SUPERIOR COURT

CANADA
PROVINCE OF QUEBEC
DISTRICT OF MONTREAL

No: 500-11-048114-157

DATE: April 25, 2018

PRESIDED BY: THE HONOURABLE STEPHEN W. HAMILTON, J.S.C.

IN THE MATTER OF THE PLAN OF COMPROMISE OR ARRANGEMENT OF:

BLOOM LAKE GENERAL PARTNER LIMITED
QUINTO MINING CORPORATION
8568391 CANADA LIMITED
CLIFFS QUÉBEC IRON MINING ULC
WABUSH IRON CO. LIMITED
WABUSH RESOURCES INC.
Petitioners
and
THE BLOOM LAKE IRON ORE MINE LIMITED PARTNERSHIP
BLOOM LAKE RAILWAY COMPANY LIMITED
WABUSH MINES
ARNAUD RAILWAY COMPANY
WABUSH LAKE RAILWAY COMPANY LIMITED
Mises-en-cause
and
FTI CONSULTING CANADA INC.
Monitor
and
MICHAEL KEEPER, TERENCE WATT,
DAMIEN LEBEL AND NEIL JOHNSON
and
SYNDICAT DES MÉTALLOS, LOCAL 6254,
SYNDICAT DES MÉTALLOS, LOCAL 6285
SYNDICAT DES MÉTALLOS, LOCAL 9996
Objecting parties

JG5439

RECTIFIED JUDGMENT ON THE AMENDED MOTION FOR THE ISSUANCE OF A PLAN FILING AND MEETINGS ORDER (#642)*

OVERVIEW

[1] The CCAA Parties seek the issuance of a Plan Filing and Meetings Order (the "Meetings Order") which would, *inter alia*, authorize the CCAA Parties to (1) file the Joint Plan of Compromise and Arrangement dated April 16, 2018 (the "Plan") and (2) convene meetings of their creditors for the purpose of considering and voting on the Plan.

[2] The creditors of the CCAA Parties are, for the most part, in agreement that the proposed Meetings Order should be issued.

[3] The Representative Employees and the Union ask the Court to amend the proposed Meetings Order to give their counsel a deemed proxy to vote in counsel's discretion the claims of the salaried employees and retirees and the unionized employees and retirees respectively, unless the employee or retiree opts out by advising the Monitor that he or she will attend the meeting in person or appoints a different person to act as proxy.

CONTEXT

[4] The CCAA Parties[1] sought and received Court protection under the *Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act*[2] on January 27, 2015 (for the Bloom Lake CCAA Parties) and May 20, 2015 (for the Wabush CCAA Parties). That protection has been extended by the Court on a number of occasions. FTI Consulting Canada Inc. was appointed as Monitor.

[5] While under Court protection, the CCAA Parties have liquidated all or virtually all of their assets with the result that the Monitor holds substantial funds. The major remaining assets are (1) the potential preference claim by Cliffs Québec Iron Mining ULC ("CQIM") against various non-filed affiliates ("NFA") arising from the reorganization of CQIM in December 2014 that included a $142 million cash payment by CQIM and the transfer of the Australian subsidiaries of CQIM, and (2) potential preference claims by other CCAA Parties against NFA arising from certain payments in an aggregate amount of approximately US$30.6 million.

---

* The Court rectifies its judgment dated April 20, 2018 (1) to correct in paragraph 16 that the Attorney-General of Canada on behalf of the Office of the Superintendent of Financial Institutions did not take any position on the amendment proposed by the Representative Employees and the Union and (2) to make incidental changes to paragraphs 5, 6 and 8 of the Plan Filing and Meetings Order annexed to the judgment to make the Order consistent with the judgment.

1 The Petitioners and the Mis-en-cause.

2 R.S.C. 1985, c. C-36 (the "CCAA").

[6] In March 2018, the Monitor negotiated a settlement of these potential claims. Essentially, the NFA agreed to forego the benefit of any distributions or payments they may otherwise be entitled to receive as secured and unsecured creditors of the CCAA Parties[3] and to make an additional cash contribution of $5 million, in exchange for releases. The Monitor estimates that the overall increase in the aggregate amounts that would be distributed to the third party unsecured creditors of the CCAA Parties as a result of the proposed settlement and the Plan would likely be in the range of approximately $62 million to approximately $100 million.[4]

[7] The Monitor consulted with Quebec North Shore and Labrador Railway Company Inc. ("QNS&L"), the largest single third party unsecured creditor of CQIM, which supports the settlement. The Monitor did not consult with any other creditor. The employees and retirees are not creditors of CQIM.

[8] Based on this settlement, the CCAA Parties prepared the Plan. It is a joint plan on behalf of all of the CCAA Parties.[5] Essentially, the Plan distributes the liquidation proceeds and the settlement proceeds allocated to each CCAA Party amongst its third party unsecured creditors on a *pro rata* basis. The Plan proposes the limited substantive consolidation of certain CCAA Parties for the purposes of voting and distributions under the Plan, such that there are five classes of creditors:

a) Unsecured creditors of CQIM and Quinto Mining Corporation;

b) Unsecured creditors of Bloom Lake General Partner Limited ("BLGP") and The Bloom Lake Iron Ore Mine Limited Partnership ("BLLP");

c) Unsecured creditors of Wabush Iron Co. Limited, Wabush Resources Inc. and Wabush Mines;

d) Unsecured creditors of Arnaud Railway Company;

e) Unsecured creditors of Wabush Lake Railway Company Limited.

[9] The Plan also provides for broad releases in favour of the NFA, the Monitor and the directors, officer, employees, advisors, legal counsel and agents of the CCAA Parties, the Monitor and the NFA. The Plan does not release the NFA and their directors from class actions instituted in Newfoundland and Labrador on behalf of the employees and retirees.

[10] The CCAA Parties seek the issuance of the Meetings Order, which provides, *inter alia*, for:

---

3 The NFA filed secured and unsecured claims in excess of $1 billion against the CCAA Parties.

4 Forty-Third Report to the Court submitted by FTI Consulting Canada Inc., in its Capacity as Monitor, dated March 19, 2018.

5 8568391 Canada Limited and Bloom Lake Railway Company Limited ("BLRC"), have no pre-filing creditors and will be dissolved.

a) authorizing the filing of the Plan;

b) authorizing the CCAA Parties to convene meetings of the third party unsecured creditors;

c) approval of (i) the notice and documentation to be sent to the third party unsecured creditors in respect of the meetings; and (ii) and the procedure for the conduct of the meetings;

d) the scheduling of a hearing for the sanctioning of the Plan on June 29, 2018;

e) approval of the exclusion of 8568391 and BLRC, which have no pre-filing creditors, and limited substantive consolidation of (i) CQIM and Quinto, (ii) BLGP and BLLP, and (iii) Wabush Iron, Wabush Resources and Wabush Mines for the purposes of voting and distributions under the Plan;

f) approval of the classification of the third party unsecured creditors of each CCAA Party; and

g) other ancillary orders and declarations.

[11] The Monitor has recommended that the Motion should be granted and that the proposed Meetings Order should be issued.[6] The third party creditors of the CCAA Parties are, for the most part, in agreement.

[12] The issue relates to the voting rights of the 2,400 employees and retirees of the Wabush CCAA parties.[7] On June 22, 2015, Michael Keeper, Terence Watt, Damien Lebel and Neil Johnson (the "Representative Employees") were appointed as representatives for the non-unionized employees and retirees of the Wabush CCAA Parties. The order provided from an opt-out right, but the Court is advised that no non-unionized employee or retiree opted out of representation by the Representative Employees. The Union has acted on behalf of the unionized employees and retirees since the beginning of the CCAA proceedings pursuant to its right and duty to represent its members. There is no express order of the Court appointing it as representative, but the Court did authorize the Union to file proofs of claim on behalf of its members.

[13] The employees and retirees are significant creditors of the Wabush CCAA Parties. The employees and retirees have filed 1,089 claims totalling $103.8 million against Wabush Iron, Wabush Resources and Wabush Mines, 449 claims totalling $27.9 million against Arnaud Railway and 393 claims totalling $50.5 million against Wabush Lake Railway, with respect to other post-employment benefits ("OPEBs"),

---

6 Forty-Fourth Report to the Court submitted by FTI Consulting Canada Inc., in its Capacity as Monitor, dated March 22, 2018, par. 68.

7 Wabush Iron, Wabush Resources, Wabush Mines, Arnaud Railway and Wabush Lake Railway.

including life insurance and health care.[8] In addition, four claims in the aggregate amount of approximately $3.3 million relate to employee grievances, were filed jointly and severally against Arnaud Railway and Wabush Iron, Wabush Resources and Wabush Mines. 2,376 employees and retirees are members of the Wabush pension plans. The Plan Administrator has filed claims of approximately $56 million in the aggregate against Wabush Iron, Wabush Resources and Wabush Mines, Arnaud Railway and Wabush Lake Railway with respect to the amounts owing to the Wabush pension plans, including the deficit in the plans. The issue of whether those claims are unsecured or benefit from a deemed trust is currently before the Québec Court of Appeal, with a hearing starting June 11, 2018.

POSITION OF THE PARTIES

[14] As described above, the Representative Employees and the Union ask the Court to amend the proposed Meetings Order to give their counsel a deemed proxy to vote in counsel's discretion the claims of the salaried employees and retirees and the unionized employees and retirees respectively, unless the employee or retiree opts out by advising the Monitor that he or she will attend the meeting in person or appoints a different person to act as proxy.

[15] The Union also argues that it has the right to vote on behalf of its members and retirees pursuant to its "monopole de représentation".

[16] The Pension Plan Administrator [...] and the Superintendent of Pensions of Newfoundland [...] support the amendment.

[17] The CCAA Parties, the Monitor and QNS&L, the largest third party unsecured creditor, oppose the amendment.

ISSUES IN DISPUTE

[18] The issues that the Court must decide can be summarized as follows:

1. Should it issue the Meetings Order?
2. Does the Union have the right to vote on behalf of its members and retirees?
3. Should the Court give counsel for the Representative Employees and counsel for the Union a discretionary deemed proxy to vote the claims of the employees and retirees, subject only to an opt-out right?

---

[8] The claims against Arnaud Railway and Wabush Lake Railway overlap with the claims against Wabush Mines.

ANALYSIS

1. Issuance of the Meetings Order

[19] The standard for issuing a meeting order is low. The Court can refuse to summon a meeting of the creditors if it determines that the plan is contrary to the creditors' interests, lacks economic reality, is unworkable and unrealistic in the circumstances, or is doomed to failure due to a lack of creditor support.[9]

[20] The Monitor has reviewed the Plan and the Meetings Order and it recommends that the proposed Meetings Order be issued, based on the following considerations:[10]

- The filing of a joint plan significantly simplifies matters and creates no apparent material prejudice to any creditor;
- The limited substantive consolidation is reasonable and appropriate;
- The Plan provides significant incremental recoveries for the creditors and is in the best interests of all stakeholders;
- The granting of the Meetings Order would provide the forum for the creditors to consider and vote on the Plan;
- There is nothing about the Plan that would render it incapable of being approved by the creditors or sanctioned by the Court;
- The classification of creditors is reasonable and appropriate;
- The Meetings Order provides for reasonable and sufficient notice;
- The deadline for filing proxies is reasonable in the circumstances;
- The provisions of the Meetings Order governing the conduct of the meetings are reasonable and appropriate in the circumstances.

[21] Save for the issue of the voting rights of the employees and retirees, the creditors all agree that the Meetings Order should be issued.

[22] The Court concludes that there should be meetings of creditors to consider and vote on the Plan. It will grant the Meetings Order.

---

9 *Unique Broadband Systems (Re)*, 2013 ONSC 676, par. 52 and 95; *Kerr Interior Systems Ltd. (Re)*, 2011 ABQB 214, par. 29; *ScoZinc Ltd. (Re)*, 2009 NSSC 163, par. 7-9; *Re Fracmaster Ltd.*, 1999 ABQB 379, par. 24; *Canadian Red Cros Society/la Société canadienne de la Croix-Rouge, Re*, 1998 CanLII 14907 (ON SC), par. 37.

10 44th Report, *supra* note 6, par. 60-68.

2. Union's right to vote

[23] The Union pleads that it has the right to vote on behalf of the unionized employees and retirees pursuant to its monopoly on representation of its members.

[24] The Union points to Section 69 of the Québec *Labour Code*:[11]

> **69.** A certified association may exercise all the recourses which the collective agreement grants to each employee whom it represents without being required to prove that the interested party has assigned his claim.

[25] The Supreme Court refers to this as the principle of exclusive representation or the monopoly of representation:

> 41 One of the fundamental principles we find in Quebec labour law, and one which it has in common with federal law and the law of the other provinces, is the monopoly that the union is granted over representation. This principle applies in respect of a defined group of employees or bargaining unit, in relation to a specific employer or company, at the end of a procedure of certification by an administrative tribunal or agency. Once certification is granted, it imposes significant obligations on the employer, imposing on it a duty to recognize the certified union and bargain with it in good faith with the aim of concluding a collective agreement (s. 53 L.C.). Once the collective agreement is concluded, it is binding on both the employees and the employer (ss. 67 and 68 L.C.). For the purposes of administering the collective agreement, the certified association exercises all the recourses of the employees whom it represents without being required to prove that the interested party has assigned his or her claim (s. 69 L.C.).[12]
>
> [Emphasis added]

[26] The Union also points to the Newfoundland and Labrador *Labour Relations Act*,[13] which is very relevant given that more than half of the employees reported for work in Labrador. Section 50 provides:

> **50.** Where a trade union or a council of trade unions is certified, under this Act, as the bargaining agent of a unit,
>
> (a) the bargaining agent so certified immediately replaces another bargaining agent of the unit and has exclusive authority to conduct collective bargaining on behalf of employees in the unit and to bind them by a collective agreement until its certification in respect of employees in the unit is revoked;
>
> [...]
>
> [Emphasis added]

---

11 CQLR, chapter C-27.
12 *Noël* v. *Société d'énergie de la Baie James*, 2001 SCC 39, par. 41.
13 RSNL 1990, chapter L-1.

[27] Even though the language in the Newfoundland and Labrador statute relates only to the negotiation and conclusion of the collective agreement, the Court will assume that the principle of exclusive representation exists and is just as broad under the laws of Newfoundland and Labrador as it is in Québec.

[28] It is clear that the principle of exclusive representation means that an individual employee or retiree does not have the right to file and to pursue a grievance with respect to a breach of the collective agreement.[14]

[29] The Court is not satisfied, however, that the principle of exclusive representation gives the Union the right to vote the employees' and retirees' claims in the CCAA.

[30] First, the principle of exclusive representation relates to claims under the collective agreement. It does not give the Union the right to vote for the employees and retirees in all circumstances. For example, employees retain the right to vote individually on such important issues as the acceptance of a collective agreement or the decision to strike. The vote on a plan under the CCAA is not the exercise of a claim under the collective agreement. In some cases (although not in the present matter), the vote may determine whether the employer continues its operations and whether the employees keep their jobs.

[31] Further, the Union was not able to point to any authority extending the principle of exclusive representation to voting on a proof of claim with the result that the union had the right to vote on behalf of its members without any court authorization. There are a few examples of CCAA proceedings where the court has authorized the union to vote the claims of its members,[15] but no example was given to the Court of any case where the court concluded that the union had the right to vote on behalf of its members without such authorization.

[32] Finally, the Court notes that if the right to vote on behalf of the members belongs to the Union pursuant to the principle of exclusive representation, then the proposed opt-out would be a breach of that monopoly and would be invalid.

[33] These arguments lead the Court to dismiss the Union's argument that it has the right to vote on behalf of the unionized employees and retirees pursuant to the principle of exclusive representation.

---

14 *Québec (Procureur général)* c. *Désir*, 2008 QCCA 1756, par. 8.

15 See the meeting orders issued with respect to U.S. Steel Canada Inc., Collins & Aikman Canada Inc., Nortel Networks Corporation, Hollinger Canadian Publishing Holdings Co., Co-op Atlantic and NewPage Port Hawkesbury Corp., and the Frequently Asked Questions with respect to Fraser Papers inc.

3. Discretionary deemed proxy

[34] The Court will analyze the appropriateness of a discretionary deemed proxy by asking several questions.

3.1 Is a deemed proxy appropriate?

[35] First, before giving a deemed proxy to anyone, the Court must be satisfied that there is a valid reason to do so.

[36] The Representative Employees and the Union plead that the deemed proxy is necessary to ensure that all of the employees and retirees exercise their right to vote. In his affidavit, Michael Keeper, one of the Representative Employees, states the following:

> 24. Individual voting by the 690 Salaried Members, as advocated by the Monitor and CCAA Parties, is completely inappropriate for our large, vulnerable creditor group who are not sophisticated commercial creditors. The Salaried Members are spread across Canada, many in the remote regions. This will make it impossible to reach many of them with the Proposed Plan, all the related documents, and the associated ballot in time to allow them to cast their vote. Many Salaried Members are old and infirmed, living in nursing home facilities, do not have internet access or fax machines, and many cannot understand complex legal documents, such as the Proposed Plan, the court orders, and the Monitor's Reports. For many, they will not understand the nature or consequences of the Proposed Plan and how it affects them, and it is not practical for Representative Counsel nor the Representatives to contact every one of them to provide advice and answer their questions in time to ensure that they are able to make an informed decision as to their rights and how the Proposed Plan impacts them.

[37] Nicolas Lapierre, the Union representative responsible for this matter, makes similar comments in his sworn declaration:

> 16. En effet, j'ai lu le Plan et l'ensemble des documents qui l'accompagnent, que je trouve compliqués et difficiles à comprendre;
>
> 17. En raison de cette complexité, plusieurs Membres ne seront pas en mesure de comprendre ce qu'ils doivent faire avec ces documents ou ce qu'ils signifient, d'autant plus que certains de ces travailleurs sont partiellement ou totalement analphabètes, alors que d'autres sont âgés et maladies à un point tel où ils ne sont plus en mesure de s'occuper de leurs affaires par eux-mêmes;
>
> 18. Il y a ainsi de réelles possibilités que les Membres ne soient pas en mesure de voter ou de désigner quelqu'un pour le faire en leur nom, ce qui équivaudrait à les priver de leur droit de vote.

[38] The Court considers these concerns to be somewhat overstated. There is nothing exceptional about the Wabush employees and retirees as compared to the

employees and retirees of other companies. It should be possible to reach the great majority of them. While some of them may not have access to the internet or a fax machine, the Court doubts that the number is large. While some may not have the capacity to make a decision, there is likely someone who can make a decision on their behalf. The Plan itself is a complicated legal document that uses language which is difficult to understand, but the Monitor's reports are much easier to understand and the parties have the opportunity to include in the package that goes to the creditors a letter explaining matters in even simpler terms. The decision that the employees and retirees have to take is a fairly simple yes or no decision and the consequences of each decision can be explained.

[39] Nevertheless, it remains clear that a number of votes will be lost. Each employee and retiree has the right to vote on the Plan and every vote is important. One of the Court's objectives in this matter is to ensure that each employee and retiree is given the opportunity to vote and the Court's hope is that all will vote. The deemed proxy is a way to achieve that result.

[40] In addition to the cases where a deemed proxy was given to the union,[16] the parties point to only three examples of cases where deemed proxies were given to vote on behalf of non-unionized employees and retirees.[17] The CCAA Parties and the Monitor distinguish those cases on the basis that the deemed proxies were to vote in favour of the plan.

[41] These examples of deemed proxies confirm that the Court has jurisdiction to give deemed proxies in the present matter. That jurisdiction is not affected by whether the vote is in favour of the plan or against it.

[42] The CCAA Parties and the monitor also argue that a deemed proxy gives the proxy holder too much leverage.

[43] The Court does not agree. The deemed proxy simply ensures that the employees and retirees exercise the leverage that they should have, based on their numbers and the value of their claims.

[44] For all of these reasons, the Court concludes that it is appropriate to give a deemed proxy.

3.2 Who should exercise the deemed proxy?

[45] The Representative Employees and the Union argue that their counsel should exercise the deemed proxy.

[46] The Court agrees.

---

16 *Ibid.*

17 See the Nortel, Hollinger and U.S. Steel meeting orders.

[47] The Representative Employees were appointed by the Court for the purpose of representing the non-unionized employees and retirees. The Union is given that role by statute. They are the appropriate representatives to exercise the deemed proxies.

[48] The Court adopts the following reasoning of Justice Wilton-Siegel in the U.S. Steel CCAA proceedings:

> [15] Further, I am satisfied that it is appropriate that Representative Counsel act as the deemed proxy for the administrator for the non-unionized pension plans and for the current and former non-unionized employees having OPEB claims, given the active involvement of Representative Counsel in these proceedings to date on behalf of, and the commonality of interest of, the current and former non-unionized employees. I note as well that a procedure exists for individuals who have opted to represent themselves, and for individuals who have been represented by Representative Counsel but who choose to participate directly at the creditors meetings, to appoint an alternative proxy or to attend and vote in person at the creditors meetings.[18]

[49] The CCAA Parties and the Monitor argue that there is no commonality of interest in the present matter in that not all of the employees and retirees have both a pension claim and an OPEB claim. They argue that some employees and retirees may want the pension issues pursued rather than the OPEB claims while others may want the opposite, because of their personal circumstances.

[50] Those considerations may be relevant in assessing whether it is appropriate for the Representative Employees and the Union to pursue the deemed trust for the pension claims. However, that matter is not before the Court today and that issue was not raised when the matter was before the Court.

[51] Moreover, these considerations are of no relevance on the deemed proxy issue: the pension issues are excluded from the Plan and the only issue being raised is whether the settlement with the NFA should have generated more for the unsecured creditors. No employee or retiree has a divergent interest on this issue.

[52] The Court therefore concludes that counsel for the Representative Employees and for the Union are the appropriate persons to hold the deemed proxies.

3.3 Should the deemed proxy be discretionary?

[53] The Representative Employees and the Union say that they have not yet taken a position on whether they will vote for or against the Plan. They have concerns as to whether the settlement with the NFA is the best deal that could be achieved, but they have not had any discussions with the Monitor or with anyone else. They anticipate, as do the CCAA Parties and the Monitor, that there will be further discussions and negotiations right up until the vote. In that context, the Representative Employees and

---

[18] *U.S. Steel Canada Inc. (Re)*, 2017 ONSC 1967, par. 15.

the Union ask that the proxy holder be allowed to vote the claims in his or her discretion. They argue that an employee or retiree who wants to vote for or against the Plan can opt out of the deemed proxy by attending the meeting, by appointing a different proxy, or by indicating his or her vote on the proxy form.

[54] The discretionary deemed proxy is fundamentally undemocratic. The deemed proxy is intended to ensure that all of the employee and retiree claims are voted. But making it discretionary has the effect of taking away the individuals' right to vote or even to know how his or her claim is being voted and giving it to someone else. This is not a good outcome.

[55] The opt-out right suggested by counsel for the Representative Employees and the Union does not solve these problems. If negotiations and discussions continue right up to the vote, as the parties seem to anticipate, the employees and retirees will have to decide whether to opt out on the basis of a Plan that may not the final version and without knowing the final recommendation of the Representative Employees and the Union or the position the proxy holder will take on their behalf if they do not opt out.

[56] The CCAA Parties and the Monitor argue that there is no precedent for such a discretionary deemed proxy. They argue that the few examples of deemed proxies all provide that the proxy holder will vote in favour of the plan. They found no examples of deemed proxies to vote against the plan or to vote in the discretion of the proxy holder. The Representative Employees and the Union did not submit any examples either.

[57] The Representative Employees and the Union plead that there is no difference between a deemed proxy to vote in favour of the plan and a deemed proxy to vote against it. The Court agrees in principle. In the three examples of deemed proxies to vote in favour of the plan, it appears from the materials that the representatives of the employees participated or were consulted in the preparation of the plan and were prepared to support it. The practical reality is that there are no deemed proxies to vote against a plan because if the employees representatives are consulted before the plan is filed and they are opposed to the plan, the plan will likely be modified before it is filed in order to gain their support.

[58] The problem in the present matter is that there were no negotiations or discussions prior to the filing of the Plan and there have been no discussions in the three weeks since the filing of the Plan. Everyone is waiting for this order before they begin serious discussions.

[59] That is unfortunate. The negotiations anticipated by the parties will have the effect of depriving the employees and retirees of any real participation in the process. There will be a meeting to explain the Plan to them, but subsequent negotiations will mean that the Plan as explained to them is not the final version of the Plan. If negotiations continue up until the meeting, there will be no time to explain the final version of the Plan to the employees and retirees.

[60] In other words, the justification for the discretionary deemed proxy is that the Representative Employees and the Union cannot take a final position on the Plan today and that the Plan may be amended up until the vote. The solution is to give them more time to take a final position and to ensure that the Plan is not amended after they take that final position, not to give them the right to vote the individuals' claims in their discretion.

[61] For these reasons, the Court will not authorize a discretionary deemed proxy. The deemed proxy must be either a deemed proxy to vote for the Plan or a deemed proxy to vote against it. The Court will delay the mailing of the Meeting Materials to allow the parties to have the discussions and negotiations that should have taken place before now so that the Representative Employees and the Union can take a final position for or against the Plan.

CONCLUSIONS

[62] As a result, the Court will order the following.

[63] The date of the meetings will remain June 18, 2018. That is two months from now. There is time for the parties to discuss the current version of the Plan and either satisfy themselves that it is reasonable or negotiate changes to it. The Court will give them one month to do so.

[64] The date for mailing the Meeting Materials to the creditors will be pushed back to May 21, 2018 to allow for this month of negotiations. The Meeting Materials will include the final version of the Plan as well as letters from counsel for the Representative Employees and the Union in which they must take a position for or against the Plan. The deemed proxy will be to vote in accordance with that recommendation. That way, the employees and retirees will have the opportunity to make a real choice, based on the final version of the Plan and in full knowledge of how their claim will be voted if they do not execute a proxy.

[65] It follows that there can be no amendments to the Plan after May 18, 2018 without the authorization of the Court. Moreover, any amendment authorized after that date will likely involve the postponement of the creditors' meetings scheduled for June 18, 2018.

FOR THESE REASONS, THE COURT:

[66] **GRANTS** the Plan Filing and Meetings Order as amended by the Court and annexed to this judgment;

[67] **ORDERS** the parties not to amend the Plan after May 18, 2018 without the authorization of the Court;

[68] **RESERVES** the right of the parties to make further representations to the Court with respect to the documents to be mailed to the creditors on May 21, 2018;

[69] **THE WHOLE, WITHOUT COSTS.**

STEPHEN W. HAMILTON, J.S.C.

Mtre Bernard Boucher
Mtre Natalie Bussière
Mtre Emily Hazlett
BLAKE, CASSELS & GRAYDON LLP
For the Petitioners and the Mises-en-cause

Mtre Sylvain Rigaud
Mtre Crystal Ashby
NORTON ROSE FULLBRIGHT LLP
For the Monitor

Mtre Andrew J. Hatnay
KOSKIE MINSKY LLP
Mtre Mark Meland
FISHMAN FLANZ MELAND PAQUIN LLP
For the Objecting parties Michael Keeper, Terence Watt, Damien Lebel and Neil Johnson

Mtre Daniel Boudreault
PHILION LEBLANC BEAUDRY AVOCATS
For the Objecting parties Syndicat des Métallos Section locale 6254, 6285 et 9996

Mtre Edward Bechard-Torres
IMK LLP
For the Superintendent of Pensions of Newfoundland

Mtre Antoine Lippé
DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE – CANADA
For the Attorney General of Canada

Mtre Louis Robillard
RETRAITE QUÉBEC
For Retraite Québec

Mtre Gerry Apostolatos
LANGLOIS AVOCATS
For Quebec North Shore and Labrador Railway Company Inc.

Mtre Gabriel Serena
CAIN LAMARRE
For Ville de Fermont

Mtre Martin Roy
STEIN MONAST
For Ville de Sept-Îles

Mtre Ouassim Tadlaoui
BORDEN LADNER GERVAIS
For Groupe UNNU-EBC S.E.N.C.

Hearing date: April 16, 2018