoast also submits that Rio Nevada has had more than enough time to attempt a sale of assets or a restructuring, as it has been making efforts to resolve its financial problems since mid-August, 2000. However, Rio Nevada has had only seventeen days of protection under the CCAA, and the Monitor reports that Rio Nevada has had extensive discussions with potential purchasers and merger partners and is investigating the possibility of a re-financing. There is no suggestion of lack of diligence by Rio Nevada in attempting to formulate a reasonable reorganization plan.

23 The actual market value of Rio Nevada will be determined by its ability to restructure and to sell assets. Given the report of the Monitor, some potential exists for a plan of arrangement to be proposed that will cover the Westcoast debt and

31 The only evidence that may suggest lack of good faith by Rio Nevada is Westcoast's complaint that it was misled by Rio Nevada's management with respect to the status of well remediation, and also misled with respect to the acquisition of the shares of Concorde and Tierra. These are issues that relate more to Westcoast's decision to terminate the gas purchase contract than to Rio Nevada's conduct under CCAA proceedings, and are, at any event, in dispute between the parties. I am satisfied by the evidence put forward by Rio Nevada and by the Monitor that Rio Nevada has acted and is acting in good faith with respect to these proceedings.

32 As to whether circumstances exist that make the continuation of the stay appropriate, there are a number of factors that must be taken into account. The continuation of the stay in this case is supported by the basic purpose of the CCAA, to allow an insolvent company a reasonable period of time to reorganize and propose a plan of arrangement to its creditors and the court and to prevent manoeuvres for positioning among creditors in the interim; *Pacific National Lease Holding Corp., Re*⁷; *Meridian Development Inc. v. Toronto Dominion Bank*⁸. Westcoast has not satisfied the Court that an attempt at an acceptable compromise or arrangement is doomed to failure at this point in time. Negotiations for restructuring a sale or refinancing are ongoing, and there has been a strengthening of the management team. Rio Nevada continues in business, and plans are underway to remediate its two major wells, which will significantly increase the company's rate of production. A Monitor is in place, which provides comfort to the creditors that assets are not being dissipated and current operations are being supervised. The extension sought is not unduly long, and is supported by the secured creditors other than Westcoast. The costs of the CCAA proceedings are likely no less onerous than the costs of a receivership in these circumstances, and the relief sought under the CCAA less drastic to all constituencies than the order that would likely have to be made in a receivership.

33 I find that Rio Nevada has established that continuation of the stay is appropriate, and that the conditions to granting such an order have been met.

Application dismissed; cross-application granted.

Footnotes

¹ 11(6) *Burden of proof on application* - The court shall not make an order under subsection ... (4) [to extend a stay] 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.

² (1992), 10 C.B.R. (3d) 23 (Ont. Gen. Div.) at page 30.

³ (1992), 9 C.B.R. (3d) 25 (B.C. C.A.) at page 28.

⁴ (1990), 1 C.B.R. (3d) 101, 41 O.A.C. 282 (Ont. C.A.), (sub nom. *Elan Corp. v. Comiskey*), at page 316.

⁵ [2000] B.C.J. No. 135 (B.C. S.C.) at paragraph 25

⁶ [1991] O.J. No. 429 (Ont. Gen. Div.)

⁷ (August 17, 1992), Doc. A922870 (B.C. S.C.)

⁸ [1984] 5 W.W.R. 215, 53 A.R. 39 (Alta. Q.B.)

End of Document

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

TAB ;

2000 CarswellBC 1365
British Columbia Supreme Court

Sharp-Rite Technologies Ltd., Re

2000 CarswellBC 1365, 19 C.B.R. (4th) 130

In the Matter of the Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act R.S.C. 1985, c. C-36

In the Matter of the Company Act, R.S.B.C. 1996 c. 62

In the Matter of Sharp-Rite Technologies Ltd., Petitioner

Holmes J.

Judgment: April 7, 2000*
Docket: Vancouver A993276

Proceedings: Leave to appeal refused 2000 BCCA 402 (B.C. C.A. [In Chambers])

Counsel: *Ms H.M.B. Ferris*, for Petitioner.
G.A. Phillips, for Concurrent Mechanical Integration Inc.

Subject: Corporate and Commercial; Insolvency; Civil Practice and Procedure

Headnote

Corporations --- Arrangements and compromises — Under Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act — Arrangements — Effect of arrangement — Stay of proceedings

Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act, R.S.C. 1985, c. C-36, ss. 11(3), 18.1.

Table of Authorities

Cases considered by *Holmes J.* :

Cam-Net Communications v. Vancouver Telephone Co., 182 D.L.R. (4th) 436, 1999 BCCA 751, 71 B.C.L.R. (3d) 226, 132 B.C.A.C. 52, 215 W.A.C. 52, 2 B.L.R. (3d) 118, 17 C.B.R. (4th) 26 (B.C. C.A.) — applied

Citibank Canada v. Confederation Life Insurance Co. (1996), 42 C.B.R. (3d) 288, (sub nom. *Citibank Canada v. Confederation Life Insurance Co. (Liquidation)*) 15 O.T.C. 26 (Ont. Gen. Div.) — considered

Coba Industries Ltd. v. Millie's Holdings (Canada) Ltd. (1985), 20 D.L.R. (4th) 689 (B.C. C.A.) — applied

Telford v. Holt, 21 C.P.C. (2d) 1, [1987] 2 S.C.R. 193, 41 D.L.R. (4th) 385, 78 N.R. 321, (sub nom. *Holt v. Telford*) [1987] 6 W.W.R. 385, 54 Alta. L.R. (2d) 193, 81 A.R. 385, 37 B.L.R. 241, 46 R.P.R. 234 (S.C.C.) — referred to

Statutes considered:

Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act, R.S.C. 1985, c. C-36

Generally — referred to

s. 11(3) [en. 1997, c. 12, s. 124] — considered

s. 18.1 [en. 1997, c. 12, s. 125] — considered

APPLICATION by defendant for declaration that initial and confirming order under *Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act* was not bar to its filing statement of defence, including claims of set-off and counterclaim.

Holmes J. (orally) :

1 THE COURT: The applicant, C.M.I., seeks a declaration that the initial and confirming order in this matter is not a bar to it filing a defence, including claims of set-off and a counter-claim in respect of B.C. action S000698, Vancouver registry, between Sharp-Rite as Plaintiff and C.M.I as Defendant.

2 Alternatively, the application seeks an order that the applicant be granted liberty to file a defence, including set-off and a counter-claim *nunc pro tunc* to March 1, 2000. An order is also sought that paragraphs 1(b),(c),(f),(g) and (h) of the confirming order be varied and that paragraph 1(g) be struck as contrary to Section 18.1 of the *Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act* .

3 Sharp-Rite commenced action against C.M.I. February 6, 2000, for the outstanding balance of account alleged to be due and payable. The amount claimed is \$181,150.26. The Statement of Defence filed by C.M.I. claims for set-off, a counter-claim and a claim described as unjust enrichment.

4 As to the counter-claim, the initial and confirming orders extending Sharp-Rite the protection of the C.C.A.A. stayed the commencement of any counter-claim against Sharp-Rite. A counter-claim is an action, and actions against companies under the protection of the C.C.A.A. are prohibited by Section 11(3) of the Act. A claim that could be independent as a cause of action would be one capable of compromise under the C.C.A.A. plan. The act provides they be stayed and dealt with under internal process.

5 Madam Justice Rowles of the Court of Appeal in *Cam-Net Communications v. Vancouver Telephone Co.*, 1999 BCCA 751 (B.C. C.A.) p. 13 paragraph 47, and in all cases I'm using the citations as provided to me by counsel.

6 I quote:

Equitable set-off, operating as it does as a true defence, is really a means of denying the Plaintiff's claim in whole or in part and is not an attempt to raise an independent claim of the sort which should be compromised in the C.C.A.A. reorganization. If the Applicant fails to show that its claim is truly an equitable set-off, then its claim would be an independent action which must be compromised by the C.C.A.A. plan. In either event, the doctrine of equitable set-off should be given its proper reach in the context of C.C.A.A. reorganization.

7 I consider that it is clearly not open to C.M.I. to plead a counterclaim. The application for leave to file a counter-claim is accordingly dismissed.

8 As to set-off, the position regarding set-off by a debtor sued by a company under protection of the C.C.A.A. is different. The C.C.A.A. was amended September 1997 by the addition of Section 18.1, and I quote:

The law of set-off applies to all claims made against a debtor company and to all actions instituted by it for the recovery of debts due to the company in the same manner and to the same extent as if the company were Plaintiff or Defendant, as the case may be.

9 The Act therefore now permits the operation of the law of set-off. The rules in respect of set-off allow its proper use as a specific defence against a qualifying claim.

10 Madame Justice Rowles in *Cam-Net* summarized the situation, in insolvency context, at page 15, paragraph 24. She said:

Equitable set-off, as claimed by the Applicant in this case, will only be permitted where the claims are so closely related that it would be unfair or unjust to treat the claims separately.

11 She was paraphrasing Houlden and Morawetz, who describe the position as:

Equitable set-off arises where there is such a relationship between the claims of the parties that it would be unconscionable or inequitable not to permit set-off. For equitable set-off, there must be a close connection and inter-relatedness of the transaction sought to be set off, and, if this is lacking, equitable set-off will not be allowed.

12 The strict adherence required in respect of the law of set-off in an insolvency proceeding, and the necessity for it, is concisely stated by Madam Justice Rowles in *Cam-Net* at paragraph 22, and I quote:

Misusing the law of set-off is one example of how persons with a claim against the company in reorganization might attempt to escape the C.C.A.A. compromise. A party claiming set-off, as *Camnet* notes in its factum, realizes its claim on a dollar-for-dollar basis, while other creditors who have participated in the C.C.A.A. proceedings have their claims reduced substantially for this reason. The legislative intent animating the C.C.A.A. reorganization regime requires that

the courts remain vigilant to claims of set-off in thereorganization context.

13 Citations given,

Where set-off was refused when allowing equitable set-off, it would have the effect of defeating the intention of the bankruptcy legislation, and in particular giving the claimant a preference over other creditors.

14 Mr. Justice Blair in *Citibank Canada v. Confederation Life Insurance Co.* (1996), 42 C.B.R. (3d) 288 (Ont. Gen. Div.) , described how set-off may arise contractually, or at law, including by statute or in equity: see generally *Telford v. Holt* (1987), 41 D.L.R. (4th) 385 (S.C.C.) .

15 There was no written agreement here between the parties for set-off of claims. Legal set-off requires there be a liquidated amount and a mutuality of claim. I do not agree that the claim of C.M.I. expressed in the Statement of Defence to be a claim for unjust enrichment as a legal set-off.

16 Equitable set-off principles extracted from the decision of the Supreme Court of Canada, which was approving of the British Columbia Court of Appeal decision in *Coba Industries Ltd. v. Millie's Holdings (Canada) Ltd.* (1985), 20 D.L.R. (4th) 689 (B.C. C.A.) and which, for present purposes, are summarized in *Blue Ridge* at page 12, are, and I quote:

- (1) The party relying on a set-off must show some equitable ground for being protected against his adversaries' demands;
- (2) the equitable ground must go to the very root of the Plaintiff's claim before a set-off will be allowed;
- (3) a cross-claim must be clearly connected with the demand of the Plaintiff, that it would be manifestly unjust to allow the Plaintiff to enforce payment without taking into consideration the cross-claim;
- (4) the Plaintiff's claim and the cross-claim need not arise from the same transaction;
- (5) unliquidated claims are on the same footing as liquidated claims.

17 I have reviewed the evidence and the arguments as to the course of dealing between these parties. I have concern that there is cogent evidence that C.M.I. did not consider Sharp-Rite's claim for outstanding debt was subject to any substantial reduction because of any right to be claimed of set-off that had arisen until after the time that Sharp-Rite came within the C.C.A.A. protection. I cannot resolve the contradictory evidence of the parties in this regard, but I do consider the fact that there is a dispute, a factor I must take into account.

18 I also have concern for "NCR" invoicing by the Applicant which did not occur until after the C.C.A.A. initial order was made. The circumstances of delay reflect adversely as to the existence of any process of genuine set-off or mutuality regarding contemporary cross-claim.

19 I must also have regard to the applicant's pleading of the matters of set-off and counter-claim, which essentially categorized the claims being breaches of contract. The evidence in general suggests that for the bulk of the claim sought to be raised by set-off and counter-claim, that is an accurate categorization and they do comprise a separate cause of action.

20 I accept, however, that there is some scope for the Applicant to raise a plea of set-off that qualifies under the general principles of set-off. It is, however, of limited scope.

21 In my view, Madam Justice Rowles has provided a very useful test to discover a true set-off that is permissible in C.C.A.A. actions, and I quote from *Cam-Net* at paragraph 44:

The authorities are clear that a Defendant's claim will not be viewed as an equitable set-off, as opposed to a counter-claim, unless it is closely or intimately connected with or directly impeaches the Plaintiff's claim. If it does, however, then it's juridical operation will be, in the words of Lord Simon in *Aries Tanker*, *supra*, 'in the nature of a true defence.'

In the present case, the Applicant's claim does not appear intimately connected with that of *Cam-Net*. The Applicant has alleged damages caused by *Cam-Net's* breach of the very contract and of the very obligations on which the Applicant seeks to recover payment.

22 I accept that there is some scope to raise set-off that would qualify under the equitable principles and would not offend against the necessary balance of treating creditors equally under the C.C.A.A. stay to prevent one gaining an unfair advantage over another. I would define the general area of permissible set-off here as being those N.C.R. invoices or invoices for materials, labour or administrative costs relating to defective product delivered to C.M.I. by Sharp-Rite for which specific invoices were issued and delivered by C.M.I. prior to the date of the initial order, provided they relate to invoice charges by Sharp-Rite that are within the balance being sued upon.

23 Additionally, I would allow a pleading of set-off to include N.C.R. or charge-back invoices that relate to specific invoices by Sharp-Rite, delivered to the applicant within 30 days prior to the initial order. I accept the fact that the C.C.A.A. protection order might well cause a party to defer what would otherwise be appropriate set-off or related appropriate cross-claim billing.

24 The applications are dismissed, except that leave is granted to amend the statement of defence *nunc pro tunc* to March 1, 2000, to provide for a plea of set-off limited as I have outlined.

25 Though the applicant has succeeded in part only, I consider it appropriate they have the costs of this application.

26 COUNSEL: Thank you, my lord.

Application dismissed.

Footnotes

⁸ Leave to appeal refused 2000 BCCA 402, 19 C.B.R. (4th) 135 (B.C. C.A. [In Chambers]).

End of Document

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

TAB 10

2010 SCC 60
Supreme Court of Canada

Ted Leroy Trucking [Century Services] Ltd., Re

2010 CarswellBC 3419, 2010 CarswellBC 3420, 2010 SCC 60, [2010] 3 S.C.R. 379, [2010] G.S.T.C. 186, [2011] 2 W.W.R. 383, [2011] B.C.W.L.D. 533, [2011] B.C.W.L.D. 534, 12 B.C.L.R. (5th) 1, 196 A.C.W.S. (3d) 27, 2011 D.T.C. 5006 (Eng.), 2011 G.T.C. 2006 (Eng.), 296 B.C.A.C. 1, 326 D.L.R. (4th) 577, 409 N.R. 201, 503 W.A.C. 1, 72 C.B.R. (5th) 170, J.E. 2011-5

**Century Services Inc. (Appellant) and Attorney General of Canada on behalf of
Her Majesty The Queen in Right of Canada (Respondent)**

Deschamps J., McLachlin C.J.C., Binnie, LeBel, Fish, Abella, Charron, Rothstein, Cromwell JJ.

Heard: May 11, 2010
Judgment: December 16, 2010
Docket: 33239

Proceedings: reversing *Ted Leroy Trucking Ltd., Re* (2009), 2009 CarswellBC 1195, 2009 G.T.C. 2020 (Eng.), 2009 BCCA 205, 270 B.C.A.C. 167, 454 W.A.C. 167, [2009] 12 W.W.R. 684, 98 B.C.L.R. (4th) 242, [2009] G.S.T.C. 79 (B.C. C.A.); reversing *Ted Leroy Trucking Ltd., Re* (2008), 2008 CarswellBC 2895, 2008 BCSC 1805, [2008] G.S.T.C. 221, 2009 G.T.C. 2011 (Eng.) (B.C. S.C. [In Chambers])

Counsel: Mary I.A. Buttery, Owen J. James, Matthew J.G. Curtis for Appellant
Gordon Bourgard, David Jacyk, Michael J. Lema for Respondent

Subject: Estates and Trusts; Goods and Services Tax (GST); Tax — Miscellaneous; Insolvency

Related Abridgment Classifications

For all relevant Canadian Abridgment Classifications refer to highest level of case via History.

Headnote

Tax --- Goods and Services Tax — Collection and remittance — GST held in trust

Debtor owed Crown under Excise Tax Act (ETA) for unremitted GST — Debtor sought relief under Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act (CCAA) — Under order of BC Supreme Court, amount of GST debt was placed in trust account and remaining proceeds of sale of assets paid to major secured creditor — Debtor's application for partial lifting of stay of proceedings to assign itself into bankruptcy was granted, while Crown's application for payment of tax debt was dismissed — Crown's appeal to BC Court of Appeal was allowed — Creditor appealed to Supreme Court of Canada — Appeal allowed — Analysis of ETA and CCAA yielded conclusion that CCAA provides that statutory deemed trusts do not apply, and that Parliament did not intend to restore Crown's deemed trust priority in GST claims under CCAA when it amended ETA in 2000 — Parliament had moved away from asserting priority for Crown claims under both CCAA and Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act (BIA), and neither statute provided for preferred treatment of

GST claims — Giving Crown priority over GST claims during CCAA proceedings but not in bankruptcy would reduce use of more flexible and responsive CCAA regime — Parliament likely inadvertently succumbed to drafting anomaly — Section 222(3) of ETA could not be seen as having impliedly repealed s. 18.3 of CCAA by its subsequent passage, given recent amendments to CCAA — Court had discretion under CCAA to construct bridge to liquidation under BIA, and partially lift stay of proceedings to allow entry into liquidation — No “gap” should exist when moving from CCAA to BIA — Court order segregating funds did not have certainty that Crown rather than creditor would be beneficiary sufficient to support express trust — Amount held in respect of GST debt was not subject to deemed trust, priority or express trust in favour of Crown — Excise Tax Act, R.S.C. 1985, c. E-15, ss. 222(1), (1.1).

Tax --- General principles — Priority of tax claims in bankruptcy proceedings

Debtor owed Crown under Excise Tax Act (ETA) for unremitted GST — Debtor sought relief under Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act (CCAA) — Under order of BC Supreme Court, amount of GST debt was placed in trust account and remaining proceeds of sale of assets paid to major secured creditor — Debtor's application for partial lifting of stay of proceedings to assign itself into bankruptcy was granted, while Crown's application for payment of tax debt was dismissed — Crown's appeal to BC Court of Appeal was allowed — Creditor appealed to Supreme Court of Canada — Appeal allowed — Analysis of ETA and CCAA yielded conclusion that CCAA provides that statutory deemed trusts do not apply, and that Parliament did not intend to restore Crown's deemed trust priority in GST claims under CCAA when it amended ETA in 2000 — Parliament had moved away from asserting priority for Crown claims under both CCAA and Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act (BIA), and neither statute provided for preferred treatment of GST claims — Giving Crown priority over GST claims during CCAA proceedings but not in bankruptcy would reduce use of more flexible and responsive CCAA regime — Parliament likely inadvertently succumbed to drafting anomaly — Section 222(3) of ETA could not be seen as having impliedly repealed s. 18.3 of CCAA by its subsequent passage, given recent amendments to CCAA — Court had discretion under CCAA to construct bridge to liquidation under BIA, and partially lift stay of proceedings to allow entry into liquidation — No “gap” should exist when moving from CCAA to BIA — Court order segregating funds did not have certainty that Crown rather than creditor would be beneficiary sufficient to support express trust — Amount held in respect of GST debt was not subject to deemed trust, priority or express trust in favour of Crown.

Taxation --- Taxe sur les produits et services — Perception et versement — Montant de TPS détenu en fiducie

Débitrice devait à la Couronne des montants de TPS qu'elle n'avait pas remis, en vertu de la Loi sur la taxe d'accise (LTA) — Débitrice a entamé des procédures judiciaires en vertu de la Loi sur les arrangements avec les créanciers des compagnies (LACC) — En vertu d'une ordonnance du tribunal, le montant de la créance fiscale a été déposé dans un compte en fiducie et la balance du produit de la vente des actifs a servi à payer le créancier garanti principal — Demande de la débitrice visant à obtenir la levée partielle de la suspension de procédures afin qu'elle puisse faire cession de ses biens a été accordée, alors que la demande de la Couronne visant à obtenir le paiement des montants de TPS non remis a été rejetée — Appel interjeté par la Couronne a été accueilli — Créancier a formé un pourvoi — Pourvoi accueilli — Analyse de la LTA et de la LACC conduisait à la conclusion que le législateur 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 modifié la LTA, en 2000 — Législateur avait mis un terme à la priorité accordée aux créances de la Couronne sous les régimes de la LACC et de la Loi sur la faillite et l'insolvabilité (LFI), et ni l'une ni l'autre de ces lois ne prévoyaient que les créances relatives à la TPS bénéficiaient d'un traitement préférentiel — Fait de faire primer la priorité de la Couronne sur les créances découlant de la TPS dans le cadre de procédures fondées sur la LACC mais pas en cas de faillite aurait pour effet de restreindre le recours à la possibilité de se restructurer sous le régime plus souple et mieux adapté de la LACC — Il semblait probable que le législateur avait par inadvertance commis une anomalie rédactionnelle — On ne pourrait pas considérer l'art. 222(3) de la LTA comme ayant implicitement abrogé l'art. 18.3 de la LACC, compte tenu des modifications récemment apportées à la LACC — Sous le régime de la LACC, le tribunal avait discrétion pour établir une passerelle vers une liquidation opérée sous le régime de la LFI et de lever la suspension partielle des procédures afin de permettre à la débitrice de procéder à la transition au régime de liquidation — Il n'y avait aucune certitude, en vertu de l'ordonnance du tribunal, que la Couronne était le bénéficiaire véritable de la fiducie ni de fondement pour donner naissance à une fiducie expresse — Montant perçu au titre de la TPS ne faisait l'objet d'aucune fiducie présumée, priorité ou fiducie expresse en faveur de la Couronne.

Taxation --- Principes généraux — Priorité des créances fiscales dans le cadre de procédures en faillite

Débitrice devait à la Couronne des montants de TPS qu'elle n'avait pas remis, en vertu de la Loi sur la taxe d'accise

(LTA) — Débitrice a entamé des procédures judiciaires en vertu de la Loi sur les arrangements avec les créanciers des compagnies (LACC) — En vertu d'une ordonnance du tribunal, le montant de la créance fiscale a été déposé dans un compte en fiducie et la balance du produit de la vente des actifs a servi à payer le créancier garanti principal — Demande de la débitrice visant à obtenir la levée partielle de la suspension de procédures afin qu'elle puisse faire cession de ses biens a été accordée, alors que la demande de la Couronne visant à obtenir le paiement des montants de TPS non remis a été rejetée — Appel interjeté par la Couronne a été accueilli — Créancier a formé un pourvoi — Pourvoi accueilli — Analyse de la LTA et de la LACC conduisait à la conclusion que le législateur 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 modifié la LTA, en 2000 — Législateur avait mis un terme à la priorité accordée aux créances de la Couronne sous les régimes de la LACC et de la Loi sur la faillite et l'insolvabilité (LFI), et ni l'une ni l'autre de ces lois ne prévoyait que les créances relatives à la TPS bénéficiaient d'un traitement préférentiel — Fait de faire primer la priorité de la Couronne sur les créances découlant de la TPS dans le cadre de procédures fondées sur la LACC mais pas en cas de faillite aurait pour effet de restreindre le recours à la possibilité de se restructurer sous le régime plus souple et mieux adapté de la LACC — Il semblait probable que le législateur avait par inadvertance commis une anomalie rédactionnelle — On ne pourrait pas considérer l'art. 222(3) de la LTA comme ayant implicitement abrogé l'art. 18.3 de la LACC, compte tenu des modifications récemment apportées à la LACC — Sous le régime de la LACC, le tribunal avait discrétion pour établir une passerelle vers une liquidation opérée sous le régime de la LFI et de lever la suspension partielle des procédures afin de permettre à la débitrice de procéder à la transition au régime de liquidation — Il n'y avait aucune certitude, en vertu de l'ordonnance du tribunal, que la Couronne était le bénéficiaire véritable de la fiducie ni de fondement pour donner naissance à une fiducie expresse — Montant perçu au titre de la TPS ne faisait l'objet d'aucune fiducie présumée, priorité ou fiducie expresse en faveur de la Couronne.

The debtor company owed the Crown under the Excise Tax Act (ETA) for GST that was not remitted. The debtor commenced proceedings under the Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act (CCAA). Under an order by the B.C. Supreme Court, the amount of the tax debt was placed in a trust account, and the remaining proceeds from the sale of the debtor's assets were paid to the major secured creditor. The debtor's application for a partial lifting of the stay of proceedings in order to assign itself into bankruptcy was granted, while the Crown's application for the immediate payment of the unremitted GST was dismissed.

The Crown's appeal to the B.C. Court of Appeal was allowed. The Court of Appeal found that the lower court was bound by the ETA to give the Crown priority once bankruptcy was inevitable. The Court of Appeal ruled that there was a deemed trust under s. 222 of the ETA or that an express trust was created in the Crown's favour by the court order segregating the GST funds in the trust account.

The creditor appealed to the Supreme Court of Canada.

Held: The appeal was allowed.

Per Deschamps J. (McLachlin C.J.C., Binnie, LeBel, Charron, Rothstein, Cromwell JJ. concurring): A purposive and contextual analysis of the ETA and CCAA yielded 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. Parliament had moved away from asserting priority for Crown claims in insolvency law under both the CCAA and Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act (BIA). Unlike for source deductions, there was no express statutory basis in the CCAA or BIA for concluding that GST claims enjoyed any preferential treatment. The internal logic of the CCAA also militated against upholding a deemed trust for GST claims.

Giving the Crown priority over GST claims during CCAA proceedings but not in bankruptcy would, in practice, deprive companies of the option to restructure under the more flexible and responsive CCAA regime. It seemed likely that Parliament had inadvertently succumbed to a drafting anomaly, which could be resolved by giving precedence to s. 18.3 of the CCAA. Section 222(3) of the ETA could no longer be seen as having impliedly repealed s. 18.3 of the CCAA by being passed subsequently to the CCAA, given the recent amendments to the CCAA. The legislative context supported the conclusion that s. 222(3) of the ETA was not intended to narrow the scope of s. 18.3 of the CCAA.

The breadth of the court's discretion under the CCAA was sufficient to construct a bridge to liquidation under the BIA, so there was authority under the CCAA to partially lift the stay of proceedings to allow the debtor's entry into liquidation. There should be no gap between the CCAA and BIA proceedings that would invite a race to the courthouse to assert priorities.

The court order did not have the certainty that the Crown would actually be the beneficiary of the funds sufficient to support an express trust, as the funds were segregated until the dispute between the creditor and the Crown could be resolved. The amount collected in respect of GST but not yet remitted to the Receiver General of Canada was not subject to a deemed trust, priority or express trust in favour of the Crown.

Per Fish J. (concurring): Parliament had declined to amend the provisions at issue after detailed consideration of the insolvency regime, so the apparent conflict between s. 18.3 of the CCAA and s. 222 of the ETA should not be treated as a drafting anomaly. In the insolvency context, a deemed trust would exist only when two complementary elements co-existed: first, a statutory provision creating the trust; and second, a CCAA or BIA provision confirming its effective operation. Parliament had created the Crown's deemed trust in the Income Tax Act, Canada Pension Plan and Employment Insurance Act and then confirmed in clear and unmistakable terms its continued operation under both the CCAA and the BIA regimes. In contrast, the ETA created a deemed trust in favour of the Crown, purportedly notwithstanding any contrary legislation, but Parliament did not expressly provide for its continued operation in either the BIA or the CCAA. The absence of this confirmation reflected Parliament's intention to allow the deemed trust to lapse with the commencement of insolvency proceedings. Parliament's evident intent was to render GST deemed trusts inoperative upon the institution of insolvency proceedings, and so s. 222 of the ETA mentioned the BIA so as to exclude it from its ambit, rather than include it as the other statutes did. As none of these statutes mentioned the CCAA expressly, the specific reference to the BIA had no bearing on the interaction with the CCAA. It was the confirmatory provisions in the insolvency statutes that would determine whether a given deemed trust would subsist during insolvency proceedings.

Per Abella J. (dissenting): The appellate court properly found that s. 222(3) of the ETA gave priority during CCAA proceedings to the Crown's deemed trust in unremitted GST. The failure to exempt the CCAA from the operation of this provision was a reflection of clear legislative intent. Despite the requests of various constituencies and case law confirming that the ETA took precedence over the CCAA, there was no responsive legislative revision and the BIA remained the only exempted statute. There was no policy justification for interfering, through interpretation, with this clarity of legislative intention and, in any event, the application of other principles of interpretation reinforced this conclusion. Contrary to the majority's view, the "later in time" principle did not favour the precedence of the CCAA, as the CCAA was merely re-enacted without significant substantive changes. According to the Interpretation Act, in such circumstances, s. 222(3) of the ETA remained the later provision. The chambers judge was required to respect the priority regime set out in s. 222(3) of the ETA and so did not have the authority to deny the Crown's request for payment of the GST funds during the CCAA proceedings.

La compagnie débitrice devait à la Couronne des montants de TPS qu'elle n'avait pas remis, en vertu de la Loi sur la taxe d'accise (LTA). La débitrice a entamé des procédures judiciaires en vertu de la Loi sur les arrangements avec les créanciers des compagnies (LACC). En vertu d'une ordonnance du tribunal, le montant de la créance fiscale a été déposé dans un compte en fiducie et la balance du produit de la vente des actifs de la débitrice a servi à payer le créancier garanti principal. La demande de la débitrice visant à obtenir la levée partielle de la suspension de procédures afin qu'elle puisse faire cession de ses biens a été accordée, alors que la demande de la Couronne visant à obtenir le paiement immédiat des montants de TPS non remis a été rejetée.

L'appel interjeté par la Couronne a été accueilli. La Cour d'appel a conclu que le tribunal se devait, en vertu de la LTA, de donner priorité à la Couronne une fois la faillite inévitable. La Cour d'appel a estimé que l'art. 222 de la LTA établissait une fiducie présumée ou bien que l'ordonnance du tribunal à l'effet que les montants de TPS soient détenus dans un compte en fiducie créait une fiducie expresse en faveur de la Couronne.

Le créancier a formé un pourvoi.

Arrêt: Le pourvoi a été accueilli.

Deschamps, J. (McLachlin, J.C.C., Binnie, LeBel, Charron, Rothstein, Cromwell, JJ., souscrivant à son opinion) : Une analyse téléologique et contextuelle de la LTA et de la LACC conduisait à la conclusion que le législateur 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 modifié la LTA, en 2000. Le législateur avait mis un terme à la priorité accordée aux créances de la Couronne dans le cadre du droit de l'insolvabilité, sous le régime de la LACC et celui de la Loi sur la faillite et l'insolvabilité (LFI). Contrairement aux retenues à la source, aucune disposition législative expresse ne permettait de conclure que les créances relatives à la TPS bénéficiaient d'un traitement préférentiel sous le régime de la LACC ou celui de la LFI. La logique interne de la LACC allait également à l'encontre du maintien de la fiducie réputée à l'égard des créances découlant de la TPS.

Le fait de faire primer la priorité de la Couronne sur les créances découlant de la TPS dans le cadre de procédures fondées sur la LACC mais pas en cas de faillite aurait pour effet, dans les faits, de priver les compagnies de la possibilité de se restructurer sous le régime plus souple et mieux adapté de la LACC. Il semblait probable que le législateur avait par inadvertance commis une anomalie rédactionnelle, laquelle pouvait être corrigée en donnant préséance à l'art. 18.3 de la LACC. On ne pouvait plus considérer l'art. 222(3) de la LTA comme ayant implicitement abrogé l'art. 18.3 de la LACC parce qu'il avait été adopté après la LACC, compte tenu des modifications récemment apportées à la LACC. Le contexte législatif étayait la conclusion suivant laquelle l'art. 222(3) de la LTA n'avait pas pour but de restreindre la portée de l'art. 18.3 de la LACC.

L'ampleur du pouvoir discrétionnaire conféré au tribunal par la LACC était suffisant pour établir une passerelle vers une liquidation opérée sous le régime de la LFI, de sorte qu'il avait, en vertu de la LACC, le pouvoir de lever la suspension partielle des procédures afin de permettre à la débitrice de procéder à la transition au régime de liquidation. Il n'y avait aucune certitude, en vertu de l'ordonnance du tribunal, que la Couronne était le bénéficiaire véritable de la fiducie ni de fondement pour donner naissance à une fiducie expresse, puisque les fonds étaient détenus à part jusqu'à ce que le litige entre le créancier et la Couronne soit résolu. Le montant perçu au titre de la TPS mais non encore versé au receveur général du Canada ne faisait l'objet d'aucune fiducie présumée, priorité ou fiducie expresse en faveur de la Couronne.

Fish, J. (souscrivant aux motifs des juges majoritaires) : Le législateur a refusé de modifier les dispositions en question suivant un examen approfondi du régime d'insolvabilité, de sorte qu'on ne devrait pas qualifier l'apparente contradiction entre l'art. 18.3 de la LACC et l'art. 222 de la LTA d'anomalie rédactionnelle. Dans un contexte d'insolvabilité, on ne pourrait conclure à l'existence d'une fiducie présumée que lorsque deux éléments complémentaires étaient réunis : en premier lieu, une disposition législative qui crée la fiducie et, en second lieu, une disposition de la LACC ou de la LFI qui confirme l'existence de la fiducie. Le législateur a établi une fiducie présumée en faveur de la Couronne dans la Loi de l'impôt sur le revenu, le Régime de pensions du Canada et la Loi sur l'assurance-emploi puis, il a confirmé en termes clairs et explicites sa volonté de voir cette fiducie présumée produire ses effets sous le régime de la LACC et de la LFI. Dans le cas de la LTA, il a établi une fiducie présumée en faveur de la Couronne, sciemment et sans égard pour toute législation à l'effet contraire, mais n'a pas expressément prévu le maintien en vigueur de celle-ci sous le régime de la LFI ou celui de la LACC. L'absence d'une telle confirmation témoignait de l'intention du législateur de laisser la fiducie présumée devenir caduque au moment de l'introduction de la procédure d'insolvabilité. L'intention du législateur était manifestement de rendre inopérantes les fiducies présumées visant la TPS dès l'introduction d'une procédure d'insolvabilité et, par conséquent, l'art. 222 de la LTA mentionnait la LFI de manière à l'exclure de son champ d'application, et non de l'y inclure, comme le faisaient les autres lois. Puisqu'aucune de ces lois ne mentionnait spécifiquement la LACC, la mention explicite de la LFI n'avait aucune incidence sur l'interaction avec la LACC. C'était les dispositions confirmatoires que l'on trouvait dans les lois sur l'insolvabilité qui déterminaient si une fiducie présumée continuerait d'exister durant une procédure d'insolvabilité.

Abella, J. (dissidente) : La Cour d'appel a conclu à bon droit que l'art. 222(3) de la LTA donnait préséance à la fiducie présumée qui est établie en faveur de la Couronne à l'égard de la TPS non versée. Le fait que la LACC n'ait pas été soustraite à l'application de cette disposition témoignait d'une intention claire du législateur. Malgré les demandes répétées de divers groupes et la jurisprudence ayant confirmé que la LTA l'emportait sur la LACC, le législateur n'est pas intervenu et la LFI est demeurée la seule loi soustraite à l'application de cette disposition. Il n'y avait pas 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 et, de toutes manières, cette conclusion était renforcée par l'application d'autres principes d'interprétation. Contrairement à l'opinion des juges majoritaires, le principe de la préséance de la « loi postérieure » ne militait pas en faveur de la préséance de la LACC, celle-ci ayant été simplement adoptée à nouveau sans que l'on ne lui ait apporté de modifications importantes. En vertu de la Loi d'interprétation, dans ces circonstances, l'art. 222(3) de la LTA demeurait la disposition postérieure. Le juge siégeant en son cabinet était tenu de respecter le régime de priorités établi à l'art. 222(3) de la LTA, et 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.

Table of Authorities

Cases considered by *Deschamps J.*:

Air Canada, Re (2003), 42 C.B.R. (4th) 173, 2003 CarswellOnt 2464 (Ont. S.C.J. [Commercial List]) — referred to

Air Canada, Re (2003), 2003 CarswellOnt 4967 (Ont. S.C.J. [Commercial List]) — referred to

Alternative granite & marbre inc., Re (2009), (sub nom. *Dep. Min. Rev. Quebec v. Caisse populaire Desjardins de Montmagny*) 2009 G.T.C. 2036 (Eng.), (sub nom. *Quebec (Revenue) v. Caisse populaire Desjardins de Montmagny*) [2009] 3 S.C.R. 286, 312 D.L.R. (4th) 577, [2009] G.S.T.C. 154, (sub nom. *9083-4185 Québec Inc. (Bankrupt), Re*) 394 N.R. 368, 60 C.B.R. (5th) 1, 2009 SCC 49, 2009 CarswellQue 10706, 2009 CarswellQue 10707 (S.C.C.) — referred to

ATB Financial v. Metcalfe & Mansfield Alternative Investments II Corp. (2008), 2008 ONCA 587, 2008 CarswellOnt 4811, (sub nom. *Metcalfe & Mansfield Alternative Investments II Corp., Re*) 240 O.A.C. 245, (sub nom. *Metcalfe & Mansfield Alternative Investments II Corp., Re*) 296 D.L.R. (4th) 135, (sub nom. *Metcalfe & Mansfield Alternative Investments II Corp., Re*) 92 O.R. (3d) 513, 45 C.B.R. (5th) 163, 47 B.L.R. (4th) 123 (Ont. C.A.) — considered

Canadian Airlines Corp., Re (2000), [2000] 10 W.W.R. 269, 20 C.B.R. (4th) 1, 84 Alta. L.R. (3d) 9, 9 B.L.R. (3d) 41, 2000 CarswellAlta 662, 2000 ABQB 442, 265 A.R. 201 (Alta. Q.B.) — referred to

Canadian Red Cross Society / Société Canadienne de la Croix Rouge, Re (2000), 2000 CarswellOnt 3269, 19 C.B.R. (4th) 158 (Ont. S.C.J.) — referred to

Doré c. Verdun (Municipalité) (1997), (sub nom. *Doré v. Verdun (City)*) [1997] 2 S.C.R. 862, (sub nom. *Doré v. Verdun (Ville)*) 215 N.R. 81, (sub nom. *Doré v. Verdun (City)*) 150 D.L.R. (4th) 385, 1997 CarswellQue 159, 1997 CarswellQue 850 (S.C.C.) — distinguished

Dylex Ltd., Re (1995), 31 C.B.R. (3d) 106, 1995 CarswellOnt 54 (Ont. Gen. Div. [Commercial List]) — considered

First Vancouver Finance v. Minister of National Revenue (2002), [2002] 3 C.T.C. 285, (sub nom. *Minister of National Revenue v. First Vancouver Finance*) 2002 D.T.C. 6998 (Eng.), (sub nom. *Minister of National Revenue v. First Vancouver Finance*) 2002 D.T.C. 7007 (Fr.), 288 N.R. 347, 212 D.L.R. (4th) 615, [2002] G.S.T.C. 23, [2003] 1 W.W.R. 1, 45 C.B.R. (4th) 213, 2002 SCC 49, 2002 CarswellSask 317, 2002 CarswellSask 318, [2002] 2 S.C.R. 720 (S.C.C.) — considered

Gauntlet Energy Corp., Re (2003), 30 Alta. L.R. (4th) 192, 2003 ABQB 894, 2003 CarswellAlta 1735, [2003] G.S.T.C. 193, 49 C.B.R. (4th) 213, [2004] 10 W.W.R. 180, 352 A.R. 28 (Alta. Q.B.) — referred to

Hongkong Bank of Canada v. Chef Ready Foods Ltd. (1990), 51 B.C.L.R. (2d) 84, 1990 CarswellBC 394, 4 C.B.R. (3d) 311, (sub nom. *Chef Ready Foods Ltd. v. Hongkong Bank of Canada*) [1991] 2 W.W.R. 136 (B.C. C.A.) — referred to

Ivaco Inc., Re (2006), 2006 C.E.B. & P.G.R. 8218, 25 C.B.R. (5th) 176, 83 O.R. (3d) 108, 275 D.L.R. (4th) 132, 2006 CarswellOnt 6292, 56 C.C.P.B. 1, 26 B.L.R. (4th) 43 (Ont. C.A.) — referred to

Komunik Corp., Re (2010), 2010 CarswellQue 686, 2010 QCCA 183 (Que. C.A.) — referred to

Komunik Corp., Re (2009), 2009 QCCS 6332, 2009 CarswellQue 13962 (Que. S.C.) — referred to

Nova Metal Products Inc. v. Comiskey (Trustee of) (1990), 1990 CarswellOnt 139, 1 C.B.R. (3d) 101, (sub nom. *Elan Corp. v. Comiskey*) 1 O.R. (3d) 289, (sub nom. *Elan Corp. v. Comiskey*) 41 O.A.C. 282 (Ont. C.A.) — considered

Ottawa Senators Hockey Club Corp., Re (2005), 2005 G.T.C. 1327 (Eng.), 6 C.B.R. (5th) 293, 2005 D.T.C. 5233 (Eng.), 2005 CarswellOnt 8, [2005] G.S.T.C. 1, 193 O.A.C. 95, 73 O.R. (3d) 737 (Ont. C.A.) — not followed

Pacific National Lease Holding Corp., Re (1992), 72 B.C.L.R. (2d) 368, 19 B.C.A.C. 134, 34 W.A.C. 134, 15 C.B.R. (3d) 265, 1992 CarswellBC 524 (B.C. C.A. [In Chambers]) — referred to

Philip's Manufacturing Ltd., Re (1992), 9 C.B.R. (3d) 25, 67 B.C.L.R. (2d) 84, 4 B.L.R. (2d) 142, 1992 CarswellBC 542 (B.C. C.A.) — referred to

Quebec (Deputy Minister of Revenue) c. Rainville (1979), (sub nom. *Bourgeault. Re*) 33 C.B.R. (N.S.) 301, (sub nom. *Bourgeault's Estate v. Quebec (Deputy Minister of Revenue)*) 30 N.R. 24, (sub nom. *Bourgeault. Re*) 105 D.L.R. (3d) 270, 1979 CarswellQue 165, 1979 CarswellQue 266, (sub nom. *Quebec (Deputy Minister of Revenue) v. Bourgeault (Trustee of)*) [1980] 1 S.C.R. 35 (S.C.C.) — referred to

Reference re Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act (Canada) (1934), [1934] 4 D.L.R. 75, 1934 CarswellNat 1, 16 C.B.R. 1, [1934] S.C.R. 659 (S.C.C.) — referred to

Royal Bank v. Sparrow Electric Corp. (1997), 193 A.R. 321, 135 W.A.C. 321, [1997] 2 W.W.R. 457, 208 N.R. 161, 12 P.P.S.A.C. (2d) 68, 1997 CarswellAlta 112, 1997 CarswellAlta 113, 46 Alta. L.R. (3d) 87, (sub nom. *R. v. Royal Bank*) 97 D.T.C. 5089, 143 D.L.R. (4th) 385, 44 C.B.R. (3d) 1, [1997] 1 S.C.R. 411 (S.C.C.) — considered

Skeena Cellulose Inc., Re (2003), 2003 CarswellBC 1399, 2003 BCCA 344, 184 B.C.A.C. 54, 302 W.A.C. 54, 43 C.B.R. (4th) 187, 13 B.C.L.R. (4th) 236 (B.C. C.A.) — referred to

Skydome Corp., Re (1998), 16 C.B.R. (4th) 118, 1998 CarswellOnt 5922 (Ont. Gen. Div. [Commercial List]) — referred to

Solid Resources Ltd., Re (2002), [2003] G.S.T.C. 21, 2002 CarswellAlta 1699, 40 C.B.R. (4th) 219 (Alta. Q.B.) — referred to

Stelco Inc., Re (2005), 253 D.L.R. (4th) 109, 75 O.R. (3d) 5, 2 B.L.R. (4th) 238, 9 C.B.R. (5th) 135, 2005 CarswellOnt 1188, 196 O.A.C. 142 (Ont. C.A.) — referred to

United Used Auto & Truck Parts Ltd., Re (1999), 12 C.B.R. (4th) 144, 1999 CarswellBC 2673 (B.C. S.C. [In Chambers]) — referred to

United Used Auto & Truck Parts Ltd., Re (2000), 2000 BCCA 146, 135 B.C.A.C. 96, 221 W.A.C. 96, 2000 CarswellBC 414, 73 B.C.L.R. (3d) 236, 16 C.B.R. (4th) 141, [2000] 5 W.W.R. 178 (B.C. C.A.) — referred to

Cases considered by Fish J.:

Ottawa Senators Hockey Club Corp., Re (2005), 2005 G.T.C. 1327 (Eng.), 6 C.B.R. (5th) 293, 2005 D.T.C. 5233 (Eng.), 2005 CarswellOnt 8, [2005] G.S.T.C. 1, 193 O.A.C. 95, 73 O.R. (3d) 737 (Ont. C.A.) — not followed

Cases considered by Abella J. (dissenting):

Canada (Attorney General) v. Canada (Public Service Staff Relations Board) (1977), [1977] 2 F.C. 663, 14 N.R. 257, 74 D.L.R. (3d) 307, 1977 CarswellNat 62, 1977 CarswellNat 62F (Fed. C.A.) — referred to

Doré c. Verdun (Municipalité) (1997), (sub nom. *Doré v. Verdun (City)*) [1997] 2 S.C.R. 862, (sub nom. *Doré v. Verdun (Ville)*) 215 N.R. 81, (sub nom. *Doré v. Verdun (City)*) 150 D.L.R. (4th) 385, 1997 CarswellQue 159, 1997 CarswellQue 850 (S.C.C.) — referred to

Ottawa Senators Hockey Club Corp., Re (2005), 2005 G.T.C. 1327 (Eng.), 6 C.B.R. (5th) 293, 2005 D.T.C. 5233 (Eng.), 2005 CarswellOnt 8, [2005] G.S.T.C. 1, 193 O.A.C. 95, 73 O.R. (3d) 737 (Ont. C.A.) — considered

R. v. Tele-Mobile Co. (2008), 2008 CarswellOnt 1588, 2008 CarswellOnt 1589, 2008 SCC 12, (sub nom. *Tele-Mobile Co. v. Ontario*) 372 N.R. 157, 55 C.R. (6th) 1, (sub nom. *Ontario v. Tele-Mobile Co.*) 229 C.C.C. (3d) 417, (sub nom. *Tele-Mobile Co. v. Ontario*) 235 O.A.C. 369, (sub nom. *Tele-Mobile Co. v. Ontario*) [2008] 1 S.C.R. 305, (sub nom. *R. v. Tele-Mobile Company (Telus Mobility)*) 92 O.R. (3d) 478 (note), (sub nom. *Ontario v. Tele-Mobile Co.*) 291 D.L.R. (4th) 193 (S.C.C.) — considered

Statutes considered by Deschamps J.:

Bank Act, S.C. 1991, c. 46
Generally — referred to

Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act, R.S.C. 1985, c. B-3
Generally — referred to

s. 67(2) — referred to

s. 67(3) — referred to

s. 81.1 [en. 1992, c. 27, s. 38(1)] — considered

s. 81.2 [en. 1992, c. 27, s. 38(1)] — considered

s. 86(1) — considered

s. 86(3) — referred to

Bankruptcy Act and to amend the Income Tax Act in consequence thereof, Act to amend the, S.C. 1992, c. 27
Generally — referred to

s. 39 — referred to

Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act, the Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act and the Income Tax Act, Act to amend the, S.C. 1997, c. 12

s. 73 — referred to

s. 125 — referred to

s. 126 — referred to

Canada Pension Plan, R.S.C. 1985, c. C-8

Generally — referred to

s. 23(3) — referred to

s. 23(4) — referred to

Cités et villes, Loi sur les, L.R.Q., c. C-19

en général — referred to

Code civil du Québec, L.Q. 1991, c. 64

en général — referred to

art. 2930 — referred to

Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act, Act to Amend, S.C. 1952-53, c. 3

Generally — referred to

Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act, 1933, S.C. 1932-33, c. 36

Generally — referred to

Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act, R.S.C. 1985, c. C-36

Generally — referred to

s. 11 — considered

s. 11(1) — considered

s. 11(3) — referred to

s. 11(4) — referred to

s. 11(6) — referred to

s. 11.02 [en. 2005, c. 47, s. 128] — referred to

s. 11.09 [en. 2005, c. 47, s. 128] — considered

s. 11.4 [en. 1997, c. 12, s. 124] — referred to

s. 18.3 [en. 1997, c. 12, s. 125] — considered

s. 18.3(1) [en. 1997, c. 12, s. 125] — considered

s. 18.3(2) [en. 1997, c. 12, s. 125] — considered

s. 18.4 [en. 1997, c. 12, s. 125] — referred to

s. 18.4(1) [en. 1997, c. 12, s. 125] — considered

s. 18.4(3) [en. 1997, c. 12, s. 125] — considered

s. 20 — considered

s. 21 — considered

s. 37 — considered

s. 37(1) — referred to

Employment Insurance Act, S.C. 1996, c. 23

Generally — referred to

s. 86(2) — referred to

s. 86(2.1) [en. 1998, c. 19, s. 266(1)] — referred to

Excise Tax Act, R.S.C. 1985, c. E-15

Generally — referred to

s. 222(1) [en. 1990, c. 45, s. 12(1)] — referred to

s. 222(3) [en. 1990, c. 45, s. 12(1)] — considered

Fairness for the Self-Employed Act, S.C. 2009, c. 33

Generally — referred to

Income Tax Act, R.S.C. 1985, c. 1 (5th Supp.)

s. 227(4) — referred to

s. 227(4.1) [en. 1998, c. 19, s. 226(1)] — referred to

Interpretation Act, R.S.C. 1985, c. I-21

s. 44(f) — considered

Personal Property Security Act, S.A. 1988, c. P-4.05

Generally — referred to

Sales Tax and Excise Tax Amendments Act, 1999, S.C. 2000, c. 30

Generally — referred to

Wage Earner Protection Program Act, S.C. 2005, c. 47, s. 1

Generally — referred to

s. 69 — referred to

s. 128 — referred to

s. 131 — referred to

Statutes considered *Fish J.*:

Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act, R.S.C. 1985, c. B-3

Generally — referred to

s. 67(2) — considered

s. 67(3) — considered

Canada Pension Plan, R.S.C. 1985, c. C-8

Generally — referred to

s. 23 — considered

Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act, R.S.C. 1985, c. C-36

Generally — referred to

s. 11 — considered

s. 18.3(1) [en. 1997, c. 12, s. 125] — considered

s. 18.3(2) [en. 1997, c. 12, s. 125] — considered

s. 37(1) — considered

Employment Insurance Act, S.C. 1996, c. 23

Generally — referred to

s. 86(2) — referred to

s. 86(2.1) [en. 1998, c. 19, s. 266(1)] — referred to

Excise Tax Act, R.S.C. 1985, c. E-15

Generally — referred to

s. 222 [en. 1990, c. 45, s. 12(1)] — considered

s. 222(1) [en. 1990, c. 45, s. 12(1)] — considered

s. 222(3) [en. 1990, c. 45, s. 12(1)] — considered

s. 222(3)(a) [en. 1990, c. 45, s. 12(1)] — considered

Income Tax Act, R.S.C. 1985, c. 1 (5th Supp.)

Generally — referred to

s. 227(4) — considered

s. 227(4.1) [en. 1998, c. 19, s. 226(1)] — considered

s. 227(4.1)(a) [en. 1998, c. 19, s. 226(1)] — considered

Statutes considered *Abella J.* (dissenting):

Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act, R.S.C. 1985, c. B-3

Generally — referred to

Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act, R.S.C. 1985, c. C-36

Generally — referred to

s. 11 — considered

s. 11(1) — considered

s. 11(3) — considered

s. 18.3(1) [en. 1997, c. 12, s. 125] — considered

s. 37(1) — considered

Excise Tax Act, R.S.C. 1985, c. E-15

Generally — referred to

s. 222 [en. 1990, c. 45, s. 12(1)] — considered

s. 222(3) [en. 1990, c. 45, s. 12(1)] — considered

Interpretation Act, R.S.C. 1985, c. I-21

s. 2(1)"enactment" — considered

s. 44(f) — considered

Winding-up and Restructuring Act, R.S.C. 1985, c. W-11

Generally — referred to

APPEAL by creditor from judgment reported at 2009 CarswellBC 1195, 2009 BCCA 205, [2009] G.S.T.C. 79, 98 B.C.L.R. (4th) 242, [2009] 12 W.W.R. 684, 270 B.C.A.C. 167, 454 W.A.C. 167, 2009 G.T.C. 2020 (Eng.) (B.C. C.A.), allowing Crown's appeal from dismissal of application for immediate payment of tax debt.

Deschamps J.:

1 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 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.

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 (B.C. S.C. [In Chambers])).

6 The Crown's appeal was allowed by the British Columbia Court of Appeal (2009 BCCA 205, [2009] G.S.T.C. 79, 270 B.C.A.C. 167 (B.C. C.A.)). 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 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]

G.S.T.C. 1, 73 O.R. (3d) 737 (Ont. 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?

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 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 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 Arrangement Act (Canada)*, [1934] S.C.R. 659 (S.C.C.), 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 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, October 3, 1991, at pp. 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 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, 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, ss. 25 and 29; see also *Alternative granite & marbre inc., Re*, 2009 SCC 49, [2009] 3 S.C.R. 286, [2009] G.S.T.C. 154 (S.C.C.); *Quebec (Deputy Minister of Revenue) c. Rainville* (1979), [1980] 1 S.C.R. 35 (S.C.C.); *Proposed Bankruptcy Act Amendments: Report of the Advisory Committee on Bankruptcy and Insolvency* (1986)).

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, [2003] G.S.T.C. 193, 30 Alta. L.R. (4th) 192 (Alta. Q.B.), at para. 19).

25 Mindful of the historical background of the *CCAA* and *BIA*, I now turn to the first question at issue.

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., Re*, 2009 QCCS 6332 (Que. S.C.), leave to appeal granted, 2010 QCCA 183 (Que. C.A.)). 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 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 am. 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. Bank. 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 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 v. Sparrow Electric Corp.*, [1997] 1 S.C.R. 411 (S.C.C.), 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. Minister of National Revenue*, 2002 SCC 49, [2002] G.S.T.C. 23, [2002] 2 S.C.R. 720 (S.C.C.), 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").

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, 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.

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 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, [2003] G.S.T.C. 21 (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 c. Verdun (Municipalité)*, [1997] 2 S.C.R. 862 (S.C.C.), 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, 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 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.

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*.

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 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 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.

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" (*ATB Financial v. Metcalfe & Mansfield Alternative Investments II Corp.*, 2008 ONCA 587, 92 O.R. (3d) 513 (Ont. C.A.), 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. Gen. Div. [Commercial List])), 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.

(*Nova Metal Products Inc. v. Comiskey (Trustee of)* (1990), 41 O.A.C. 282 (Ont. C.A.), 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 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., *Hongkong Bank of Canada v. Chef Ready Foods Ltd.* (1990), 51 B.C.L.R. (2d) 84 (B.C. C.A.), at pp. 88-89; *Pacific National Lease Holding Corp., Re* (1992), 19 B.C.A.C. 134 (B.C. C.A. [In Chambers]), 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 (Alta. Q.B.), at para. 144, *per* Paperny J. (as she then was); *Air Canada, Re* (2003), 42 C.B.R. (4th) 173 (Ont. S.C.J. [Commercial List]), at para. 3; *Air Canada, Re* [2003 CarswellOnt 4967 (Ont. S.C.J. [Commercial List]), 2003 CanLII 49366, 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.

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. Gen. Div. [Commercial List]); *United Used Auto & Truck Parts Ltd., Re*, 2000 BCCA 146, 135 B.C.A.C. 96 (B.C. C.A.), *aff'g* (1999), 12 C.B.R. (4th) 144 (B.C. S.C. [In Chambers]); 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 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 (B.C. C.A.), at paras. 45-47, *per* Newbury J.A.; *Stelco Inc. (Re)* (2005), 75 O.R. (3d) 5 (Ont. C.A.), 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 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 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*.

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 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 lost in bankruptcy *Ivaco Inc. (Re)*

(2006), 83 O.R. (3d) 108 (Ont. C.A.), 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 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. Tysse 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) inferrable from the court's order of April 29, 2008, sufficient to support an express trust.

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 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.

Fish J. (concurring):

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*"). 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 (B.C. S.C. [In Chambers])).

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, [2005] G.S.T.C. 1 (Ont. 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.

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:

227 (4) Trust for moneys deducted — 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) Extension of trust — 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 apart from the property of the person, in trust for Her Majesty whether or not the property is subject to such a security interest, ...

...

... and the proceeds of such property shall be paid to the Receiver General in priority to all such security interests.

100 The continued operation of this deemed trust is expressly *confirmed* in s. 18.3 of the CCAA:

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 being held in trust for Her Majesty unless it would be so regarded in the absence of that statutory provision.

(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*...

101 The operation of the *ITA* deemed trust is also confirmed in s. 67 of the *BIA*:

67 (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.

(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*...

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.

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) the *CCAA* and in s. 67(3) 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) [Deemed] 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 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).

...

(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 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, [2009] G.S.T.C. 79 (B.C. C.A.), at para. 37). *All* of the deemed trust 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 be subject to no deemed trust or priority in favour of the Crown.

Abella J. (dissenting):

114 The central issue in this appeal is whether s. 222 of the *Excise Tax Act*, R.S.C. 1985, c. E-15 ("*EIA*"), 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:

222 (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.

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, [2005] G.S.T.C. 1 (Ont. 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 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 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, at pp. 37-38). 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 *R. v. Tele-Mobile Co.*, 2008 SCC 12, [2008] 1 S.C.R. 305 (S.C.C.), 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]

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*).

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 c. Verdun (Municipalité)*, [1997] 2 S.C.R. 862 (S.C.C.)).

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:

[T]he 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 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 *Canada (Attorney General) v. Canada (Public Service Staff Relations Board)*, [1977] 2 F.C. 663 (Fed. C.A.), dealing with the predecessor provision to s. 44(f)). It directs that new enactments not be construed as “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 reorder the provisions of this Act”. During second reading, the Hon. Bill Rompkey, then the Deputy Leader of the Government in the 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 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.

Appeal allowed.

Pourvoi accueilli.

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,

(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,
- (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, 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 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 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.

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 in respect of any related interest, penalties or other amounts.

...

20. [Act to be applied jointly 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);

(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 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 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 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.

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) [Deemed] 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 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

- (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
- (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

(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.

Footnotes

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.

² The amendments did not come into force until September 18, 2009.

TAB 11

2012 ONSC 2515
Ontario Superior Court of Justice [Commercial List]

Timminco Ltd., Re

2012 CarswellOnt 5390, 2012 ONSC 2515, 216 A.C.W.S. (3d) 286

**In the Matter of the Companies' Creditors
Arrangement Act, R.S.C. 1985 c. C-36, as Amended**

In the Matter of a Plan of Compromise or Arrangement of
Timminco Limited and Bécancour Silicon Inc., Applicants

Morawetz J.

Heard: March 26, 2012
Judgment: April 27, 2012
Docket: CV-12-9539-00CL

Counsel: James C. Orr, N. Mizobuchi, for St. Clair Penneyfeather, Plaintiff in Class Proceeding, Penneyfeather v. Timminco Limited et al

P. O'Kelly, A. Taylor, for Applicants

P. LeVay, for Photon Defendants

A. Lockhart, for Wacker Chemie AG

K.D. Kraft, for Chubb Insurance Company of Canada

D.J. Bell, for John P. Walsh

A. Hatnay, James Harnum, for Mercer Canada, Administrator of the Timminco Haley Plan

S. Weisz, for Monitor, FTI Consulting Canada Inc.

Subject: Insolvency; Civil Practice and Procedure

Related Abridgment Classifications

For all relevant Canadian Abridgment Classifications refer to highest level of case via History.

Headnote

Bankruptcy and insolvency --- Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act — Initial application — Lifting of stay

Plaintiff sought to bring class proceedings regarding insurance proceeds against company that was protected under Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act — Stay under Act was lifted for purposes of bringing leave to appeal regarding limitation period — Hearing was held regarding lifting stay generally — Stay not lifted — Stay was put in place for restructuring and sale — If plaintiff's proceedings were to continue, executive team would have to devote considerable time to proceedings — Time sensitivity was largely alleviated by lifting stay with regards to leave proceedings — Insurance proceeds were not available to other creditors.

Table of Authorities

Cases considered by *Morawetz J.*:

Algoma Steel Corp. v. Royal Bank (1992), 8 O.R. (3d) 449, 93 D.L.R. (4th) 98, 55 O.A.C. 303, 11 C.B.R. (3d) 11, 1992 CarswellOnt 163 (Ont. C.A.) — referred to

Canwest Global Communications Corp., Re (2011), 2011 ONSC 2215, 2011 CarswellOnt 2392, 75 C.B.R. (5th) 156 (Ont. S.C.J. [Commercial List]) — referred to

Carey Canada Inc., Re (2006), 29 C.B.R. (5th) 81, 2006 CarswellOnt 7748 (Ont. S.C.J. [Commercial List]) — referred to

Stelco Inc., Re (2005), 253 D.L.R. (4th) 109, 75 O.R. (3d) 5, 2 B.L.R. (4th) 238, 9 C.B.R. (5th) 135, 2005 CarswellOnt 1188, 196 O.A.C. 142 (Ont. C.A.) — referred to

Western Canadian Shopping Centres Inc. v. Dutton (2001), (sub nom. *Western Canadian Shopping Centres Inc. v. Bennett Jones Verchere*) 201 D.L.R. (4th) 385, [2002] 1 W.W.R. 1, 286 A.R. 201, 253 W.A.C. 201, 8 C.P.C. (5th) 1, 94 Alta. L.R. (3d) 1, 272 N.R. 135, 2001 SCC 46, 2001 CarswellAlta 884, 2001 CarswellAlta 885, [2001] 2 S.C.R. 534 (S.C.C.) — referred to

Statutes considered:

Class Proceedings Act, 1992, S.O. 1992, c. 6
Generally — referred to

s. 12 — referred to

s. 28 — referred to

Securities Act, R.S.O. 1990, c. S.5
Generally — referred to

s. 138.14 [en. 2002, c. 22, s. 185] — referred to

HEARING regarding lifting stay of proceedings imposed under *Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act*.

Morawetz J.:

1 St. Clair Penneyfeather, the Plaintiff in the *Penneyfeather v. Timminco Limited, et al* action, Court File No. CV-09-378701-00CP (the "Class Action"), brought this motion for an order lifting the stay of proceedings, as provided by the Initial Order of January 3, 2012 and extended by court order dated January 27, 2012, and permitting Mr. Penneyfeather to continue the Class Action against Timminco Limited ("Timminco"), Dr. Heinz Schimmelbusch, Mr. Robert Dietrich, Mr. Rene Boisvert, Mr. Arthur R. Spector, Mr. Jack Messman, Mr. John C. Fox, Mr. Michael D. Winfield, Mr. Mickey M. Yaksich and Mr. John P. Walsh.

2 The Class Action was commenced on May 14, 2009 and has been case managed by Perell J. The following steps have taken place in the litigation:

(a) a carriage motion;

(b) a motion to substitute the Representative Plaintiff;

(c) a motion to force disclosure of insurance policies;

(d) a motion for leave to appeal the result of the insurance motion which was heard by the Divisional Court and dismissed;

(e) settlement discussions;

(f) when settlement discussions were terminated, Perell J. declined an expedited leave hearing and instead declared any limitation period to be stayed;

(g) a motion for particulars; and

(h) a motion served but not heard to strike portions of the Statement of Claim.

3 On February 16, 2012, the Court of Appeal for Ontario set aside the decision of Perell J. declaring that s. 28 of the *Class Proceedings Act* suspended the running of the three-year limitation period under s. 138.14 of the *Securities Act*.

4 The Plaintiffs' counsel received instructions to seek leave to appeal the decision of the Court of Appeal for Ontario to the Supreme Court of Canada. The leave materials were required to be served and filed by April 16, 2012.

5 On April 10, 2012, the following endorsement was released in respect of this motion:

The portion of the motion dealing with lifting the stay for the Plaintiff to seek leave to appeal the recent decision of the Court of Appeal for Ontario to the Supreme Court of Canada on the limitation period issue was not opposed. This portion of the motion is granted and an order shall issue to give effect to the foregoing. The balance of the requested relief is under reserve.

6 Counsel to Mr. Penneyfeather submits that, apart from the leave to appeal issues, there are steps that may occur before Perell J. as a result of the Court of Appeal ruling. Counsel references that the Defendants may bring motions for partial judgment and the Plaintiff could seek to have the court proceed with leave and certification with any order to be granted *nunc pro tunc* pursuant to s. 12 of the *Class Proceedings Act*.

7 Counsel to Mr. Penneyfeather submits that the three principal objectives of the *Class Proceedings Act* are judicial economy, access to justice and behaviour modification. (See *Western Canadian Shopping Centres Inc. v. Dutton*, [2001] 2 S.C.R. 534 (S.C.C.) at paras. 27-29.), and under the *Securities Act*, the deterrent represented by private plaintiffs armed with a realistic remedy is important in ensuring compliance with continuous disclosure rules.

8 Counsel submits that, in this situation, there is only one result that will not do violence to a primary legislative purpose and that is to lift the stay to permit the Class Action to proceed on the condition that any potential execution excludes Timminco's assets. Counsel further submits that, as a practical result, this would limit recovery in the Class Action to the proceeds of the insurance policies, or in the event that the insurers decline coverage because of fraud, to the personal assets of those officers and directors found responsible for the fraud.

9 Counsel to Mr. Penneyfeather takes the position that the requested outcome is consistent with the judicial principal that the CCAA is not meant as a refuge insulating insurers from providing appropriate indemnification. (See *Algoma Steel Corp. v. Royal Bank*, [1992] O.J. No. 889 (Ont. C.A.) at paras. 13-15 and *Carey Canada Inc., Re*, [2006] O.J. No. 4905 (Ont. S.C.J. [Commercial List]) at paras. 7, 16-17.)

10 In this case, counsel contends that, when examining the relative prejudice to the parties, the examination strongly favours lifting the stay in the manner proposed since the insurance proceeds are not available to other creditors and there would be no financial unfairness caused by lifting the stay.

11 The position put forward by Mr. Penneyfeather must be considered in the context of the CCAA proceedings. As stated in the affidavit of Ms. Konyukhova, the stay of proceedings was put in place in order to allow Timminco and Bécancour Silicon Inc. ("BSI" and, together with Timminco, the "Timminco Entities") to pursue a restructuring and sales process that is intended to maximize recovery for the stakeholders. The Timminco Entities continue to operate as a going concern, but with a substantially reduced management team. The Timminco Entities currently have only ten active employees, including Mr. Kalins, President, General Counsel and Corporate Secretary and three executive officers (the "Executive Team").

12 Counsel to the Timminco Entities submits that, if Mr. Penneyfeather is permitted to pursue further steps in the Class Action, key members of the Executive Team will be required to spend significant amounts of their time dealing with the Class Action in the coming months, which they contend is a key time in the CCAA proceedings. Counsel contends that the executive team is currently focussing on the CCAA proceedings and the sales process.

13 Counsel to the Timminco Entities points out that the Executive Team has been required to direct most of their time to restructuring efforts and the sales process. Currently, the "stalking horse" sales process will continue into June 2012 and I am satisfied that it will require intensive time commitments from management of the Timminco Entities.

14 It is reasonable to assume that, by late June 2012, all parties will have a much better idea as to when the sales process will be complete.

15 The stay of proceedings is one of the main tools available to achieve the purpose of the CCAA. The stay provides the Timminco Entities with a degree of time in which to attempt to arrange an acceptable restructuring plan or sale of assets in order to maximize recovery for stakeholders. The court's jurisdiction in granting a stay extends to both preserving the *status quo* and facilitating a restructuring. See *Stelco Inc., Re*, [2005] O.J. No. 1171 (Ont. C.A.) at para. 36.

16 Further, the party seeking to lift a stay bears a heavy onus as the practical effect of lifting a stay is to create a scenario where one stakeholder is placed in a better position than other stakeholders, rather than treating stakeholders equally in accordance with their priorities. See *Canwest Global Communications Corp., Re*, [2011] O.J. No. 1590 (Ont. S.C.J. [Commercial List]) at para. 27.

17 Courts will consider a number of factors in assessing whether it is appropriate to lift a stay, but those factors can generally be grouped under three headings: (a) the relative prejudice to parties; (b) the balance of convenience; and (c) where relevant, the merits (*i.e.* if the matter has little chance of success, there may not be sound reasons for lifting the stay). See *Canwest Global Communications (Re)*, *supra*, at para. 27.

18 Counsel to the Timminco Entities submits that the relative prejudice to the parties and the balance of convenience clearly favours keeping the stay in place, rather than to allow the Plaintiff to proceed with the SCC leave application. As noted above, leave has been granted to allow the Plaintiff to proceed with the SCC leave application. Counsel to the Timminco Entities further submits that, while the merits are vigorously disputed by the Defendants in the context of a Class Action, the Timminco Entities will not ask this court to make any determinations based on the merits of the Plaintiff's claim.

19 I can well recognize why Mr. Penneyfeather wishes to proceed. The objective of the Plaintiff in the Class Action is to access insurance proceeds that are not available to other creditors. However, the reality of the situation is that the operating side of Timminco is but a shadow of its former self. I accept the argument put forth by counsel to the Applicant that, if the Executive Team is required to spend significant amounts of time dealing with the Class Action in the coming months, it will detract from the ability of the Executive Team to focus on the sales process in the CCAA proceeding to the potential detriment of the Timminco Entities' other stakeholders. These are two competing interests. It seems to me, however, that the primary focus has to be on the sales process at this time. It is important that the Executive Team devote its energy to ensuring that the sales process is conducted in accordance with the timelines previously approved. A delay in the sales process may very well have a negative impact on the creditors of Timminco. Conversely, the time sensitivity of the Class Action has been, to a large extent, alleviated by the lifting of the stay so as to permit the leave application to the Supreme Court of Canada.

20 It is also significant to recognize the submission of counsel on behalf of Mr. Walsh. Counsel to Mr. Walsh takes the position that Mr. Penneyfeather has nothing more than an "equity claim" as defined in the CCAA and, as such, his claim (both against the company and its directors who, in turn, would have an equity claim based on indemnity rights) would be subordinated to any creditor claims. Counsel further submits that of all the potential claims to require adjudication, presumably, equity claims would be the least pressing to be adjudicated and do not become relevant until all secured and unsecured claims have been paid in full.

21 In my view, it is not necessary for me to comment on this submission, other than to observe that to the extent that the claim of Mr. Penneyfeather is intended to access certain insurance proceeds, it seems to me that the prosecution of such claim can be put on hold, for a period of time, so as to permit the Executive Team to concentrate on the sales process.

22 Having considered the relative prejudice to the parties and the balance of convenience, I have concluded that it is premature to lift the stay at this time, with respect to the Timminco Entities, other than with respect to the leave application to the Supreme Court of Canada. It also follows, in my view, that the stay should be left in place with respect to the claim as against the directors and officers. Certain members of this group are involved in the Executive Team and, for the reasons stated above, I am satisfied that it is not appropriate to lift the stay as against them.

23 With respect to the claim against Photon, as pointed out by their counsel, it makes no sense to lift the stay only as against Photon and leave it in place with respect to the Timminco Entities. As counsel submits, the Timminco Entities have an interest in both the legal issues and the factual issues that may be advanced if Mr. Penneyfeather proceeds as against Photon, as any such issues as are determined in Timminco's absence may cause unfairness to Timminco, particularly, if Mr. Penneyfeather later seeks to rely on those findings as against Timminco. I am in agreement with counsel's submission that to make such an order would be prejudicial to Timminco's business and property. In addition, I accept the submission that it would also be unfair to Photon to require it to answer Mr. Penneyfeather's allegations in the absence of Timminco as counsel has indicated that Photon will necessarily rely on documents and information produced by Timminco as part of its own defence.

24 I am also in agreement with the submission that it would be wasteful of judicial resources to permit the class proceedings to proceed as against Photon but not Timminco as, in addition to the duplicative use of court time, there would be the possibility of inconsistent findings on similar or identical factual issues and legal issues. For these reasons, I have concluded that it is not appropriate to lift the stay as against Photon.

25 In the result, the motion dealing with issues not covered by the April 10, 2012 endorsement is dismissed without prejudice to the rights of the Plaintiff to renew his request no sooner than 75 days after today's date.

Order accordingly.

IN THE MATTER OF the *Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act*, R.S.C. 1985, c. C-36, as amended

Court File No: CV-14-10518-00CL

AND IN THE MATTER OF a plan of compromise or arrangement of The Cash Store Financial Services Inc., The Cash Store Inc., TCS Cash Store Inc., Instalogs Inc., 7252331 Canada Inc., 5515433 Manitoba Inc., and 1693926 Alberta Ltd Doing Business as "The Title Store"

Ontario

**SUPERIOR COURT OF JUSTICE
COMMERCIAL LIST**

Proceeding commenced at Toronto

BOOK OF AUTHORITIES

May 11, 2014

OSLER, HOSKIN & HARCOURT LLP
P.O. Box 50, 1 First Canadian Place
Toronto, ON M5X 1B8

Marc Wasserman LSUC#44066M
Tel: (416) 862-4908

Jeremy Dacks LSUC# 41851R
Tel: (416) 862-4923
Fax: (416) 862-6666

Counsel for the Chief Restructuring Officer to the Applicants