ENTERED

JUDICIAL CENTRE OF CALGARY
FILED
Jul 14, 2021
nk
by Email
CLERK OF THE COURT

701975

Justice Romaine
JS
July 16, 2021

Form 7
[Rule 3.8]

Clerk's Stamp

COURT FILE NUMBER	2101-05019
COURT	COURT OF QUEEN'S BENCH OF ALBERTA
JUDICIAL CENTRE	CALGARY

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

AND IN THE MATTER OF THE COMPROMISE OR ARRANGEMENT OF COALSPUR MINES (OPERATIONS) LTD.

DOCUMENT **BENCH BRIEF OF THE APPLICANTS**

ADDRESS FOR SERVICE AND CONTACT INFORMATION OF PARTY FILING THIS DOCUMENT

OSLER, HOSKIN & HARCOURT LLP
Barristers & Solicitors
Brookfield Place, Suite 2700
225 6 Ave SW
Calgary, AB T2P 1N2

Solicitors: Randal Van de Mosselaer / Emily Paplawski
Telephone: (403) 260-7000
Facsimile: (403) 260-7024
Email: RVandemosselaer@osler.com / EPaplawski@osler.com
File Number: 1217428

I. INTRODUCTION

1. This bench brief is filed in support of an application by Coalspur Mines (Operations) Ltd. ("**Coalspur**" or the "**Applicant**") for, among other things, approval of: (a) the Settlement Agreement and Mutual Release between Coalspur, Ridley Terminals Inc. ("**RTI**") and Cline Trust Company LLC ("**CTC**"), dated July 13, 2021 (the "**Settlement Agreement**"); and (b) an increase to the interim financing approved by this Court in the Amended and Restated Initial Order, granted May 6, 2021 (the "**Amended Initial Order**") from USD$26,000,000 (the "**Interim Financing Facility**") to USD$56,000,000.

2. This bench brief addresses Coalspur's request for approval of the Settlement Agreement. The legal principles applicable to Coalspur's request for an increase to the Interim Financing Facility are discussed further in the Bench Brief filed by Coalspur on April 21, 2021 in support of the Amended Initial Order.[1]

II. FACTS

3. On May 7, 2021, Coalspur served RTI with a Notice (the "**Disclaimer Notice**") by Debtor Company to Disclaim or Resiliate a Terminal Services Agreement between RTI and Coalspur, dated January 1, 2018 (as amended pursuant to a Settlement Agreement and Mutual Release dated July 1, 2020 and a Letter Agreement dated February 13, 2021, the "**Terminal Services Agreement**").[2]

4. RTI objected to the Disclaimer Notice and filed an application seeking, among other things, a declaration pursuant to section 32 of the *Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act*, RSC 1985, c

[1] A copy of the Bench Brief can be access at: http://cfcanada.fticonsulting.com/coalspur/motions.htm (see: Originating Motion, April 26, 2021, Application Materials – Osler, Hoskin & Harcourt LLP as counsel to the Applicant).
[2] Fifth Affidavit of Michael Beyer, sworn July 14, 2020 ("**Beyer Affidavit**") at para 6.

C-36 (the "**CCAA**")[3] that the Terminal Services Agreement shall not be disclaimed or resiliated (the "**RTI Application**").[4]

5. In response to the RTI Application and various allegations made by RTI against Coalspur, Coalspur filed an application seeking, among other things, a declaration that Coalspur is not compelled to perform the Terminal Services Agreement until such agreement is disclaimed (the "**Coalspur Application**").[5]

6. Following the filing of the RTI Application and the Coalspur Application, RTI and Coalspur pursued good faith settlement discussions to settle the various issues between them, including with respect to the Disclaimer Notice. Such discussion ultimately culminated in the Settlement Agreement.[6]

7. The Settlement Agreement, among other things, will: (a) settle all matters arising out of or in any way relating to the Terminal Services Agreement, the Disclaimer Notice, the RTI Application, the Coalspur Application, and/or Coalspur's ongoing proceedings under the CCAA, (b) terminate the Terminal Services Agreement consensually and without further litigation, (c) result in the exchange of mutual releases as between Coalspur and RTI and RTI and CTC, and (d) result in withdrawal of the RTI Application and Coalspur Application.[7]

III. LAW AND ARGUMENT

8. The CCAA does not provide an express statutory framework for the settlement of claims in the course of proceedings under the statute. The Court's jurisdiction to approve settlement

[3] CCAA at s. 32 **[TAB 1]**.
[4] Beyer Affidavit at para 7.
[5] Beyer Affidavit at para 8.
[6] Beyer Affidavit at para 10.
[7] Beyer Affidavit at para 11.

agreements may be found in the breadth of its discretion and authority under the CCAA, and particularly:

(a) the Court's general power under section 11 of the *CCAA* to make any order that it considers appropriate in the circumstances;[8]

(b) the Court's power to impose terms and conditions on the granting of a stay following an initial order under subsection 11.02(2) of the CCAA;[9] and

(c) the Court's inherent jurisdiction to "fill in the gaps" of the CCAA to give effect to its objectives.[10]

9. As confirmed by the Supreme Court of Canada in *Century Services Inc v Canada (Attorney General)*, the *CCAA* is a remedial statute that provides the courts with "broad and flexible authority" to make such orders to give effect to the objectives of the statute, including, as earlier discussed, to avoid the social and economic losses associated with insolvency proceedings.[11]

10. Justice Morawetz has articulated the relevant considerations in the Court's assessment of a settlement agreement in the *CCAA* context, as follows:

(a) Is the settlement fair and reasonable?

---

[8] CCAA at s. 11 **[TAB 1]**; *Re Walter Energy Canada Holdings Inc*, 2017 BCSC 1968 at para 32 **[TAB 2]**, citing *Re Great Basin Gold Ltd*, 2012 BCSC 1773 at para 16.
[9] CCAA, s 11.02(2) **[TAB 1]**; *Re Nortel Networks Corp*, 2010 ONSC 1708 at para 68 [*Nortel 2010 Decision*] **[TAB 3]**, referring to the analogous former s. 11(4) of the CCAA; *Re Calpine Canada Energy Ltd*, 2007 ABCA 266 at paras 25-26 **[TAB 4]**, citing *Re Smoky River Coal Ltd*, 1999 ABCA 179 at paras 53, 60.
[10] *Re Nortel Networks Corp*, (2009), 55 CBR (5th) 229 (Ont SCJ [Commercial List]) at para 30 **[TAB 5]**, citing *Re Canadian Red Cross Society*, (1998), 5 CBR (4th) 299 (Ont SCJ GenDiv [Commercial List]) at para 43, *Re PSINET Ltd*, (2001), 28 CBR (4th) 95 (Ont SCJ [Commercial List]) at para 5, and *ATB Financial v Metcalfe & Mansfield Alternative Investments II Corp*, 2008 ONCA 587 at paras 43-52, leave to appeal ref'd [2008] SCCA No 337 [*ATB Financial*].
[11] *Century Services Inc v Canada (Attorney General)*, 2010 SCC 60 at paras 18-19 **[TAB 6]**.

(b) Does the settlement provide substantial benefit to the stakeholders?

(c) Is the settlement consistent with the purpose and spirit of the *CCAA*?[12]

11. In assessing whether the proposed settlement is fair and reasonable, the court will consider "its balancing of the interests of all parties; its equitable treatment of the [parties], including creditors who are not signatories to a settlement agreement; and its benefit to the Applicant and its stakeholders generally".[13]

12. Where a settlement agreement is fair, reasonable, and consistent with the spirit and purpose of the CCAA, Courts have made clear that such negotiated resolutions are "encouraged". As Madam Justice Fitzpatrick noted in *Great Basin Gold Ltd. (Re)*:

> [T]he chances of achieving a successful restructuring proceeding increase where the parties can agree on certain issues. Settlement agreements between the parties in these types of proceedings are very much encouraged where resolutions take place in the boardroom, as opposed to the courtroom. There is every reason to encourage such settlements, with approval and implementation subject to appropriate judicial oversight.[14]

13. Here, the Settlement Agreement is fair and reasonable. It is the result of significant good faith discussions between Coalspur and RTI, and provides a significant benefit to Coalspur's stakeholders by, among other things:

(a) avoiding the costs and uncertainty which would be otherwise be associated with litigating the RTI Application and the Coalspur Application;

---

[12] *Labourers' Pension Fund of Central and Eastern Canada v Sino-Forest Corp*, 2013 ONSC 1078 at para 49, leave to appeal to ONCA ref'd, 2013 ONCA 456, leave to appeal to SCC ref'd, [2013] SCCA No 395 [*Sino-Forest*] **[TAB 7]**, citing *Robertson v ProQuest Information & Learning Co*, 2011 ONSC 1647 (Ont SCJ [Commercial List]) at para 22.

[13] *Nortel 2010 Decision* at para 73 **[TAB 3]**.

[14] *Re Great Basin Gold Ltd*, 2012 BCSC 1773 at para 15 **[TAB 8]**.

(b) providing Coalspur with greater flexibility with respect to restructuring options and alternatives for exiting these CCAA proceedings as it eliminates a potentially significant claim which RTI may otherwise advance in these proceedings; and

(c) resulting in a termination of the Terminal Services Agreement on a consensual basis, thereby facilitating Coalspur's performance of the Amended and Restated Westshore Agreement and realization of related savings for the benefit of all stakeholders.[15]

14. In these circumstances, Coalspur submits that the relevant considerations overwhelmingly support approval of the Settlement Agreement, and Coalspur respectfully requests that this Honourable Court grant the relief requested and approve the Settlement Agreement.

ALL OF WHICH IS RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED THIS 14th day of July, 2021



Randal Van de Mosselaer / Emily Paplawski
Osler, Hoskin & Harcourt LLP
Counsel for the Applicants

[15] As discussed in greater detail in the Confidential Affidavit of Donald S. Swartz II, sworn June 8, 2020.

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

TAB	AUTHORITY
1.	*Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act,* RSC 1986, c C-36
2.	*Re Walter Energy Canada Holdings, Inc*, 2017 BCSC 1968
3.	*Re Nortel Networks Corp*, 2010 ONSC 1708
4.	*Re Calpine Canada Energy Ltd*, 2007 ABCA 266
5.	*Re Nortel Networks Corp*, (2009), 55 CBR (5th) 229 (Ont SCJ [Commercial List])
6.	*Century Services Inc v Canada (Attorney General)*, 2010 SCC 60
7.	*Labourers' Pension Fund of Central and Eastern Canada v Sino-Forest Corp*, 2013 ONSC 1078, leave to appeal to ONCA ref'd, 2013 ONCA 456, leave to appeal to SCC ref'd, [2013] SCCA No 395
8.	*Re Great Basin Gold Ltd*, 2012 BCSC 1773

TAB 1

CANADA

CONSOLIDATION

CODIFICATION

Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act

Loi sur les arrangements avec les créanciers des compagnies

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

L.R.C. (1985), ch. C-36

Current to June 16, 2021

Last amended on November 1, 2019

À jour au 16 juin 2021

Dernière modification le 1 novembre 2019

Published by the Minister of Justice at the following address:
http://laws-lois.justice.gc.ca

Publié par le ministre de la Justice à l'adresse suivante :
http://lois-laws.justice.gc.ca

available to any person specified in the order on any terms or conditions that the court considers appropriate.

R.S., 1985, c. C-36, s. 10; 2005, c. 47, s. 127.

peut être communiqué, aux conditions qu'il estime indiquées, à la personne qu'il nomme.

L.R. (1985), ch. C-36, art. 10; 2005, ch. 47, art. 127.

General power of court

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

R.S., 1985, c. C-36, s. 11; 1992, c. 27, s. 90; 1996, c. 6, s. 167; 1997, c. 12, s. 124; 2005, c. 47, s. 128.

Pouvoir général du tribunal

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

L.R. (1985), ch. C-36, art. 11; 1992, ch. 27, art. 90; 1996, ch. 6, art. 167; 1997, ch. 12, art. 124; 2005, ch. 47, art. 128.

Relief reasonably necessary

11.001 An order made under section 11 at the same time as an order made under subsection 11.02(1) or during the period referred to in an order made under that subsection with respect to an initial application shall be limited to relief that is reasonably necessary for the continued operations of the debtor company in the ordinary course of business during that period.

2019, c. 29, s. 136.

Redressements normalement nécessaires

11.001 L'ordonnance rendue au titre de l'article 11 en même temps que l'ordonnance rendue au titre du paragraphe 11.02(1) ou pendant la période visée dans l'ordonnance rendue au titre de ce paragraphe relativement à la demande initiale n'est limitée qu'aux redressements normalement nécessaires à la continuation de l'exploitation de la compagnie débitrice dans le cours ordinaire de ses affaires durant cette période.

2019, ch. 29, art. 136.

Rights of suppliers

11.01 No order made under section 11 or 11.02 has the effect of

(a) prohibiting a person from requiring immediate payment for goods, services, use of leased or licensed property or other valuable consideration provided after the order is made; or

(b) requiring the further advance of money or credit.

2005, c. 47, s. 128.

Droits des fournisseurs

11.01 L'ordonnance prévue aux articles 11 ou 11.02 ne peut avoir pour effet :

a) d'empêcher une personne d'exiger que soient effectués sans délai les paiements relatifs à la fourniture de marchandises ou de services, à l'utilisation de biens loués ou faisant l'objet d'une licence ou à la fourniture de toute autre contrepartie de valeur qui ont lieu après l'ordonnance;

b) d'exiger le versement de nouvelles avances de fonds ou de nouveaux crédits.

2005, ch. 47, art. 128.

Stays, etc. — initial application

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

(a) staying, until otherwise ordered by the court, all proceedings taken or that might be taken in respect of the company under the *Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act* or the *Winding-up and Restructuring Act*;

Suspension : demande initiale

11.02 (1) Dans le cas d'une demande initiale visant une compagnie débitrice, le tribunal peut, par ordonnance, aux conditions qu'il peut imposer et pour la période maximale de dix jours qu'il estime nécessaire :

a) suspendre, jusqu'à nouvel ordre, toute procédure qui est ou pourrait être intentée contre la compagnie sous le régime de la *Loi sur la faillite et l'insolvabilité* ou de la *Loi sur les liquidations et les restructurations*;

(b) 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.

b) surseoir, jusqu'à nouvel ordre, à la continuation de toute action, poursuite ou autre procédure contre la compagnie;

c) interdire, jusqu'à nouvel ordre, l'introduction de toute action, poursuite ou autre procédure contre la compagnie.

Stays, etc. — other than initial application

(2) 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.

Suspension : demandes autres qu'initiales

(2) Dans le cas d'une demande, autre qu'une demande initiale, visant une compagnie débitrice, le tribunal peut, par ordonnance, aux conditions qu'il peut imposer et pour la période qu'il estime nécessaire :

a) suspendre, jusqu'à nouvel ordre, toute procédure qui est ou pourrait être intentée contre la compagnie sous le régime des lois mentionnées à l'alinéa (1)a);

b) surseoir, jusqu'à nouvel ordre, à la continuation de toute action, poursuite ou autre procédure contre la compagnie;

c) interdire, jusqu'à nouvel ordre, l'introduction de toute action, poursuite ou autre procédure contre la compagnie.

Burden of proof on application

(3) The court shall not make the order unless

(a) the applicant satisfies the court that circumstances exist that make the order appropriate; and

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

Preuve

(3) Le tribunal ne rend l'ordonnance que si :

a) le demandeur le convainc que la mesure est opportune;

b) dans le cas de l'ordonnance visée au paragraphe (2), le demandeur le convainc en outre qu'il a agi et continue d'agir de bonne foi et avec la diligence voulue.

Restriction

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

2005, c. 47, s. 128, 2007, c. 36, s. 62(F); 2019, c. 29, s. 137.

Restriction

(4) L'ordonnance qui prévoit l'une des mesures visées aux paragraphes (1) ou (2) ne peut être rendue qu'en vertu du présent article.

2005, ch. 47, art. 128, 2007, ch. 36, art. 62(F); 2019, ch. 29, art. 137.

Stays — directors

11.03 (1) An order made under section 11.02 may provide that no person may commence or continue any action against a director of the company on any claim against directors that arose before the commencement of proceedings under this Act and that relates to obligations of the company if directors are under any law liable in their capacity as directors for the payment of those obligations, until a compromise or an arrangement in respect of the company, if one is filed, is sanctioned by the court or is refused by the creditors or the court.

Suspension — administrateurs

11.03 (1) L'ordonnance prévue à l'article 11.02 peut interdire l'introduction ou la continuation de toute action contre les administrateurs de la compagnie relativement aux réclamations qui sont antérieures aux procédures intentées sous le régime de la présente loi et visent des obligations de la compagnie dont ils peuvent être, ès qualités, responsables en droit, tant que la transaction ou l'arrangement, le cas échéant, n'a pas été homologué par le tribunal ou rejeté par celui-ci ou les créanciers.

Exception

(2) Subsection (1) does not apply in respect of an action against a director on a guarantee given by the director relating to the company's obligations or an action seeking injunctive relief against a director in relation to the company.

Persons deemed to be directors

(3) If all of the directors have resigned or have been removed by the shareholders without replacement, any person who manages or supervises the management of the business and affairs of the company is deemed to be a director for the purposes of this section.

2005, c. 47, s. 128.

Persons obligated under letter of credit or guarantee

11.04 No order made under section 11.02 has affect on any action, suit or proceeding against a person, other than the company in respect of whom the order is made, who is obligated under a letter of credit or guarantee in relation to the company.

2005, c. 47, s. 128.

11.05 [Repealed, 2007, c. 29, s. 105]

Member of the Canadian Payments Association

11.06 No order may be made under this Act that has the effect of preventing a member of the Canadian Payments Association from ceasing to act as a clearing agent or group clearer for a company in accordance with the *Canadian Payments Act* or the by-laws or rules of that Association.

2005, c. 47, s. 128, 2007, c. 36, s. 64.

11.07 [Repealed, 2012, c. 31, s. 420]

Restriction — certain powers, duties and functions

11.08 No order may be made under section 11.02 that affects

(a) the exercise or performance by the Minister of Finance or the Superintendent of Financial Institutions of any power, duty or function assigned to them by the *Bank Act*, the *Cooperative Credit Associations Act*, the *Insurance Companies Act* or the *Trust and Loan Companies Act*;

(b) the exercise or performance by the Governor in Council, the Minister of Finance or the Canada Deposit Insurance Corporation of any power, duty or function assigned to them by the *Canada Deposit Insurance Corporation Act*; or

Exclusion

(2) La suspension ne s'applique toutefois pas aux actions contre les administrateurs pour les garanties qu'ils ont données relativement aux obligations de la compagnie ni aux mesures de la nature d'une injonction les visant au sujet de celle-ci.

Présomption : administrateurs

(3) Si tous les administrateurs démissionnent ou sont destitués par les actionnaires sans être remplacés, quiconque dirige ou supervise les activités commerciales et les affaires internes de la compagnie est réputé un administrateur pour l'application du présent article.

2005, ch. 47, art. 128.

Suspension — lettres de crédit ou garanties

11.04 L'ordonnance prévue à l'article 11.02 est sans effet sur toute action, poursuite ou autre procédure contre la personne — autre que la compagnie visée par l'ordonnance — qui a des obligations au titre de lettres de crédit ou de garanties se rapportant à la compagnie.

2005, ch. 47, art. 128.

11.05 [Abrogé, 2007, ch. 29, art. 105]

Membre de l'Association canadienne des paiements

11.06 Aucune ordonnance prévue par la présente loi ne peut avoir pour effet d'empêcher un membre de l'Association canadienne des paiements de cesser d'agir, pour une compagnie, à titre d'agent de compensation ou d'adhérent correspondant de groupe conformément à la *Loi canadienne sur les paiements* et aux règles et règlements administratifs de l'Association.

2005, ch. 47, art. 128; 2007, ch. 36, art. 64.

11.07 [Abrogé, 2012, ch. 31, art. 420]

Restrictions : exercice de certaines attributions

11.08 L'ordonnance prévue à l'article 11.02 ne peut avoir d'effet sur :

a) l'exercice par le ministre des Finances ou par le surintendant des institutions financières des attributions qui leur sont conférées par la *Loi sur les banques*, la *Loi sur les associations coopératives de crédit*, la *Loi sur les sociétés d'assurances* ou la *Loi sur les sociétés de fiducie et de prêt*;

b) l'exercice par le gouverneur en conseil, le ministre des Finances ou la Société d'assurance-dépôts du Canada des attributions qui leur sont conférées par la *Loi sur la Société d'assurance-dépôts du Canada*;

(c) the exercise by the Attorney General of Canada of any power, assigned to him or her by the *Winding-up and Restructuring Act*.

2005, c. 47, s. 128.

c) l'exercice par le procureur général du Canada des pouvoirs qui lui sont conférés par la *Loi sur les liquidations et les restructurations*.

2005, ch. 47, art. 128.

Stay — Her Majesty

11.09 (1) 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*, an employee's premium, or employer's premium, as defined in the *Employment Insurance Act*, or a premium under Part VII.1 of that 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*

Suspension des procédures : Sa Majesté

11.09 (1) L'ordonnance prévue à l'article 11.02 peut avoir pour effet de suspendre :

a) l'exercice par Sa Majesté du chef du Canada des droits que lui confère le paragraphe 224(1.2) de la *Loi de l'impôt sur le revenu* ou toute disposition du *Régime de pensions du Canada* ou de la *Loi sur l'assurance-emploi* qui renvoie à ce paragraphe et qui prévoit la perception d'une cotisation, au sens du *Régime de pensions du Canada*, d'une cotisation ouvrière ou d'une cotisation patronale, au sens de la *Loi sur l'assurance-emploi*, ou d'une cotisation prévue par la partie VII.1 de cette loi ainsi que des intérêts, pénalités et autres charges afférents, à l'égard d'une compagnie qui est un débiteur fiscal visé à ce paragraphe ou à cette disposition, pour la période se terminant au plus tard :

(i) à l'expiration de l'ordonnance,

(ii) au moment du rejet, par le tribunal ou les créanciers, de la transaction proposée,

(iii) six mois après que le tribunal a homologué la transaction ou l'arrangement,

(iv) au moment de tout défaut d'exécution de la transaction ou de l'arrangement,

(v) au moment de l'exécution intégrale de la transaction ou de l'arrangement;

b) l'exercice par Sa Majesté du chef d'une province, pour la période que le tribunal estime indiquée et se terminant au plus tard au moment visé à celui des sous-alinéas a)(i) à (v) qui, le cas échéant, est applicable, des droits que lui confère toute disposition législative de cette province à l'égard d'une compagnie qui est un débiteur visé par la loi provinciale, s'il s'agit d'une disposition dont l'objet est semblable à celui du paragraphe 224(1.2) de la *Loi de l'impôt sur le revenu*, ou qui renvoie à ce paragraphe, et qui prévoit la perception d'une somme, ainsi que des intérêts, pénalités et autres charges afférents, laquelle :

(i) soit a été retenue par une personne sur un paiement effectué à une autre personne, ou déduite

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.

When order ceases to be in effect

(2) 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*, an employee's premium, or employer's premium, as defined in the *Employment Insurance Act*, or a premium under Part VII.1 of that 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

d'un tel paiement, et se rapporte à un impôt semblable, de par sa nature, à l'impôt sur le revenu auquel les particuliers sont assujettis en vertu de la *Loi de l'impôt sur le revenu*,

(ii) soit est de même nature qu'une cotisation prévue par le *Régime de pensions du Canada*, si la province est une province instituant un régime général de pensions au sens du paragraphe 3(1) de cette loi et si la loi provinciale institue un régime provincial de pensions au sens de ce paragraphe.

Cessation d'effet

(2) Les passages de l'ordonnance qui suspendent l'exercice des droits de Sa Majesté visés aux alinéas (1)a) ou b) cessent d'avoir effet dans les cas suivants :

a) la compagnie manque à ses obligations de paiement à l'égard de toute somme qui devient due à Sa Majesté après le prononcé de l'ordonnance et qui pourrait faire l'objet d'une demande aux termes d'une des dispositions suivantes :

(i) le paragraphe 224(1.2) de la *Loi de l'impôt sur le revenu*,

(ii) toute disposition du *Régime de pensions du Canada* ou de la *Loi sur l'assurance-emploi* qui renvoie au paragraphe 224(1.2) de la *Loi de l'impôt sur le revenu* et qui prévoit la perception d'une cotisation, au sens du *Régime de pensions du Canada*, d'une cotisation ouvrière ou d'une cotisation patronale, au sens de la *Loi sur l'assurance-emploi*, ou d'une cotisation prévue par la partie VII.1 de cette loi ainsi que des intérêts, pénalités et autres charges afférents,

(iii) toute disposition législative provinciale dont l'objet est semblable à celui du paragraphe 224(1.2) de la *Loi de l'impôt sur le revenu*, ou qui renvoie à ce paragraphe, et qui prévoit la perception d'une somme, ainsi que des intérêts, pénalités et autres charges afférents, laquelle :

(A) soit a été retenue par une personne sur un paiement effectué à une autre personne, ou déduite d'un tel paiement, et se rapporte à un impôt semblable, de par sa nature, à l'impôt sur le revenu auquel les particuliers sont assujettis en vertu de la *Loi de l'impôt sur le revenu*,

(B) soit est de même nature qu'une cotisation prévue par le *Régime de pensions du Canada*, si la province est une province instituant un régime général de pensions au sens du paragraphe 3(1) de cette loi et si la loi provinciale institue un

(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*, an employee's premium, or employer's premium, as defined in the *Employment Insurance Act*, or a premium under Part VII.1 of that 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.

Operation of similar legislation

(3) 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*, an employee's premium, or employer's premium, as defined in the *Employment Insurance Act*, or a premium under Part VII.1 of that 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.

régime provincial de pensions au sens de ce paragraphe;

b) un autre créancier a ou acquiert le droit de réaliser sa garantie sur un bien qui pourrait être réclamé par Sa Majesté dans l'exercice des droits que lui confère l'une des dispositions suivantes :

(i) le paragraphe 224(1.2) de la *Loi de l'impôt sur le revenu*,

(ii) toute disposition du *Régime de pensions du Canada* ou de la *Loi sur l'assurance-emploi* qui renvoie au paragraphe 224(1.2) de la *Loi de l'impôt sur le revenu* et qui prévoit la perception d'une cotisation, au sens du *Régime de pensions du Canada*, d'une cotisation ouvrière ou d'une cotisation patronale, au sens de la *Loi sur l'assurance-emploi*, ou d'une cotisation prévue par la partie VII.1 de cette loi ainsi que des intérêts, pénalités et autres charges afférents,

(iii) toute disposition législative provinciale dont l'objet est semblable à celui du paragraphe 224(1.2) de la *Loi de l'impôt sur le revenu*, ou qui renvoie à ce paragraphe, et qui prévoit la perception d'une somme, ainsi que des intérêts, pénalités et autres charges afférents, laquelle :

(A) soit a été retenue par une personne sur un paiement effectué à une autre personne, ou déduite d'un tel paiement, et se rapporte à un impôt semblable, de par sa nature, à l'impôt sur le revenu auquel les particuliers sont assujettis en vertu de la *Loi de l'impôt sur le revenu*,

(B) soit est de même nature qu'une cotisation prévue par le *Régime de pensions du Canada*, si la province est une province instituant un régime général de pensions au sens du paragraphe 3(1) de cette loi et si la loi provinciale institue un régime provincial de pensions au sens de ce paragraphe.

Effet

(3) L'ordonnance prévue à l'article 11.02, à l'exception des passages de celle-ci qui suspendent l'exercice des droits de Sa Majesté visés aux alinéas (1)a) ou b), n'a pas pour effet de porter atteinte à l'application des dispositions suivantes :

a) les paragraphes 224(1.2) et (1.3) de la *Loi de l'impôt sur le revenu*;

b) toute disposition du *Régime de pensions du Canada* ou de la *Loi sur l'assurance-emploi* qui

the collection of a contribution, as defined in the *Canada Pension Plan*, an employee's premium, or employer's premium, as defined in the *Employment Insurance Act*, or a premium under Part VII.1 of that 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.

2005, c. 47, s. 128; 2009, c. 33, s. 28.

renvoie au paragraphe 224(1.2) de la *Loi de l'impôt sur le revenu* et qui prévoit la perception d'une cotisation, au sens du *Régime de pensions du Canada*, d'une cotisation ouvrière ou d'une cotisation patronale, au sens de la *Loi sur l'assurance-emploi*, ou d'une cotisation prévue par la partie VII.1 de cette loi ainsi que des intérêts, pénalités et autres charges afférents;

c) toute disposition législative provinciale dont l'objet est semblable à celui du paragraphe 224(1.2) de la *Loi de l'impôt sur le revenu*, ou qui renvoie à ce paragraphe, et qui prévoit la perception d'une somme, ainsi que des intérêts, pénalités et autres charges afférents, laquelle :

(i) soit a été retenue par une personne sur un paiement effectué à une autre personne, ou déduite d'un tel paiement, et se rapporte à un impôt semblable, de par sa nature, à l'impôt sur le revenu auquel les particuliers sont assujettis en vertu de la *Loi de l'impôt sur le revenu*,

(ii) soit est de même nature qu'une cotisation prévue par le *Régime de pensions du Canada*, si la province est une province instituant un régime général de pensions au sens du paragraphe 3(1) de cette loi et si la loi provinciale institue un régime provincial de pensions au sens de ce paragraphe.

Pour l'application de l'alinéa c), la disposition législative provinciale en question est réputée avoir, à l'encontre de tout créancier et malgré tout texte législatif fédéral ou provincial et toute autre règle de droit, la même portée et le même effet que le paragraphe 224(1.2) de la *Loi de l'impôt sur le revenu* quant à la somme visée au sous-alinéa c)(i), ou que le paragraphe 23(2) du *Régime de pensions du Canada* quant à la somme visée au sous-alinéa c)(ii), et quant aux intérêts, pénalités et autres charges afférents, quelle que soit la garantie dont bénéficie le créancier.

2005, ch. 47, art. 128; 2009, ch. 33, art. 28.

Meaning of *regulatory body*

11.1 (1) In this section, ***regulatory body*** means a person or body that has powers, duties or functions relating to the enforcement or administration of an Act of Parliament or of the legislature of a province and includes a person or body that is prescribed to be a regulatory body for the purpose of this Act.

Définition de *organisme administratif*

11.1 (1) Au présent article, ***organisme administratif*** s'entend de toute personne ou de tout organisme chargé de l'application d'une loi fédérale ou provinciale; y est assimilé toute personne ou tout organisme désigné à ce titre par règlement.

Regulatory bodies — order under section 11.02

(2) Subject to subsection (3), no order made under section 11.02 affects a regulatory body's investigation in respect of the debtor company or an action, suit or proceeding that is taken in respect of the company by or

Organisme administratif — ordonnance rendue en vertu de l'article 11.02

(2) Sous réserve du paragraphe (3), l'ordonnance prévue à l'article 11.02 ne porte aucunement atteinte aux mesures — action, poursuite ou autre procédure — prises à l'égard de la compagnie débitrice par ou devant un

Decision

(8) The decision of the Superintendent of Bankruptcy after the hearing, together with the reasons for the decision, must be given in writing to the monitor not later than three months after the conclusion of the hearing, and is public.

Review by Federal Court

(9) A decision of the Superintendent of Bankruptcy given under subsection (8) is deemed to be a decision of a federal board, commission or other tribunal that may be reviewed and set aside under the *Federal Courts Act*.

2005, c. 47, s. 131; 2007, c. 36, s. 75.

Delegation

31 (1) The Superintendent of Bankruptcy may, in writing, authorize any person to exercise or perform, subject to any terms and conditions that he or she may specify in the authorization, any of the powers, duties or functions of the Superintendent of Bankruptcy under sections 29 and 30.

Notification to monitor

(2) If the Superintendent of Bankruptcy delegates in accordance with subsection (1), the Superintendent or the delegate must give notice of the delegation in the prescribed manner to any monitor who may be affected by the delegation.

2005, c. 47, s. 131.

Agreements

Disclaimer or resiliation of agreements

32 (1) Subject to subsections (2) and (3), a debtor company may — on notice given in the prescribed form and manner to the other parties to the agreement and the monitor — disclaim or resiliate any agreement to which the company is a party on the day on which proceedings commence under this Act. The company may not give notice unless the monitor approves the proposed disclaimer or resiliation.

Court may prohibit disclaimer or resiliation

(2) Within 15 days after the day on which the company gives notice under subsection (1), a party to the agreement may, on notice to the other parties to the agreement and the monitor, apply to a court for an order that the agreement is not to be disclaimed or resiliated.

Court-ordered disclaimer or resiliation

(3) If the monitor does not approve the proposed disclaimer or resiliation, the company may, on notice to the other parties to the agreement and the monitor, apply to

Décision

(8) La décision du surintendant des faillites est rendue par écrit, motivée et remise au contrôleur dans les trois mois suivant la clôture de l'audition, et elle est publique.

Examen de la Cour fédérale

(9) La décision du surintendant, rendue et remise conformément au paragraphe (8), est assimilée à celle d'un office fédéral et est soumise au pouvoir d'examen et d'annulation prévu par la *Loi sur les Cours fédérales*.

2005, ch. 47, art. 131; 2007, ch. 36, art. 75.

Pouvoir de délégation

31 (1) Le surintendant des faillites peut, par écrit, selon les modalités qu'il précise, déléguer les attributions que lui confèrent les articles 29 et 30.

Notification

(2) En cas de délégation, le surintendant des faillites ou le délégué en avise, de la manière réglementaire, tout contrôleur qui pourrait être touché par cette mesure.

2005, ch. 47, art. 131.

Contrats et conventions collectives

Résiliation de contrats

32 (1) Sous réserve des paragraphes (2) et (3), la compagnie débitrice peut — sur préavis donné en la forme et de la manière réglementaires aux autres parties au contrat et au contrôleur et après avoir obtenu l'acquiescement de celui-ci relativement au projet de résiliation — résilier tout contrat auquel elle est partie à la date à laquelle une procédure a été intentée sous le régime de la présente loi.

Contestation

(2) Dans les quinze jours suivant la date à laquelle la compagnie donne le préavis mentionné au paragraphe (1), toute partie au contrat peut, sur préavis aux autres parties au contrat et au contrôleur, demander au tribunal d'ordonner que le contrat ne soit pas résilié.

Absence d'acquiescement du contrôleur

(3) Si le contrôleur n'acquiesce pas au projet de résiliation, la compagnie peut, sur préavis aux autres parties au

a court for an order that the agreement be disclaimed or resiliated.

Factors to be considered

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

(a) whether the monitor approved the proposed disclaimer or resiliation;

(b) whether the disclaimer or resiliation would enhance the prospects of a viable compromise or arrangement being made in respect of the company; and

(c) whether the disclaimer or resiliation would likely cause significant financial hardship to a party to the agreement.

Date of disclaimer or resiliation

(5) An agreement is disclaimed or resiliated

(a) if no application is made under subsection (2), on the day that is 30 days after the day on which the company gives notice under subsection (1);

(b) if the court dismisses the application made under subsection (2), on the day that is 30 days after the day on which the company gives notice under subsection (1) or on any later day fixed by the court; or

(c) if the court orders that the agreement is disclaimed or resiliated under subsection (3), on the day that is 30 days after the day on which the company gives notice or on any later day fixed by the court.

Intellectual property

(6) If the company has granted a right to use intellectual property to a party to an agreement, the disclaimer or resiliation does not affect the party's right to use the intellectual property — including the party's right to enforce an exclusive use — during the term of the agreement, including any period for which the party extends the agreement as of right, as long as the party continues to perform its obligations under the agreement in relation to the use of the intellectual property.

Loss related to disclaimer or resiliation

(7) If an agreement is disclaimed or resiliated, a party to the agreement who suffers a loss in relation to the disclaimer or resiliation is considered to have a provable claim.

contrat et au contrôleur, demander au tribunal d'ordonner la résiliation du contrat.

Facteurs à prendre en considération

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

a) l'acquiescement du contrôleur au projet de résiliation, le cas échéant;

b) la question de savoir si la résiliation favorisera la conclusion d'une transaction ou d'un arrangement viable à l'égard de la compagnie;

c) le risque que la résiliation puisse vraisemblablement causer de sérieuses difficultés financières à une partie au contrat.

Résiliation

(5) Le contrat est résilié :

a) trente jours après la date à laquelle la compagnie donne le préavis mentionné au paragraphe (1), si aucune demande n'est présentée en vertu du paragraphe (2);

b) trente jours après la date à laquelle la compagnie donne le préavis mentionné au paragraphe (1) ou à la date postérieure fixée par le tribunal, si ce dernier rejette la demande présentée en vertu du paragraphe (2);

c) trente jours après la date à laquelle la compagnie donne le préavis mentionné au paragraphe (3) ou à la date postérieure fixée par le tribunal, si ce dernier ordonne la résiliation du contrat en vertu de ce paragraphe.

Propriété intellectuelle

(6) Si la compagnie a autorisé par contrat une personne à utiliser un droit de propriété intellectuelle, la résiliation n'empêche pas la personne de l'utiliser ni d'en faire respecter l'utilisation exclusive, à condition qu'elle respecte ses obligations contractuelles à l'égard de l'utilisation de ce droit, et ce pour la période prévue au contrat et pour toute période additionnelle dont elle peut et décide de se prévaloir de son propre gré.

Pertes découlant de la résiliation

(7) En cas de résiliation du contrat, toute partie à celui-ci qui subit des pertes découlant de la résiliation est réputée avoir une réclamation prouvable.

Reasons for disclaimer or resiliation

(8) A company shall, on request by a party to the agreement, provide in writing the reasons for the proposed disclaimer or resiliation within five days after the day on which the party requests them.

Exceptions

(9) This section does not apply in respect of

(a) an eligible financial contract;

(b) a collective agreement;

(c) a financing agreement if the company is the borrower; or

(d) a lease of real property or of an immovable if the company is the lessor.

2005, c. 47, s. 131; 2007, c. 29, s. 108, c. 36, ss. 76, 112.

Collective agreements

33 (1) If proceedings under this Act have been commenced in respect of a debtor company, any collective agreement that the company has entered into as the employer remains in force, and may not be altered except as provided in this section or under the laws of the jurisdiction governing collective bargaining between the company and the bargaining agent.

Application for authorization to serve notice to bargain

(2) A debtor company that is a party to a collective agreement and that is unable to reach a voluntary agreement with the bargaining agent to revise any of the provisions of the collective agreement may, on giving five days notice to the bargaining agent, apply to the court for an order authorizing the company to serve a notice to bargain under the laws of the jurisdiction governing collective bargaining between the company and the bargaining agent.

Conditions for issuance of order

(3) The court may issue the order only if it is satisfied that

(a) a viable compromise or arrangement could not be made in respect of the company, taking into account the terms of the collective agreement;

(b) the company has made good faith efforts to renegotiate the provisions of the collective agreement; and

Motifs de la résiliation

(8) Dans les cinq jours qui suivent la date à laquelle une partie au contrat le lui demande, la compagnie lui expose par écrit les motifs de son projet de résiliation.

Exceptions

(9) Le présent article ne s'applique pas aux contrats suivants :

a) les contrats financiers admissibles;

b) les conventions collectives;

c) les accords de financement au titre desquels la compagnie est l'emprunteur;

d) les baux d'immeubles ou de biens réels au titre desquels la compagnie est le locateur.

2005, ch. 47, art. 131; 2007, ch. 29, art. 108, ch. 36, art. 76 et 112.

Conventions collectives

33 (1) Si une procédure a été intentée sous le régime de la présente loi à l'égard d'une compagnie débitrice, toute convention collective que celle-ci a conclue à titre d'employeur demeure en vigueur et ne peut être modifiée qu'en conformité avec le présent article ou les règles de droit applicables aux négociations entre les parties.

Demande pour que le tribunal autorise le début de négociations en vue de la révision

(2) Si elle est partie à une convention collective à titre d'employeur et qu'elle ne peut s'entendre librement avec l'agent négociateur sur la révision de celle-ci, la compagnie débitrice peut, après avoir donné un préavis de cinq jours à l'agent négociateur, demander au tribunal de l'autoriser, par ordonnance, à donner à l'agent négociateur un avis de négociations collectives pour que celui-ci entame les négociations collectives en vue de la révision de la convention collective conformément aux règles de droit applicables aux négociations entre les parties.

Cas où l'autorisation est accordée

(3) Le tribunal ne rend l'ordonnance que s'il est convaincu, à la fois :

a) qu'une transaction ou un arrangement viable à l'égard de la compagnie ne pourrait être fait compte tenu des dispositions de la convention collective;

b) que la compagnie a tenté de bonne foi d'en négocier de nouveau les dispositions;

TAB 2

2017 BCSC 1968
British Columbia Supreme Court

Walter Energy Canada Holdings, Inc. (Re)

2017 CarswellBC 3037, 2017 BCSC 1968, [2017] B.C.W.L.D. 6712,
[2017] B.C.W.L.D. 6713, 284 A.C.W.S. (3d) 688, 54 C.B.R. (6th) 57

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

And In the Matter of the Business Corporations Act, S.B.C. 2002, c. 57, as Amended

And In the Matter of a Plan of Compromise and Arrangement of New Walter Energy Canada Holdings, Inc., New Walter Canadian Coal Corp., New Brule Coal Corp., New Willow Creek Coal Corp., New Energybuild Holdings ULC

Fitzpatrick J.

Heard: October 6, 2017
Judgment: November 1, 2017
Docket: Vancouver S1510120

Counsel: P. Riesterer, for Petitioners
T. Jeffries, for United Mine Workers of America 1974 Pension Plan and Trust
M. Nied, for Warrior Met Coal, LLC
J. Sanders, for United Steelworkers, Local 1-424
V. Tickle, P.J. Reardon, for Monitor, KPMG

***Fitzpatrick J.*:**

Introduction

1 The petitioners, now called the New Walter Canada Group, apply for an order approving a settlement of certain claims. This is a significant development in these *Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act*, R.S.C. 1985, c. C-36 (the "*CCAA*") proceedings, in that the settlement will pave the way so as to allow all other claims to be settled expeditiously. Importantly, it will also allow the distribution of substantial funds to the creditors arising from the earlier monetization of the majority of the assets.

2 The petitioners also seek authorization to advance further funds to the U.K. arm of the Walter Energy group of companies, and specifically, Energybuild Group Limited or Energybuild Ltd. ("Energybuild"), on a secured basis and not exceeding an aggregate amount of 900,000. Finally, the petitioners seek an extension of the stay period to December 15, 2017.

3 For the reasons that follow, I grant the relief sought by the petitioners.

Background

4 The history of this matter has already been recounted in numerous decisions of this Court: *Walter Energy Canada Holdings, Inc., Re*, 2016 BCSC 1413 (B.C. S.C.) ; 2016 BCSC 2470 (B.C. S.C.); 2017 BCSC 53 (B.C. S.C.). Essentially, the coal mining assets of the petitioners were sold and the focus of the proceeding then moved to a consideration of the claims advanced by creditors, or alleged creditors.

5 The amounts available for distribution to the creditors is estimated to be in excess of $63 million by the end of 2017.

6 The most significant claim advanced against the petitioners was that of a U.S. entity, the United Mine Workers of America 1974 Pension Plan and Trust (the "1974 Plan"). The 1974 Plan asserted its claim pursuant to certain "controlled group" provisions of U.S. legislation, being the *Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974*, 29 U.S.C.]§ 1001, as amended ("*ERISA*"). The significance of the 1974 Plan's claim cannot be understated as it was in excess of $1.2 billion. If the claim was valid, it stood to consume the majority of the funds available for distribution to the other creditors, such that the substantial Canadian creditors' claims would have received only a nominal recovery.

7 The validity of the 1974 Plan's claim was addressed by this Court. On May 1, 2017, I held that the 1974 Plan's claim was governed by Canadian substantive law and not U.S. substantive law: *Walter Energy Canada Holdings, Inc., Re*, 2017 BCSC 709 (B.C. S.C.) at paras. 177-78, 182. Effectively, this resulted in the rejection of the 1974 Plan's claim against the petitioners.

8 The 1974 Plan filed an application for leave to appeal from my decision. Leave was granted by the British Columbia Court of Appeal on June 9, 2017. The appeal was scheduled to be heard on August 16, 2017. Eventually, the hearing date was adjourned in light of the ongoing negotiations between the parties which, if successful, would obviate the need to proceed.

9 In late September 2017, those negotiations were successful and resulted in the preparation of the Settlement Term Sheet Re Plan of Compromise and Arrangement (the "Settlement Term Sheet") which is presented for approval on this application.

10 There is no opposition to the approval of the Settlement Term Sheet. All stakeholders appearing are in support. The evidence on this application includes the affidavit #15 of William Aziz of BlueTree Advisors Inc., the Chief Restructuring Officer, and the Monitor who has filed its Thirteenth Report dated October 4, 2017.

The Settlement Term Sheet

11 As described above, the Settlement Term Sheet is the result of lengthy arm's length negotiation between the petitioners, the 1974 Plan and Warrior Met Coal, LLC ("Warrior"). Warrior is another U.S. entity who had advanced claims against some of the petitioners' assets. Warrior's claim was significant because, if the 1974 Plan's claim was not valid, the full amount of the claims against the operating subsidiaries within the New Walter Canada Group would be paid in full, resulting in monies flowing to the holding companies within the New Walter Canada Group against which Warrior's claim had been filed.

12 The essential terms of the Settlement Term Sheet are as follows.

a) Settlement of Warrior's Claims

13 The Settlement Term Sheet provides for a settlement and allowance of two claims asserted by Warrior: (i) a claim in respect of certain shared services provided by the U.S. Walter Energy entities to the Canadian Walter Energy entities (the "Shared Services Claim"); and (ii) a claim in relation to accrued but unpaid interest owing in respect of a promissory note between Walter Energy, Inc. and Walter Energy Canada Holdings, Inc. dated April 1, 2011 and related documents, which claim was compromised pursuant to an order of the Court pronounced December 21, 2016. That compromise was made pursuant to a proposal by the original Canadian Walter Energy entities pursuant to the *Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act*, R.S.C. 1985, c. B-3, which proposal was approved by the Court on December 21, 2016 (the "Hybrid Debt Claim").

14 Under the Settlement Term Sheet, Warrior's claims will be an Allowed Claim, as that phrase is defined in a Claims Process Order granted in these proceedings on August 16, 2016. Warrior's claims will be as follows: the Shared Services Claim will be an Allowed Claim in the amount of $9,892,193.32; and, the Hybrid Debt Claim will be an Allowed Claim to be further compromised such that it is equal to the amount of the Available Net Proceeds (as described below). Further, in the Settlement Term Sheet, Warrior expressly consents to the use of the Available Net Proceeds in the manner described below.

b) Settlement of the 1974 Plan's Claim, Appeal and Related Cost Awards

15 The Settlement Term Sheet provides that, in consideration of the 1974 Plan abandoning its appeal, the petitioners will pay the first $13 million of Available Net Proceeds to the 1974 Plan, and Warrior shall receive the remainder (if any) of Available Net Proceeds (after the payment of certain other amounts described below) in respect of the Hybrid Debt Claim.

16 Further, the petitioners have agreed that, in consideration of the abandonment of the 1974 Plan's appeal, they will (i) not pursue costs against the 1974 Plan in relation to proceedings arising from the assertion of its claim, both in this Court and in the Court of Appeal; and (ii) pay the costs of the United Steelworkers Local 1-424 ("USW"). The USW had been very much involved in opposing the efforts of the 1974 Plan to assert its claim. The USW's costs are fixed at $75,000, which is to be paid from the funds available for distribution.

17 The 1974 Plan's agreement to abandon its appeal is contingent upon the petitioners' payment of $13 million to the 1974 Plan from the Available Net Proceeds. The uncertainty as to whether this payment can be made arises because it is not yet known exactly what claims might be advanced against the petitioners.

18 The process under the Claims Process Order has been underway for some time now. Arising from that process, there are Allowed Claims of $23.8 million and unresolved claims of $7.5 million. However, more recently, the Monitor has been undertaking the process of flushing out any further restructuring claims pursuant to the Claims Process Amendment Order granted August 15, 2017. No claims have yet been received, however, the claims bar date is at the end of today. As of the hearing, no claims had been received that would potentially result in less than $13 million being available to be paid to the 1974 Plan from the Available Net Proceeds.

19 Accordingly, the 1974 Plan will adjourn its appeal so as to conclude the unresolved restructuring claims process towards determining that $13 million will, in any event, be available to be paid to the 1974 Plan, rather than Warrior, after deducting (i) all payments and taking all reserves required to administer and wind down the estate as contemplated; (ii) payment of the USW costs amount; and (iii) payment in full of all Allowed Claims, including the Shared Services Claim but excluding the Hybrid Debt Claim (the "Available Net Proceeds"). The 1974 Plan will then abandon its appeal following the petitioners' payment to the 1974 Plan of $13 million.

20 In the event that additional claims are filed in the unresolved restructuring claims process and they become Allowed Claims, such that it is determined that the Available Net Proceeds will be insufficient to pay $13 million to the 1974 Plan, the Settlement Term Sheet provides that (i) the 1974 Plan may bring its appeal at that time; and (ii) the petitioners, the Monitor and the USW may pursue costs against the 1974 Plan in relation to proceedings arising from the assertion of its claim, both in this Court and in the Court of Appeal.

21 Under the Settlement Term Sheet, the 1974 Plan's claim shall not become an Allowed Claim unless the 1974 Plan brings forward its appeal in the manner permitted by the Settlement Term Sheet and a final order is issued declaring that the 1974 Plan's claim is an Allowed Claim in respect of the petitioners.

22 The Settlement Term Sheet also provides that the director of the corporations composing the petitioners (who was also the director of the original Canadian Walter Energy petitioner companies) shall be paid an aggregate amount of US$250,000 from the Available Net Proceeds "in consideration for his commitment to [the petitioners] throughout the *CCAA* [p]roceedings".

c) Plan of Compromise or Arrangement

23 Upon the completion of the unresolved restructuring claim process or such earlier date as the petitioners and the Monitor may decide (after consultation with Warrior), the petitioners intend to bring forward a motion seeking the Court's approval of a plan of compromise or arrangement (the "Plan") that contains the principal terms set out in the Settlement Term Sheet. I am advised that the petitioners will bring this motion only if they and the Monitor are satisfied that sufficient funds will be available to address all remaining matters in the *CCAA* proceedings and the orderly wind-down or other process for the Walter U.K. Group, which includes Energybuild.

24 The terms that will be included in the proposed Plan are set out in the Settlement Term Sheet and include, among others terms, the following:

a) Warrior, as the sole claimant with a claim that is to be compromised under the Plan, shall be the sole claimant entitled to vote on the Plan;

b) the Plan will provide for the payment in full in cash of all claims that become Allowed Claims other than the Hybrid Debt Claim, provided that the petitioners and the Monitor determine that:

i. the petitioners have an amount sufficient to pay in full in cash all Allowed Claims and the full amount of all Claims that become Allowed Claims after the date of the Settlement Term Sheet;

ii. if there is an interim distribution, the petitioners have an amount sufficient to pay in full in cash any claim that is the subject of an unresolved Notice of Dispute if all such disputed claims were to become Allowed Claims; and

iii. the petitioners have retained an amount sufficient to address professional fees and other costs necessary for the effective administration of all remaining matters in connection with these *CCAA* proceedings, and to address whatever process occurs with respect to the Walter U.K. Group.

25 The 1974 Plan has agreed to support the petitioners in obtaining Court approval and implementation of the Plan.

d) Release of Claims against the Walter U.K. Group

26 Cambrian Energybuild Holdings ULC ("Cambrian") is one of the petitioners. It is the holding company for the coal mining operating companies in the United Kingdom. Its subsidiaries include Energybuild, the operating entity or entities that own and operate the Aberpergym underground coal mine located at the Neath Valley in Wales. The mine is currently in care and maintenance.

27 Efforts have been underway for some time on the part of the petitioners and the directors of the Walter U.K. Group in analyzing Energybuild's business and seeking opportunities to sell Energybuild and its affiliates or their assets. An interested party has come forward regarding a potential sale of Energybuild and certain of its affiliates. The interested party remains interested in acquiring these assets, but has requested that certain conditions be satisfied in respect of claims that may be made against Energybuild and any of its affiliates that may be acquired. One of those potential claims is that of the 1974 Plan, who similarly asserts that the Walter U.K. Group entities are liable for its claim under *ERISA*. In addition, there appears to be the potential for Warrior to assert claims directly against the Walter U.K. Group entities in relation to its intercompany claims by the U.S. Walter Energy entities.

28 Therefore, the petitioners and the Walter U.K. Group have sought, as part of the Settlement Term Sheet, to address any such claims. If not addressed, these lingering issues may result in the interested party disengaging entirely from the negotiations which the stakeholders hoped would lead to a sale of Energybuild and its assets.

29 The Settlement Term Sheet addresses the principal conditions precedent that relate to the sale of Energybuild and certain of its affiliates. In order to facilitate the sale of the Walter U.K. Group, any entity included within that Group or any of their respective assets, the Settlement Term Sheet provides for releases by both the 1974 Plan and Warrior on certain terms. These releases are effective immediately and are not dependent on whether there is at least Available Net Proceeds of $13 million available for payment to the 1974 Plan or that the appeal is abandoned. Accordingly, these releases allow the petitioners and the directors of the Walter U.K. Group to proceed immediately to conclude a sale in the U.K., if possible.

30 The Term Sheet provides that the proceeds from any sale of the U.K. assets are to be applied as follows:

a) first, to repay amounts advanced to or for the benefit of the Walter U.K. Group on a secured basis, as has already been authorized by orders granted in these *CCAA* proceedings. To date, 600,000 has been advanced and it is proposed that authorization be given for a further 300,000;

b) second, to wind up any Walter U.K. Group entity that is not the subject of any sale in a cost effective and tax efficient manner that protects the Walter U.K. Group's directors and officers from liability to the fullest extent possible, at the discretion of the petitioners;

c) third, if any amounts remain, such amounts shall be distributed to Warrior in respect of Warrior's claim asserted against the Walter U.K. Group, up to the maximum amount of 4,666,779; and

d) fourth, if any amounts remain, such amounts shall be distributed to Cambrian on account of its equity interest in Energybuild.

Approval of Settlement Term Sheet

31 The petitioners seek approval of the Settlement Term Sheet pursuant to the *CCAA*, s. 11, which provides that I may exercise my discretion to make any order that I consider "appropriate in the circumstances".

32 In *Great Basin Gold Ltd., Re*, 2012 BCSC 1773 (B.C. S.C. [In Chambers]) at para. 16, I concluded that s. 11 provides the necessary jurisdictional basis to consider and approve a settlement agreement even before the presentation of a plan of arrangement.

33 Regional Senior Justice Morawetz of the Superior Court of Justice has articulated, a number of times, the relevant considerations in approving a settlement in the *CCAA* context:

a. is the settlement fair and reasonable?

b. does the settlement provide substantial benefit to stakeholders? and

c. is the settlement consistent with the purpose and spirit of the *CCAA*?

See: *Labourers' Pension Fund of Central and Eastern Canada v. Sino-Forest Corp.*, 2013 ONSC 1078 (Ont. S.C.J. [Commercial List]) at para. 49, leave to appeal refused 2013 ONCA 456 (Ont. C.A.); *1511419 Ontario Inc., Re*, 2015 ONSC 7538 (Ont. S.C.J.) at para. 14.

34 In my view, all three of the above considerations are satisfied here and support that the Settlement Term Sheet should be approved:

a) the settlement removes a major stumbling block in providing a distribution to creditors, many of whom are former employees of the petitioners who have suffered financial distress as a result of not being paid their wages and other benefits;

b) if the 1974 Plan's claim were to proceed to a hearing of the appeal, there would be significant delay in resolving the issues. In addition, there would be significant cost to the petitioners, the CRO and the Monitor in participating in those proceedings;

c) the settlement avoids the risk of the 1974 Plan being successful, a result that would effectively deprive the claimants with Allowed Claims of any meaningful recovery;

d) the settlement allows the petitioners to proceed to a determination of the remaining claims on their merits which will also facilitate a final distribution to the creditors;

e) all of the Allowed Claims, many of whom are former employees, will receive their claim amounts in full. Only Warrior will face any compromise of its claim. Effectively, the payment of $13 million to the 1974 Plan has no effect on the Allowed Claims since it is sourced from the Available Net Proceeds that would otherwise be paid to Warrior; and

f) the settlement will also facilitate the sale of the Walter U.K. Group assets in terms of the releases from the 1974 Plan and Warrior, which are effective immediately. A timely resolution of that aspect of the restructuring will be to the benefit of all parties in bringing these proceedings to a close.

35 There can be no doubt but that this settlement achieves what few *CCAA* proceedings achieve, namely a somewhat timely but full recovery for the vast majority of claimants. That the parties were able to resolve their differences to avoid the complex and costly legal battles to come is a testament to the ingenuity of the stakeholders and the flexibility that the *CCAA* affords in these difficult circumstances.

36 In *Ted Leroy Trucking Ltd., Re*, 2010 SCC 60 (S.C.C.) , the Court confirmed the well-known description of the *CCAA* as being a remedial statute and that the court has "broad and flexible authority" to facilitate the reorganization of the debtor towards achieving the objectives of the *CCAA*, including avoiding the social and economic losses arising from restructuring proceedings: paras. 15-19.

37 These particular comments of the Court in *Century Services* bear repeating in respect of this application:

[70] . . . Appropriateness under the *CCAA* is assessed by inquiring whether the order sought advances the policy objectives underlying the *CCAA*. The question is whether the order will usefully further efforts to achieve the remedial purpose of the *CCAA* — avoiding the social and economic losses resulting from liquidation of an insolvent company. 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.

[Emphasis added.]

38 The Monitor supports the approval of the Settlement Term Sheet as being fair and reasonable, describing it as a "highly favourable outcome" for the petitioners' creditors who are to be paid in full. The Monitor expects that there will be sufficient funds to pay all of the Allowed Claims such that there is little likelihood of there being insufficient funds with which to pay $13 million to the 1974 Plan. In the circumstances, this appears to be a reasonable expectation.

39 The only hesitation I had with respect to the approval of the Settlement Term Sheet arose from the proposal that the director be paid US$250,000, in light of what was described as his commitment and the risks that he has undertaken in the fulfillment of his duties throughout these proceedings.

40 A somewhat similar circumstance arose in *Veris Gold Corp., Re*, 2015 BCSC 399 (B.C. S.C.) , where approval of fees was sought in relation to amounts said to have accrued throughout a *CCAA* proceeding. In that case, the approval of the fees would have affected pre-existing claims after the fact:

[62] The matter of timing requires some discussion. The effect of the relief now sought by the Special Committee is such that their fees would be paid in priority to DB's security. WBox takes no position in respect of the relief sought, no doubt given the higher priority of its security as against DB's secured position.

[63] If such an application had been brought in a more timely manner, then the court would have been in a position to consider the matter based on the circumstances at the time. In addition, the stakeholders, such as DB, would have been able to assess the relief sought in respect of its position at that time. Court-ordered charges to protect persons providing services to the debtor can be sought under the *CCAA*: see for example, s. 11.4 (critical suppliers); s. 11.52 (fees and expenses of financial, legal and other experts).

> [64] This is not unlike a situation where court-ordered charges are sought when services have already been provided and relief is only sought some time later. Inevitably, the argument is that it is only "fair" that the services delivered prior to the date of the charge be included. In addition, this is not unlike the situation where limits of spending have been imposed in respect of such charges, and the limits are exceeded and only later sought to be increased. In all of these circumstances, delay in seeking relief disadvantages the stakeholders in terms of considering the effect of the relief sought in the context of the current situation, and deprives them of a consideration of other options that might be available at the time. In addition, this delay puts the court in the very uncomfortable position of potentially depriving persons who have provided such services in good faith of the normal costs of doing so.
>
> [Emphasis added.]

41 Having considered the matter, I do not see that any similar issues or disadvantages to the stakeholders arise in relation to the proposed payment to be made to the director. Unlike the situation in *Veris Gold*, this amount to be paid is only sourced from the Available Net Proceeds, which effectively means that Warrior will fund that amount from funds that would otherwise be paid to it. Warrior agrees to the payment of that amount. Accordingly, no Allowed Claims will be affected.

42 I conclude that the Settlement Term Sheet is fair and reasonable, that it provides a substantial benefit to the creditors of the petitioners and that it is consistent with the purpose and spirit of the *CCAA*.

Approval of Further Advances to the Walter U.K. Group

43 As set out above, the petitioners have already been funding the Walter U.K. Group in respect of its working capital requirements. The advances, which are secured, are currently outstanding in the amount of 600,000.

44 Mr. Aziz indicates that, with the releases set out in the Settlement Term Sheet now in hand, further time will be needed to hopefully conclude the negotiations with the party who has expressed an interest in purchasing the Walter U.K. Group's assets. The petitioners have been provided with cash flow forecasts for Energybuild that indicate a cash need of approximately 300,000 through to the end of the proposed extended stay period, namely December 15, 2017.

45 As such, the New Walter Canada Group is seeking this Court's authorization to advance up to an additional 300,000 (for an aggregate maximum of 900,000) on a secured basis to the Walter U.K. Group to fund Energybuild's working capital needs while negotiations regarding a potential sale continue. Mr. Aziz advises that no additional funds will be advanced unless the petitioners determine that such further advance will be in the best interests of Cambrian and the other members of the petitioners. By that statement, I take it to be the case that, if the negotiations do not result fairly quickly in a sale of the assets, other measures will be considered to deal with the Walter U.K. Assets as expeditiously and efficiently as possible.

46 All of the circumstances here support the conclusion that the further interim financing should be approved based on the factors set out in the *CCAA*, s. 11.2(4). That financing is approved on the terms sought.

Stay Extension

47 The current stay period expires today, October 6, 2017.

48 The petitioners seek an extension of the stay period to December 15, 2017. This extension is being requested to allow them to complete the unresolved restructuring claims process; possibly bring court proceedings to address any disputed claims; sell the Walter U.K. Group assets, if possible; develop the Plan and bring it before the Court for approval to implement the Settlement Term Sheet; and finally, address the distribution of the proceeds.

49 Both Mr. Aziz and the Monitor confirm what is manifestly apparent; namely, that the petitioners continue to act in good faith and with due diligence in these proceedings. The Monitor supports the extension of the stay period as being a reasonable estimate of the time required to address these final matters.

50 I have no hesitation in concluding that the requested stay extension is appropriate in the circumstances and that the petitioners are acting in good faith and with due diligence: *CCAA*, s. 11.02(2) and (3).

Conclusion

51 The proposed settlement, as contained in the Settlement Term Sheet, is fair and reasonable. The Settlement Term Sheet, between the petitioners, Warrior and the 1974 Plan is approved. I also order that the parties to the Settlement Term Sheet comply with their obligations under the Settlement Term Sheet and that the Monitor assist in that respect by taking all reasonable and necessary steps to do so.

52 Cambrian Energybuild Holdings ULC is authorized to advance up to a further 300,000 (for an aggregate maximum of 900,000) to Energybuild, on a secured basis.

53 Finally, the stay of proceedings in respect of the petitioners is extended to December 15, 2017.

Application granted.

TAB 3

2010 ONSC 1708
Ontario Superior Court of Justice [Commercial List]

Nortel Networks Corp., Re

2010 CarswellOnt 1754, 2010 ONSC 1708, 192 A.C.W.S. (3d) 368, 63 C.B.R. (5th) 44, 81 C.C.P.B. 56

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 3-5, 2010
Judgment: March 26, 2010
Docket: 09-CL-7950

Counsel: Derrick Tay, Jennifer Stam, Suzanne Wood for Applicants
Lyndon Barnes, Adam Hirsh for Nortel Directors
Benjamin Zarnett, Gale Rubenstein, C. Armstrong, Melaney Wagner for Monitor, Ernst & Young Inc.
Arthur O. Jacques for Nortel Canada Current Employees
Deborah McPhail for Superintendent of Financial Services (non-PBGF)
Mark Zigler, Susan Philpott for Former and Long-Term Disability Employees
Ken Rosenberg, M. Starnino for Superintendent of Financial Services in its capacity as Administrator of the Pension Benefit Guarantee Fund
S. Richard Orzy, Richard B. Swan for Informal Nortel Noteholder Group
Alex MacFarlane, Mark Dunsmuir for Unsecured Creditors' Committee of Nortel Networks Inc.
Leanne Williams for Flextronics Inc.
Barry Wadsworth for CAW-Canada
Pamela Huff for Northern Trust Company, Canada
Joel P. Rochon, Sakie Tambakos for Opposing Former and Long-Term Disability Employees
Robin B. Schwill for Nortel Networks UK Limited (In Administration)
Sorin Gabriel Radulescu for himself
Guy Martin for himself, Marie Josee Perrault
Peter Burns for himself
Stan and Barbara Arnelien for themselves

***Morawetz J.*:**

Introduction

1 On January 14, 2009, Nortel Networks Corporation ("NNC"), Nortel Networks Limited "(NNL"), Nortel Networks Global Corporation, Nortel Networks International Corporation and Nortel Networks Technology Corporation (collectively, the "Applicants") were granted a stay of proceedings pursuant to the *Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act* ("CCAA") and Ernst & Young Inc. was appointed as Monitor.

2 The Applicants have historically operated a number of pension, benefit and other plans (both funded and unfunded) for their employees and pensioners, including:

(i) Pension benefits through two registered pension plans, the Nortel Networks Limited Managerial and Non-Negotiated Pension Plan and the Nortel Networks Negotiated Pension Plan (the "Pension Plans"); and

(ii) Medical, dental, life insurance, long-term disability and survivor income and transition benefits paid, except for survivor termination benefits, through Nortel's Health and Welfare Trust (the "HWT").

3 Since the CCAA filing, the Applicants have continued to provide medical, dental and other benefits, through the HWT, to pensioners and employees on long-term disability ("Former and LTD Employees") and active employees ("HWT Payments") and have continued all current service contributions and special payments to the Pension Plans ("Pension Payments").

4 Pension Payments and HWT Payments made by the Applicants to the Former and LTD Employees while under CCAA protection are largely discretionary. As a result of Nortel's insolvency and the significant reduction in the size of Nortel's operations, the unfortunate reality is that, at some point, cessation of such payments is inevitable. The Applicants have attempted to address this situation by entering into a settlement agreement (the "Settlement Agreement") dated as of February 8, 2010, among the Applicants, the Monitor, the Former Employees' Representatives (on their own behalf and on behalf of the parties they represent), the LTD Representative (on her own behalf and on behalf of the parties she represents), Representative Settlement Counsel and the CAW-Canada (the "Settlement Parties").

5 The Applicants have brought this motion for approval of the Settlement Agreement. From the standpoint of the Applicants, the purpose of the Settlement Agreement is to provide for a smooth transition for the termination of Pension Payments and HWT Payments. The Applicants take the position that the Settlement Agreement represents the best efforts of the Settlement Parties to negotiate an agreement and is consistent with the spirit and purpose of the CCAA.

6 The essential terms of the Settlement Agreement are as follows:

(a) until December 31, 2010, medical, dental and life insurance benefits will be funded on a pay-as-you-go basis to the Former and LTD Employees;

(b) until December 31, 2010, LTD Employees and those entitled to receive survivor income benefits will receive income benefits on a pay-as-you-go basis;

(c) the Applicants will continue to make current service payments and special payments to the Pension Plans in the same manner as they have been doing over the course of the proceedings under the CCAA, through to March 31, 2010, in the aggregate amount of $2,216,254 per month and that thereafter and through to September 30, 2010, the Applicants shall make only current service payments to the Pension Plans, in the aggregate amount of $379,837 per month;

(d) any allowable pension claims, in these or subsequent proceedings, concerning any Nortel Worldwide Entity, including the Applicants, shall rank *pari passu* with ordinary, unsecured creditors of Nortel, and no part of any such HWT claims shall rank as a preferential or priority claim or shall be the subject of a constructive trust or trust of any nature or kind;

(e) proofs of claim asserting priority already filed by any of the Settlement Parties, or the Superintendent on behalf of the Pension Benefits Guarantee Fund are disallowed in regard to the claim for priority;

(f) any allowable HWT claims made in these or subsequent proceedings shall rank *pari passu* with ordinary unsecured creditors of Nortel;

(g) the Settlement Agreement does not extinguish the claims of the Former and LTD Employees;

(h) Nortel and, *inter alia*, its successors, advisors, directors and officers, are released from all future claims regarding Pension Plans and the HWT, provided that nothing in the release shall release a director of the Applicants from any matter referred to in subsection 5.1(2) of the CCAA or with respect to fraud on the part of any Releasee, with respect to that Releasee only;

(i) upon the expiry of all appeals and rights of appeal in respect thereof, Representative Settlement Counsel will withdraw their application for leave to appeal the decision of the Court of Appeal, dated November 26, 2009, to the Supreme Court of Canada on a with prejudice basis; [1]

(j) a CCAA plan of arrangement in the Nortel proceedings will not be proposed or approved if that plan does not treat the Pension and HWT claimants *pari passu* to the other ordinary, unsecured creditors ("Clause H.1"); and

(k) if there is a subsequent amendment to the *Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act* ("BIA") that "changes the current, relative priorities of the claims against Nortel, no party is precluded by this Settlement Agreement from arguing the applicability" of that amendment to the claims ceded in this Agreement ("Clause H.2").

7 The Settlement Agreement does *not* relate to a distribution of the HWT as the Settlement Parties have agreed to work towards developing a Court-approved distribution of the HWT corpus in 2010.

8 The Applicants' motion is supported by the Settlement Parties and by the Board of Directors of Nortel.

9 The Official Committee of Unsecured Creditors of Nortel Networks Inc. ("UCC"), the informal Nortel Noteholder Group (the "Noteholders"), and a group of 37 LTD Employees (the "Opposing LTD Employees") oppose the Settlement Agreement.

10 The UCC and Noteholders oppose the Settlement Agreement, principally as a result of the inclusion of Clause H.2.

11 The Opposing LTD Employees oppose the Settlement Agreement, principally as a result of the inclusion of the third party releases referenced in [6h] above.

The Facts

A. Status of Nortel's Restructuring

12 Although it was originally hoped that the Applicants would be able to restructure their business, in June 2009 the decision was made to change direction and pursue sales of Nortel's various businesses.

13 In response to Nortel's change in strategic direction and the impending sales, Nortel announced on August 14, 2009 a number of organizational updates and changes including the creation of groups to support transitional services and management during the sales process.

14 Since June 2009, Nortel has closed two major sales and announced a third. As a result of those transactions, approximately 13,000 Nortel employees have been or will be transferred to purchaser companies. That includes approximately 3,500 Canadian employees.

15 Due to the ongoing sales of Nortel's business units and the streamlining of Nortel's operations, it is expected that by the close of 2010, the Applicants' workforce will be reduced to only 475 employees. There is a need to wind-down and rationalize benefits and pension processes.

16 Given Nortel's insolvency, the significant reduction in Nortel's operations and the complexity and size of the Pension Plans, both Nortel and the Monitor believe that the continuation and funding of the Pension Plans and continued funding of medical, dental and other benefits is not a viable option.

B. The Settlement Agreement

17 On February 8, 2010 the Applicants announced that a settlement had been reached on issues related to the Pension Plans, and the HWT and certain employment related issues.

18 Recognizing the importance of providing notice to those who will be impacted by the Settlement Agreement, including the Former Employees, the LTD Employees, unionized employees, continuing employees and the provincial pension plan regulators ("Affected Parties"), Nortel brought a motion to this Court seeking the approval of an extensive notice and opposition process.

19 On February 9, 2010, this Court approved the notice program for the announcement and disclosure of the Settlement (the "Notice Order").

20 As more fully described in the Monitor's Thirty-Sixth, Thirty-Ninth and Thirty-Ninth Supplementary Reports, the Settlement Parties have taken a number of steps to notify the Affected Parties about the Settlement.

21 In addition to the Settlement Agreement, the Applicants, the Monitor and the Superintendent, in his capacity as administrator of the Pension Benefits Guarantee Fund, entered into a letter agreement on February 8, 2010, with respect to certain matters pertaining to the Pension Plans (the "Letter Agreement").

22 The Letter Agreement provides that the Superintendent will not oppose an order approving the Settlement Agreement ("Settlement Approval Order"). Additionally, the Monitor and the Applicants will take steps to complete an orderly transfer of the Pension Plans to a new administrator to be appointed by the Superintendent effective October 1, 2010. Finally, the Superintendent will not oppose any employee incentive program that the Monitor deems reasonable and necessary or the creation of a trust with respect to claims or potential claims against persons who accept directorships of a Nortel Worldwide Entity in order to facilitate the restructuring.

Positions of the Parties on the Settlement Agreement

The Applicants

23 The Applicants take the position that the Settlement is fair and reasonable and balances the interests of the parties and other affected constituencies equitably. In this regard, counsel submits that the Settlement:

(a) eliminates uncertainty about the continuation and termination of benefits to pensioners, LTD Employees and survivors, thereby reducing hardship and disruption;

(b) eliminates the risk of costly and protracted litigation regarding Pension Claims and HWT Claims, leading to reduced costs, uncertainty and potential disruption to the development of a Plan;

(c) prevents disruption in the transition of benefits for current employees;

(d) provides early payments to terminated employees in respect of their termination and severance claims where such employees would otherwise have had to wait for the completion of a claims process and distribution out of the estates;

(e) assists with the commitment and retention of remaining employees essential to complete the Applicants' restructuring; and

(f) does not eliminate Pension Claims or HWT Claims against the Applicants, but maintains their quantum and validity as ordinary and unsecured claims.

24 Alternatively, absent the approval of the Settlement Agreement, counsel to the Applicants submits that the Applicants are not required to honour such benefits or make such payments and such benefits could cease immediately. This would cause undue hardship to beneficiaries and increased uncertainty for the Applicants and other stakeholders.

25 The Applicants state that a central objective in the Settlement Agreement is to allow the Former and LTD Employees to transition to other sources of support.

26 In the absence of the approval of the Settlement Agreement or some other agreement, a cessation of benefits will occur on March 31, 2010 which would have an immediate negative impact on Former and LTD Employees. The Applicants submit that extending payments to the end of 2010 is the best available option to allow recipients to order their affairs.

27 Counsel to the Applicants submits that the Settlement Agreement brings Nortel closer to finalizing a plan of arrangement, which is consistent with the sprit and purpose of the CCAA. The Settlement Agreement resolves uncertainties associated with the outstanding Former and LTD Employee claims. The Settlement Agreement balances certainty with clarity, removing litigation risk over priority of claims, which properly balances the interests of the parties, including both creditors and debtors.

28 Regarding the priority of claims going forward, the Applicants submit that because a deemed trust, such as the HWT, is not enforceable in bankruptcy, the Former and LTD Employees are by default *pari passu* with other unsecured creditors.

29 In response to the Noteholders' concern that bankruptcy prior to October 2010 would create pension liabilities on the estate, the Applicants committed that they would not voluntarily enter into bankruptcy proceedings prior to October 2010. Further, counsel to the Applicants submits the court determines whether a bankruptcy order should be made if involuntary proceedings are commenced.

30 Further, counsel to the Applicants submits that the court has the jurisdiction to release third parties under a Settlement Agreement where the releases (1) are connected to a resolution of the debtor's claims, (2) will benefit creditors generally and (3) are not overly broad or offensive to public policy. See *ATB Financial v. Metcalfe & Mansfield Alternative Investments II Corp.* (2008), 92 O.R. (3d) 513 (Ont. C.A.), [*Metcalfe*] at para. 71, leave to appeal refused, (S.C.C.) and *Grace Canada Inc., Re* (Ont. S.C.J. [Commercial List]) [*Grace 2008*] at para. 40.

31 The Applicants submit that a settlement of the type put forward should be approved if it is consistent with the spirit and purpose of the CCAA and is fair and reasonable in all the circumstances. Elements of fairness and reasonableness include balancing the interests of parties, including any objecting creditor or creditors, equitably (although not necessarily equally); and ensuring that the agreement is beneficial to the debtor and its stakeholders generally, as per *Air Canada, Re* (Ont. S.C.J. [Commercial List]) [*Air Canada*]. The Applicants assert that this test is met.

The Monitor

32 The Monitor supports the Settlement Agreement, submitting that it is necessary to allow the Applicants to wind down operations and to develop a plan of arrangement. The Monitor submits that the Settlement Agreement provides certainty, and does so with input from employee stakeholders. These stakeholders are represented by Employee Representatives as mandated by the court and these Employee Representatives were given the authority to approve such settlements on behalf of their constituents.

33 The Monitor submits that Clause H.2 was bargained for, and that the employees did give up rights in order to have that clause in the Settlement Agreement; particularly, it asserts that Clause H.1 is the counterpoint to Clause H.2. In this regard, the Settlement Agreement is fair and reasonable.

34 The Monitor asserts that the court may either (1) approve the Settlement Agreement, (2) not approve the Settlement Agreement, or (3) not approve the Settlement Agreement but provide practical comments on the applicability of Clause H.2.

Former and LTD Employees

35 The Former Employees' Representatives' constituents number an estimated 19,458 people. The LTD Employees number an estimated 350 people between the LTD Employee's Representative and the CAW-Canada, less the 37 people in the Opposing LTD Employee group.

36 Representative Counsel to the Former and LTD Employees acknowledges that Nortel is insolvent, and that much uncertainty and risk comes from insolvency. They urge that the Settlement Agreement be considered within the scope of this reality. The alternative to the Settlement Agreement is costly litigation and significant uncertainty.

37 Representative Counsel submits that the Settlement Agreement is fair and reasonable for all creditors, but especially the represented employees. Counsel notes that employees under Nortel are unique creditors under these proceedings, as they are not sophisticated creditors and their personal welfare depends on receiving distributions from Nortel. The Former and LTD Employees assert that this is the best agreement they could have negotiated.

38 Representative Counsel submits that bargaining away of the right to litigate against directors and officers of the corporation, as well at the trustee of the HWT, are examples of the concessions that have been made. They also point to the giving up of the right to make priority claims upon distribution of Nortel's estate and the HWT, although the claim itself is not extinguished. In exchange, the Former and LTD Employees will receive guaranteed coverage until the end of 2010. The Former and LTD Employees submit that having money in hand today is better than uncertainty going forward, and that, on balance, this Settlement Agreement is fair and reasonable.

39 In response to allegations that third party releases unacceptably compromise employees' rights, Representative Counsel accepts that this was a concession, but submits that it was satisfactory because the claims given up are risky, costly and very uncertain. The releases do not go beyond s. 5.1(2) of the CCAA, which disallows releases relating to misrepresentations and wrongful or oppressive conduct by directors. Releases as to deemed trust claims are also very uncertain and were acceptably given up in exchange for other considerations.

40 The Former and LTD Employees submit that the inclusion of Clause H.2 was essential to their approval of the Settlement Agreement. They characterize Clause H.2 as a no prejudice clause to protect the employees by not releasing any future potential benefit. Removing Clause H.2 from the Settlement Agreement would be not the approval of an agreement, but rather the creation of an entirely new Settlement Agreement. Counsel submits that without Clause H.2, the Former and LTD Employees would not be signatories.

CAW

41 The CAW supports the Settlement Agreement. It characterizes the agreement as Nortel's recognition that it has a moral and legal obligation to its employees, whose rights are limited by the laws in this country. The Settlement Agreement temporarily alleviates the stress and uncertainty its constituents feel over the winding up of their benefits and is satisfied with this result.

42 The CAW notes that some members feel they were not properly apprised of the facts, but all available information has been disclosed, and the concessions made by the employee groups were not made lightly.

Board of Directors

43 The Board of Directors of Nortel supports the Settlement Agreement on the basis that it is a practical resolution with compromises on both sides.

Opposing LTD Employees

44 Mr. Rochon appeared as counsel for the Opposing LTD Employees, notwithstanding that these individuals did not opt out of having Representative Counsel or were represented by the CAW. The submissions of the Opposing LTD Employees were compelling and the court extends it appreciation to Mr. Rochon and his team in co-ordinating the representatives of this group.

45 The Opposing LTD Employees put forward the position that the cessation of their benefits will lead to extreme hardship. Counsel submits that the Settlement Agreement conflicts with the spirit and purpose of the CCAA because the LTD Employees are giving up legal rights in relation to a $100 million shortfall of benefits. They urge the court to consider the unique circumstances of the LTD Employees as they are the people hardest hit by the cessation of benefits.

46 The Opposing LTD Employees assert that the HWT is a true trust, and submit that breaches of that trust create liabilities and that the claim should not be released. Specifically, they point to a $37 million shortfall in the HWT that they should be able to pursue.

47 Regarding the third party releases, the Opposing LTD Employees assert that Nortel is attempting to avoid the distraction of third party litigation, rather than look out for the best interests of the Former and LTD Employees. The Opposing LTD Employees urge the court not to release the only individuals the Former and LTD Employees can hold accountable for any breaches of trust. Counsel submits that Nortel has a common law duty to fund the HWT, which the Former and LTD Employees should be allowed to pursue.

48 Counsel asserts that allowing these releases (a) is not necessary and essential to the restructuring of the debtor, (b) does not relate to the insolvency process, (c) is not required for the success of the Settlement Agreement, (d) does not meet the requirement that each party contribute to the plan in a material way and (e) is overly broad and therefore not fair and reasonable.

49 Finally, the Opposing LTD Employees oppose the *pari passu* treatment they will be subjected to under the Settlement Agreement, as they have a true trust which should grant them priority in the distribution process. Counsel was not able to provide legal authority for such a submission.

50 A number of Opposing LTD Employees made in person submissions. They do not share the view that Nortel will act in their best interests, nor do they feel that the Employee Representatives or Representative Counsel have acted in their best interests. They shared feelings of uncertainty, helplessness and despair. There is affidavit evidence that certain individuals will be unable to support themselves once their benefits run out, and they will not have time to order their affairs. They expressed frustration and disappointment in the CCAA process.

UCC

51 The UCC was appointed as the representative for creditors in the U.S. Chapter 11 proceedings. It represents creditors who have significant claims against the Applicants. The UCC opposes the motion, based on the inclusion of Clause H.2, but otherwise the UCC supports the Settlement Agreement.

52 Clause H.2, the UCC submits, removes the essential element of finality that a settlement agreement is supposed to include. The UCC characterizes Clause H.2 as a take back provision; if activated, the Former and LTD Employees have compromised nothing, to the detriment of other unsecured creditors. A reservation of rights removes the finality of the Settlement Agreement.

53 The UCC claims it, not Nortel, bears the risk of Clause H.2. As the largest unsecured creditor, counsel submits that a future change to the BIA could subsume the UCC's claim to the Former and LTD Employees and the UCC could end up with nothing at all, depending on Nortel's asset sales.

Noteholders

54 The Noteholders are significant creditors of the Applicants. The Noteholders oppose the settlement because of Clause H.2, for substantially the same reasons as the UCC.

55 Counsel to the Noteholders submits that the inclusion of H.2 is prejudicial to the non-employee unsecured creditors, including the Noteholders. Counsel submits that the effect of the Settlement Agreement is to elevate the Former and LTD Employees, providing them a payout of $57 million over nine months while everyone else continues to wait, and preserves their rights in the event the laws are amended in future. Counsel to the Noteholders submits that the Noteholders forego millions of dollars while remaining exposed to future claims.

56 The Noteholders assert that a proper settlement agreement must have two elements: a real compromise, and resolution of the matters in contention. In this case, counsel submits that there is no resolution because there is no finality in that Clause

H.2 creates ambiguity about the future. The very object of a Settlement Agreement, assert the Noteholders, is to avoid litigation by withdrawing claims, which this agreement does not do.

Superintendent

57 The Superintendent does not oppose the relief sought, but this position is based on the form of the Settlement Agreement that is before the Court.

Northern Trust

58 Northern Trust, the trustee of the pension plans and HWT, takes no position on the Settlement Agreement as it takes instructions from Nortel. Northern Trust indicates that an oversight left its name off the third party release and asks for an amendment to include it as a party released by the Settlement Agreement.

Law and Analysis

A. Representation and Notice Were Proper

59 It is well settled that the Former Employees' Representatives and the LTD Representative (collectively, the "Settlement Employee Representatives") and Representative Counsel have the authority to represent the Former Employees and the LTD Beneficiaries for purposes of entering into the Settlement Agreement on their behalf: *see Grace 2008*, *supra* at para 32.

60 The court appointed the Settlement Employee Representatives and the Representative Settlement Counsel. These appointment orders have not been varied or appealed. Unionized employees continue to be represented by the CAW. The Orders appointing the Settlement Employee Representatives expressly gave them authority to represent their constituencies "for the purpose of settling or compromising claims" in these Proceedings. Former Employees and LTD Employees were given the right to opt out of their representation by Representative Settlement Counsel. After provision of notice, only one former employee and one active employee exercised the opt-out right.

B. Effect of the Settlement Approval Order

61 In addition to the binding effect of the Settlement Agreement, many additional parties will be bound and affected by the Settlement Approval Order. Counsel to the Applicants submits that the binding nature of the Settlement Approval Order on all affected parties is a crucial element to the Settlement itself. In order to ensure all Affected Parties had notice, the Applicants obtained court approval of their proposed notice program.

62 Even absent such extensive noticing, virtually all employees of the Applicants are represented in these proceedings. In addition to the representative authority of the Settlement Employee Representatives and Representative Counsel as noted above, Orders were made authorizing a Nortel Canada Continuing Employees' Representative and Nortel Canada Continuing Employees' Representative Counsel to represent the interests of continuing employees on this motion.

63 I previously indicated that "the overriding objective of appointing representative counsel for employees is to ensure that the employees have representation in the CCAA process": *Nortel Networks Corp., Re* (Ont. S.C.J. [Commercial List]) at para 16. I am satisfied that this objective has been achieved.

64 The Record establishes that the Monitor has undertaken a comprehensive notice process which has included such notice to not only the Former Employees, the LTD Employees, the unionized employees and the continuing employees but also the provincial pension regulators and has given the opportunity for any affected person to file Notices of Appearance and appear before this court on this motion.

65 I am satisfied that the notice process was properly implemented by the Monitor.

66 I am satisfied that Representative Counsel has represented their constituents' interests in accordance with their mandate, specifically, in connection with the negotiation of the Settlement Agreement and the draft Settlement Approval Order and appearance on this Motion. There have been intense discussions, correspondence and negotiations among Representative Counsel, the Monitor, the Applicants, the Superintendent, counsel to the Board of the Applicants, the Noteholder Group and the Committee with a view to developing a comprehensive settlement. NCCE's Representative Counsel have been apprised of the settlement discussions and served with notice of this Motion. Representatives have held Webinar sessions and published press releases to inform their constituents about the Settlement Agreement and this Motion.

C. Jurisdiction to Approve the Settlement Agreement

67 The CCAA is a flexible statute that is skeletal in nature. It has been described as a "sketch, an outline, a supporting framework for the resolution of corporate insolvencies in the public interest". *Nortel Networks Corp., Re* (Ont. S.C.J. [Commercial List]) at paras. 28-29, citing *Metcalfe*, *supra*, at paras. 44 and 61.

68 Three sources for the court's authority to approve pre-plan agreements have been recognized:

(a) the power of the court to impose terms and conditions on the granting of a stay under s. 11(4) of the CCAA;

(b) the power of the court to make an order "on such terms as it may impose" pursuant to s. 11(4) of the CCAA; and

(c) the inherent jurisdiction of the court to "fill in the gaps" of the CCAA in order to give effect to its objects: see *Nortel Networks Corp., Re* (Ont. S.C.J. [Commercial List]) at para. 30, citing *Canadian Red Cross Society / Société Canadienne de la Croix-Rouge, Re* (Ont. Gen. Div. [Commercial List]) [*Canadian Red Cross*] at para. 43; *Metcalfe*, *supra* at para. 44.

69 In *Stelco Inc., Re* (2005), 78 O.R. (3d) 254 (Ont. C.A.), the Ontario Court of Appeal considered the court's jurisdiction under the CCAA to approve agreements, determining at para. 14 that it is not limited to preserving the *status quo*. Further, agreements made prior to the finalization of a plan or compromise are valid orders for the court to approve: *Grace 2008*, *supra* at para. 34.

70 In these proceedings, this court has confirmed its jurisdiction to approve major transactions, including settlement agreements, during the stay period defined in the Initial Order and prior to the proposal of any plan of compromise or arrangement: see, for example, *Nortel Networks Corp., Re* (Ont. S.C.J. [Commercial List]); *Nortel Networks Corp., Re* (Ont. S.C.J. [Commercial List]) and *Nortel Networks Corp., Re*, 2010 ONSC 1096 (Ont. S.C.J. [Commercial List]).

71 I am satisfied that this court has jurisdiction to approve transactions, including settlements, in the course of overseeing proceedings during a CCAA stay period and prior to any plan of arrangement being proposed to creditors: see *Calpine Canada Energy Ltd., Re* (Alta. C.A. [In Chambers]) [*Calpine*] at para. 23, affirming (Alta. Q.B.); *Canadian Red Cross*, *supra*; *Air Canada*, *supra*; *Grace 2008*, *supra*, and *Grace Canada Inc., Re* (Ont. S.C.J. [Commercial List]) [*Grace 2010*], leave to appeal to the C.A. refused February 19, 2010; *Nortel Networks Corp., Re*, 2010 ONSC 1096 (Ont. S.C.J. [Commercial List]).

D. Should the Settlement Agreement Be Approved?

72 Having been satisfied that this court has the jurisdiction to approve the Settlement Agreement, I must consider whether the Settlement Agreement *should* be approved.

73 A Settlement Agreement can be approved if it is consistent with the spirit and purpose of the CCAA and is fair and reasonable in all circumstances. What makes a settlement agreement fair and reasonable is its balancing of the interests of all parties; its equitable treatment of the parries, including creditors who are not signatories to a settlement agreement; and its benefit to the Applicant and its stakeholders generally.

i) Sprit and Purpose

74 The CCAA is a flexible instrument; part of its purpose is to allow debtors to balance the conflicting interests of stakeholders. The Former and LTD Employees are significant creditors and have a unique interest in the settlement of their claims. This Settlement Agreement brings these creditors closer to ultimate settlement while accommodating their special circumstances. It is consistent with the spirit and purpose of the CCAA.

ii) Balancing of Parties' Interests

75 There is no doubt that the Settlement Agreement is comprehensive and that it has support from a number of constituents when considered in its totality.

76 There is, however, opposition from certain constituents on two aspects of the proposed Settlement Agreement: (1) the Opposing LTD Employees take exception to the inclusion of the third party releases; (2) the UCC and Noteholder Groups take exception to the inclusion of Clause H.2.

Third Party Releases

77 Representative Counsel, after examining documentation pertaining to the Pension Plans and HWT, advised the Former Employees' Representatives and Disabled Employees' Representative that claims against directors of Nortel for failing to properly fund the Pension Plans were unlikely to succeed. Further, Representative Counsel advised that claims against directors or others named in the Third Party Releases to fund the Pension Plans were risky and could take years to resolve, perhaps unsuccessfully. This assisted the Former Employees' Representatives and the Disabled Employees' Representative in agreeing to the Third Party Releases.

78 The conclusions reached and the recommendations made by both the Monitor and Representative Counsel are consistent. They have been arrived at after considerable study of the issues and, in my view, it is appropriate to give significant weight to their positions.

79 In *Grace 2008*, *supra*, and *Grace 2010*, *supra*, I indicated that a Settlement Agreement entered into with Representative Counsel that contains third party releases is fair and reasonable where the releases are necessary and connected to a resolution of claims against the debtor, will benefit creditors generally and are not overly broad or offensive to public policy.

80 In this particular case, I am satisfied that the releases are necessary and connected to a resolution of claims against the Applicants.

81 The releases benefit creditors generally as they reduces the risk of litigation against the Applicants and their directors, protect the Applicants against potential contribution claims and indemnity claims by certain parties, including directors, officers and the HWT Trustee; and reduce the risk of delay caused by potentially complex litigation and associated depletion of assets to fund potentially significant litigation costs.

82 Further, in my view, the releases are not overly broad or offensive to public policy. The claims being released specifically relate to the subject matter of the Settlement Agreement. The parties granting the release receive consideration in the form of both immediate compensation and the maintenance of their rights in respect to the distribution of claims.

Clause H.2

83 The second aspect of the Settlement Agreement that is opposed is the provision known as Clause H.2. Clause H.2 provides that, in the event of a bankruptcy of the Applicants, and notwithstanding any provision of the Settlement Agreement, if there are any amendments to the BIA that change the current, relative priorities of the claims against the Applicants, no party is precluded from arguing the applicability or non-applicability of any such amendment in relation to any such claim.

84 The Noteholders and UCC assert that Clause H.2 causes the Settlement Agreement to not be a "settlement" in the true and proper sense of that term due to a lack of certainty and finality. They emphasize that Clause H.2 has the effect of undercutting

the essential compromises of the Settlement Agreement in imposing an unfair risk on the non-employee creditors of NNL, including NNI, after substantial consideration has been paid to the employees.

85 This position is, in my view, well founded. The inclusion of the Clause H.2 creates, rather than eliminates, uncertainty. It creates the potential for a fundamental alteration of the Settlement Agreement.

86 The effect of the Settlement Agreement is to give the Former and LTD Employees preferred treatment for certain claims, notwithstanding that priority is not provided for in the statute nor has it been recognized in case law. In exchange for this enhanced treatment, the Former Employees and LTD Beneficiaries have made certain concessions.

87 The Former and LTD Employees recognize that substantially all of these concessions could be clawed back through Clause H.2. Specifically, they acknowledge that future Pension and HWT Claims will rank *pari passu* with the claims of other ordinary unsecured creditors, but then go on to say that should the BIA be amended, they may assert once again a priority claim.

88 Clause H.2 results in an agreement that does not provide certainty and does not provide finality of a fundamental priority issue.

89 The Settlement Parties, as well as the Noteholders and the UCC, recognize that there are benefits associated with resolving a number of employee-related issues, but the practical effect of Clause H.2 is that the issue is not fully resolved. In my view, Clause H.2 is somewhat inequitable from the standpoint of the other unsecured creditors of the Applicants. If the creditors are to be bound by the Settlement Agreement, they are entitled to know, with certainty and finality, the effect of the Settlement Agreement.

90 It is not, in my view, reasonable to require creditors to, in effect, make concessions in favour of the Former and LTD Employees today, and be subject to the uncertainty of unknown legislation in the future.

91 One of the fundamental purposes of the CCAA is to facilitate a process for a compromise of debt. A compromise needs certainty and finality. Clause H.2 does not accomplish this objective. The inclusion of Clause H.2 does not recognize that at some point settlement negotiations cease and parties bound by the settlement have to accept the outcome. A comprehensive settlement of claims in the magnitude and complexity contemplated by the Settlement Agreement should not provide an opportunity to re-trade the deal after the fact.

92 The Settlement Agreement should be fair and reasonable in all the circumstances. It should balance the interests of the Settlement Parties and other affected constituencies equitably and should be beneficial to the Applicants and their stakeholders generally.

93 It seems to me that Clause H.2 fails to recognize the interests of the other creditors of the Applicants. These creditors have claims that rank equally with the claims of the Former Employees and LTD Employees. Each have unsecured claims against the Applicants. The Settlement Agreement provides for a transfer of funds to the benefit of the Former Employees and LTD Employees at the expense of the remaining creditors. The establishment of the Payments Charge crystallized this agreed upon preference, but Clause H.2 has the effect of not providing any certainty of outcome to the remaining creditors.

94 I do not consider Clause H.2 to be fair and reasonable in the circumstances.

95 In light of this conclusion, the Settlement Agreement cannot be approved in its current form.

96 Counsel to the Noteholder Group also made submissions that three other provisions of the Settlement Agreement were unreasonable and unfair, namely:

(i) ongoing exposure to potential liability for pension claims if a bankruptcy order is made before October 1, 2010;

(ii) provisions allowing payments made to employees to be credited against employees' claims made, rather than from future distributions or not to be credited at all; and

(iii) lack of clarity as to whether the proposed order is binding on the Superintendent in all of his capacities under the *Pension Benefits Act* and other applicable law, and not merely in his capacity as Administrator on behalf of the Pension Benefits Guarantee Fund.

97 The third concern was resolved at the hearing with the acknowledgement by counsel to the Superintendent that the proposed order would be binding on the Superintendent in all of his capacities.

98 With respect to the concern regarding the potential liability for pension claims if a bankruptcy order is made prior to October 1, 2010, counsel for the Applicants undertook that the Applicants would not take any steps to file a voluntary assignment into bankruptcy prior to October 1, 2010. Although such acknowledgment does not bind creditors from commencing involuntary bankruptcy proceedings during this time period, the granting of any bankruptcy order is preceded by a court hearing. The Noteholders would be in a position to make submissions on this point, if so advised. This concern of the Noteholders is not one that would cause me to conclude that the Settlement Agreement was unreasonable and unfair.

99 Finally, the Noteholder Group raised concerns with respect to the provision which would allow payments made to employees to be credited against employees' claims made, rather than from future distributions, or not to be credited at all. I do not view this provision as being unreasonable and unfair. Rather, it is a term of the Settlement Agreement that has been negotiated by the Settlement Parties. I do note that the proposed treatment with respect to any payments does provide certainty and finality and, in my view, represents a reasonable compromise in the circumstances.

Disposition

100 I recognize that the proposed Settlement Agreement was arrived at after hard-fought and lengthy negotiations. There are many positive aspects of the Settlement Agreement. I have no doubt that the parties to the Settlement Agreement consider that it represents the best agreement achievable under the circumstances. However, it is my conclusion that the inclusion of Clause H.2 results in a flawed agreement that cannot be approved.

101 I am mindful of the submission of counsel to the Former and LTD Employees that if the Settlement Agreement were approved, with Clause H.2 excluded, this would substantively alter the Settlement Agreement and would, in effect, be a creation of a settlement and not the approval of one.

102 In addition, counsel to the Superintendent indicated that the approval of the Superintendent was limited to the proposed Settlement Agreement and would not constitute approval of any altered agreement.

103 In *Grace 2008*, *supra*, I commented that a line-by-line analysis was inappropriate and that approval of a settlement agreement was to be undertaken in its entirety or not at all, at para. 74. A similar position was taken by the New Brunswick Court of Queen's Bench in *Wandlyn Inns Limited (Re)* (1992), 15 C.B.R. (3d) 316 (N.B. Q.B.). I see no reason or basis to deviate from this position.

104 Accordingly, the motion is dismissed.

105 In view of the timing of the timing of the release of this decision and the functional funding deadline of March 31, 2010, the court will make every effort to accommodate the parties if further directions are required.

106 Finally, I would like to express my appreciation to all counsel and in person parties for the quality of written and oral submissions.

Motion dismissed.

Footnotes

1 On March 25, 2010, the Supreme Court of Canada released the following: *Donald Sproule et al. v. Nortel Networks Corporation et al.* (Ont.) (Civil) (By Leave) (33491) (The motions for directions and to expedite the application for leave to appeal

are dismissed. The application for leave to appeal is dismissed with no order as to costs./La requête en vue d'obtenir des directives et la requête visant à accélérer la procédure de demande d'autorisation d'appel sont rejetées. La demande d'autorisation d'appel est rejetée; aucune ordonnance n'est rendue concernant les dépens.): <http://scc.lexum.umontreal.ca/en/news_release/2010/10-03-25.3a/10-03-25.3a.html>

TAB 4

2007 ABCA 266
Alberta Court of Appeal (In Chambers)

Calpine Canada Energy Ltd., Re

2007 CarswellAlta 1097, 2007 ABCA 266, [2007] A.W.L.D. 3481, [2007] A.J. No. 917, 161 A.C.W.S. (3d) 370, 33 B.L.R. (4th) 94, 35 C.B.R. (5th) 27, 410 W.A.C. 25, 417 A.R. 25, 80 Alta. L.R. (4th) 60

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

And In the Matter of Calpine Canada Energy Limited, Calpine Canada Power Ltd., Calpine Canada Energy Finance ULC, Calpine Energy Services Canada Ltd., Calpine Canada Resources Company, Calpine Canada Power Services Ltd., Calpine Canada Energy Finance II ULC, Calpine Natural Gas Services Limited and 3094479 Nova Scotia Company (the "CCAA Applicants")

Calpine Power L.P. (Appellant / Applicant (Creditor)) and The CCAA Applicants and Calpine Energy Services Canada Partnership, Calpine Canada Natural Gas Partnership and Calpine Canadian Saltend Limited Partnership (Respondents / Applicants)

Calpine Canada Natural Gas Partnership (Respondent / Applicant / CCAA Party) and Calpine Energy Services Canada Partnership and Lisa Winslow, Trustee of Calpine Greenfield Commercial Trust (Respondents / (CCAA Applicant and Interested Parties)) and Calpine Power L.P. (Appellant / Applicant / (Creditor in CCAA Proceedings))

C. O'Brien J.A.

Heard: August 15, 2007
Judgment: August 17, 2007
Docket: Calgary Appeal 0701-0222-AC, 0701-0223-AC

Proceedings: refusing leave to appeal *Calpine Canada Energy Ltd., Re* (2007), 2007 CarswellAlta 1050, 2007 ABQB 504 (Alta. Q.B.)

Counsel: P.T. Linder, Q.C., R. Van Dorp for Applicant, CPL
L.B. Robinson, Q.C., S.F. Collins, J.A. Carfagnini for CCAA Applicants and the CCAA Parties (Respondents)
H.A. Gorman for Ad Hoc ULCI Noteholders Committee
P.H. Griffin, U. Sheikh for Calpine Corporation and other US Debtors
F.R. Dearlove for HSBC
P. McCarthy, Q.C., J. Kruger for Ernst & Young Inc., the Monitor
N.S. Rabinovitch for Lien Debtholders
R. De Waal for Unsecured Creditors Committee

***C. O'Brien J.A.*:**

Introduction

1 Calpine Power L.P. (CLP) applies for a stay pending appeal and leave to appeal three orders granted on July 24, 2007 in a proceeding under the *Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act*, R.S.C. 1985, c. C-36, as amended (CCAA). At the request of counsel, the applications have been dealt with on an expedited basis. Oral submissions were heard on August 15, at the close of which I undertook to deliver judgment by the end of the week. I do so now.

Background facts

2 In December 2005, Calpine Canada Energy Limited, Calpine Canada Power Ltd., Calpine Canada Energy Finance ULC, Calpine Energy Services Canada Ltd., Calpine Canada Resources Company, Calpine Canada Power Services Ltd., Calpine Canada Energy Finance II ULC, Calpine Natural Gas Services Limited, and 3094479 Nova Scotia Company (CCAA Applicants) sought and obtain protection under the CCAA. At the same time, the parties referred to as the US Debtors sought and obtained similar protection under Chapter 11 of the U. S. Bankruptcy Code.

3 A monitor, Ernst & Young Inc., was appointed under the CCAA proceedings and a stay of proceedings was ordered against the CCAA Applicants and against Calpine Energy Services Canada Partnership, Calpine Canada Natural Gas Partnership and Calpine Canadian Saltend Limited Partnership. The latter three parties collectively are referred to as the CCAA Parties and those parties together with the CCAA Applicants as the CCAA Debtors.

4 This insolvency is extremely complex, involving many related corporations and partnerships, and highly intertwined legal and financial obligations. The goal of restructuring and realizing maximum value for assets has been made more difficult by a number of cross-border issues.

5 As described in the Monitor's 23rd Report, dated June 28, 2007, the CCAA Debtors and the US Debtors concluded that the most appropriate way to resolve the issues between them was to concentrate on reaching a consensual global agreement that resolved virtually all the material cross-border issues between them. The parties negotiated a global settlement agreement (GSA) subject to the approval of both Canadian and U. S. courts, execution of the GSA and the sale by Calpine Canada Resources Company of its holdings of Calpine Canada Energy Finance ULC (ULC1) Notes in the face amount of US$359,770,000 (the CCRC ULC1 Notes). Counsel at the oral hearing informed me that the Notes were sold on August 14, 2007, yielding a net amount of approximately US $403 million, an amount exceeding the face amount.

6 On July 24, 2007, the CCAA Applicants sought and obtained three orders. First, an order approving the terms of the GSA and directing the various parties to execute such documents and implement the transactions necessary to give effect to the GSA. Second, an order permitting CCRC and ULC1 to take the necessary steps to sell the CCRC ULC1 Notes. Third, an extension of the stay contemplated by the initial CCAA order to December 20, 2007. No objection was taken to the latter two orders and both were granted. The supervising judge also, in brief oral reasons, approved the GSA with written reasons to follow. Written Reasons for Judgment were subsequently filed on July 31, 2007: *Calpine Canada Energy Ltd., Re*, 2007 ABQB 504 (Alta. Q.B.). The reasons are careful and detailed. They fully set out the relevant facts and canvas the applicable law and as I see no need to repeat the facts and authorities, the reasons should be read in conjunction with these relatively short reasons dealing with the applications arising therefrom.

7 The applications to the supervising judge were made concurrently with applications by the US Debtors to the US Bankruptcy Court in New York state, the applications proceeding simultaneously by video conference. The applications to the US Court, including an application for approval of the GSA, were also granted.

8 The applicant, CLP, the Calpine Canada Energy Finance II ULC (ULC2) Indenture Trustee and a group referring to itself as the "Ad Hoc Committee of Creditors of Calpine Canada Resources Company" opposed the approval of the GSA. CPL is the only party seeking leave to appeal.

9 CLP submits that the supervising judge erred in concluding that the GSA was not a compromise or plan of arrangement and therefore, sections 4 and 5 of the CCAA did not apply and no vote by creditors was necessary.

10 Sections 4 and 5 of the CCAA provide:

> 4. Where a compromise or an arrangement is proposed between a debtor company and its unsecured creditors or any class of them, the court may, on the application in a summary way of the company, of any such creditor or of the trustee

in bankruptcy or liquidator of the company, order a meeting of the creditors or class of creditors, and, if the court so determines, of the shareholders of the company, to be summoned in such manner as the court directs.

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

11 CLP further submits that the jurisdiction of the supervising judge to approve the GSA is governed by section 6 of the CCAA. Section 6 provides:

> Where a majority in number representing two-thirds in value of the creditors, or class of creditors, as the case may be, present and voting either in person or by proxy at the meeting or meetings thereof respectively held pursuant to sections 4 and 5, or either of those sections, agree to any compromise or arrangement either as proposed or as altered or modified at the meeting or meetings, the compromise or arrangement may be sanctioned by the court, and if so sanctioned is binding
>
> > (a) on all the creditors or the class of creditors, as the case may be, and on any trustee for any such class of creditors, whether secured or unsecured, as the case may be, and on the company; and
> >
> > (b) in the case of a company that has made an authorized assignment or against which a bankruptcy order has been made under the Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act or is in the course of being wound up under the Winding-up and Restructuring Act, on the trustee in bankruptcy or liquidator and contributories of the company.

12 The supervising judge found that the GSA is not linked to or subject to a plan of arrangement and does not compromise the rights of creditors that are not parties to it or have not consented to it, and it does not have the effect of unilaterally depriving creditors of contractual rights without their participation in the GSA. She concluded that the GSA was not a compromise or arrangement for the purposes of section 4 of the CCAA. In the course of her reasons she cites a number of cases for support that the court has jurisdiction to review and approve transactions and settlement agreements during the stay period of a CCAA proceedings if an agreement is fair and reasonable and will be beneficial to the debtor and its stakeholders generally.

Test for leave to appeal

13 This Court has repeatedly stated, for example in *Liberty Oil & Gas Ltd., Re*, 2003 ABCA 158, 44 C.B.R. (4th) 96 (Alta. C.A.), at paras. 15-16, that the test for leave under the CCAA involves a single criterion that there must be serious and arguable grounds that are of real and significant interest to the parties. The four factors used to assess whether this criterion is present are:

> (1) Whether the point on appeal is of significance to the practice;
>
> (2) Whether the point raised is of significance to the action itself;
>
> (3) Whether the appeal is *prima facie* meritorious or, on the other hand, whether it is frivolous; and
>
> (4) Whether the appeal will unduly hinder the progress of the action.

14 In assessing these factors, consideration should also be given to the applicable standard of review: *Canadian Airlines Corp., Re*, 2000 ABCA 149, 261 A.R. 120 (Alta. C.A. [In Chambers]). Having regard to the commercial nature of the proceedings which often require quick decisions, and to the intimate knowledge acquired by a supervising judge in overseeing a CCAA proceedings, appellate courts have expressed a reluctance to interfere, except in clear cases: *Smoky River Coal Ltd., Re*, 1999 ABCA 179, 237 A.R. 326 (Alta. C.A.) at para. 61.

Analysis

15 The standard of review plays a significant, if not decisive, role in the outcome of this application for leave to appeal. The supervising judge, on the record of evidence before her, found that the GSA was "not a plan of compromise or arrangement with creditors" (Reasons, para. 51). This was a finding of fact, or at most, a finding of mixed law and fact. The applicant has identified no extricable error of law so the applicable standard is palpable or overriding error.

16 The statute itself contains no definition of a compromise or arrangement. Moreover, it does not appear that a compromise or an arrangement has been *proposed* between a debtor company and either its unsecured or secured creditors, or any class of them within the scope of sections 4 or 5 of the CCAA. Neither the company, a creditor, nor anyone made application to convene a meeting under those sections.

17 Rather, the GSA settles certain intercorporate claims between certain Canadian Calpine entities and certain US Calpine entities subject to certain conditions, including the approvals both of the Court of Queen's Bench of Alberta and of the US Bankruptcy Court.

18 This is not to minimize the magnitude, significance and complexity of the issues dealt with in the intercorporate settlement which, by definition, was not between arm's length companies. The material cross-border issues are identified in the 23 rd Report of the monitor and listed by the supervising judge (Reasons, para. 5).

19 It is implicit in her reasons, if not express, that the supervising judge accepted the analysis of the monitor, and found that the GSA would likely ultimately result in payment in full of all Canadian creditors, including CLP. CLP does not challenge this finding, but points out that payment is not assured, and rightly relies upon its status as a creditor to challenge the approval in the meantime until such time as it has been paid.

20 The supervising judge further found that the GSA "does not compromise the rights of creditors that are not parties to it or have not consented to it, and it certainly does not have the effect of unilaterally depriving creditors of contractual rights without their participation in the GSA" (Reasons, para. 51). CPL challenges this finding. In order to succeed in its proposed appeal, CPL must also demonstrate palpable and overriding error in these further findings of the supervising judge which once again, involve findings of fact or of mixed law and fact.

Application in this case

21 CPL submits that the "fundamental problem" with the approval granted by the supervising judge is that the GSA is in reality a plan of arrangement because it settles virtually all matters in dispute in the Canadian CCAA estate and therefore, entitles the applicant to a vote. CPL argues that the GSA must be an arrangement or compromise within the meaning of sections 4, 5 and 6 of the CCAA because, in its view, the GSA requires non party creditors to make concessions, re-orders the priorities of creditors and distributes assets of the estate.

22 The supervising judge acknowledged at the outset of her analysis that if the GSA were a plan of arrangement or compromise, a vote by creditors would be necessary (Reasons, para. 41). However, she was satisfied that the GSA did not constitute a plan of arrangement with creditors.

23 The applicant conceded that a CCAA supervising judge has jurisdiction to approve transactions, including settlements in the course of overseeing proceedings during a stay period and prior to any plan of arrangement being proposed to creditors. This concession was proper having regard to case authority recognizing such jurisdiction and cited in the reasons of the supervising judge, including *Air Canada, Re* (2004), 47 C.B.R. (4th) 169 (Ont. S.C.J. [Commercial List]), *Playdium Entertainment Corp., Re* (2001), 31 C.B.R. (4th) 302 (Ont. S.C.J. [Commercial List]), *Canadian Red Cross Society / Société Canadienne de la Croix-Rouge, Re* (1998), 5 C.B.R. (4th) 299 (Ont. Gen. Div. [Commercial List]), *T. Eaton Co., Re* (1999), 14 C.B.R. (4th) 288 (Ont. S.C.J. [Commercial List]) and *Stelco Inc., Re* (2005), 78 O.R. (3d) 254 (Ont. C.A.).

24 The power to approve such transactions during the stay is not spelled out in the CCAA. As has often been observed, the statute is skeletal. The approval power in such instances is usually said to be found either in the broad powers under section

11(4) to make orders other than on an initial application to effectuate the stay, or in the court's inherent jurisdiction to fill in gaps in legislation so as to give effect to the objects of the CCAA, including the survival program of the debtor until it can present a plan: *Dylex Ltd., Re* (1995), 31 C.B.R. (3d) 106 (Ont. Gen. Div. [Commercial List]) at para. 8.

25 Hunt, J.A. in delivering the judgment of this Court in *Smoky River Coal*considered the history of the legislation and its objectives in allowing the company to take steps to promote a successful eventual arrangement. She concluded at para. 53:

> These statements about the goals and operation of the CCAA support the view that the discretion under s. 11(4) should be interpreted widely.

and further at para. 60:

> To summarize, the language of s. 11(4) is very broad. The CCAA must be interpreted in a remedial fashion.

26 In my view, there is no serious issue as to the jurisdiction of a supervising judge to approve a settlement agreement between consenting parties prior to consideration of a plan of arrangement pursuant to section 6 of the CCAA. The fact that the GSA is not a simple agreement between two parties, but rather resolves a number of complex issues between a number of parties, does not affect the jurisdiction of the court to approve the agreement if it is for the general benefit of all parties and otherwise meets the tests identified in the reasons of the supervising judge.

27 CPL urges that the legal issue for determination by this Court is where the line is to be drawn to say when a settlement becomes a compromise or arrangement, thus requiring a vote under section 6 before the court can grant approval. It suggests that it would be useful to this practice area for the court to set out the criteria to be considered in this regard.

28 An element of compromise is inherent in a settlement as there is invariably some give and take by the parties in reaching their agreement. The parties to the GSA made concessions for the purpose of gaining benefits. It is obvious that something more than compromise between consenting parties within a settlement agreement is required to constitute an arrangement or compromise for purposes of the CCAA as if that were not so, no settlement agreement could be approved without a vote of the creditors. As noted, that is contrary to case authority accepted by all parties to these applications.

29 The CCAA deals with compromises or arrangements sought to be imposed upon creditors generally, or classes of creditors, and a vote is a necessary mechanism to determine whether the appropriate majority of the creditors proposed to be affected support the proposed compromise or arrangement.

30 As pointed out by the supervising judge, a settlement will almost always have an impact on the financial circumstances of a debtor. A settlement will invariably have an effect on the size of the estate available for other claimants (Reasons, para. 62).

31 Whether or not a settlement constitutes a plan of arrangement requiring a vote will be dependent upon the factual circumstances of each case. Here, the supervising judge carefully reviewed the circumstances and concluded, on the basis of a number of the fact findings, that there was no plan of arrangement within the meaning of the CCAA, and that the settlement merited approval. She recognized the peculiar circumstances which distinguishes this case, and observed at para. 76 of her Reasons:

> The precedential implications of this approval must be viewed in the context of the unique circumstances that have presented a situation in which all valid claims of Canadian creditors likely will be paid in full. This outcome, particularly with respect to a cross-border insolvency of exceptional complexity, is unlikely to be matched in other insolvencies, and therefore, a decision to approve this settlement agreement will not open any floodgates.

32 At the time of granting her approval, the supervising judge had been overseeing the conduct of these CCAA proceedings since their inception — some 18 months earlier. She had the benefit of the many reports of the monitor and was familiar with the record of the proceedings. Her determination of this issue is entitled to deference in the absence of legal error or palpable and overriding error of fact.

33 CPL submits that the GSA compromises its rights and claims, and thus, challenges the express finding of the supervising judge that the settlement neither compromises the rights of creditors before it, nor deprives them of their existing contractual rights. The applicant relies upon the following effects of the GSA in making this submission:

> (i) a priority payment of $75 million out of the proceeds of the sale of bonds owned by Calpine Canada Resources Company;
>
> (ii) the release of a potential claim against Calpine Canada Energy Limited, the parent of Calpine Canada Resources Company, which is a partner of Calpine Energy Services Canada Ltd., against which CPL has a claim;
>
> (iii) the dismissal of a claim by Calpine Canada Energy Limited against Quintana Canada Holdings LLC, thereby depleting Calpine Canada Energy Limited of a potential asset which that company could use to satisfy any potential claim by CPL for any shortfall, were it not for the release of claims against Calpine Canada Energy Limited (see (ii) above); and
>
> (iv) the dismissal of the Greenfield Action brought by another CCAA Debtor against Calpine Energy Services Canada Ltd. for an alleged fraudulent conversion of its interest in Greenfield LP which was developing a 1005 Megawatt generation plant.

34 For purposes of the CCAA proceedings, the applicant is a creditor of Calpine Energy Services Canada Ltd., Calpine Canada Power Ltd. and perhaps, also, Calpine Canada Resources Company. The GSA does not change its status as a creditor of those companies, nor does it bar the applicant from any existing claims against those companies.

35 In my view, the submission of the applicant does not show any palpable and overriding error in the findings of the supervising judge that the right of creditors not parties to the GSA have not been compromised or taken away. Firstly, there is no compromise of debt if such indebtedness, as ultimately found due to the applicant, is paid in full, which is the likely result as found by the supervising judge, albeit she acknowledged that this result was not guaranteed (Reasons, para. 81). Secondly, and in any event, the fact that the GSA impacts upon the assets of the debtor companies, against which the applicant may ultimately have a claim for any shortfall experienced by it, is a common feature of any settlement agreement and as earlier explained, does not automatically result in a vote by the creditors. The further fact that one of the affected assets of the debtor companies is a cause of action, or perhaps, more correctly, a possible cause of action, does not abrogate the rights of a creditor albeit there may be less monies to be realized at the end of the day.

36 The GSA does not usurp the right of the creditors to vote on a plan of arrangement if it becomes necessary to propose such a plan to the creditors. As explained by the supervising judge, the settlement between the CCAA Debtors and the US Debtors unlocked the Canadian proceedings to meaningful progress in asset realization and claims resolution, and provided the mechanisms for resolving the remaining issues and significant creditor claims, and the clarification of priorities.

37 It is correct, of course, that if the claims of CPL are paid in full in the course of the CCAA proceedings, it will never be necessary for it to vote on a plan of arrangement. The applicant should have no complaint with that result. On the other hand, if the claims are not satisfied, it seems likely a plan of arrangement will ultimately be proposed to the applicant, who will then have its right to vote on any such plan.

38 CPL argues that the supervising judge was not entitled to assess the merits of the GSA *vis-à-vis* the creditors as this was a matter for the exclusive business judgment of the creditors and to be exercised by their vote. As became apparent during the course of its submissions, if a vote were required, from the perspective of the CPL, this would give it veto power over the GSA. Unless clearly mandated by the statute, this is a result to be avoided. While it is understandable that an individual creditor seeks to obtain as much leverage as possible in order to enhance its negotiating position, the objectives and purposes of the CCAA could easily be frustrated in such circumstances by the self interest of a single creditor. Court approval requires, as a primary consideration, the determination that an agreement is fair and reasonable and will be beneficial to the debtor and its stakeholders generally. As the supervising judge noted, court approval of settlements and major transaction can and often is

given over the objections of one or more parties because the court must act for the greater good consistent with the purpose and spirit and within the confines of the legislation.

39 I am not persuaded that the applicant has demonstrated any reasonably arguable error of law in the reasons of the supervising judge or any palpable and overriding errors in her findings of fact or findings of mixed fact and law. In the absence of any such error, it follows that she had discretion to approve the GSA, which she exercised based upon her assessment of the merits and reasonableness of the settlement, and other factors in accordance with the principles set out in the authorities, cited in her reasons, governing the approval of transactions, including settlements, during the stay period prior to a plan of arrangement being submitted to the creditors.

Conclusion

40 CPL has failed to establish serious and arguable grounds for granting leave. In particular, two of the factors used to assess whether this criterion is present have not been met. It has not been demonstrated that the point on appeal is of significance to the parties having regard to the fact dependent nature of whether a plan of arrangement has been proposed to creditors. More importantly, having regard to the standard of review and the findings of the supervising judge, the applicant has not demonstrated that the appeal for which leave is sought is *prima facie* meritorious.

41 The application for leave is dismissed. It follows that the application for a stay likewise fails and is dismissed.

42 Finally, I would be remiss if I did not acknowledge the excellent quality of the submissions, both written and oral, of counsel on these applications. The submissions were of great assistance in permitting the application to be dealt with in an abbreviated time frame.

Application dismissed.

TAB 5

2009 CarswellOnt 4467
Ontario Superior Court of Justice [Commercial List]

Nortel Networks Corp., Re

2009 CarswellOnt 4467, [2009] O.J. No. 3169, 179 A.C.W.S. (3d) 265, 55 C.B.R. (5th) 229

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)

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

Morawetz J.

Heard: June 29, 2009
Written reasons: July 23, 2009
Docket: 09-CL-7950

Counsel: Derrick Tay, Jennifer Stam for Nortel Networks Corporation, et al
Lyndon Barnes, Adam Hirsh for Board of Directors of Nortel Networks Corporation, Nortel Networks Limited
J. Carfagnini, J. Pasquariello for Monitor, Ernst & Young Inc.
M. Starnino for Superintendent of Financial Services, Administrator of PBGF
S. Philpott for Former Employees
K. Zych for Noteholders
Pamela Huff, Craig Thorburn for MatlinPatterson Global Advisors LLC, MatlinPatterson Global Opportunities Partners III L.P., Matlin Patterson Opportunities Partners (Cayman) III L.P.
David Ward for UK Pension Protection Fund
Leanne Williams for Flextronics Inc.
Alex MacFarlane for Official Committee of Unsecured Creditors
Arthur O. Jacques, Tom McRae for Felske & Sylvain (de facto Continuing Employees' Committee)
Robin B. Schwill, Matthew P. Gottlieb for Nortel Networks UK Limited
A. Kauffman for Export Development Canada
D. Ullman for Verizon Communications Inc.
G. Benchetrit for IBM

***Morawetz J.*:**

Introduction

1 On June 29, 2009, I granted the motion of the Applicants and approved the bidding procedures (the "Bidding Procedures") described in the affidavit of Mr. Riedel sworn June 23, 2009 (the "Riedel Affidavit") and the Fourteenth Report of Ernst & Young, Inc., in its capacity as Monitor (the "Monitor") (the "Fourteenth Report"). The order was granted immediately after His Honour Judge Gross of the United States Bankruptcy Court for the District of Delaware (the "U.S. Court") approved the Bidding Procedures in the Chapter 11 proceedings.

2 I also approved the Asset Sale Agreement dated as of June 19, 2009 (the "Sale Agreement") among Nokia Siemens Networks B.V. ("Nokia Siemens Networks" or the "Purchaser"), as buyer, and Nortel Networks Corporation ("NNC"), Nortel Networks Limited ("NNL"), Nortel Networks, Inc. ("NNI") and certain of their affiliates, as vendors (collectively the "Sellers") in the form attached as Appendix "A" to the Fourteenth Report and I also approved and accepted the Sale Agreement for the purposes of conducting the "stalking horse" bidding process in accordance with the Bidding Procedures including, the Break-Up Fee and the Expense Reimbursement (as both terms are defined in the Sale Agreement).

3 An order was also granted sealing confidential Appendix "B" to the Fourteenth Report containing the schedules and exhibits to the Sale Agreement pending further order of this court.

4 The following are my reasons for granting these orders.

5 The hearing on June 29, 2009 (the "Joint Hearing") was conducted by way of video conference with a similar motion being heard by the U.S. Court. His Honor Judge Gross presided over the hearing in the U.S. Court. The Joint Hearing was conducted in accordance with the provisions of the Cross-Border Protocol, which had previously been approved by both the U.S. Court and this court.

6 The Sale Agreement relates to the Code Division Multiple Access ("CMDA") business Long-Term Evolution ("LTE") Access assets.

7 The Sale Agreement is not insignificant. The Monitor reports that revenues from CDMA comprised over 21% of Nortel's 2008 revenue. The CDMA business employs approximately 3,100 people (approximately 500 in Canada) and the LTE business employs approximately 1,000 people (approximately 500 in Canada). The purchase price under the Sale Agreement is $650 million.

Background

8 The Applicants were granted CCAA protection on January 14, 2009. Insolvency proceedings have also been commenced in the United States, the United Kingdom, Israel and France.

9 At the time the proceedings were commenced, Nortel's business operated through 143 subsidiaries, with approximately 30,000 employees globally. As of January 2009, Nortel employed approximately 6,000 people in Canada alone.

10 The stated purpose of Nortel's filing under the CCAA was to stabilize the Nortel business to maximize the chances of preserving all or a portion of the enterprise. The Monitor reported that a thorough strategic review of the company's assets and operations would have to be undertaken in consultation with various stakeholder groups.

11 In April 2009, the Monitor updated the court and noted that various restructuring alternatives were being considered.

12 On June 19, 2009, Nortel announced that it had entered into the Sale Agreement with respect to its assets in its CMDA business and LTE Access assets (collectively, the "Business") and that it was pursuing the sale of its other business units. Mr. Riedel in his affidavit states that Nortel has spent many months considering various restructuring alternatives before determining in its business judgment to pursue "going concern" sales for Nortel's various business units.

13 In deciding to pursue specific sales processes, Mr. Riedel also stated that Nortel's management considered:

(a) the impact of the filings on Nortel's various businesses, including deterioration in sales; and

(b) the best way to maximize the value of its operations, to preserve jobs and to continue businesses in Canada and the U.S.

14 Mr. Riedel notes that while the Business possesses significant value, Nortel was faced with the reality that:

(a) the Business operates in a highly competitive environment;

(b) full value cannot be realized by continuing to operate the Business through a restructuring; and

(c) in the absence of continued investment, the long-term viability of the Business would be put into jeopardy.

15 Mr. Riedel concluded that the proposed process for the sale of the Business pursuant to an auction process provided the best way to preserve the Business as a going concern and to maximize value and preserve the jobs of Nortel employees.

16 In addition to the assets covered by the Sale Agreement, certain liabilities are to be assumed by the Purchaser. This issue is covered in a comprehensive manner at paragraph 34 of the Fourteenth Report. Certain liabilities to employees are included on this list. The assumption of these liabilities is consistent with the provisions of the Sale Agreement that requires the Purchaser to extend written offers of employment to at least 2,500 employees in the Business.

17 The Monitor also reports that given that certain of the U.S. Debtors are parties to the Sale Agreement and given the desire to maximize value for the benefit of stakeholders, Nortel determined and it has agreed with the Purchaser that the Sale Agreement is subject to higher or better offers being obtained pursuant to a sale process under s. 363 of the U.S. Bankruptcy Code and that the Sale Agreement shall serve as a "stalking horse" bid pursuant to that process.

18 The Bidding Procedures provide that all bids must be received by the Seller by no later than July 21, 2009 and that the Sellers will conduct an auction of the purchased assets on July 24, 2009. It is anticipated that Nortel will ultimately seek a final sales order from the U.S. Court on or about July 28, 2009 and an approval and vesting order from this court in respect of the Sale Agreement and purchased assets on or about July 30, 2009.

19 The Monitor recognizes the expeditious nature of the sale process but the Monitor has been advised that given the nature of the Business and the consolidation occurring in the global market, there are likely to be a limited number of parties interested in acquiring the Business.

20 The Monitor also reports that Nortel has consulted with, among others, the Official Committee of Unsecured Creditors (the "UCC") and the bondholder group regarding the Bidding Procedures and is of the view that both are supportive of the timing of this sale process. (It is noted that the UCC did file a limited objection to the motion relating to certain aspects of the Bidding Procedures.)

21 Given the sale efforts made to date by Nortel, the Monitor supports the sale process outlined in the Fourteenth Report and more particularly described in the Bidding Procedures.

22 Objections to the motion were filed in the U.S. Court and this court by MatlinPatterson Global Advisors LLC, MatlinPatterson Global Opportunities Partners III L.P. and Matlin Patterson Opportunities Partners (Cayman) III L.P. (collectively, "MatlinPatterson") as well the UCC.

23 The objections were considered in the hearing before Judge Gross and, with certain limited exceptions, the objections were overruled.

Issues and Discussion

24 The threshold issue being raised on this motion by the Applicants is whether the CCAA affords this court the jurisdiction to approve a sales process in the absence of a formal plan of compromise or arrangement and a creditor vote. If the question is answered in the affirmative, the secondary issue is whether this sale should authorize the Applicants to sell the Business.

25 The Applicants submit that it is well established in the jurisprudence that this court has the jurisdiction under the CCAA to approve the sales process and that the requested order should be granted in these circumstances.

26 Counsel to the Applicants submitted a detailed factum which covered both issues.

27 Counsel to the Applicants submits that one of the purposes of the CCAA is to preserve the going concern value of debtors companies and that the court's jurisdiction extends to authorizing sale of the debtor's business, even in the absence of a plan or creditor vote.

28 The CCAA is a flexible statute and it is particularly useful in complex insolvency cases in which the court is required to balance numerous constituents and a myriad of interests.

29 The CCAA has been described as "skeletal in nature". It has also been described as a "sketch, an outline, a supporting framework for the resolution of corporate insolvencies in the public interest". *ATB Financial v. Metcalfe & Mansfield Alternative Investments II Corp.* (2008), 45 C.B.R. (5th) 163 (Ont. C.A.) at paras. 44, 61, leave to appeal refused [2008] S.C.C.A. No. 337 (S.C.C.). ("ATB Financial").

30 The jurisprudence has identified as sources of the court's discretionary jurisdiction, *inter alia*:

> (a) the power of the court to impose terms and conditions on the granting of a stay under s. 11(4) of the CCAA;
>
> (b) the specific provision of s. 11(4) of the CCAA which provides that the court may make an order "on such terms as it may impose"; and
>
> (c) the inherent jurisdiction of the court to "fill in the gaps" of the CCAA in order to give effect to its objects. *Canadian Red Cross Society / Société Canadienne de la Croix-Rouge, Re* (1998), 5 C.B.R. (4th) 299 (Ont. Gen. Div. [Commercial List]) at para. 43; *PSINET Ltd., Re* (2001), 28 C.B.R. (4th) 95 (Ont. S.C.J. [Commercial List]) at para. 5, *ATB Financial*, *supra*, at paras. 43-52.

31 However, counsel to the Applicants acknowledges that the discretionary authority of the court under s. 11 must be informed by the purpose of the CCAA.

> Its exercise must be guided by the scheme and object of the Act and by the legal principles that govern corporate law issues. *Re Stelco Inc.* (2005), 9 C.B.R. (5th) 135 (Ont. C.A.) at para. 44.

32 In support of the court's jurisdiction to grant the order sought in this case, counsel to the Applicants submits that Nortel seeks to invoke the "overarching policy" of the CCAA, namely, to preserve the going concern. *Residential Warranty Co. of Canada Inc., Re* (2006), 21 C.B.R. (5th) 57 (Alta. Q.B.) at para. 78.

33 Counsel to the Applicants further submits that CCAA courts have repeatedly noted that the purpose of the CCAA is to preserve the benefit of a going concern business for all stakeholders, or "the whole economic community":

> The purpose of the CCAA is to facilitate arrangements that might avoid liquidation of the company and allow it to continue in business to the benefit of the whole economic community, including the shareholders, the creditors (both secured and unsecured) and the employees. *Citibank Canada v. Chase Manhattan Bank of Canada* (1991), 5 C.B.R. (3rd) 167 (Ont. Gen. Div.) at para. 29. *Re Consumers Packaging Inc*. (2001) 27 C.B.R. (4th) 197 (Ont. C.A.) at para. 5.

34 Counsel to the Applicants further submits that the CCAA should be given a broad and liberal interpretation to facilitate its underlying purpose, including the preservation of the going concern for the benefit of all stakeholders and further that it should not matter whether the business continues as a going concern under the debtor's stewardship or under new ownership, for as long as the business continues as a going concern, a primary goal of the CCAA will be met.

35 Counsel to the Applicants makes reference to a number of cases where courts in Ontario, in appropriate cases, have exercised their jurisdiction to approve a sale of assets, even in the absence of a plan of arrangement being tendered to stakeholders for a vote. In doing so, counsel to the Applicants submits that the courts have repeatedly recognized that they have jurisdiction under the CCAA to approve asset sales in the absence of a plan of arrangement, where such sale is in the best interests of stakeholders generally. *Canadian Red Cross Society / Société Canadienne de la Croix-Rouge, Re*, *supra*, *Re PSINet*, *supra*,

Consumers Packaging Inc., Re [2001 CarswellOnt 3482 (Ont. C.A.)], *supra*, *Stelco Inc., Re* (2004), 6 C.B.R. (5th) 316 (Ont. S.C.J. [Commercial List]) at para. 1, *Tiger Brand Knitting Co., Re* (2005), 9 C.B.R. (5th) 315 (Ont. S.C.J.), *Caterpillar Financial Services Ltd. v. Hard-Rock Paving Co.* (2008), 45 C.B.R. (5th) 87 (Ont. S.C.J.) and *Lehndorff General Partner Ltd., Re* (1993), 17 C.B.R. (3d) 24 (Ont. Gen. Div. [Commercial List]).

36 In *Re Consumers Packaging*, *supra*, the Court of Appeal for Ontario specifically held that a sale of a business as a going concern during a CCAA proceeding is consistent with the purposes of the CCAA:

> The sale of Consumers' Canadian glass operations as a going concern pursuant to the Owens-Illinois bid allows the preservation of Consumers' business (albeit under new ownership), and is therefore consistent with the purposes of the CCAA.
>
> ...we cannot refrain from commenting that Farley J.'s decision to approve the Owens-Illinois bid is consistent with previous decisions in Ontario and elsewhere that have emphasized the broad remedial purpose of flexibility of the CCAA and have approved the sale and disposition of assets during CCAA proceedings prior to a formal plan being tendered. *Re Consumers Packaging, supra, at paras. 5, 9.*

37 Similarly, in *Canadian Red Cross Society / Société Canadienne de la Croix-Rouge, Re*, *supra*, Blair J. (as he then was) expressly affirmed the court's jurisdiction to approve a sale of assets in the course of a CCAA proceeding before a plan of arrangement had been approved by creditors. *Canadian Red Cross Society / Société Canadienne de la Croix-Rouge, Re*, *supra*, at paras. 43, 45.

38 Similarly, in *PSINet Limited*, *supra*, the court approved a going concern sale in a CCAA proceeding where no plan was presented to creditors and a substantial portion of the debtor's Canadian assets were to be sold. Farley J. noted as follows:

> [If the sale was not approved,] there would be a liquidation scenario ensuing which would realize far less than this going concern sale (which appears to me to have involved a transparent process with appropriate exposure designed to maximize the proceeds), thus impacting upon the rest of the creditors, especially as to the unsecured, together with the material enlarging of the unsecured claims by the disruption claims of approximately 8,600 customers (who will be materially disadvantaged by an interrupted transition) plus the job losses for approximately 200 employees. *Re PSINet Limited*, *supra*, at para. 3.

39 In *Re Stelco Inc*., *supra*, in 2004, Farley J. again addressed the issue of the feasibility of selling the operations as a going concern:

> I would observe that usually it is the creditor side which wishes to terminate CCAA proceedings and that when the creditors threaten to take action, there is a realization that a liquidation scenario will not only have a negative effect upon a CCAA applicant, but also upon its workforce. Hence, the CCAA may be employed to provide stability during a period of necessary financial and operational restructuring - and if a restructuring of the "old company" is not feasible, then there is the exploration of the feasibility of the sale of the operations/enterprise as a going concern (with continued employment) in whole or in part. *Re Stelco Inc*, *supra*, at para. 1.

40 I accept these submissions as being general statements of the law in Ontario. The value of equity in an insolvent debtor is dubious, at best, and, in my view, it follows that the determining factor should not be whether the business continues under the debtor's stewardship or under a structure that recognizes a new equity structure. An equally important factor to consider is whether the case can be made to continue the business as a going concern.

41 Counsel to the Applicants also referred to decisions from the courts in Quebec, Manitoba and Alberta which have similarly recognized the court's jurisdiction to approve a sale of assets during the course of a CCAA proceeding. *Boutiques San Francisco Inc., Re* (2004), 7 C.B.R. (5th) 189 (C.S. Que.), *Winnipeg Motor Express Inc., Re* (2008), 49 C.B.R. (5th) 302 (Man. Q.B.) at paras. 41, 44, and *Calpine Canada Energy Ltd., Re* (2007), 35 C.B.R. (5th) 1 (Alta. Q.B.) at para. 75.

42 Counsel to the Applicants also directed the court's attention to a recent decision of the British Columbia Court of Appeal which questioned whether the court should authorize the sale of substantially all of the debtor's assets where the debtor's plan "will simply propose that the net proceeds from the sale...be distributed to its creditors". In *Cliffs Over Maple Bay Investments Ltd. v. Fisgard Capital Corp.* (2008), 46 C.B.R. (5th) 7 (B.C. C.A.) ("*Cliffs Over Maple Bay*"), the court was faced with a debtor who had no active business but who nonetheless sought to stave off its secured creditor indefinitely. The case did not involve any type of sale transaction but the Court of Appeal questioned whether a court should authorize the sale under the CCAA without requiring the matter to be voted upon by creditors.

43 In addressing this matter, it appears to me that the British Columbia Court of Appeal focussed on whether the court should grant the requested relief and not on the question of whether a CCAA court has the jurisdiction to grant the requested relief.

44 I do not disagree with the decision in *Cliffs Over Maple Bay*. However, it involved a situation where the debtor had no active business and did not have the support of its stakeholders. That is not the case with these Applicants.

45 The *Cliffs Over Maple Bay* decision has recently been the subject of further comment by the British Columbia Court of Appeal in *Asset Engineering LP v. Forest & Marine Financial Ltd. Partnership*, 2009 BCCA 319 (B.C. C.A.).

46 At paragraphs 24 - 26 of the *Forest and Marine* decision, Newbury J.A. stated:

> 24. In *Cliffs Over Maple Bay*, the debtor company was a real estate developer whose one project had failed. The company had been dormant for some time. It applied for CCAA protection but described its proposal for restructuring in vague terms that amounted essentially to a plan to "secure sufficient funds" to complete the stalled project (Para. 34). This court, per Tysoe J.A., ruled that although the Act can apply to single-project companies, its purposes are unlikely to be engaged in such instances, since mortgage priorities are fully straight forward and there will be little incentive for senior secured creditors to compromise their interests (Para. 36). Further, the Court stated, the granting of a stay under s. 11 is "not a free standing remedy that the court may grant whenever an insolvent company wishes to undertake a "restructuring"...Rather, s. 11 is ancillary to the fundamental purpose of the CCAA, and a stay of proceedings freezing the rights of creditors should only be granted in furtherance of the CCAA's fundamental purpose". That purpose has been described in *Meridian Developments Inc. v. Toronto Dominion Bank* (1984) 11 D.L.R. (4th) 576 (Alta. Q.B.):
>
> > 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. [at 580]
>
> 25. The Court was not satisfied in *Cliffs Over Maple Bay* that the "restructuring" contemplated by the debtor would do anything other than distribute the net proceeds from the sale, winding up or liquidation of its business. The debtor had no intention of proposing a plan of arrangement, and its business would not continue following the execution of its proposal - thus it could not be said the purposes of the statute would be engaged...
>
> 26. In my view, however, the case at bar is quite different from *Cliffs Over Maple Bay*. Here, the main debtor, the Partnership, is at the centre of a complicated corporate group and carries on an active financing business that it hopes to save notwithstanding the current economic cycle. (The business itself which fills a "niche" in the market, has been carried on in one form or another since 1983.) The CCAA is appropriate for situations such as this where it is unknown whether the "restructuring" will ultimately take the form of a refinancing or will involve a reorganization of the corporate entity or entities and a true compromise of the rights of one or more parties. The "fundamental purpose" of the Act - to preserve the *status quo* while the debtor prepares a plan that will enable it to remain in business to the benefit of all concerned - will be furthered by granting a stay so that the <u>means</u> contemplated by the Act - a compromise or arrangement - can be developed, negotiated and voted on if necessary...

47 It seems to me that the foregoing views expressed in *Forest and Marine* are not inconsistent with the views previously expressed by the courts in Ontario. The CCAA is intended to be flexible and must be given a broad and liberal interpretation to achieve its objectives and a sale by the debtor which preserves its business as a going concern is, in my view, consistent with those objectives.

48 I therefore conclude that the court does have the jurisdiction to authorize a sale under the CCAA in the absence of a plan.

49 I now turn to a consideration of whether it is appropriate, in this case, to approve this sales process. Counsel to the Applicants submits that the court should consider the following factors in determining whether to authorize a sale under the CCAA in the absence of a plan:

(a) is a sale transaction warranted at this time?

(b) will the sale benefit the whole "economic community"?

(c) do any of the debtors' creditors have a *bona fide* reason to object to a sale of the business?

(d) is there a better viable alternative?

I accept this submission.

50 It is the position of the Applicants that Nortel's proposed sale of the Business should be approved as this decision is to the benefit of stakeholders and no creditor is prejudiced. Further, counsel submits that in the absence of a sale, the prospects for the Business are a loss of competitiveness, a loss of value and a loss of jobs.

51 Counsel to the Applicants summarized the facts in support of the argument that the Sale Transaction should be approved, namely:

(a) Nortel has been working diligently for many months on a plan to reorganize its business;

(b) in the exercise of its business judgment, Nortel has concluded that it cannot continue to operate the Business successfully within the CCAA framework;

(c) unless a sale is undertaken at this time, the long-term viability of the Business will be in jeopardy;

(d) the Sale Agreement continues the Business as a going concern, will save at least 2,500 jobs and constitutes the best and most valuable proposal for the Business;

(e) the auction process will serve to ensure Nortel receives the highest possible value for the Business;

(f) the sale of the Business at this time is in the best interests of Nortel and its stakeholders; and

(g) the value of the Business is likely to decline over time.

52 The objections of MatlinPatterson and the UCC have been considered. I am satisfied that the issues raised in these objections have been addressed in a satisfactory manner by the ruling of Judge Gross and no useful purpose would be served by adding additional comment.

53 Counsel to the Applicants also emphasize that Nortel will return to court to seek approval of the most favourable transaction to emerge from the auction process and will aim to satisfy the elements established by the court for approval as set out in *Royal Bank v. Soundair Corp.* (1991), 7 C.B.R. (3d) 1 (Ont. C.A.) at para. 16.

Disposition

54 The Applicants are part of a complicated corporate group. They carry on an active international business. I have accepted that an important factor to consider in a CCAA process is whether the case can be made to continue the business as a going concern. I am satisfied having considered the factors referenced at [49], as well as the facts summarized at [51], that the Applicants have met this test. I am therefore satisfied that this motion should be granted.

55 Accordingly, I approve the Bidding Procedures as described in the Riedel Affidavit and the Fourteenth Report of the Monitor, which procedures have been approved by the U.S. Court.

56 I am also satisfied that the Sale Agreement should be approved and further that the Sale Agreement be approved and accepted for the purposes of conducting the "stalking horse" bidding process in accordance with the Bidding Procedures including, without limitation the Break-Up Fee and the Expense Reimbursement (as both terms are defined in the Sale Agreement).

57 Further, I have also been satisfied that Appendix B to the Fourteenth Report contains information which is commercially sensitive, the dissemination of which could be detrimental to the stakeholders and, accordingly, I order that this document be sealed, pending further order of the court.

58 In approving the Bidding Procedures, I have also taken into account that the auction will be conducted prior to the sale approval motion. This process is consistent with the practice of this court.

59 Finally, it is the expectation of this court that the Monitor will continue to review ongoing issues in respect of the Bidding Procedures. The Bidding Procedures permit the Applicants to waive certain components of qualified bids without the consent of the UCC, the bondholder group and the Monitor. However, it is the expectation of this court that, if this situation arises, the Applicants will provide advance notice to the Monitor of its intention to do so.

Motion granted.

TAB 6

2010 SCC 60, 2010 CSC 60
Supreme Court of Canada

Ted Leroy Trucking [Century Services] Ltd., Re

2010 CarswellBC 3419, 2010 CarswellBC 3420, 2010 SCC 60, 2010 CSC 60, [2010] 3 S.C.R. 379, [2010] G.S.T.C. 186, [2010] S.C.J. No. 60, [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

***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 (C.S. Que.), leave to appeal granted, 2010 QCCA 183 (C.A. Que.)). 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. Tysoe J.A. in the Court of Appeal concluded as an alternative ground for allowing the Crown's appeal that it was the beneficiary of an express trust. I disagree.

83 Creation of an express trust requires the presence of three certainties: intention, subject matter, and object. Express or "true trusts" arise from the acts and intentions of the settlor and are distinguishable from other trusts arising by operation of law (see D. W. M. Waters, M. R. Gillen and L. D. Smith, eds., *Waters' Law of Trusts in Canada* (3rd ed. 2005), at pp. 28-29 especially fn. 42).

84 Here, there is no certainty to the object (i.e. the beneficiary) 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 11 [1] 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 derogani*).

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), <u>despite</u> 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 <u>being</u> 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), <u>notwithstanding</u> 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 (i);

(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 conjointly with other Acts] — The provisions of this Act may be applied together with the provisions of any Act of Parliament or of the legislature of any province, that authorizes or makes provision for the sanction of compromises or arrangements between a company and its shareholders or any class of them.

***Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act*, R.S.C. 1985, c. C-36 (as at September 18, 2009)**

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

...

11.02 (1) Stays, etc. — initial application — A court may, on an initial application in respect of a debtor company, make an order on any terms that it may impose, effective for the period that the court considers necessary, which period may not be more than 30 days,

(a) staying, until otherwise ordered by the court, all proceedings taken or that might be taken in respect of the company under the *Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act* or the *Winding-up and Restructuring Act*;

(b) restraining, until otherwise ordered by the court, further proceedings in any action, suit or proceeding against the company; and

(c) prohibiting, until otherwise ordered by the court, the commencement of any action, suit or proceeding against the company.

(2) Stays, etc. — other than initial application — A court may, on an application in respect of a debtor company other than an initial application, make an order, on any terms that it may impose,

(a) staying, until otherwise ordered by the court, for any period that the court considers necessary, all proceedings taken or that might be taken in respect of the company under an Act referred to in paragraph (1)(*a*);

(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 7

2013 ONSC 1078
Ontario Superior Court of Justice [Commercial List]

Labourers' Pension Fund of Central and Eastern Canada v. Sino-Forest Corp.

2013 CarswellOnt 3361, 2013 ONSC 1078, 100 C.B.R. (5th) 30, 227 A.C.W.S. (3d) 930, 37 C.P.C. (7th) 135

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 Sino-Forest Corporation, Applicant

The Trustees of the Labourers' Pension Fund of Central and Eastern Canada, The Trustees of the International Union of Operating Engineers Local 793 Pension Plan for Operating Engineers in Ontario, Sjunde Ap-Fonden, David Grant and Robert Wong, Plaintiffs and Sino-Forest Corporation, Ernst & Young LLP, BDO Limited (Formerly Known as BDO McCabe Lo Limited), Allen T.Y. Chan, W. Judson Martin, Kai Kit Poon, David J. Horsley, William E. Ardell, James P. Bowland, James M.E. Hyde, Edmund Mak, Simon Murray, Peter Wang, Garry J. West, Pöyry (Beijing) Consulting Company Limited, Credit Suisse Securities (Canada) In., TD Securities Inc., Dundee Securities Corporation, RBC Dominion Securities Inc., Scotia Capital Inc., CIBC World Markets Inc., Merrill Lunch Canada Inc., Canaccord Financial Ltd., Maison Placements Canada Inc., Credit Suisse Securities (USA) LLC and Merrill Lynch, Pierce, Fenner & Smith Incorporated (Successor by Merger to Banc of America Securities LLC), Defendants

Morawetz J.

Heard: February 4, 2013
Judgment: March 20, 2013
Docket: CV-12-9667-00CL, CV-11-431153-00CP

Counsel: Kenneth Rosenberg, Max Starnino, A. Dimitri Lascaris, Daniel Bach, Charles M. Wright, Jonathan Ptak, for Ad Hoc Committee of Purchasers including the Class Action Plaintiffs
Peter Griffin, Peter Osborne, Shara Roy, for Ernst & Young LLP, John Pirie and David Gadsden, for Pöyry (Beijing) Consulting Company Ltd.
Robert W. Staley for Sino-Forest Corporation
Won J. Kim, Michael C. Spencer, Megan B. McPhee for Objectors, Invesco Canada Ltd., Northwest & Ethical Investments LP and Comité Syndical National de Retraite Bâtirente Inc.
John Fabello Rebecca Wise, for Underwriters
Ken Dekker, Peter Greene for BDO Limited
Emily Cole, Joseph Marin for Allen Chan
James Doris for U.S. Class Action
Brandon Barnes for Kai Kit Poon
Robert Chadwick, Brendan O'Neill for Ad Hoc Committee of Noteholders
Derrick Tay, Cliff Prophet for Monitor, FTI Consulting Canada Inc.
Simon Bieber for David Horsley
James Grout for Ontario Securities Commission
Miles D. O'Reilly, Q.C. for Junior Objectors, Daniel Lam and Senthilvel Kanagaratnam

***Morawetz J.*:**

Introduction

1 The Ad Hoc Committee of Purchasers of the Applicant's Securities (the "Ad Hoc Securities Purchasers' Committee" or the "Applicant"), including the representative plaintiffs in the Ontario class action (collectively, the "Ontario Plaintiffs"), bring this motion for approval of a settlement and release of claims against Ernst & Young LLP [the "Ernst & Young Settlement", the "Ernst & Young Release", the "Ernst & Young Claims" and "Ernst & Young", as further defined in the Plan of Compromise and Reorganization of Sino-Forest Corporation ("SFC") dated December 3, 2012 (the "Plan")].

2 Approval of the Ernst & Young Settlement is opposed by Invesco Canada Limited ("Invesco"), Northwest and Ethical Investments L.P. ("Northwest"), Comité Syndical National de Retraite Bâtirente Inc. ("Bâtirente"), Matrix Asset Management Inc. ("Matrix"), Gestion Férique and Montrusco Bolton Investments Inc. ("Montrusco") (collectively, the "Objectors"). The Objectors particularly oppose the no-opt-out and full third-party release features of the Ernst & Young Settlement. The Objectors also oppose the motion for a representation order sought by the Ontario Plaintiffs, and move instead for appointment of the Objectors to represent the interests of all objectors to the Ernst & Young Settlement.

3 For the following reasons, I have determined that the Ernst & Young Settlement, together with the Ernst & Young Release, should be approved.

Facts

Class Action Proceedings

4 SFC is an integrated forest plantation operator and forest productions company, with most of its assets and the majority of its business operations located in the southern and eastern regions of the People's Republic of China. SFC's registered office is in Toronto, and its principal business office is in Hong Kong.

5 SFC's shares were publicly traded over the Toronto Stock Exchange. During the period from March 19, 2007 through June 2, 2011, SFC made three prospectus offerings of common shares. SFC also issued and had various notes (debt instruments) outstanding, which were offered to investors, by way of offering memoranda, between March 19, 2007 and June 2, 2011.

6 All of SFC's debt or equity public offerings have been underwritten. A total of 11 firms (the "Underwriters") acted as SFC's underwriters, and are named as defendants in the Ontario class action.

7 Since 2000, SFC has had two auditors: Ernst & Young, who acted as auditor from 2000 to 2004 and 2007 to 2012, and BDO Limited ("BDO"), who acted as auditor from 2005 to 2006. Ernst & Young and BDO are named as defendants in the Ontario class action.

8 Following a June 2, 2011 report issued by short-seller Muddy Waters LLC ("Muddy Waters"), SFC, and others, became embroiled in investigations and regulatory proceedings (with the Ontario Securities Commission (the "OSC"), the Hong Kong Securities and Futures Commission and the Royal Canadian Mounted Police) for allegedly engaging in a "complex fraudulent scheme". SFC concurrently became embroiled in multiple class action proceedings across Canada, including Ontario, Quebec and Saskatchewan (collectively, the "Canadian Actions"), and in New York (collectively with the Canadian Actions, the "Class Action Proceedings"), facing allegations that SFC, and others, misstated its financial results, misrepresented its timber rights, overstated the value of its assets and concealed material information about its business operations from investors, causing the collapse of an artificially inflated share price.

9 The Canadian Actions are comprised of two components: first, there is a shareholder claim, brought on behalf of SFC's current and former shareholders, seeking damages in the amount of $6.5 billion for general damages, $174.8 million in connection with a prospectus issued in June 2007, $330 million in relation to a prospectus issued in June 2009, and $319.2 million in relation to a prospectus issued in December 2009; and second, there is a noteholder claim, brought on behalf of former holders of SFC's notes (the "Noteholders"), in the amount of approximately $1.8 billion. The noteholder claim asserts, among other things, damages for loss of value in the notes.

10 Two other class proceedings relating to SFC were subsequently commenced in Ontario: *Smith et al. v. Sino-Forest Corporation et al.*, which commenced on June 8, 2011; and *Northwest and Ethical Investments L.P. et al. v. Sino-Forest Corporation et al.*, which commenced on September 26, 2011.

11 In December 2011, there was a motion to determine which of the three actions in Ontario should be permitted to proceed and which should be stayed (the "Carriage Motion"). On January 6, 2012, Perell J. granted carriage to the Ontario Plaintiffs, appointed Siskinds LLP and Koskie Minsky LLP to prosecute the Ontario class action, and stayed the other class proceedings.

CCAA Proceedings

12 SFC obtained an initial order under the *Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act*, R.S.C. 1985, c. C-36 ("CCAA") on March 30, 2012 (the "Initial Order"), pursuant to which a stay of proceedings was granted in respect of SFC and certain of its subsidiaries. Pursuant to an order on May 8, 2012, the stay was extended to all defendants in the class actions, including Ernst & Young. Due to the stay, the certification and leave motions have yet to be heard.

13 Throughout the CCAA proceedings, SFC asserted that there could be no effective restructuring of SFC's business, and separation from the Canadian parent, if the claims asserted against SFC's subsidiaries arising out of, or connected to, claims against SFC remained outstanding.

14 In addition, SFC and FTI Consulting Canada Inc. (the "Monitor") continually advised that timing and delay were critical elements that would impact on maximization of the value of SFC's assets and stakeholder recovery.

15 On May 14, 2012, an order (the "Claims Procedure Order") was issued that approved a claims process developed by SFC, in consultation with the Monitor. In order to identify the nature and extent of the claims asserted against SFC's subsidiaries, the Claims Procedure Order required any claimant that had or intended to assert a right or claim against one or more of the subsidiaries, relating to a purported claim made against SFC, to so indicate on their proof of claim.

16 The Ad Hoc Securities Purchasers' Committee filed a proof of claim (encapsulating the approximately $7.3 billion shareholder claim and $1.8 billion noteholder claim) in the CCAA proceedings on behalf of all putative class members in the Ontario class action. The plaintiffs in the New York class action filed a proof of claim, but did not specify quantum of damages. Ernst & Young filed a proof of claim for damages and indemnification. The plaintiffs in the Saskatchewan class action did not file a proof of claim. A few shareholders filed proofs of claim separately. No proof of claim was filed by Kim Orr Barristers P.C. ("Kim Orr"), who represent the Objectors.

17 Prior to the commencement of the CCAA proceedings, the plaintiffs in the Canadian Actions settled with Pöyry (Beijing) Consulting Company Limited ("Pöyry") (the "Pöyry Settlement"), a forestry valuator that provided services to SFC. The class was defined as all persons and entities who acquired SFC's securities in Canada between March 19, 2007 to June 2, 2011, and all Canadian residents who acquired SFC securities outside of Canada during that same period (the "Pöyry Settlement Class").

18 The notice of hearing to approve the Pöyry Settlement advised the Pöyry Settlement Class that they may object to the proposed settlement. No objections were filed.

19 Perell J. and Émond J. approved the settlement and certified the Pöyry Settlement Class for settlement purposes. January 15, 2013 was fixed as the date by which members of the Pöyry Settlement Class, who wished to opt-out of either of the Canadian Actions, would have to file an opt-out form for the claims administrator, and they approved the form by which the right to optout was required to be exercised.

20 Notice of the certification and settlement was given in accordance with the certification orders of Perell J. and Émond J. The notice of certification states, in part, that:

IF YOU CHOOSE TO OPT OUT OF THE CLASS, YOU WILL BE OPTING OUT OF THE **ENTIRE** PROCEEDING. THIS MEANS THAT YOU WILL BE UNABLE TO PARTICIPATE IN ANY FUTURE SETTLEMENT OR JUDGMENT REACHED WITH OR AGAINST THE REMAINING DEFENDANTS.

21 The opt-out made no provision for an opt-out on a conditional basis.

22 On June 26, 2012, SFC brought a motion for an order directing that claims against SFC that arose in connection with the ownership, purchase or sale of an equity interest in SFC, and related indemnity claims, were "equity claims" as defined in section 2 of the CCAA, including the claims by or on behalf of shareholders asserted in the Class Action Proceedings. The equity claims motion did not purport to deal with the component of the Class Action Proceedings relating to SFC's notes.

23 In reasons released July 27, 2012 [*Sino-Forest Corp., Re*, 2012 ONSC 4377 (Ont. S.C.J. [Commercial List])], I granted the relief sought by SFC (the "Equity Claims Decision"), finding that "the claims advanced in the shareholder claims are clearly equity claims". The Ad Hoc Securities Purchasers' Committee did not oppose the motion, and no issue was taken by any party with the court's determination that the shareholder claims against SFC were "equity claims". The Equity Claims Decision was subsequently affirmed by the Court of Appeal for Ontario on November 23, 2012 [*Sino-Forest Corp., Re*, 2012 ONCA 816 (Ont. C.A.)].

Ernst & Young Settlement

24 The Ernst & Young Settlement, and third party releases, was not mentioned in the early versions of the Plan. The initial creditors' meeting and vote on the Plan was scheduled to occur on November 29, 2012; when the Plan was amended on November 28, 2012, the creditors' meeting was adjourned to November 30, 2012.

25 On November 29, 2012, Ernst & Young's counsel and class counsel concluded the proposed Ernst & Young Settlement. The creditors' meeting was again adjourned, to December 3, 2012; on that date, a new Plan revision was released and the Ernst & Young Settlement was publicly announced. The Plan revision featured a new Article 11, reflecting the "framework" for the proposed Ernst & Young Settlement and for third-party releases for named third-party defendants as identified at that time as the Underwriters or in the future.

26 On December 3, 2012, a large majority of creditors approved the Plan. The Objectors note, however, that proxy materials were distributed weeks earlier and proxies were required to be submitted three days prior to the meeting and it is evident that creditors submitting proxies only had a pre-Article 11 version of the Plan. Further, no equity claimants, such as the Objectors, were entitled to vote on the Plan. On December 6, 2012, the Plan was further amended, adding Ernst & Young and BDO to Schedule A, thereby defining them as named third-party defendants.

27 Ultimately, the Ernst & Young Settlement provided for the payment by Ernst & Young of $117 million as a settlement fund, being the full monetary contribution by Ernst & Young to settle the Ernst & Young Claims; however, it remains subject to court approval in Ontario, and recognition in Quebec and the United States, and conditional, pursuant to Article 11.1 of the Plan, upon the following steps:

> (a) the granting of the sanction order sanctioning the Plan including the terms of the Ernst & Young Settlement and the Ernst & Young Release (which preclude any right to contribution or indemnity against Ernst & Young);
>
> (b) the issuance of the Settlement Trust Order;
>
> (c) the issuance of any other orders necessary to give effect to the Ernst & Young Settlement and the Ernst & Young Release, including the Chapter 15 Recognition Order;
>
> (d) the fulfillment of all conditions precedent in the Ernst & Young Settlement; and
>
> (e) all orders being final orders not subject to further appeal or challenge.

28 On December 6, 2012, Kim Orr filed a notice of appearance in the CCAA proceedings on behalf of three Objectors: Invesco, Northwest and Bâtirente. These Objectors opposed the sanctioning of the Plan, insofar as it included Article 11, during the Plan sanction hearing on December 7, 2012.

29 At the Plan sanction hearing, SFC's counsel made it clear that the Plan itself did not embody the Ernst & Young Settlement, and that the parties' request that the Plan be sanctioned did not also cover approval of the Ernst & Young Settlement. Moreover, according to the Plan and minutes of settlement, the Ernst & Young Settlement would not be consummated (*i.e.* money paid and releases effective) unless and until several conditions had been satisfied in the future.

30 The Plan was sanctioned on December 10, 2012 with Article 11. The Objectors take the position that the Funds' opposition was dismissed as premature and on the basis that nothing in the sanction order affected their rights.

31 On December 13, 2012, the court directed that its hearing on the Ernst & Young Settlement would take place on January 4, 2013, under both the CCAA and the *Class Proceedings Act, 1992*, S.O. 1992, c. 6 ("CPA"). Subsequently, the hearing was adjourned to February 4, 2013.

32 On January 15, 2013, the last day of the opt-out period established by orders of Perell J. and Émond J., six institutional investors represented by Kim Orr filed opt-out forms. These institutional investors are Northwest and Bâtirente, who were two of the three institutions represented by Kim Orr in the Carriage Motion, as well as Invesco, Matrix, Montrusco and Gestion Ferique (all of which are members of the Pöyry Settlement Class).

33 According to the opt-out forms, the Objectors held approximately 1.6% of SFC shares outstanding on June 30, 2011 (the day the Muddy Waters report was released). By way of contrast, Davis Selected Advisors and Paulson and Co., two of many institutional investors who support the Ernst & Young Settlement, controlled more than 25% of SFC's shares at this time. In addition, the total number of outstanding objectors constitutes approximately 0.24% of the 34,177 SFC beneficial shareholders as of April 29, 2011.

Law and Analysis

Court's Jurisdiction to Grant Requested Approval

34 The Claims Procedure Order of May 14, 2012, at paragraph 17, provides that any person that does not file a proof of claim in accordance with the order is barred from making or enforcing such claim as against any other person who could claim contribution or indemnity from the Applicant. This includes claims by the Objectors against Ernst & Young for which Ernst & Young could claim indemnity from SFC.

35 The Claims Procedure Order also provides that the Ontario Plaintiffs are authorized to file one proof of claim in respect of the substance of the matters set out in the Ontario class action, and that the Quebec Plaintiffs are similarly authorized to file one proof of claim in respect of the substance of the matters set out in the Quebec class action. The Objectors did not object to, or oppose, the Claims Procedure Order, either when it was sought or at any time thereafter. The Objectors did not file an independent proof of claim and, accordingly, the Canadian Claimants were authorized to and did file a proof of claim in the representative capacity in respect of the Objectors' claims.

36 The Ernst & Young Settlement is part of a CCAA plan process. Claims, including contingent claims, are regularly compromised and settled within CCAA proceedings. This includes outstanding litigation claims against the debtor and third parties. Such compromises fully and finally dispose of such claims, and it follows that there are no continuing procedural or other rights in such proceedings. Simply put, there are no "opt-outs" in the CCAA.

37 It is well established that class proceedings can be settled in a CCAA proceeding. See *Robertson v. ProQuest Information & Learning Co.*, 2011 ONSC 1647 (Ont. S.C.J. [Commercial List]) [*Robertson*].

38 As noted by Pepall J. (as she then was) in *Robertson*, para. 8:

When dealing with the consensual resolution of a CCAA claim filed in a claims process that arises out of ongoing litigation, typically no court approval is required. In contrast, class proceedings settlements must be approved by the court. The notice and process for dissemination of the settlement agreement must also be approved by the court.

39 In this case, the notice and process for dissemination have been approved.

40 The Objectors take the position that approval of the Ernst & Young Settlement would render their opt-out rights illusory; the inherent flaw with this argument is that it is not possible to ignore the CCAA proceedings.

41 In this case, claims arising out of the class proceedings are claims in the CCAA process. CCAA claims can be, by definition, subject to compromise. The Claims Procedure Order establishes that claims as against Ernst & Young fall within the CCAA proceedings. Thus, these claims can also be the subject of settlement and, if settled, the claims of all creditors in the class can also be settled.

42 In my view, these proceedings are the appropriate time and place to consider approval of the Ernst & Young Settlement. This court has the jurisdiction in respect of both the CCAA and the CPA.

Should the Court Exercise Its Discretion to Approve the Settlement

43 Having established the jurisdictional basis to consider the motion, the central inquiry is whether the court should exercise its discretion to approve the Ernst & Young Settlement.

CCAA Interpretation

44 The CCAA is a "flexible statute", and the court has "jurisdiction to approve major transactions, including settlement agreements, during the stay period defined in the Initial Order". The CCAA affords courts broad jurisdiction to make orders and "fill in the gaps in legislation so as to give effect to the objects of the CCAA." [*Nortel Networks Corp., Re*, 2010 ONSC 1708 (Ont. S.C.J. [Commercial List]), paras. 66-70 ("*Re Nortel"*)); *Canadian Red Cross Society / Société Canadienne de la Croix-Rouge, Re* (1998), 5 C.B.R. (4th) 299, 72 O.T.C. 99 (Ont. Gen. Div. [Commercial List]), para. 43]

45 Further, as the Supreme Court of Canada explained in *Ted Leroy Trucking Ltd., Re*, 2010 SCC 60 (S.C.C.), para. 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 described 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 (internal citations omitted). ...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.

46 It is also established that third-party releases are not an uncommon feature of complex restructurings under the CCAA [*ATB Financial v. Metcalfe & Mansfield Alternative Investments II Corp.*, 2008 ONCA 587 (Ont. C.A.) ("*ATB Financial*"); *Nortel Networks Corp., Re*, *supra*; *Robertson*, *supra*; *Muscletech Research & Development Inc., Re* (2007), 30 C.B.R. (5th) 59, 156 A.C.W.S. (3d) 22 (Ont. S.C.J. [Commercial List]) ("*Muscle Tech*"); *Grace Canada Inc., Re* (2008), 50 C.B.R. (5th) 25 (Ont. S.C.J. [Commercial List]); *Allen-Vanguard Corp., Re*, 2011 ONSC 5017 (Ont. S.C.J. [Commercial List])].

47 The Court of Appeal for Ontario has specifically confirmed that a third-party release is justified where the release forms part of a comprehensive compromise. As Blair J. A. stated in *ATB Financial*, *supra*:

> 69. In keeping with this scheme and purpose, I do not suggest that any and all releases between creditors of the debtor company seeking to restructure and third parties may be made the subject of a compromise or arrangement between the debtor and its creditors. Nor do I think the fact that the releases may be "necessary" in the sense that the third parties or

the debtor may refuse to proceed without them, of itself, advances the argument in favour of finding jurisdiction (although it may well be relevant in terms of the fairness and reasonableness analysis).

70. The release of the claim in question must be justified as part of the compromise or arrangement between the debtor and its creditors. In short, there must be a reasonable connection between the third party claim being compromised in the plan and the restructuring achieved by the plan to warrant inclusion of the third party release in the plan ...

71. In the course of his reasons, the application judge made the following findings, all of which are amply supported on the record:

a) The parties to be released are necessary and essential to the restructuring of the debtor;

b) The claims to be released are rationally related to the purpose of the Plan and necessary for it;

c) The Plan cannot succeed without the releases;

d) The parties who are to have claims against them released are contributing in a tangible and realistic way to the Plan; and

e) The Plan will benefit not only the debtor companies but creditor Noteholders generally.

72. Here, then — as was the case in T&N — there is a close connection between the claims being released and the restructuring proposal. The tort claims arise out of the sale and distribution of the ABCP Notes and their collapse in value, just as do the contractual claims of the creditors against the debtor companies. The purpose of the restructuring is to stabilize and shore up the value of those notes in the long run. The third parties being released are making separate contributions to enable those results to materialize. Those contributions are identified earlier, at para. 31 of these reasons. The application judge found that the claims being released are not independent of or unrelated to the claims that the Noteholders have against the debtor companies; they are closely connected to the value of the ABCP Notes and are required for the Plan to succeed ...

73. I am satisfied that the wording of the CCAA — construed in light of the purpose, objects and scheme of the Act and in accordance with the modern principles of statutory interpretation — supports the court's jurisdiction and authority to sanction the Plan proposed here, including the contested third-party releases contained in it.

. . .

78. ... I believe the open-ended CCAA permits third-party releases that are reasonably related to the restructuring at issue because they are encompassed in the comprehensive terms "compromise" and "arrangement" and because of the double-voting majority and court sanctioning statutory mechanism that makes them binding on unwilling creditors.

. . .

113. At para. 71 above I recited a number of factual findings the application judge made in concluding that approval of the Plan was within his jurisdiction under the CCAA and that it was fair and reasonable. For convenience, I reiterate them here — with two additional findings — because they provide an important foundation for his analysis concerning the fairness and reasonableness of the Plan. The application judge found that:

a) The parties to be released are necessary and essential to the restructuring of the debtor;

b) The claims to be released are rationally related to the purpose of the Plan and necessary for it;

c) The Plan cannot succeed without the releases;

d) The parties who are to have claims against them released are contributing in a tangible and realistic way to the Plan;

e) The Plan will benefit not only the debtor companies but creditor Noteholders generally;

f) The voting creditors who have approved the Plan did so with knowledge of the nature and effect of the releases; and that,

g) The releases are fair and reasonable and not overly broad or offensive to public policy.

48 Furthermore, in *ATB Financial*, *supra*, para. 111, the Court of Appeal confirmed that parties are entitled to settle allegations of fraud and to include releases of such claims as part of the settlement. It was noted that "there is no legal impediment to granting the release of an antecedent claim in fraud, provided the claim is in the contemplation of the parties to the release at the time it is given".

Relevant CCAA Factors

49 In assessing a settlement within the CCAA context, the court looks at the following three factors, as articulated in *Robertson*, *supra*:

(a) whether the settlement is fair and reasonable;

(b) whether it provides substantial benefits to other stakeholders; and

(c) whether it is consistent with the purpose and spirit of the CCAA.

50 Where a settlement also provides for a release, such as here, courts assess whether there is "a reasonable connection between the third party claim being compromised in the plan and the restructuring achieved by the plan to warrant inclusion of the third party release in the plan". Applying this "nexus test" requires consideration of the following factors: [*ATB Financial*, *supra*, para. 70]

(a) Are the claims to be released rationally related to the purpose of the plan?

(b) Are the claims to be released necessary for the plan of arrangement?

(c) Are the parties who have claims released against them contributing in a tangible and realistic way? and

(d) Will the plan benefit the debtor and the creditors generally?

Counsel Submissions

51 The Objectors argue that the proposed Ernst & Young Release is not integral or necessary to the success of Sino-Forest's restructuring plan, and, therefore, the standards for granting thirdparty releases in the CCAA are not satisfied. No one has asserted that the parties require the Ernst & Young Settlement or Ernst & Young Release to allow the Plan to go forward; in fact, the Plan has been implemented prior to consideration of this issue. Further, the Objectors contend that the $117 million settlement payment is not essential, or even related, to the restructuring, and that it is concerning, and telling, that varying the end of the Ernst & Young Settlement and Ernst & Young Release to accommodate opt-outs would extinguish the settlement.

52 The Objectors also argue that the Ernst & Young Settlement should not be approved because it would vitiate opt-out rights of class members, as conferred as follows in section 9 of the CPA: "Any member of a class involved in a class proceeding may opt-out of the proceeding in the manner and within the time specified in the certification order." This right is a fundamental element of procedural fairness in the Ontario class action regime [*Fischer v. IG Investment Management Ltd.*, 2012 ONCA 47 (Ont. C.A.), para. 69], and is not a mere technicality or illusory. It has been described as absolute [*Durling v. Sunrise Propane Energy Group Inc.*, 2011 ONSC 266 (Ont. S.C.J.)]. The opt-out period allows persons to pursue their self-interest and to preserve their rights to pursue individual actions [*Mangan v. Inco Ltd.* (1998), 16 C.P.C. (4th) 165, 38 O.R. (3d) 703 (Ont. Gen. Div.)].

53 Based on the foregoing, the Objectors submit that a proposed class action settlement with Ernst & Young should be approved solely under the CPA, as the Pöyry Settlement was, and not through misuse of a third-party release procedure under the CCAA. Further, since the minutes of settlement make it clear that Ernst & Young retains discretion not to accept or recognize normal opt-outs if the CPA procedures are invoked, the Ernst & Young Settlement should not be approved in this respect either.

54 Multiple parties made submissions favouring the Ernst & Young Settlement (with the accompanying Ernst & Young Release), arguing that it is fair and reasonable in the circumstances, benefits the CCAA stakeholders (as evidenced by the broad-based support for the Plan and this motion) and rationally connected to the Plan.

55 Ontario Plaintiffs' counsel submits that the form of the bar order is fair and properly balances the competing interests of class members, Ernst & Young and the non-settling defendants as:

> (a) class members are not releasing their claims to a greater extent than necessary;
>
> (b) Ernst & Young is ensured that its obligations in connection to the Settlement will conclude its liability in the class proceedings;
>
> (c) the non-settling defendants will not have to pay more following a judgment than they would be required to pay if Ernst & Young remained as a defendant in the action; and
>
> (d) the non-settling defendants are granted broad rights of discovery and an appropriate credit in the ongoing litigation, if it is ultimately determined by the court that there is a right of contribution and indemnity between the co-defendants.

56 SFC argues that Ernst & Young's support has simplified and accelerated the Plan process, including reducing the expense and management time otherwise to be incurred in litigating claims, and was a catalyst to encouraging many parties, including the Underwriters and BDO, to withdraw their objections to the Plan. Further, the result is precisely the type of compromise that the CCAA is designed to promote; namely, Ernst & Young has provided a tangible and significant contribution to the Plan (notwithstanding any pitfalls in the litigation claims against Ernst & Young) that has enabled SFC to emerge as Newco/NewcoII in a timely way and with potential viability.

57 Ernst & Young's counsel submits that the Ernst & Young Settlement, as a whole, including the Ernst & Young Release, must be approved or rejected; the court cannot modify the terms of a proposed settlement. Further, in deciding whether to reject a settlement, the court should consider whether doing so would put the settlement in "jeopardy of being unravelled". In this case, counsel submits there is no obligation on the parties to resume discussions and it could be that the parties have reached their limits in negotiations and will backtrack from their positions or abandon the effort.

Analysis and Conclusions

58 The Ernst & Young Release forms part of the Ernst & Young Settlement. In considering whether the Ernst & Young Settlement is fair and reasonable and ought to be approved, it is necessary to consider whether the Ernst & Young Release can be justified as part of the Ernst & Young Settlement. See *ATB Financial*, *supra*, para. 70, as quoted above.

59 In considering the appropriateness of including the Ernst & Young Release, I have taken into account the following.

60 Firstly, although the Plan has been sanctioned and implemented, a significant aspect of the Plan is a distribution to SFC's creditors. The significant and, in fact, only monetary contribution that can be directly identified, at this time, is the $117 million from the Ernst & Young Settlement. Simply put, until such time as the Ernst & Young Settlement has been concluded and the settlement proceeds paid, there can be no distribution of the settlement proceeds to parties entitled to receive them. It seems to me that in order to effect any distribution, the Ernst & Young Release has to be approved as part of the Ernst & Young Settlement.

61 Secondly, it is apparent that the claims to be released against Ernst & Young are rationally related to the purpose of the Plan and necessary for it. SFC put forward the Plan. As I outlined in the Equity Claims Decision, the claims of Ernst & Young

as against SFC are intertwined to the extent that they cannot be separated. Similarly, the claims of the Objectors as against Ernst & Young are, in my view, intertwined and related to the claims against SFC and to the purpose of the Plan.

62 Thirdly, although the Plan can, on its face, succeed, as evidenced by its implementation, the reality is that without the approval of the Ernst & Young Settlement, the objectives of the Plan remain unfulfilled due to the practical inability to distribute the settlement proceeds. Further, in the event that the Ernst & Young Release is not approved and the litigation continues, it becomes circular in nature as the position of Ernst & Young, as detailed in the Equity Claims Decision, involves Ernst & Young bringing an equity claim for contribution and indemnity as against SFC.

63 Fourthly, it is clear that Ernst & Young is contributing in a tangible way to the Plan, by its significant contribution of $117 million.

64 Fifthly, the Plan benefits the claimants in the form of a tangible distribution. Blair J.A., at paragraph 113 of *ATB Financial*, *supra*, referenced two further facts as found by the application judge in that case; namely, the voting creditors who approved the Plan did so with the knowledge of the nature and effect of the releases. That situation is also present in this case.

65 Finally, the application judge in *ATB Financial*, *supra*, held that the releases were fair and reasonable and not overly broad or offensive to public policy. In this case, having considered the alternatives of lengthy and uncertain litigation, and the full knowledge of the Canadian plaintiffs, I conclude that the Ernst & Young Release is fair and reasonable and not overly broad or offensive to public policy.

66 In my view, the Ernst & Young Settlement is fair and reasonable, provides substantial benefits to relevant stakeholders, and is consistent with the purpose and spirit of the CCAA. In addition, in my view, the factors associated with the *ATB Financial* nexus test favour approving the Ernst & Young Release.

67 In *Nortel Networks Corp., Re*, *supra*, para. 81, I noted that the releases benefited creditors generally because they "reduced the risk of litigation, protected Nortel against potential contribution claims and indemnity claims and reduced the risk of delay caused by potentially complex litigation and associated depletion of assets to fund potentially significant litigation costs". In this case, there is a connection between the release of claims against Ernst & Young and a distribution to creditors. The plaintiffs in the litigation are shareholders and Noteholders of SFC. These plaintiffs have claims to assert against SFC that are being directly satisfied, in part, with the payment of $117 million by Ernst & Young.

68 In my view, it is clear that the claims Ernst & Young asserted against SFC, and SFC's subsidiaries, had to be addressed as part of the restructuring. The interrelationship between the various entities is further demonstrated by Ernst & Young's submission that the release of claims by Ernst & Young has allowed SFC and the SFC subsidiaries to contribute their assets to the restructuring, unencumbered by claims totalling billions of dollars. As SFC is a holding company with no material assets of its own, the unencumbered participation of the SFC subsidiaries is crucial to the restructuring.

69 At the outset and during the CCAA proceedings, the Applicant and Monitor specifically and consistently identified timing and delay as critical elements that would impact on maximization of the value and preservation of SFC's assets.

70 Counsel submits that the claims against Ernst & Young and the indemnity claims asserted by Ernst & Young would, absent the Ernst & Young Settlement, have to be finally determined before the CCAA claims could be quantified. As such, these steps had the potential to significantly delay the CCAA proceedings. Where the claims being released may take years to resolve, are risky, expensive or otherwise uncertain of success, the benefit that accrues to creditors in having them settled must be considered. See *Nortel Networks Corp., Re*, *supra*, paras. 73 and 81; and *Muscletech*, *supra*, paras. 19-21.

71 Implicit in my findings is rejection of the Objectors' arguments questioning the validity of the Ernst & Young Settlement and Ernst & Young Release. The relevant consideration is whether a proposed settlement and third-party release sufficiently benefits all stakeholders to justify court approval. I reject the position that the $117 million settlement payment is not essential, or even related, to the restructuring; it represents, at this point in time, the only real monetary consideration available to stakeholders.

The potential to vary the Ernst & Young Settlement and Ernst & Young Release to accommodate opt-outs is futile, as the court is being asked to approve the Ernst & Young Settlement and Ernst & Young Release as proposed.

72 I do not accept that the class action settlement should be approved solely under the CPA. The reality facing the parties is that SFC is insolvent; it is under CCAA protection, and stakeholder claims are to be considered in the context of the CCAA regime. The Objectors' claim against Ernst & Young cannot be considered in isolation from the CCAA proceedings. The claims against Ernst & Young are interrelated with claims as against SFC, as is made clear in the Equity Claims Decision and Claims Procedure Order.

73 Even if one assumes that the opt-out argument of the Objectors can be sustained, and optout rights fully provided, to what does that lead? The Objectors are left with a claim against Ernst & Young, which it then has to put forward in the CCAA proceedings. Without taking into account any argument that the claim against Ernst & Young may be affected by the claims bar date, the claim is still capable of being addressed under the Claims Procedure Order. In this way, it is again subject to the CCAA fairness and reasonable test as set out in *ATB Financial*, *supra*.

74 Moreover, CCAA proceedings take into account a class of creditors or stakeholders who possess the same legal interests. In this respect, the Objectors have the same legal interests as the Ontario Plaintiffs. Ultimately, this requires consideration of the totality of the class. In this case, it is clear that the parties supporting the Ernst & Young Settlement are vastly superior to the Objectors, both in number and dollar value.

75 Although the right to opt-out of a class action is a fundamental element of procedural fairness in the Ontario class action regime, this argument cannot be taken in isolation. It must be considered in the context of the CCAA.

76 The Objectors are, in fact, part of the group that will benefit from the Ernst & Young Settlement as they specifically seek to reserve their rights to "opt-in" and share in the spoils.

77 It is also clear that the jurisprudence does not permit a dissenting stakeholder to opt-out of a restructuring. [*Sammi Atlas Inc., Re* (1998), 3 C.B.R. (4th) 171 (Ont. Gen. Div. [Commercial List])).] If that were possible, no creditor would take part in any CCAA compromise where they were to receive less than the debt owed to them. There is no right to opt-out of any CCAA process, and the statute contemplates that a minority of creditors are bound by the plan which a majority have approved and the court has determined to be fair and reasonable.

78 SFC is insolvent and all stakeholders, including the Objectors, will receive less than what they are owed. By virtue of deciding, on their own volition, not to participate in the CCAA process, the Objectors relinquished their right to file a claim and take steps, in a timely way, to assert their rights to vote in the CCAA proceeding.

79 Further, even if the Objectors had filed a claim and voted, their minimal 1.6% stake in SFC's outstanding shares when the Muddy Waters report was released makes it highly unlikely that they could have altered the outcome.

80 Finally, although the Objectors demand a right to conditionally opt-out of a settlement, that right does not exist under the CPA or CCAA. By virtue of the certification order, class members had the ability to opt-out of the class action. The Objectors did not opt-out in the true sense; they purported to create a conditional opt-out. Under the CPA, the right to opt-out is "in the manner and within the time specified in the certification order". There is no provision for a conditional opt-out in the CPA, and Ontario's single opt-out regime causes "no prejudice...to putative class members". [CPA, section 9; *Osmun v. Cadbury Adams Canada Inc.* (2009), 85 C.P.C. (6th) 148 (Ont. S.C.J.), paras. 43-46; and *Eidoo v. Infineon Technologies AG*, 2012 ONSC 7299 (Ont. S.C.J.).]

Miscellaneous

81 For greater certainty, it is my understanding that the issues raised by Mr. O'Reilly have been clarified such that the effect of this endorsement is that the Junior Objectors will be included with the same status as the Ontario Plaintiffs.

Disposition

82 In the result, for the foregoing reasons, the motion is granted. A declaration shall issue to the effect that the Ernst & Young Settlement is fair and reasonable in all the circumstances. The Ernst & Young Settlement, together with the Ernst & Young Release, is approved and an order shall issue substantially in the form requested. The motion of the Objectors is dismissed.

Motion granted.

TAB 8

2012 BCSC 1773
British Columbia Supreme Court [In Chambers]

Great Basin Gold Ltd., Re

2012 CarswellBC 3710, 2012 BCSC 1773, [2013] B.C.W.L.D. 1881, 224 A.C.W.S. (3d) 22, 99 C.B.R. (5th) 219

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

In the Matter of the Business Corporations Act, S.B.C. 2002, c. 57

In the Matter of Great Basin Gold Ltd. Petitioner

Fitzpatrick J.

Heard: November 20, 2012
Oral reasons: November 20, 2012
Docket: Vancouver S126583

Counsel: P.J. Reardon, J. Cockbill for Petitioner
J.R. Sandrelli, C. Cheuk for Certain Unaffiliated Holders of the Petitioner's Senior Unsecured Convertible Debentures (the "Noteholders")
P. Rubin for Credit Suisse, AG
J.I. McLean, Q.C. for Monitor, KPMG Inc.

***Fitzpatrick J.*, In chambers:**

1 Much of the history of this *Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act*, R.S.C. 1985, c. C-36 ("*CCAA*") proceeding is outlined in my earlier reasons: *Great Basin Gold Ltd., Re*, 2012 BCSC 1459 (B.C. S.C.).

2 Broadly speaking, there were substantial issues joined between the principal combatants, Credit Suisse and the Ad Hoc Group, as defined in those reasons. Those issues principally related to the approval of the DIP loan facility that I had earlier granted in favour of Credit Suisse. The Ad Hoc Group disputed the granting of that DIP facility and launched an appeal of my October 1 order. I also understand that certain proceedings were commenced in the United States by the Ad Hoc Group towards a challenge of the granting of the guarantee and security by the U.S. companies of the group.

3 Following the issuance of those reasons on October 1, 2012, Credit Suisse and the Ad Hoc Group arrived at a tentative settlement of the issues arising between them. On October 16, 2012, I granted an order authorizing the petitioner to enter into this settlement agreement. The order also provided that the petitioner and the trustee under the trust indenture, Computershare Trust Company of Canada, were authorized to enter into such agreements as are required by the terms of the settlement. The members of the Ad Hoc Group are participants under the trust indenture.

4 An important aspect of the settlement negotiated by the Ad Hoc Group for the benefit of the entire debentureholders group is a guarantee from the U.S. holding company, Great Basin Gold Inc. ("GBGI"), and also certain subordinate security issued by GBGI in relation to that guarantee. From the debentureholder group's perspective, this settlement results in a substantial improvement of their current position. As with most settlement agreements, in return for these benefits, the debentureholder group must give up certain things. The agreements also provide that the debentureholder group will not proceed with certain challenges asserted to date, that being principally relating to the Credit Suisse guarantee and security that was approved by my earlier orders. The debentureholder group must also abandon the appeal proceedings and the U.S. proceedings which are referred to above. Finally, the debentureholder group must also agree to abandon the criminal interest rate issue, and other challenges to such matters as the KERP and the appointment of CIBC World Markets as the financial advisor.

5 Understandably, Credit Suisse requires that any settlement be approved by the entire debentureholders group and they also require an opinion from a lawyer to the effect that the documentation to evidence the settlement, including an intercreditor agreement, is binding upon the entire debentureholder group.

6 The significance of the settlement is that it buys peace between Credit Suisse and the Ad Hoc Group. At the present time, the Credit Suisse DIP facility is in default and further funding under the DIP facility is in limbo pending a finalization of the settlement. Accordingly, the finalization of the settlement is of tremendous significance in this case such that it will allow a continuation of the DIP financing to be advanced to the GBG Group who is desperately in need of these funds.

7 The difficulty that arises in terms of finalizing the settlement relates to how the parties can ensure that the entire debentureholder group will be bound by the settlement. The trust indenture does provide for the calling of meetings to consider resolutions by the debentureholder group. However, counsel for the Ad Hoc Group candidly points out that the full extent of what is intended to be agreed to by the debentureholder group under the settlement may not be within the specific terms of resolutions contemplated by the trust debenture.

8 In any event, I note that with respect to some matters at least, the trust indenture does provide for a meeting process by which a meeting may be held and written resolutions would be voted upon. I am also advised that those matters would require a special resolution, or in other words, a two-thirds majority.

9 It is of some significance on this application that the Ad Hoc Group, together with another debentureholder who is also in support of this application, hold in excess of a two-thirds majority from among the overall debentureholder group.

10 I am advised that it is not possible in the circumstances to even call a meeting that the debentureholders under the trust indenture given the exigencies of the situation in relation to the need for funding. Nevertheless, there has been some effort to engage the trustee under the trust indenture, Computershare. There have been ongoing discussions between the Ad Hoc Group and Computershare in that the trustee has been kept apprised of the settlement negotiations and the terms of the tentative settlement. I am advised that Computershare is fully supportive of the settlement and has no difficulty, subject to these issues relating to process, in proceeding with these transactions.

11 There have also been efforts to engage other debentureholders who are not represented by the Ad Hoc Group and the other debentureholder who supports the application. Following my earlier order on October 16, Computershare forwarded to the debentureholders copies of certain pleadings relating to this transaction which reference the terms of the proposed settlement. I am also advised by counsel for the Ad Hoc Group that their offices have fielded a number of calls from these other debentureholders. So it cannot be said that the other debentureholders are entirely in the dark in terms of what has been tentatively agreed to by the Ad Hoc Group and what is intended to be accomplished through the settlement agreement.

12 The issue in the first instance is whether I have the jurisdiction to provide the relief granted. The relief sought is not only an approval of the settlement agreement, but also an order authorizing the trustee, Computershare, to execute the various documents related to the settlement agreement such that these documents will be legal, valid and binding obligations of the trustee and all debentureholders.

13 The applicable statutory authority is s. 11 of the *CCAA* which endows the court with a wide statutory discretion to grant such orders as are "appropriate in the circumstances":

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

14 As discussed by the Supreme Court of Canada in *Ted Leroy Trucking Ltd., Re*, 2010 SCC 60 (S.C.C.), the *CCAA* is a remedial statute and the court has "broad and flexible authority" to facilitate the reorganization of the debtor towards achieving the objectives of the *CCAA*, including avoiding the social and economic losses arising from restructuring proceedings: paras. 15-19. The exercise of the court's discretion was further discussed by the Court at paras. 59-72. In particular, the Court stated:

> [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.

15 The last paragraph of the above quote makes the point that the chances of achieving a successful restructuring proceeding increase where the parties can agree on certain issues. Settlement agreements between the parties in these types of proceedings are very much encouraged where resolutions take place in the boardroom, as opposed to the courtroom. There is every reason to encourage such settlements, with approval and implementation subject to appropriate judicial oversight.

16 There is ample authority to the effect that s. 11 of the CCAA provides the court with jurisdiction to approve settlements even before the presentation of a plan of arrangement: *Calpine Canada Energy Ltd., Re*, 2007 ABCA 266 (Alta. C.A. [In Chambers]) at para. 26, *Nortel Networks Corp., Re*, 2010 ONSC 1708 (Ont. S.C.J. [Commercial List]) at para. 71.

17 In *Nortel Networks*, Mr. Justice Morawetz sets out the test to be applied in approving a settlement agreement:

> [73] A Settlement Agreement can be approved if it is consistent with the spirit and purpose of the CCAA and is fair and reasonable in all circumstances. What makes a settlement agreement fair and reasonable is its balancing of the interests of all parties; its equitable treatment of the parries, including creditors who are not signatories to a settlement agreement; and its benefit to the Applicant and its stakeholders generally.

18 I have no difficulty in concluding that the settlement agreement between Credit Suisse, the Ad Hoc Group and the petitioner group is fair and reasonable in the circumstances. The crux of the issue here is whether it is fair and reasonable to those debentureholders who have not yet participated in this process and have not perhaps fully appreciated the import of the agreement, particularly as it relates to the benefits to be achieved by the debentureholder group and the rights that the group will be giving up as a result of the transactions.

19 I would emphasize again this settlement has arisen by extensive negotiations as between Credit Suisse and the Ad Hoc Group. While those negotiations have taken place on the part of the Ad Hoc Group towards its own interests, inevitably the gains will accrue to the debentureholder group as a whole. Having considered the terms of the overall settlement agreement, I would be astounded if any debentureholders who were fully aware of those matters were to take a contrary position towards opposing the settlement agreement. Again, it is of significance that as a result of this settlement, funding under the DIP facility will continue, which will be a benefit to all stakeholders.

20 Nevertheless, I agree that fairness and reasonableness dictate in these proceedings that those other debentureholders have some input. The process already undertaken by the Ad Hoc Group has addressed that matter to a certain extent. What is proposed is that a more fullsome notice of the settlement agreement be given to the debentureholder group as a whole.

21 Firstly, it is proposed that there be a press release which will include reference to not only the pleadings but the specific settlement documents which are posted on the Monitor's website. In addition, the press release will refer to counsel for the Ad Hoc Group, in Canada, the U.S. and South Africa, who are available to respond to any enquiries from debentureholders

regarding the settlement agreement. Secondly, Computershare is to request that CDS send a notice to the debentureholders of the order sought today (called the "Settlement Implementation Order"). That notice will, as will the press release, highlight to the debentureholders that the deadline for any debentureholder to apply to vary, rescind or otherwise object to the Settlement Implementation Order will be within 21 days of the date of the Order. If there is no objection with that 21-day period, the settlement agreement will be fully effective and will constitute legal, valid and binding obligations of Computershare and all of the debentureholders and the consequences of not applying to challenge this Order will also be brought specifically to the attention of those persons reading the press release and the notice.

22 The Monitor had earlier indicated its support of the settlement agreement in accordance with the Third Report which was considered on the earlier application. Counsel for the Monitor has again confirmed its support of the settlement agreement and the process by which notice is to be given to the other debentureholders outlined above. Not surprisingly, the GBG Group is also in support.

23 I am satisfied that this process is appropriate and will give any other debentureholder sufficient time to challenge the Order if they wish. Again, I would emphasize that it is a critical aspect of this restructuring that this settlement be put in place as soon as possible so that the funding for the restructuring can proceed. It has already been stalled to some extent and no doubt to the detriment of the stakeholders as a whole. It is time to put an end to this prejudice delay and more the restructuring forward. Accordingly, the order sought is granted.

Application granted.