

TAB 5

Indexed as:

Pacific National Lease Holding Corp. (Re)

**IN THE MATTER OF the Companies Creditors Arrangement Act
R.S.C. 1985, C. C-36, and
IN THE MATTER OF the Company Act, R.S.B.C. 1979, C. 59, and
IN THE MATTER OF the Pacific National Lease Holding
Corporation, Pacific National Financial Corporation, Pacific
National Leasing Corp., Pacific National Vehicle Leasing
Corp., Southborough Holdings Inc. and Pac Nat Equities Corp.**

[1992] B.C.J. No. 2309

19 B.C.A.C. 134

72 B.C.L.R. (2d) 368

15 C.B.R. (3d) 265

36 A.C.W.S. (3d) 389

Vancouver Registry: CA016047

British Columbia Court of Appeal
(In Chambers)

MacFarlane J.A.

Heard: October 22, 1992

Judgment: October 28, 1992

(13 pp.)

Debtor and creditor -- Insolvency -- Creditors arrangements -- Stay of all proceedings against insolvent debtor -- Statutory severance payments -- Creation of trust fund to secure making of severance payments.

Application for leave to appeal an order made under the Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act.

The petitioner applied to establish a trust fund to indemnify its directors and officers with respect to statutory severance payments. In the alternative, it wished to use available funds to meet those payments. There was no evidence that the operations of the petitioner would be impaired if the payments were not made. Its applications were refused. It argued that the trial judge erred in ordering the debtor not to abide by relevant mandatory statutory provisions.

HELD: Application dismissed. The Act preserved the status quo and protected all creditors while a re-organization was being attempted. The steps sought to be taken by the petitioner in this case would amount to an unacceptable alteration of that status quo. In exercising its powers under this statute, the court sought to serve creditors which included shareholders and employees. If in doing so, a decision of the court conflicted with provincial legislation, the pursuit of the purposes of the Act must prevail.

STATUTES, REGULATIONS AND RULES CITED:

Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act, R.S.C. 1985, c. C-36. Employment Standards Act, S.B.C. 1979, c. 10.

Counsel for the Petitioners (Appellants): H.C. Ritchie Clark and D.D. Nugent.

Counsel for Sun Life Trust Co.: W.E.J. Skelly.

Counsel for the Mutual Life Assurance Co. of Canada: M.P. Carroll.

Counsel for the Commcorp Financial Services Inc. and National Trust: W.C. Kaplan.

National Bank of Canada: H.W. Veenstra.

MACFARLANE J.A. (refusing leave to appeal):-- This is an application for leave to appeal an order of Mr. Justice Brenner pronounced the 17th day of August, 1992, pursuant to the Companies Creditors Arrangement Act R.S.C. 1985, c. C-36 (the "C.C.A.A.").

- 1 The petitioners had become insolvent prior to July 22, 1992, when they made an application under the C.C.A.A. for a stay of all proceedings so that they might attempt a reorganization of their affairs as contemplated by the C.C.A.A..
- 2 Mr. Justice Brenner made an ex parte order on July 23, 1992. The effect of the order was to stay all proceedings against the petitioners.
- 3 The order permitted the petitioners to maintain in trust a sum not exceeding \$1,500,000.00, to satisfy the potential liabilities of directors and officers of the petitioner companies with respect to the payment of wages under provincial legislation and remittances in connection therewith pursuant to federal legislation. The petitioners had previously established that fund to protect its directors and

officers from potential personal liability under the Employment Standards Act S.B.C. 1979, c. 10 for failing to make the payments mandated by that statute.

4 On July 31, 1992, Mr. Justice Brenner heard a number of applications brought by various interested parties seeking to set aside the ex parte stay order or, if the stay order was not set aside, to vary its terms. Mr. Justice Brenner amended and replaced the stay order with an order on terms proposed by the parties. That order has not yet been entered and has gone through a number of amendments. The order provided that on an interim basis, pending the hearing and determination of an application on the merits of the issues, the petitioners should not, without further order of the Court, make any payment to any employee or employees of the petitioners in respect of unpaid wages, severance, termination, lay-off, vacation pay or other benefits arising or otherwise payable as a result of the termination of an employee or employees.

5 The merits were argued in August and on August 17 Mr. Justice Brenner delivered the reasons for judgment and made the order which is the subject of this application.

6 The operative portions of the order read as follows:

THIS COURT ORDERS that the application by the Petitioners to make statutory severance payments or to maintain a trust fund to indemnify its directors and officers with respect to statutory severance payments is dismissed;

THIS COURT FURTHER ORDERS that any proceedings that may be brought by employees of the Petitioners to compel payment of statutory severance payments are stayed.

7 The appeal concerns the order made under the first paragraph of the order, not against the stay granted in the second paragraph.

8 The reasons for judgment of Mr. Justice Brenner are careful and detailed and are contained in 17 pages. The reasons contain a review of the essential facts, including the circumstances which gave rise to the financial difficulties of the petitioners, the competing arguments with respect to the need and the ability to make severance payments to employees whose services had been terminated, a consideration of the purposes of the C.C.A.A., the principle derived from the judgment of Mr. Justice Macdonald in Westar Mining Ltd., unreported reasons for judgment, August 11, 1992 (which dealt with a similar issue), and the application of that principle to the facts of this case.

9 The essential facts are that the petitioners are a group of inter-related companies that have carried on a leasing business for some years. Just prior to the commencement of the C.C.A.A. proceedings the petitioners had over \$246,000,000.00 in lease portfolios under administration. They had a workforce of approximately 230 which, by the time Mr. Justice Brenner gave his reasons on

August 17, 1992, had been reduced to 60. The provisions of the Employment Standards Act had not, by August 17, 1992, given rise to any actual liability with respect to the severance of the employees who had left the company. The potential liability was not known but the company said that it could be as much as \$1,500,000.

10 Mr. Skelly informed me, upon the hearing of the application, that the latest information indicated a liability for severance pay in an amount of approximately \$850,000.00 and for vacation pay in an amount of approximately \$150,000.00 for a total potential liability of \$1,000,000.00. I understand from counsel that once the Funders are repaid there may be as much as \$61,000,000.00 available to meet other liabilities.

11 Mr. Clark, for the petitioners, was not prepared to concede that the potential liability had been reduced, and submits that a trust fund of about \$1,300,000.00 is required.

12 The petitioners were in the business of purchasing equipment or vehicles and entering into leases with third parties. The initial purchases were financed with security on such leases granted in favour of National Bank of Canada and by way of a trust deed in favour of Canada Trust Company and Royal Trust Company. Additional financial advances were obtained from the other respondents, who are 27 other financial institutions, referred to in the material as the "Funders". The Funders advanced monies and took security, in part by way of assignment of the lease revenue stream. The monies advanced by the Funders exceeded the amount which the petitioners had paid for the equipment or vehicles. The difference, together with other revenue, was the petitioners' profit.

13 The arrangements with the Funders provided that the petitioners would continue the ongoing administration of the leases, including collection of the monthly lease payments, which would be forwarded to the Funders.

14 The petitioners got into financial difficulties, which they revealed to the Funders. The Funders and the petitioners were not able to agree to a plan to deal with this crisis. As a result the petitioners sought protection under the C.C.A.A..

15 The appellants seek an order of this Court setting aside the order made August 17, 1992, and authorizing the petitioners to comply with the statutes governing their operations (and in particular the Employment Standards Act) and permitting them to continue to maintain the Trust Funds with respect to possible claims against directors and officers arising out of the various federal and provincial statutes.

[para16] The petitioners assert that Mr. Justice Brenner erred:-

1. In ordering the appellants not to abide by the relevant mandatory statutory provisions including those under the Employment Standards

Act, requiring the appellants to pay all the statutory payments in full, and thereby order the appellants to breach a mandatory statute regarding statutory payments.

2. In ruling that he had the inherent jurisdiction under the Companies Creditors Arrangement Act or otherwise to order the appellants to breach the Employment Standards Act regarding statutory payments and thereby order the petitioners to commit offences under such statute.
3. In failing to properly apply the relevant legal principles applicable to a decision regarding the payment of statutory payments including such payments to former employees.
4. In ruling that the payment of unpaid wages and holiday and vacation pay accruing to the appellants' employees was to be treated in the same manner as severance pay.
5. In suspending the provisions of the July 23, 1992 order authorizing the Trust Fund.
6. In failing to provide any protection to the directors and officers of the appellants by way of the Trust Fund when ordering the petitioners to breach the Employment Standards Act, thereby exposing the directors and officers of the petitioners to liabilities under that statute and to prosecution for offences thereunder.

17 I understand the submission of the respondents to be that the real issue is whether a judge, acting pursuant to the powers given by the C.C.A.A., may make an order the purpose of which is to hold all creditors at bay pending an attempted reorganization of the affairs of a company, and which is intended to prevent a creditor obtaining a preference which it would not have if the attempted re-organization fails, and bankruptcy occurs.

18 I think that the answer is given in *Chef Ready Foods Ltd. v. Hong Kong Bank of Canada* (1990), B.C.L.R. (2d) 84. In that case Mr. Justice Gibbs, at pp. 88-89, said:

The purpose of the C.C.A.A. is to facilitate the making of a compromise or arrangement between an insolvent debtor company and its creditors to the end that the company is able to continue in business. It is available to any company incorporated in Canada with assets or business activities in Canada that is not a bank, a railway company, a telegraph company, an insurance company, a trust company, or a loan company. When a company has recourse to the C.C.A.A. the Court is called upon to play a kind of supervisory role to preserve the status quo to move the process along to the

point where a compromise or arrangement is approved or it is evident that the attempt is doomed to failure. Obviously time is critical. Equally obviously, if the attempt at a compromise or arrangement is to have any prospect of success, there must be a means of holding the creditors at bay. Hence the powers vested in the Court under Section 11.

19 In the same case, at p. 92, Mr. Justice Gibbs considered whether security given under the Bank Act gave preference to the Bank over other creditors, despite the provisions of the C.C.A.A.. He said:

It is apparent from these excerpts and from the wording of the statute, that in contrast with ss. 178 and 179 of the Bank Act which are preoccupied with the competing rights and duties of the borrower and the lender, the C.C.A.A. serves the interests of a broad constituency of investors, creditors and employees. If a bank's right in respect of s. 178 security are accorded a unique status which renders those rights immune from the provisions of the C.C.A.A., the protection afforded that constituency for any company which has granted s. 178 security will be largely illusory. It will be illusory because almost inevitably the realization by the bank on its security will destroy the company as a going concern. Here, for example, if the bank signifies and collects the accounts receivable, Chef Ready will be deprived of working capital. Collapse and liquidation must necessarily follow. The lesson will be that where s. 178 security is present a single creditor can frustrate the public policy objectives of the C.C.A.A. There will be two classes of debtor companies: those for whom there are prospects for recovery under the C.C.A.A.; those for whom the C.C.A.A. may be irrelevant dependent upon the whim of the s. 178 security holder. Given the economic circumstances which prevailed when the C.C.A.A. was enacted, it is difficult to imagine that the legislators of the day intended that result to follow.

20 Mr. Justice Brenner, after reviewing that and other authorities, said:

- (1) The purpose of the C.C.A.A. is to allow an insolvent company a reasonable period of time to reorganize its affairs and prepare and file a plan for its continued operation subject to the requisite approval of the creditors and the Court. (2) The C.C.A.A. is intended to serve not only the company's creditors but also a broad constituency which includes the shareholders and the employees. (3) During the stay period the Act is intended to prevent maneuvers (sic) for positioning amongst the creditors of the company. (4) The function of the Court during the stay period is to play a supervisory

role to preserve the status quo and to move the process along to the point where a compromise or arrangement is approved or it is evident that the attempt is doomed to failure. (5) The status quo does not mean preservation of the relative pre-debt status of each creditor. Since the companies under C.C.A.A. orders continue to operate and having regard to the broad constituency of interests the Act is intended to serve, preservation of the status quo is not intended to create a rigid freeze of relative pre-stay positions. (6) The Court has a broad discretion to apply these principles to the facts of a particular case.

Counsel do not suggest that statement of principles is incorrect.

21 Mr. Justice Brenner then referred to the judgment of Mr. Justice Macdonald in Westar, and concluded:

In my view, to allow the Petitioners to make statutory severance payments or to authorize a fund out of the company's operating revenues for that purpose would be an unacceptable alteration of the status quo in effect when the order was granted.

22 He said earlier that he did not understand Mr. Justice Macdonald to be saying in Westar that in no case should a court ever authorize severance payments when a company is operating under the C.C.A.A.

23 He held, in effect, that it was a proper exercise of the discretion given to a judge under the C.C.A.A. to order that no preference be given to any creditor while a reorganization was being attempted under the C.C.A.A.

24 It appears to me that an order which treats creditors alike is in accord with the purpose of the C.C.A.A. Without the provisions of that statute the petitioner companies might soon be in bankruptcy, and the priority which the employees now have would be lost. The process provided by the C.C.A.A. is an interim one. Generally, it suspends but does not determine the ultimate rights of any creditor. In the end it may result in the rights of employees being protected, but in the meantime it preserves the status quo and protects all creditors while a re-organization is being attempted.

25 So far as the directors and officers are concerned, they were personally liable for potential claims under the Employment Standards Act before July 22. Nothing has changed. No authority has been cited to show that the directors and officers have a preferred right over other potential creditors.

26 This case is not so much about the rights of employees as creditors, but the right of the court under the C.C.A.A. to serve not the special interests of the directors and officers of the company but

the broader constituency referred to in *Chef Ready Foods Ltd.* Such a decision may inevitably conflict with provincial legislation, but the broad purposes of the C.C.A.A. must be served.

27 In this case Mr. Justice Brenner reviewed the evidence and made certain findings of fact. He concluded that it would be an unacceptable alteration of the status quo for the petitioners to make statutory severance payments or to authorize a fund out of the companies' operating revenues for that purpose. He also found that there was no evidence before him that the petitioners' operation will be impaired if terminated employees do not receive severance pay and instead become creditors of the company. He said that there was no evidence that the directors and officers will resign and be unavailable to assist the company in its organization plans.

28 Despite what I have said, there may be an arguable case for the petitioners to present to a panel of this Court on discreet questions of law. But I am of the view that this Court should exercise its powers sparingly when it is asked to intervene with respect to questions which arise under the C.C.A.A. The process of management which the Act has assigned to the trial Court is an ongoing one. In this case a number of orders have been made. Some, including the one under appeal, have not been settled or entered. Other applications are pending. The process contemplated by the Act is continuing.

29 A colleague has suggested that a judge exercising a supervisory function under the C.C.A.A. is more like a judge hearing a trial, who makes orders in the course of that trial, than a chambers judge who makes interlocutory or proceedings for which he has no further responsibility.

30 Also, we know that in a case where a judgment has not been entered, it may be open to a judge to reconsider his or her judgment, and alter its terms. In supervising a proceeding under the C.C.A.A. orders are made, and orders are varied as changing circumstances require. Orders depend upon a careful and delicate balancing of a variety of interests and of problems. In that context appellate proceedings may well upset the balance, and delay or frustrate the process under the C.C.A.A. I do not say that leave will never be granted in a C.C.A.A. proceeding. But the effect upon all parties concerned will be an important consideration in deciding whether leave ought to be granted.

31 In all the circumstances I would refuse leave to appeal.

MACFARLANE J.A.

TAB 6

judge to consider the pleadings of the parties and all of the evidence properly admissible before her which constitutes the record in this case. (*Dawson*, at p. 269 D.L.R.).

[41] In assessing the evidence, the motions judge was entitled to consider the language of the contractual documents entered into by the parties, the history of their dealings at the time of entry into those written contractual documents and the implications of the alleged Collateral Agreement. In conducting that assessment, in my view, she did not make findings of credibility nor improperly weigh conflicting evidence. Based on a review of the motions judge's reasons as a whole, I am not persuaded that her review of the evidentiary record involved anything more than a determination of the narrow question of whether there was a genuine issue for trial.

III. DISPOSITION

[42] Accordingly, for the reasons set out above, I would dismiss the appeal. Luis is entitled to his costs of the appeal.

[43] The Redemption Agreement provides that Tropic will pay for and indemnify Luis for all reasonable solicitor and client legal costs and other related expenses incurred by him in connection with any enforcement proceedings concerning the Redemption Agreement, the Guarantee or the Note. The Guarantee contains a similar agreement by Xela concerning enforcement by Luis of his rights under the Guarantee. Before this court, the appellants agreed that Luis, if successful on appeal, is entitled to his costs on a substantial indemnity basis in accordance with a Bill of Costs filed on his behalf. Accordingly, Luis' costs of the appeal are fixed on a substantial indemnity basis, in the sum of \$37,568.08, inclusive of disbursements and Goods and Services Tax.

Appeal dismissed with costs.

Algoma Steel Inc. v. Union Gas Limited

[Indexed as: Algoma Steel Inc. v. Union Gas Ltd.]

*Court of Appeal for Ontario, Weiler, Rosenberg and Feldman J.J.A.
January 17, 2003*

Debtor and creditor — Arrangements — Appeals — Standard of appellate review of order made in proceedings under Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act — Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act, R.S.C. 1985, c. C-36.

Debtor and creditor — Arrangements — Set-off — Equitable set-off — Legal set-off — Creditor in proceedings under Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act claiming legal and equitable set-off — Legal set-off not established — Equitable set-off established — Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act, R.S.C. 1985, c. C-36.

In 1999, Algoma Steel Inc. ("Algoma") obtained gas under a renewable one-year contract under which it bought gas from a supplier, sold the gas to Union Gas Limited ("Union"), which arranged for its transportation, and then repurchased the gas from Union. Algoma paid for the gas in accordance with Union's rate schedule as approved by the Ontario Energy Board. In 1999, Algoma overpaid for the gas and was entitled to a \$2.2 million rebate subject to the Energy Board approving the payment. The Energy Board approved a rebate; however, it ordered the payment to be deferred while certain deferral accounts were reviewed.

In 2000, Algoma changed its relationship with Union and entered into two new contracts with respect to obtaining gas, that is, a gas services contract and an assignment contract. Under this new arrangement, Union assigned to Algoma the right to access gas transportation from TransCanada Pipelines Limited ("TCPL"). Under this new arrangement, Algoma was to pay TCPL directly, but if it failed to pay, then Union was obliged to indemnify TCPL.

On April 23, 2001, Algoma applied for and obtained an order under the *Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act* ("CCAA"). At the time of the order, Algoma owed Union \$461,244 under the 2000 gas services contract, and because Algoma had failed to pay TCPL, Union was liable to indemnify TCPL in the amount of \$1,265,934. In the proceedings under the CCAA, Union purported to set off these sums against the amount it owed for the 1999 rebate. It relied upon s. 18.1 of the CCAA, which preserves rights of set-off. On a motion, Farley J. held that Union had not established a claim for legal set-off and could claim an equitable set off only in relation to the gas services contract. Union appealed.

Held, the appeal should be allowed.

For appeals, for which leave is required under the CCAA, the usual standard of review applies, and the Court of Appeal was required to give deference to the findings of the motions judge even where, as in this case, the decision was based on a paper record. Further, an appellate court should show considerable deference when called on to review inferences from facts. Where, however, the issue concerns the application of a legal standard to a set of facts, the question is one of mixed fact and law and a somewhat less deferential standard of review may be appropriate, although not the standard of correctness required for questions of law.

The immediate appeal concerned both inferences from facts and a question of mixed fact and law. Farley J. was correct with respect to legal set-off but incorrect with respect to equitable set-off. A condition for legal set-off is that the obligations must be debts and Farley J.'s decision that a debt had not been shown turned exclusively on the inferences to be drawn from the undisputed facts. He did not make any palpable or overriding error and his decision was supported by the evidence. The decision about equitable set-off, however was different and there was an error in the application of the test for equitable set-off to the facts. While he recognized that the assignment agreement was integral to the 2000 gas services agreement, Farley J. refused equitable set-off for the amounts owing under the assignment agreement because it was not the same type of contract as the supply of gas by Union. This was not a sufficient reason to refuse equitable set-off given the interrelationship between the two 2000 agreements. There was a close relationship between the 1998 contract and both of the 2000 contracts because they

all, in one way or another, facilitated the supply of gas to Algoma. It would be unjust to allow Algoma to enforce payment of the rebate without taking into account its liability to Union under the assignment agreement which formed an integral part of the arrangement between the parties.

Cases referred to

Cam-Net Communications v. Vancouver Telephone Co. Ltd. (1999), 71 B.C.L.R. (3d) 226, 182 D.L.R. (4th) 436, 17 C.B.R. (4th) 26, 2 B.L.R. (3d) 118 (C.A.); *Coba Industries Ltd. v. Millie's Holdings (Canada) Ltd. and Tsang* (1985), 65 B.C.L.R. 31, 20 D.L.R. (4th) 689, [1985] 6 W.W.R. 14, 36 R.P.R. 259 (C.A.), affg (1984), 55 B.C.L.R. 326 (S.C.); *Equity Waste Management of Canada Corp. v. Halton Hills (Town)* (1997), 35 O.R. (3d) 321, 40 M.P.L.R. (2d) 107 (C.A.), revg (1995), 22 M.P.L.R. (2d) 167 (Ont. Gen. Div.), supp. reasons (1994), 22 O.R. (3d) 796, 27 M.P.L.R. (2d) 123 (Gen. Div.); *Federal Commerce & Navigation Ltd. v. Molena Alpha Inc.*, [1979] 1 All E.R. 307, [1979] A.C. 757, 122 Sol. Jo. 843, [1979] 1 Lloyd's Rep. 201 (H.L.), affg on other grounds [1978] 3 All E.R. 1066 (C.A.); *Housen v. Nikolaisen*, 2002 SCC 33, (2002), 219 Sask. R. 1, 211 D.L.R. (4th) 577, 286 N.R. 1, 272 W.A.C. 1, [2002] 7 W.W.R. 1, 30 M.P.L.R. (3d) 1, 10 C.C.L.T. (3d) 157; *Telford v. Holt*, [1987] 2 S.C.R. 193, 54 Alta. L.R. (2d) 193, 41 D.L.R. (4th) 385, 78 N.R. 321, [1987] 6 W.W.R. 385, 37 B.L.R. 241, 21 C.P.C. (2d) 1, 46 R.P.R. 234

Statutes referred to

Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act, R.S.C. 1985, c. C-36, ss. 13, 18.1 [as am.]
Courts of Justice Act, R.S.O. 1990, c. C.43, s. 111

Authorities referred to

Palmer, K.R., *The Law of Set-Off in Canada* (Aurora, Ont.: Canada Law Book, 1993)

Appeal from an order made in proceedings under the *Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act*, R.S.C. 1985, c. C-36.

James P. Dube, for appellant.

Geoffrey R. Hall, for respondent.

The judgment of the court was delivered by

[1] ROSENBERG J.A.: — This appeal from an Order of Farley J. concerns the application of legal and equitable set-off in the context of the *Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act*, R.S.C. 1985, c. C-36, as amended ["CCAA"]. On April 23, 2001, the respondent Algoma Steel Inc. obtained an initial order under the CCAA. At that time, Algoma was indebted to the appellant Union Gas Limited under two contracts (the "2000 contracts") for gas services in March and April of 2001 amounting to just under \$2 million. At the same time, Algoma was entitled to a rebate from Union of approximately \$2.2 million plus interest as a result of an overpayment for gas services in 1999. Union sought to set off amounts owed to it by Algoma against the 1999 rebate.

The motions judge held that Union had not established a claim for legal set-off. He held that Union had made out a claim for an equitable set-off but only in relation to one of the contracts in the amount of \$461,244. Because of various orders made in the CCAA proceedings, this means that Union must pay the entire amount of the 1999 rebate less the \$461,244 and is not entitled to payment of \$1,265,934 owed to it under the 2000 contract. Union submits that the motions judge erred in refusing to allow legal set-off and, in the alternative, erred in limiting the scope of equitable set-off.

[2] In my view, the motions judge did not err with respect to legal set-off but did err with respect to equitable set-off. Accordingly, I would allow the appeal with costs.

The Facts

The relationship between Algoma and Union

[3] The facts are based entirely upon affidavits filed by two employees of Union. Algoma filed no affidavits and did not cross-examine the Union employees. I begin with a summary of the facts that lead to Algoma's entitlement to the \$2.2 million rebate. In 1999, Algoma obtained gas on a buy/sell arrangement under which Algoma bought natural gas from a resource supplier (presumably in Western Canada) and sold the gas to Union. Union arranged for the transportation of the gas on its own account and then sold the gas back to Algoma in Ontario when it was needed. In 1999, the relationship between Union and Algoma was governed by a contract commencing November 1, 1998 and terminating on October 31, 1999. This contract was subject to automatic renewal for successive one-year periods.¹

[4] Under the 1998 contract, Algoma was required to pay for the gas services in accordance with Union's rate schedule as approved by the Ontario Energy Board. These rates are based on many factors including projected costs of gas. If those projections are found to be either too high or too low following the end of a calendar year, Algoma may have either overpaid or underpaid Union. To track actual costs with projected costs, Union established deferral accounts for the various classes of customers. Algoma is in a Rate 100 class. As it happened, in 1999, Algoma and the other Rate 100 customers overpaid and were entitled to a

¹ Although not stated explicitly in the affidavits, it appears that the contract did renew for a further year.

rebate. However, Union could not repay its customers without approval from the Board. Union therefore made an application to the Board in which it proposed to pay the rebates to the customers. The total rebate for the Rate 100 class is just under \$4 million. According to the affidavit of the Union employee, Algoma's share of the rebate "approximates \$2.2 million". Algoma is also entitled to interest on the rebate accruing from January 1, 2000 at a rate set by the Board.

[5] In its July 21, 2001 decision, the Board approved Union's proposal. But instead of authorizing immediate payment, the Board directed Union to bring forward the balances in all of the year 2000 deferral accounts for review. In a further decision dated October 16, 2001, the Board directed Union to continue to hold the balances in the deferral accounts until the 2001 and 2002 rates are implemented and 2000 and 2001 deferral balances are disposed of. According to the Union employee's affidavit, this will not affect Algoma's rebate because it is not entitled to share in the 2000 and 2001 deferral accounts. By the time of the hearing before the motions judge, the Board had not yet indicated when Union could pay the rebate to its customers, including Algoma.

[6] I will now deal with the contracts that governed the Union/Algoma relationship when the CCAA orders were made. In 2000, Algoma changed its relationship with Union so that it no longer had a buy-sell arrangement. In October 2000, the parties entered into two new contracts. These contracts may conveniently be referred to as the 2000 gas services contract and the assignment agreement. Both contracts covered almost the same period; from November 1, 2000 to October 31, 2001 for the 2000 gas services contract and November 1, 2000 to November 1, 2001 for the assignment agreement. As a result of the new arrangement, Algoma no longer sold the gas to Union and repurchased it from Union in Ontario. Rather, Union assigned its right to access gas transportation capacity directly from TransCanada Pipelines Limited ("TCPL") through Union's contract with TCPL. Algoma thus paid TCPL directly. Importantly, however, if Algoma failed to pay TCPL for use of gas transportation capacity being accessed by it, Union was required to pay TCPL. Algoma was then required to indemnify Union.

[7] Under the 2000 gas services contract, Union continued to transport the gas from Union's metering station at the TCPL pipeline to the Algoma plant. That contract included this term:

This agreement is contingent upon the TCPL Assignment Agreement which is attached as Schedule D and forms an integral part of this arrangement. In the event either of these agreements terminate, the other agreement shall also terminate, unless agreed to otherwise by the parties.

[8] As of the April 23, 2001 CCAA order, Algoma owed Union \$461,244 under the 2000 gas services contract. Further, because Algoma failed to pay TCPL for gas transportation services obtained by Algoma under the assignment agreement, Union was obliged to indemnify TCPL in the amount of \$1,265,934. It is these two amounts that Union seeks to set off against the 1999 rebate. As indicated, the motions judge only allowed Union to set off the former amount.

The CCAA proceedings

[9] On April 23, 2001, Algoma obtained an initial order under the CCAA. As part of that order, the right of any claimant to assert, enforce or exercise any right of set-off or consolidation of accounts was stayed during the stay period. On November 9, 2001, while the stay period was still in force, Algoma obtained an order to authorize meetings of its creditors to consider its Plan of Arrangement, to establish a process for proving claims and for the subsequent barring of those claims in return for participating in the Plan. Under this order, an unsecured creditor that had not filed a proof of claim was deemed to have filed one in the amount as valued by Algoma. The creditor was then barred from making or enforcing any such deemed claim after December 12, 2001. Union did not file a proof of claim since it took the view that there was no net balance due from Algoma to Union once the 1999 rebate was factored in. Algoma denied that Union was entitled to a set-off and deemed Union's claim to be in the amounts of \$461,244 and \$1,265,934.

[10] As a result, on November 27, 2001, Union moved before Farley J. for a declaration that its rights of set-off referable to its dealings with Algoma up to April 23, 2001 were not affected by the CCAA proceedings. In this way, it sought to prevent its claims from being deemed to have been the subject of a proof of claim and then deemed to have been barred after December 12, 2001. Union relied upon s. 18.1 of the CCAA, which preserves rights of set-off. I will set out that section in full below.

The Reasons of the Motions Judge

[11] The motions judge noted that a condition for application of legal set-off is that the obligations must be debts, in the sense that they are liquidated amounts. After reviewing the Board rulings and various letters by Union to Algoma, the motions judge concluded that the 1999 rebate was not a liquidated amount. He noted that in the Union employee's affidavit the rebate "approximates \$2.2 million". Further communications between Union

and its Rate 100 customers suggested that there might not even be a rebate, depending on the decision of the Board. He therefore held that legal set-off had not been made out.

[12] As to equitable set-off, the motions judge held that the 2000 gas services contract was in substance a continuation of the 1998 contract. He concluded that there was a "close connection sufficient to ground equitable set-off as to the gas supply portion of the October 15, 2000 Agreement *vis-à-vis* any rebate which is authorized by the Board, but not any monies owing by Algoma to Union as a result of the November 1, 2000 Transportation Agreement". He therefore limited the equitable set-off as indicated above.

Analysis

General principles

[13] Algoma does not dispute that the law of set-off applies notwithstanding the CCAA proceedings. Section 18.1 of the Act makes this clear:

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

[14] Algoma does, however, submit that set-off claims should be carefully scrutinized where CCAA proceedings are underway because the effect is to give preference to certain creditors. As Rowles J.A. said in *Cam-Net Communications v. Vancouver Telephone Co.* (1999), 71 B.C.L.R. (3d) 226, 182 D.L.R. (4th) 436 (C.A.) at p. 235 B.C.L.R.:

Using, or rather misusing, the law of set-off is one example of how persons with a claim against the company in reorganization might attempt to escape the CCAA compromise. A party claiming set-off . . . realizes its claim on a dollar-for-dollar basis while other creditors, who participated in the CCAA proceedings, have their claims reduced substantially. For this reason, the legislative intent animating the CCAA reorganization regime requires that courts remain vigilant to claims of set-off in the reorganization context.

[15] I accept this principle, but I do not see it as a concern in this case. Union operates within a highly regulated regime and the disposition of the rebate is subject to scrutiny by a specialized tribunal. The amounts owing by Algoma to Union are not in doubt.

[16] There was some dispute between the parties about the standard of review by this court of the decision of the motions judge. Counsel for Union seemed to suggest that because there is

no right of appeal in CCAA proceedings and appeals are relatively rare, it was open to this court to review the decision of the motions judge on a standard of correctness even where that decision turned on findings of fact and inferences to be drawn from those facts. In my view, the usual standard of review in appeal proceedings applies and this court is required to give deference to the findings of the motions judge even where, as here, the decision is based on a paper record. The fact that there is no right of appeal and the appeal is only with leave under s. 13 of the Act only reinforces that conclusion. Decisions in the CCAA context must often be made quickly. They are, as in this case, usually made by a judge with considerable expertise in the area who has been managing the CCAA proceedings and is intimately familiar with the context and the issues at stake.

[17] This court and the Supreme Court of Canada have variously described the standard of appellate review. In *Equity Waste Management of Canada Corp. v. Halton Hills (Town)* (1997), 35 O.R. (3d) 321, 40 M.P.L.R. (2d) 107 (C.A.) at p. 336 O.R., Laskin J.A. wrote as follows:

Therefore, although the entire record before a trial judge or a motion judge consists of documentary or written evidence, as it does in this case, the judge's factual findings are entitled to deference on appeal. What standard of deference applies in such a case? It is not easy to articulate a standard less deferential than "manifest error" but falling short of "correctness". I suggest that it may simply be a matter of weight or emphasis, or that, plausibly, a uniform standard of appellate review should be applied to a trial judge's findings of fact, whether the evidence is entirely oral, entirely documentary or, more typically, a combination of the two.

What is important for this appeal is the kind of error that justifies intervention by an appellate court. An error of law obviously justifies intervention. An appellate court may interfere with a finding of fact if the trial judge or motion judge disregarded, misapprehended, or failed to appreciate relevant evidence, made a finding not reasonably supported by the evidence, or drew an unreasonable inference from the evidence.

[18] More recently the Supreme Court in *Housen v. Nikolaisen*, [2002] SCC 33, 211 D.L.R. (4th) 577, discussed at some length the standard of appellate review where the appellate court is called upon to review inferences from facts. The court concluded that the standard is one of considerable deference. Iacobucci and Major JJ. described the standard at para. 23 as follows:

We reiterate that it is not the role of appellate courts to second-guess the weight to be assigned to the various items of evidence. *If there is no palpable and overriding error with respect to the underlying facts that the trial judge relies on to draw the inference, then it is only where the inference-drawing process itself is palpably in error that an appellate court can interfere with*

the factual conclusion. The appellate court is not free to interfere with a factual conclusion that it disagrees with where such disagreement stems from a difference of opinion over the weight to be assigned to the underlying facts.

(Emphasis added)

[19] On the other hand, where the issue concerns application of a legal standard to a set of facts, the question is one of mixed fact and law and a somewhat less deferential standard may be appropriate, although not the standard of correctness required for questions of law. This was described as follows at para. 28:

However, where the error does not amount to an error of law, a higher standard is mandated. Where the trier of fact has considered all the evidence that the law requires him or her to consider and still comes to the wrong conclusion, then this amounts to an error of mixed law and fact and is subject to a more stringent standard of review: *Southam, supra*, at paras. 41 and 45. While easy to state, this distinction can be difficult in practice because matters of mixed law and fact fall along a spectrum of particularity. This difficulty was pointed out in *Southam, supra*, at para. 37:

... the matrices of facts at issue in some cases are so particular, indeed so unique, that decisions about whether they satisfy legal tests do not have any great precedential value. If a court were to decide that driving at a certain speed on a certain road under certain conditions was negligent, its decision would not have any great value as a precedent. *In short, as the level of generality of the challenged proposition approaches utter particularity, the matter approaches pure application, and hence draws nigh to being an unqualified question of mixed law and fact.* See R. P. Kerans, *Standards of Review Employed by Appellate Courts* (1994), at pp. 103-108. Of course, it is not easy to say precisely where the line should be drawn; though in most cases it should be sufficiently clear whether the dispute is over a general proposition that might qualify as a principle of law or over a very particular set of circumstances that is not apt to be of much interest to judges and lawyers in the future.

(Emphasis added)

[20] It seems to me that this appeal concerns both inferences from facts and a question of mixed fact and law. The motions judge's decision about the application of legal set-off turned exclusively on the inferences to be drawn from the undisputed facts in the affidavits. His decision that Union had not shown the rebate as a debt was fact specific. Although Union argues that the motions judge overlooked important facts and misapprehended certain facts, I am not persuaded that the motions judge made any palpable or overriding error. To the contrary, I am satisfied that his decision is supported by the evidence.

[21] The decision about equitable set-off is somewhat different since it involves application of a legal standard to a set of facts. As such, it is a question of mixed law and fact. While the assessment by the motions judge is entitled to deference, I am

nevertheless of the view that the motions judge erred in his application of the test for equitable set-off to these particular facts.

Legal set-off

[22] Section 111 of the *Courts of Justice Act*, R.S.O. 1990, c. C.43 provides the statutory framework for legal set-off. Subsections (1) and (2) provide:

111(1) In an action for payment of a debt, the defendant may, by way of defence, claim the right to set off against the plaintiff's claim a debt owed by the plaintiff to the defendant.

(2) Mutual debts may be set off against each other even if they are of a different nature.

[23] The only question on the application of legal set-off in this case was whether the rebate was a debt for the purpose of s. 111. Union accepts that debt means a liquidated sum and argues that the rebate is a liquidated sum because the amount is ascertainable and, save for interest, can neither increase nor decrease. Union submits that the amount is ascertainable and fixed because the Board has accepted its proposal for calculating the amount of the rebate. It also relies on the affidavit evidence that Algoma's share of the rebate for Rate 100 customers will be unaffected by the adjustments for the years 2000 and 2001 deferral accounts.

[24] The motions judge, however, was not prepared to draw that inference from the affidavit evidence. He relied upon the fact that Union only provided an estimate of the rebate and his reading of the Board decisions that did not explicitly state that Algoma or any of the other customers would receive a rebate. He also relied upon Union's own communications to its Rate 100 customers that suggested the amount of the rebate was not fixed. In his submissions, counsel for Algoma pointed out a number of facts upon which the decision by the motions judge could rest and that could support the inferences drawn. Counsel pointed out that to overturn the decision of the motions judge, this court would have to be satisfied of the following:

- (1) That it was appropriate to sever off the interest part of the rebate, since the rate had not yet been set by the Board.
- (2) That no significance should be attached to the use of the term "approximate" in the Union employee's description of the amount of the rebate.

- (3) That no significance should be attached to the fact that Union had not provided an exact figure for the amount of the rebate.
- (4) That the communications by Union to Algoma and its other customers concerning the uncertainty of the amount of the rebate had no significance.
- (5) That there is no significance to the fact that the Board continues to prevent Union from releasing the rebate to Algoma; put another way, that the Board has no good reason for holding up disposition of the rebate.
- (6) That the amounts of the rebates cannot change as a result of events in 2002.

[25] I am not prepared to say that the motions judge's decision disclosed a palpable and overriding error. Since his decision is supported by the evidence, the evidence supplied by Union itself, this aspect of the appeal must be dismissed.

Equitable set-off

[26] Equitable set-off is available where there is a claim for a sum whether liquidated or unliquidated. In *Telford v. Holt*, [1987] 2 S.C.R. 193, 41 D.L.R. (4th) 385, at pp. 211-12 S.C.R., pp. 398-99 D.L.R., Wilson J., speaking for the court, approved a statement of the applicable principles for equitable set-off found in *Coba Industries Ltd. v. Millie's Holdings (Canada) Ltd. and Tsang* (1985), 20 D.L.R. (4th) 689, 36 R.P.R. 259 (B.C.C.A.) at pp. 696-97 D.L.R. Those principles can be summarized as follows:

1. The party relying on a set-off must show some equitable ground for being protected against the adversary's demands.
2. The equitable ground must go to the very root of the plaintiff's claim.
3. A cross-claim must be so clearly connected with the demand of the plaintiff that it would be manifestly unjust to allow the plaintiff to enforce payment without taking into consideration the cross-claim.
4. The plaintiff's claim and the cross-claim need not arise out of the same contract.

5. Unliquidated claims are on the same footing as liquidated claims.

[27] In one way or another the first three principles, but particularly the third, are in issue in this case. Put shortly, is the 1999 rebate from the 1998 gas services contract so clearly connected with the amounts owing under the 2000 assignment agreement that it would be manifestly unjust to enforce payment of the rebate without taking into account the amounts owing under the assignment agreement? The motions judge recognized that the assignment agreement was integral to the 2000 gas services agreement, but he refused equitable set-off for the amounts owing under the assignment agreement because it was not the same type of contract as the supply of gas by Union. In my view, this was not a sufficient reason to refuse equitable set-off given the interrelationship between the two 2000 agreements.

[28] Kelly R. Palmer in *The Law of Set-Off in Canada* (Aurora, Ont.: Canada Law Book, 1993) traces the evolution of the doctrine of equitable set-off from a very strict test in which the "claim raised in set-off had to impeach the title of the plaintiff's claim" [at p. 89] to a somewhat more flexible approach based upon fairness. The leading cases describing, in some fashion, the more modern test are *Coba Industries; Telford and Federal Commerce & Navigation Ltd. v. Molena Alpha Inc.*, [1978] 3 All E.R. 1066 (C.A.) (affirmed on other grounds at [1979] 1 All E.R. 307, [1979] A.C. 757 (H.L.)).

[29] It seems to me that a very helpful test is set out in a passage from the reasons of Lord Denning in *Federal Commerce* at p. 1078 All E.R. and which was quoted with apparent approval by Wilson J. in *Telford* at pp. 213-14 S.C.R., p. 400 D.L.R.:

We have to ask ourselves: what should we do now so as to ensure fair dealing between the parties? . . . This question must be asked in each case as it arises for decision; and then, from case to case, we shall build up a series of precedents to guide those who come after us. But one thing is quite clear: it is not every cross-claim which can be deducted. It is only cross-claims that arise out of the same transaction or are closely connected with it. And it is only cross-claims which go directly to impeach the plaintiff's demands, that is, so closely connected with his demands that it would be manifestly unjust to allow him to enforce payment without taking into account the cross-claim.

(Emphasis added)

[30] In my view, there is such a close connection between the 2000 gas services contract and the 2000 assignment agreement, that the amounts owing on them cannot be severed for

the purposes of equitable set-off. The assignment agreement is attached as a schedule to the 2000 gas services contract and in the event either of the agreements terminates, the other terminates, unless otherwise agreed to by the parties. The parties agreed in the 2000 gas services contract that it was "contingent upon" the assignment agreement and that the latter formed an integral part of the latter. Accepting the correctness of the motion judge's determination that the 1998 and 2000 gas services contracts exhibit a sufficient degree of connection to justify equitable set-off, it seems to me that it would be manifestly unjust to allow Algoma to insist on payment of the rebate arising under the former without allowing Union to set-off all the amounts owing under the 2000 arrangement.

[31] The relationship between the parties under the 2000 contracts is different than the relationship under the 1998 contract but they are in a sense nothing more than a successor arrangement to accomplish what had been done under the 1998 contract. Admittedly, under the 2000 assignment agreement, the underlying relationship was between TCPL and Union. Union only became entitled to collect from Algoma because Algoma failed to pay the charges that TCPL was entitled to collect from Union. Under the agreement, Algoma agreed to indemnify Union in those circumstances. However, there is a close connection between the 1998 contract and both of the 2000 contracts because they all, in one way or another, facilitate the supply of gas to Algoma.

[32] A helpful example is *Coba Industries*, which was approved by Wilson J. in Telford. Palmer describes the facts of *Coba Industries* at p. 133 of his text:

Hp entered a sale and leaseback of property with the defendant, in the course of which Hp obtained a second mortgage over the property and granted a lease to the defendant. The lease payments were calculated to be sufficient to cover the mortgage payments. Hp assigned the mortgage to the plaintiff who notified the assignment to the defendant. When Hp fell into arrears on the lease, the defendant ceased making mortgage payments. The plaintiff sued for foreclosure, and was met with a claim for set-off.

[33] Macfarlane J.A., writing for the court in *Coba Industries*, found several facts that established the close connection necessary for equitable set-off. He wrote at p. 700 D.L.R.:

I think this evidence demonstrates that, from the outset, it was at the heart of any liability on the part of [the defendant] that [Hp] provide and assure payments under the leases sufficient to satisfy payments from time to time under both mortgages.

[34] The 1998 contract and 2000 agreements exhibit this kind of connection. Given that the motions judge found that it would be manifestly unjust not to permit Union to set off the amounts owing on the 2000 gas services contract, I conclude that it would be manifestly unjust to allow Algoma to enforce payment of the 2000 rebate without taking into account its liability to Union under the assignment agreement, which formed an integral part of the arrangement between the parties.

Disposition

[35] Accordingly, I would allow the appeal with costs on a partial indemnity basis. In accordance with the written submissions of the parties, costs are fixed at \$33,111.29.

Order accordingly.

Gariepy et al. v. Shell Oil Company et al.

[Indexed as: Gariepy v. Shell Oil Co.]

Superior Court of Justice, Nordheimer J. January 2, 2003

Civil procedure — Class proceedings — Appeal — Proposed class proceeding retains its status as such despite dismissal of certification motion as long as appeal from that decision is extant — Action remains subject to provisions of Class Proceedings Act until appeal routes have been exhausted — Motion by defendant for summary judgment following dismissal of certification motion adjourned pending final disposition of all appeals respecting issue of certification — Class Proceedings Act, 1992, S.O. 1992, c. 6.

The plaintiffs' motion to certify their action as a class proceeding under the *Class Proceedings Act, 1992* was dismissed. The plaintiffs appealed. Before the hearing of that appeal, one of the defendants brought a motion for summary judgment. The plaintiffs moved to dismiss the summary judgment motion or, alternatively, to adjourn it until the final determination of the issue of certification.

Held, the plaintiffs' motion should be granted.

A proposed class proceeding does not lose its status as such just because the motion for certification was dismissed, so long as an appeal from that decision is extant. In such circumstances, the action continues to be a proposed class proceeding and remains subject to all of the provisions of the *Class Proceedings Act, 1992* until the appeal routes have been exhausted. Procedural and practical problems may arise if a summary judgment motion proceeds before the issue of certification has been finally disposed of. The appropriate order in the circumstances was to adjourn the motion for summary judgment and to impose a term that it was not to be brought back on for hearing until all appeals respecting the issue of certification were finally disposed of.

TAB 7

2000 CarswellAlta 503, 2000 ABCA 149, 80 Alta. L.R. (3d) 213, 19 C.B.R. (4th) 33, 261 A.R. 120, 225 W.A.C. 120, [2000] A.J. No. 610

2000 CarswellAlta 503

Canadian Airlines Corp., Re

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

In the Matter of the Business Corporations Act (Alberta) S.A. 1981, c.B-15., as amended, Section 185

In the Matter of Canadian Airlines Corporation and Canadian Airlines International Ltd.

Resurgence Asset Management LLC, Applicant and Canadian Airlines Corporation and Canadian Airlines International Ltd., Respondents

Alberta Court of Appeal [In Chambers]

Wittmann J.A.

Heard: May 18, 2000

Judgment: May 29, 2000

Docket: Calgary Appeal 00-18816

© Thomson Reuters Canada Limited or its Licensors. All rights reserved.

Proceedings: (May 12, 2000), Doc. Calgary 0001-05071 [Alta. Q.B.]

Counsel: *D. Haigh, Q.C.*, and *D. Nishimura*, for Applicant.

A.L. Friend, Q.C., and *H.M. Kay, Q.C.*, for Respondents.

S. Dunphy, for Air Canada.

A.J. McConnell, for Bank of Nova Scotia Trust Company of New York and Montreal Trust Co. of Canada.

P.T. McCarthy, Q.C., for Price Waterhouse Coopers.

Subject: Corporate and Commercial; Insolvency

Corporations --- Arrangements and compromises — Under Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act — Miscellaneous issues

Applicant was unsecured creditor of C Corp. — Board appointed by A Corp. caused C Corp. to commence proceedings under CCAA under which A Corp. stood to gain substantial benefits — Proposed plan of compromise and arrangement filed under Act — Order made that classification of creditors not be fragmented to exclude A Corp. as separate class from applicant in terms of unsecured creditors, that A Corp. be entitled to vote on plan pursuant to s. 6 of Act, that there be no separation of unsecured creditors of two divisions of C Corp. for voting

2000 CarswellAlta 503, 2000 ABCA 149, 80 Alta. L.R. (3d) 213, 19 C.B.R. (4th) 33, 261 A.R. 120, 225 W.A.C. 120, [2000] A.J. No. 610

purposes, and that votes in respect of claims assigned to A Corp. be recorded and tabulated separately for purpose of consideration in application for court approval of plan — Applicant brought application for leave to appeal that order — Application dismissed — Decisions of supervising judge under Act entitled to considerable deference — Person seeking leave to appeal required to show error in principle of law or palpable and overriding error of fact — Exercise of discretion by reviewing judge not subject to review so long as discretion exercised judicially — Reviewing judge made no error of law — Applicant failed to make out prima facie meritorious case — Granting of leave would likely unduly hinder progress of action — Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act, R.S.C. 1985, c. C-36, s. 6.

Cases considered by *Wittmann J.A.*:

Blue Range Resource Corp., Re (1999), 244 A.R. 103, 209 W.A.C. 103, 12 C.B.R. (4th) 186 (Alta. C.A.) — referred to

Blue Range Resource Corp., Re, (sub nom. *Blue Range Resources Corp., Re*) 250 A.R. 172, (sub nom. *Blue Range Resources Corp., Re*) 213 W.A.C. 172, 15 C.B.R. (4th) 160, 2000 ABCA 3 (Alta. C.A. [In Chambers]) — referred to

Blue Range Resource Corp., Re (2000), (sub nom. *Blue Range Resources Corp., Re*) 250 A.R. 239, (sub nom. *Blue Range Resources Corp., Re*) 213 W.A.C. 239, 15 C.B.R. (4th) 192 (Alta. C.A. [In Chambers]) — referred to

Fairview Industries Ltd., Re (1991), 11 C.B.R. (3d) 71, (sub nom. *Fairview Industries Ltd., Re (No. 3)*) 109 N.S.R. (2d) 32, (sub nom. *Fairview Industries Ltd., Re (No. 3)*) 297 A.P.R. 32 (N.S. T.D.) — referred to

Med Finance Co. S.A. v. Bank of Montreal (1993), 24 B.C.A.C. 318, 40 W.A.C. 318, 22 C.B.R. (3d) 279 (B.C. C.A.) — referred to

Multitech Warehouse Direct Inc., Re (1995), 32 Alta. L.R. (3d) 62 (Alta. C.A.) — referred to

Norcen Energy Resources Ltd. v. Oakwood Petroleums Ltd. (1988), 64 Alta. L.R. (2d) 139, [1989] 2 W.W.R. 566, 72 C.B.R. (N.S.) 20, 72 C.R. (N.S.) 20 (Alta. Q.B.) — referred to

Northland Properties Ltd., Re (1988), 31 B.C.L.R. (2d) 35, 73 C.B.R. (N.S.) 166 (B.C. S.C.) — referred to

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

NsC Diesel Power Inc., Re (1990), 79 C.B.R. (N.S.) 1, 97 N.S.R. (2d) 295, 258 A.P.R. 295 (N.S. T.D.) — referred to

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

Power Consolidated (China) Pulp Inc. v. British Columbia Resources Investment Corp. (1988), 19 C.P.C. (3d) 396 (B.C. C.A.) — referred to

Royal Bank v. Fracmaster Ltd. (1999), (sub nom. *UTI Energy Corp. v. Fracmaster Ltd.*) 244 A.R. 93, (sub

2000 CarswellAlta 503, 2000 ABCA 149, 80 Alta. L.R. (3d) 213, 19 C.B.R. (4th) 33, 261 A.R. 120, 225 W.A.C. 120, [2000] A.J. No. 610

nom. *UTI Energy Corp. v. Fracmaster Ltd.*) 209 W.A.C. 93, 11 C.B.R. (4th) 230 (Alta. C.A.) — considered

Savage v. Amoco Acquisition Co. (1988), 59 Alta. L.R. (2d) 260, 68 C.B.R. (N.S.) 154, 40 B.L.R. 188, (sub nom. *Amoco Acquisition Co. v. Savage*) 87 A.R. 321 (Alta. C.A.) — referred to

Sklar-Peppler Furniture Corp. v. Bank of Nova Scotia (1991), 8 C.B.R. (3d) 312, 86 D.L.R. (4th) 621 (Ont. Gen. Div.) — referred to

Smoky River Coal Ltd., Re, (sub nom. *Luscar Ltd. v. Smoky River Coal Ltd.*) 237 A.R. 83, (sub nom. *Luscar Ltd. v. Smoky River Coal Ltd.*) 197 W.A.C. 83, 1999 ABCA 62 (Alta. C.A.) — referred to

Smoky River Coal Ltd., Re, 175 D.L.R. (4th) 703, 237 A.R. 326, 197 W.A.C. 326, 71 Alta. L.R. (3d) 1, [1999] 11 W.W.R. 734, 12 C.B.R. (4th) 94 (Alta. C.A.) — considered

Sovereign Life Assurance Co. v. Dodd (1891), [1891-4] All E.R. Rep. 246, [1892] 2 Q.B. 573 (Eng. C.A.) — referred to

Wellington Building Corp., Re, 16 C.B.R. 48, [1934] O.R. 653, [1934] 4 D.L.R. 626 (Ont. S.C.) — referred to

Woodward's Ltd., Re (1993), 20 C.B.R. (3d) 74, 84 B.C.L.R. (2d) 206 (B.C. S.C.) — referred to

Statutes considered:

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

s. 2 "secured creditor" — considered

s. 2 "unsecured creditor" — considered

s. 4 — considered

s. 5 — considered

s. 6 — considered

s. 6(a) — considered

s. 6(b) — considered

s. 13 — considered

APPLICATION for leave to appeal from judgment reported at (2000), 19 C.B.R. (4th) 12 (Alta. Q.B.).

Memorandum of decision. Wittmann J.A.:

Introduction

1 This is an application for leave to appeal the decision of Paperny, J. made on May 12, 2000, pursuant to the *Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act*, R.S.C. 1985, c. C-36, as amended (*CCAA*). The applicant, Resur-

2000 CarswellAlta 503, 2000 ABCA 149, 80 Alta. L.R. (3d) 213, 19 C.B.R. (4th) 33, 261 A.R. 120, 225 W.A.C. 120, [2000] A.J. No. 610

gence Asset Management LLC (Resurgence), is an unsecured creditor by virtue of its holding 58.2 per cent of U.S. \$100,000,000.00 unsecured notes issued by Canadian Airlines Corporation (CAC)

2 CAC and Canadian Airlines International Ltd. (CAIL) (collectively Canadian) commenced proceedings under the *CCAA* on March 24, 2000.

3 A proposed Plan of Compromise and Arrangement (the Plan) has been filed in this matter regarding CAC and CAIL, pursuant to the *CCAA*.

4 The decision of Paperny, J. May 12, 2000 (the Decision) ordered, among other things, that the classification of creditors not be fragmented to exclude Air Canada as a separate class from Resurgence in terms of the unsecured creditors; that Air Canada should be entitled to vote on the Plan pursuant to s. 6 of the *CCAA* at the creditors' meeting to be held May 26, 2000; that there be no separation of unsecured creditors of CAC from unsecured creditors of CAIL for voting purposes; and that votes in respect of claims assigned to Air Canada, be recorded and tabulated separately, for the purpose of consideration in the application for court approval of the Plan (the Fairness Hearing).

Leave to Appeal Under the *CCAA*

5 The section of the *CCAA* governing appeals to this Court is as follows:

13. Except in the Yukon Territory, any person dissatisfied with an order or a decision made under this Act may appeal therefrom on obtaining leave of the judge appealed from or of the court or a judge of the court to which the appeal lies and on such terms as to security and in other respects as the judge or court directs.

6 The criterion to be applied in an application for leave to appeal pursuant to the *CCAA* is not in dispute. The general criterion is embodied in the concept that there must be serious and arguable grounds that are of real and significant interest to the parties: *Re Multitech Warehouse Direct Inc.* (1995), 32 Alta. L.R. (3d) 62 (Alta. C.A.) at 63; *Re Smoky River Coal Ltd.* (1999), 237 A.R. 83 (Alta. C.A.); *Re Blue Range Resource Corp.* (1999), 244 A.R. 103 (Alta. C.A.); *Re Blue Range Resource Corp.* (2000), 15 C.B.R. (4th) 160 (Alta. C.A. [In Chambers]); *Re Blue Range Resource Corp.* (2000), 15 C.B.R. (4th) 192 (Alta. C.A. [In Chambers]).

7 Subsumed in the general criterion are four applicable elements which originated in *Power Consolidated (China) Pulp Inc. v. British Columbia Resources Investment Corp.* (1988), 19 C.P.C. (3d) 396 (B.C. C.A.), and were adopted in *Med Finance Co. S.A. v. Bank of Montreal* (1993), 22 C.B.R. (3d) 279 (B.C. C.A.). McLachlin, J.A. (as she then was) set forth the elements in *Power Consolidated* as follows at p.397:

- (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.

These elements have been considered and applied by this Court, and were not in dispute before me as proper elements of the applicable criterion.

Facts

8 On or about October 19, 1999, Air Canada announced its intention to make a bid for CAC and to proceed to complete a merger subject to a restructuring of Canadian's debt. On or about November 5, 1999, following a ruling by the Quebec Superior Court, a competing offer by Airline Industry Revitalization Co. Inc. was withdrawn and Air Canada indicated that it would proceed with its offer for CAC.

9 On or about November 11, 1999, Air Canada caused the incorporation of 853350 Alberta Ltd. (853350), for the sole purpose of acquiring the majority of the shares of CAC. At the time of incorporation, Air Canada held 10 per cent of the shares of 853350. Paul Farrar, among others, holds the remaining 90 per cent of the shares of 853350.

10 On or about November 11, 1999, Air Canada, through 853350, offered to purchase the outstanding shares of CAC at a price of \$2.00 per share for a total of \$92,000,000.00 for all of the issued and outstanding voting and non-voting shares of CAC.

11 On or about January 4, 2000, Air Canada and 853350 acquired 82 per cent of CAC's outstanding common shares for approximately \$75,000,000.00 plus the preferred shares of CAIL for a purchase price of \$59,000,000.00. Air Canada then replaced the Board of Directors of CAC with its own nominees.

12 Substantially all of the aircraft making up the fleet of Canadian are held by Air Canada through lease arrangements with various lessors or other aircraft financial agencies. These arrangements were the result of negotiations with lessors, jointly conducted by Air Canada and Canadian.

13 In general, these arrangements include the following:

(i) the leases have been renegotiated to reflect contemporary fair market value (or below) based on two independent desk top valuations; and

(ii) the present value of the difference between the financial terms under the previous lease arrangements and the renegotiated fair market value terms was characterized as "unsecured deficiency," reflected in a Promissory Note payable to the lessor from Canadian and assigned by the lessor to Air Canada.

14 In the result, Air Canada has acquired or is in the process of acquiring all but eight of the deficiency claims of aircraft lessors or financiers listed in Schedule "B" to the Plan in the total amount of \$253,506,944.00. Air Canada intends to vote those claims as an unsecured creditor under the Plan.

15 The executory contracts claims listed in Schedule "B" to the Plan total \$110,677,000.00, of which \$108,907,000.00 is the claim of Loyalty Management Group Canada Inc. (Loyalty), an entity with a long term contract with Canadian to purchase air miles. The claim is subject to an agreement of settlement between Loyalty, Canadian and Air Canada. Air Canada was assigned the Loyalty unsecured claim.

16 In the Plan, all unsecured creditors of both CAC and CAI are grouped in the same class for voting purposes.

17 Pursuant to the Plan, unsecured creditors will receive a payment of \$0.12 on the dollar for each \$1.00 of their claim unless the total amount of unsecured claims exceeds \$800 million, in which case, they will receive less. Air Canada will fund this Pro Rata Cash Amount. As a result of the assignments of the deficiency amounts

in favour of Air Canada, if the Plan is approved, Air Canada will notionally be paying a substantial proportion of the Pro Rata Cash Amount to itself.

18 The Plan further contemplates Air Canada becoming the 100 per cent owner of Canadian through 853350.

19 On April 7, 2000, an Order was granted by Paperny, J., directing that the Plan be filed by the Petitioners; establishing a claims dispute process; authorizing the calling of meetings for affected creditors to vote on the Plan to be held on May 26, 2000; authorizing the Petitioners to make application for an Order sanctioning the Plan on June 5, 2000; and providing other directions.

20 The April 7, 2000 Order established three classes of creditors: (a) the holders of Canadian Airlines Corporation 10 per cent Senior Secured Notes due 2005 (the Secured Noteholders); (b) the secured creditors of the Petitioners affected by the Plan (the Affected Secured Creditors); and (c) the unsecured creditors affected by the Plan (the Affected Unsecured Creditors).

21 On April 25, 2000, the Petitioners filed and served the Plan, in accordance with the Order of April 7, 2000. By Notice of Motion dated April 27, 2000, Resurgence brought an application, among other things, seeking "directions as to the classification and voting rights of the creditors ... (and) the quantum of the 'deficiency claims' assigned to Air Canada." Resurgence sought to have Air Canada excluded from voting as an unsecured creditor unless segregated into a separate class. Resurgence also sought to have the holders of the unsecured notes vote as a separate class.

22 The result of the April 27, 2000 motion by Resurgence is the Decision.

The Decision

23 In the Decision, the supervising chambers judge referred to her order of April 14, 2000, wherein she approved transactions involving the re-negotiation of the aircraft leases. She referred to "about \$200,000,000.00 worth of concessions for CAIL" as "concessions or deficiency claims" which were quantified and reflected in promissory notes which were assigned to Air Canada in exchange for its guarantee of the aircraft leases. The monitor approved of the method of quantifying the claims and Paperny, J. approved the transactions, reserving the issue of classification and voting to her May 12 Decision.

24 The Plan provides for one class of unsecured creditor. The unsecured class is composed of a number of types of unsecured claims including executory contracts (e.g. Air Canada from Loyalty) unsecured notes (e.g. Resurgence), aircraft leases (e.g. Air Canada from lessors), litigation claims, real estate leases and the deficiencies, if any, of the senior secured noteholders.

25 In seeking to have Air Canada vote the promissory notes in a separate class Resurgence argued several factors before Paperny, J., as set out at pp. 4-5 of the Decision as follows:

1. The Air Canada appointed board caused Canadian to enter into these *CCAA* proceedings under which Air Canada stands to gain substantial benefits in its own operations and in the merged operations and ownership contemplated after the compromise of debts under the plan.
2. Air Canada is providing the fund of money to be distributed to the Affected Unsecured Creditors and will, therefore, end up paying itself a portion of that money if it is included in the Affected Unsecured Cred-

2000 CarswellAlta 503, 2000 ABCA 149, 80 Alta. L.R. (3d) 213, 19 C.B.R. (4th) 33, 261 A.R. 120, 225 W.A.C. 120, [2000] A.J. No. 610

itors' class and permitted to vote.

3. Air Canada gave no real consideration in acquiring the deficiency claims and manufactured them only to secure a 'yes' vote.

26 She then recited the argument made by Air Canada and Canadian to the effect that the legal rights associated with Air Canada's unsecured claims are the same as those associated with the other affected unsecured claimants, and that the matters raised by Resurgence relating to classification are really matters of fairness more appropriately dealt with in a Fairness Hearing scheduled to be held June 5, 2000.

27 After observing that the *CCAA* offers no guidance with respect to the classification of claims, beyond identifying secured and unsecured categories and the possibility of classes within each category, and that the process has developed in case law, Paperny, J. embarked on a detailed analysis and consideration of the case law in this area including *Norcen Energy Resources Ltd. v. Oakwood Petroleum Ltd.* (1988), 72 C.B.R. (N.S.) 20 (Alta. Q.B.); *Sovereign Life Assurance Co. v. Dodd* (1891), [1892] 2 Q.B. 573 (Eng. C.A.); *Re Fairview Industries Ltd.* (1991), 11 C.B.R. (3d) 71 (N.S. T.D.); *Northland Properties Ltd. v. Excelsior Life Insurance Co. of Canada* (1989), 73 C.B.R. (N.S.) 195 (B.C. C.A.); *Savage v. Amoco Acquisition Co.* (1988), 68 C.B.R. (N.S.) 154 (Alta. C.A.); *Re Woodward's Ltd.* (1993), 84 B.C.L.R. (2d) 206 (B.C. S.C.); *Sklar-Peppler Furniture Corp. v. Bank of Nova Scotia* (1991), 86 D.L.R. (4th) 621 (Ont. Gen. Div.) at 626; *Re NsC Diesel Power Inc.* (1990), 79 C.B.R. (N.S.) 1 (N.S. T.D.); *Re Wellington Building Corp.*, [1934] O.R. 653, 16 C.B.R. 48 (Ont. S.C.). Paperny, J. also referred to an oft-cited article "Reorganization under the Companies Creditors Arrangement Act" by S. E. Edwards (1947), 25 Can. Bar Rev. 587. She concluded her legal analysis at pp.12-13 by setting forth the principles she found to be applicable in assessing commonality of interest as an appropriate test for the classification of creditors:

1. Commonality of interest should be viewed on the basis of the non-fragmentation test, not on an identity of interest test;
2. The interests to be considered are the legal interests the creditor holds qua creditor in relationship to the debtor company, prior to and under the plan as well as on liquidation;
3. The commonality of these interests are to be viewed purposively, bearing in mind the object of the *CCAA*, namely to facilitate reorganizations if at all possible;
4. In placing a broad and purposive interpretation on the *CCAA*, the court should be careful to resist classification approaches which would potentially jeopardize potentially viable plans.
5. Absent bad faith, the motivations of the creditors to approve or disapprove are irrelevant.
6. The requirement of creditors being able to consult together means being able to assess their legal entitlement as creditors before or after the plan in a similar manner.

The Standard of Review and Leave Applications

28 The elements of the general criterion cannot be properly considered in a leave application without regard to the standard of review that this Court applies to appeals under the *CCAA*. If leave to appeal were to be granted, the applicable standard of review is succinctly set forth by Fruman, J.A. in *Royal Bank v. Fracmaster Ltd.* (1999), 244 A.R. 93 (Alta. C.A.) where she stated for the Court at p.95:

2000 CarswellAlta 503, 2000 ABCA 149, 80 Alta. L.R. (3d) 213, 19 C.B.R. (4th) 33, 261 A.R. 120, 225 W.A.C. 120, [2000] A.J. No. 610

... this is a court of review. It is not our task to reconsider the merits of the various offers and decide which proposal might be best. The decisions made by the Chambers judge involve a good measure of discretion, and are owed considerable deference. Whether or not we agree, we will only interfere if we conclude that she acted unreasonably, erred in principle or made a manifest error.

In another recent *CCAA* case from this Court, *Re Smoky River Coal Ltd.* (1999), 237 A.R. 326 (Alta. C.A.), Hunt, J.A., speaking for the unanimous Court, extensively reviewed the history and purpose of the *CCAA*, and observed at p.341:

The fact that an appeal lies only with leave of an appellate court (s. 13 *CCAA*) suggests that Parliament, mindful that *CCAA* cases often require quick decision-making, intended that most decisions be made by the supervising judge. This supports the view that those decisions should be interfered with only in clear cases.

29 The standard of review of this Court, in reviewing the *CCAA* decision of the supervising judge, is therefore one of correctness if there is an error of law. Otherwise, for an appellate court to interfere with the decision of the supervising judge, there must be a palpable and overriding error in the exercise of discretion or in findings of fact.

Statutory Provisions

30 The *CCAA* includes provisions defining secured creditor, unsecured creditor, refers to classes of them, and provides for court approval of a plan of compromise or arrangement in the following sections:

2. Interpretation

.....

"secured creditor" means a holder of a mortgage, hypothec, pledge, charge, lien or privilege on or against, or any assignment, cession or transfer of, all or any property of a debtor company as security for indebtedness of the debtor company, or a holder of any bond of a debtor company secured by a mortgage, hypothec, pledge, charge, lien or privilege on or against, or any assignment, cession or transfer of, or a trust in respect of, all or any property of the debtor company, whether the holder or beneficiary is resident or domiciled within or outside Canada, and a trustee under any trust deed or other instrument securing any of those bonds shall be deemed to be a secured creditor for all purposes of this Act except for the purpose of voting at a creditors' meeting in respect of any of those bonds;

.....

"Unsecured creditor" means any creditor of a company who is not a secured creditor, whether resident or domiciled within or outside Canada, and a trustee for the holders of any unsecured bonds issue under a trust deed or other instrument running in favour of the trustee shall be deemed to be an unsecured creditor for all purposes of this Act except for the purpose of voting at a creditors' meeting in respect of any of those bonds.

Compromises and Arrangements

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 a 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 courts directs.

6. 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 receiving 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.

Classes of Creditors

31 It is apparent from a review of the foregoing sections that division into classes of creditors within the unsecured and secured categories may, in any given case, materially affect the outcome of the vote referenced in section 6. Compliance with section 6 triggers the ability of the court to approve or sanction the Plan and to bind the parties referenced in s. 6(a) and 6(b) of the *CCAA*. In argument before me, it was conceded by the applicant that Resurgence would not have the ability to ensure approval of the Plan by casting its vote if Air Canada were to be excised from the unsecured creditor category into a separate class. Conversely, counsel for Resurgence candidly admitted that Resurgence would effectively have a veto of the Plan if Air Canada were segregated into a separate class of unsecured creditor.

Application of the Criteria for Leave to Appeal

32 The four elements of the general criterion are set out in paragraph [7]. The first and second elements are satisfied in this case. The points raised on appeal are of significance to the action. If Resurgence succeeds, it obtains a veto. If it does not succeed, and it votes as a member of the unsecured creditors class with Air Canada, Air Canada can control the vote of the unsecured creditors.

33 In terms of the points on appeal being of significance to the practice, it may be that an appellate court's views in this province on the classification of unsecured creditors issue is desirable, there being no appellate authority from this Court on this issue. Although I have doubt as to the significance of this element of the general criterion in the context of the facts of this case, I am prepared for the purposes of this application to treat this element as having being satisfied.

34 The third element is whether the appeal is *prima facie* meritorious or, on the other hand, whether it is frivolous. In my view, the proper interpretation of this element is not a mutually exclusive application of an appeal being either meritorious or frivolous. Rather, the appeal must be *prima facie* meritorious; if it is not *prima facie* meritorious, this element is not satisfied.

35 I find that the appeal on the points raised from the Decision is not *prima facie* meritorious. In the plain ordinary meaning of the words of this element, on first impression, there must appear to be an error in principle of law or a palpable and overriding error of fact. Exercise of discretion by a supervising judge, so long as it is exercised judicially, is not a matter for interference by an appellate court, even if the appellate court were inclined to decide the matter another way. It is precisely this kind of a factor which breathes life into the modifier "*prima facie*" meritorious.

36 I have carefully reviewed all of the cases referred to by the supervising chambers judge and the principles she derived from them. In my view, she made no error in law.

37 In the exercise of her discretion, she decided neither to allow the applicant's motion to excise Air Canada from the unsecured creditors class nor to prohibit Air Canada from voting. She also declined, on the facts established before her, to separate creditors of CAC from creditors of CAIL for voting purposes. She did, however, order that Air Canada's vote be recorded and tabulated and indicated that this will be considered at the Fairness Hearing.

38 It was strenuously argued before me by the applicant, that deferring classification and voting issues to the Fairness Hearing was an error of law or principle in and of itself.

39 The argument was put in terms that if, on a proper classification of unsecured creditors, Air Canada was removed from the unsecured class, and Resurgence vetoed the Plan, the matter of a Fairness Hearing would never arise. While that may be true, it does not follow that there is any error in law in what the supervising judge did. She concluded that the separate tabulation of the votes will allow the voice of the unsecured creditors to be heard, while, at the same time, permit, rather than rule out the possibility, that the Plan might proceed. This approach is consistent with the purpose of the *CCAA* as articulated in many of the authorities in this country.

40 The supervising chambers judge also refused to exclude Air Canada from voting on the basis that the legal rights attached to the notes held by Air Canada were valid. Resurgence argued that because Air Canada had other interests in the outcome of the Plan, it should be excluded from voting as an unsegregated secured creditor. Paperny, J. held that this was an issue of fairness, as was the fact that Air Canada was really voting on its own reorganization. She did not err in principle. She expressly acknowledged the authorities that, on different facts, either allowed different classes or excluded a vote. See, for example, *Re Woodward's Ltd.* (1993), 84 B.C.L.R. (2d) 206 (B.C. S.C.); *Re Northland Properties Ltd.* (1988), 73 C.B.R. (N.S.) 166 (B.C. S.C.); *Re NsC Diesel Power Inc.* (1990), 79 C.B.R. (N.S.) 1 (N.S. T.D.).

41 The fourth element of the general criterion is whether the appeal will unduly hinder the progress of the action. In other words, will the delay involved in prosecuting, hearing and deciding the appeal be of such length so as to unduly impede the ultimate resolution of the matter by a vote or court sanction? The approach of the supervising judge to the issues raised by the applicant is that its concerns will be seriously addressed at the Fairness Hearing scheduled for June 5, 2000, pursuant to s.6 of the *CCAA*, provided the creditors vote to adopt the Plan.

2000 CarswellAlta 503, 2000 ABCA 149, 80 Alta. L.R. (3d) 213, 19 C.B.R. (4th) 33, 261 A.R. 120, 225 W.A.C. 120, [2000] A.J. No. 610

42 This element has at its root the purpose of the *CCAA*; the role of the supervising judge; the need for a timely and orderly resolution of the matter; and the effect on the interests of all parties pending a decision on appeal. The comments of McFarlane, J.A. in *Re Pacific National Lease Holding Corp.* (1992), 15 C.B.R. (3d) 265 (B.C. C.A. [In Chambers]) are particularly apt where he stated as follows at p.272:

Despite what I have said, there may be an arguable case for the petitioners to present to a panel of this Court on discreet questions of law. But I am of the view that this Court should exercise its powers sparingly when it is asked to intervene with respect to questions which arise under the C.C.A.A. The process of management which the Act has assigned to the trial Court is an ongoing one. In this case a number of orders have been made. Some, including the one under appeal, have not been settled or entered. Other applications are pending. The process contemplated by the Act is continuing.

A colleague has suggested that a judge exercising a supervisory function under the C.C.A.A. is more like a judge hearing a trial, who makes orders in the course of that trial, than a chambers judge who makes interlocutory or proceedings for which he has no further responsibility.

Also, we know that in a case where a judgment has not been entered, it may be open to a judge to reconsider his or her judgment, and alter its terms. In supervising a proceeding under the C.C.A.A. orders are made, and orders are varied as changing circumstances require. Orders depend upon a careful and delicate balancing of a variety of interests and of problems. In that context appellate proceedings may well upset the balance, and delay or frustrate the process under the C.C.A.A. I do not say that leave will never be granted in a C.C.A.A. proceeding. But the effect upon all parties concerned will be an important consideration in deciding whether leave ought to be granted.

43 In that case, it appears that McFarlane, J.A. was satisfied that the first three elements of the criteria had been met, i.e. that there "may be an arguable case for the petitioners to present to a panel of this court on discrete [sic] questions of law".

44 It was argued before me that an appeal would give rise to an uncertainty of process and a lack of confidence in it; that the creditors, or some of them, may be inclined to withdraw support for the Plan that would otherwise be forthcoming, but for the delay. None of the parties tendered affidavit evidence on this issue.

45 Nowhere in any of the authorities has the issue of onus in meeting the elements the general criterion been prominent. I am of the view that the onus is on the applicant. That onus would include the applicant producing at least some evidence on the fourth element to shift the onus to the respondents, even though it involves proving a negative, i.e. that there will not be any material adverse impact as the result of the delay occasioned by an appeal. That evidence is lacking in this case. It is lacking on both sides but the respondents do not have an initial onus in this regard. Therefore, I find that the fourth element has not been established by the applicant.

46 The last step in a proper analysis in the context of a leave application is to ascribe appropriate weight to each of the elements of the general criterion and decide over all whether the test has been met. In most cases, the last two elements will be more important, and ought to be ascribed more weight than the first two elements. The last two elements here have not been met while the first two arguably have. In the result, I am satisfied that the applicant has not met the threshold for leave to appeal on the basis of the authorities, and I am therefore denying the application.

Conclusion

2000 CarswellAlta 503, 2000 ABCA 149, 80 Alta. L.R. (3d) 213, 19 C.B.R. (4th) 33, 261 A.R. 120, 225 W.A.C. 120, [2000] A.J. No. 610

47 The application for leave to appeal the Decision is dismissed on the basis that there is no *prima facie* meritorious case and that the granting of leave would likely unduly hinder the progress of the action.

Application dismissed.

END OF DOCUMENT

TAB 8

In the Matter of the Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act, R.S.C. 1985, c. C-36, as amended and in the Matter of a Proposed Plan of Compromise or Arrangement with respect to Stelco Inc., and other Applicants listed in Schedule "A" Application under the Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act, R.S.C. 1985, c. C-36 as amended

[Indexed as: Stelco Inc. (Re)]

*Court of Appeal for Ontario, Goudge, Feldman and Blair J.J.A.
March 31, 2005*

Corporations — Directors — Removal of directors — Jurisdiction of court to remove directors — Restructuring supervised by court under Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act — Supervising judge erring in removing directors based on apprehension that directors would not act in best interests of corporation — In context of restructuring, court not having inherent jurisdiction to remove directors — Removal of directors governed by normal principles of corporate law and not by court's authority under s. 11 of Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act to supervise restructuring — Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act, R.S.C. 1985, c. C-36, s. 11.

Debtor and creditor — Arrangements — Removal of directors — Jurisdiction of court to remove directors — Restructuring supervised by court under the Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act — Supervising judge erring in removing directors based on apprehension that directors would not act in best interests of corporation — In context of restructuring, court not having inherent jurisdiction to remove directors — Removal of directors governed by normal principles of corporate law and not by court's authority under s. 11 of Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act to supervise restructuring — Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act, R.S.C. 1985, c. C-36, s. 11.

On January 29, 2004, Stelco Inc. ("Stelco") obtained protection from creditors under the *Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act* ("CCAA"). Subsequently, while a restructuring under the CCAA was under way, Clearwater Capital Management Inc. ("Clearwater") and Equilibrium Capital Management Inc. ("Equilibrium") acquired a 20 per cent holding in the outstanding publicly traded common shares of Stelco. Michael Woollcombe and Roland Keiper, who were associated with Clearwater and Equilibrium, asked to be appointed to the Stelco board of directors, which had been depleted as a result of resignations. Their request was supported by other shareholders who, together with Clearwater and Equilibrium, represented about 40 per cent of the common shareholders. On February 18, 2005, the Board acceded to the request and Woollcombe and Keiper were appointed to the Board. On the same day as their appointments, the board of directors began consideration of competing bids that had been received as a result of a court-approved capital raising process that had become the focus of the CCAA restructuring.

The appointment of Woollcombe and Keiper to the Board incensed the employees of Stelco. They applied to the court to have the appointments set aside. The employees argued that there was a reasonable apprehension that Woollcombe

and Keiper would not be able to act in the best interests of Stelco as opposed to their own best interests as shareholders. Purporting to rely on the court's inherent jurisdiction and the discretion provided by the CCAA, on February 25, 2005, Farley J. ordered Woollcombe and Keiper removed from the Board.

Woollcombe and Keiper applied for leave to appeal the order of Farley J. and if leave be granted, that the order be set aside on the grounds that (a) Farley J. did not have the jurisdiction to make the order under the provisions of the CCAA, (b) even if he did have jurisdiction, the reasonable apprehension of bias test had no application to the removal of directors, (c) he had erred in interfering with the exercise by the Board of its business judgment in filling the vacancies on the Board, and (d) in any event, the facts did not meet any test that would justify the removal of directors by a court.

Held, leave to appeal should be granted, and the appeal should be allowed.

The appeal involved the scope of a judge's discretion under s. 11 of the CCAA, in the context of corporate governance decisions made during the course of the plan negotiating and approval process of the CCAA. In particular, it involved the court's power, if any, to make an order removing directors under s. 11 of the CCAA. The order to remove directors could not be founded on inherent jurisdiction. Inherent jurisdiction is a power derived from the very nature of the court as a superior court of law, and it permits the court to maintain its authority and to prevent its process from being obstructed and abused. However, inherent jurisdiction does not operate where Parliament or the legislature has acted and, in the CCAA context, the discretion given by s. 11 to stay proceedings against the debtor corporation and the discretion given by s. 6 to approve a plan which appears to be reasonable and fair supplanted the need to resort to inherent jurisdiction. A judge is generally exercising the court's statutory discretion under s. 11 of the Act when supervising a CCAA proceeding. The order in this case could not be founded on inherent jurisdiction because it was designed to supervise the company's process, not the court's process.

The issue then was the nature of the court's power under s. 11 of the CCAA. The s. 11 discretion is not open-ended and unfettered. Its exercise was guided by the scheme and object of the Act and by the legal principles that govern corporate law issues. What the court does under s. 11 is establish the boundaries of the playing field and act as a referee in the process. The company's role in the restructuring, and that of its stakeholders, is to work out a plan or compromise that a sufficient percentage of creditors will accept and the court will approve and sanction. In the course of acting as referee, the court has authority to effectively maintain the status quo in respect of an insolvent company while it attempts to gain the approval of its creditors for the proposed compromise or arrangement which will be to the benefit of both the company and its creditors. The court is not entitled to usurp the role of the directors and management in conducting what are in substance the company's restructuring efforts. The corporate activities that take place in the course of the workout are governed by the legislation and legal principles that normally apply to such activities. The court is not catapulted into the shoes of the board of directors or into the seat of the chair of the board when acting in its supervisory role in the restructuring.

The matters relating to the removal of directors did not fall within the court's discretion under s. 11. The fact that s. 11 did not itself provide the authority for a CCAA judge to order the removal of directors, however, did not mean that the supervising judge was powerless to make such an order. Section 20 of the CCAA offered a gateway to the oppression remedy and other provisions of the *Canada*

Business Corporations Act, R.S.C. 1985, c. C-44 ("CBCA") and similar provincial statutes. The powers of a judge under s. 11 of the CCAA may be applied together with the provisions of the CBCA, including the oppression remedy provisions of that statute.

Court removal of directors is an exceptional remedy and one that is rarely exercised in corporate law. In determining whether directors have fallen foul of their obligations, more than some risk of anticipated misconduct is required before the court can impose the extraordinary remedy of removing a director from his or her duly elected or appointed office. The evidence in this case was far from reaching the standard for removal, and the record would not support a finding of oppression, even if one had been sought. The record did not support a finding that there was a sufficient risk of misconduct to warrant a conclusion of oppression. Further, Farley J.'s borrowing the administrative law notion of apprehension of bias was foreign to the principles that govern the election, appointment and removal of directors and to corporate governance considerations in general. There was nothing in the CBCA or other corporate legislation that envisaged the screening of directors in advance for their ability to act neutrally, in the best interests of the corporation, as a prerequisite for appointment. The issue to be determined was not whether there was a connection between a director and other shareholders or stakeholders, but rather whether there was some conduct on the part of the director that would justify the imposition of a corrective sanction. An apprehension of bias approach did not fit this sort of analysis.

For these reasons, Farley J. erred in declaring the appointment of Woollcombe and Keiper as directors of Stelco of no force and effect, and the appeal should be allowed.

Cases referred to

Alberta Pacific Terminals Ltd. (Re), [1991] B.C.J. No. 1065, 8 C.B.R. (3d) 99 (S.C.); *Algoma Steel Inc. (Re)*, [2001] O.J. No. 1943, 147 O.A.C. 291, 25 C.B.R. (4th) 194 (C.A.); *Algoma Steel Inc. v. Union Gas Ltd.* (2003), 63 O.R. (3d) 78, [2003] O.J. No. 71, 39 C.B.R. (4th) 5 (C.A.), revg in part [2001] O.J. No. 5046, 30 C.B.R. (4th) 163 (S.C.J.); *Babcock & Wilcox Canada Ltd. (Re)* [2000] O.J. No. 786, 18 C.B.R. (4th) 157, 5 B.L.R. (3d) 75 (S.C.J.); *Baxter Student Housing Ltd. v. College Housing Co-operative Ltd.*, [1976] 2 S.C.R. 475, 57 D.L.R. (3d) 1, 5 N.R. 515, [1976] 1 W.W.R. 1, 20 C.B.R. (N.S.) 240; *Blair v. Consolidated Enfield Corp.*, [1995] 4 S.C.R. 5, [1995] S.C.J. No. 29, 25 O.R. (3d) 480n, 128 D.L.R. (4th) 73, 187 N.R. 241, 24 B.L.R. (2d) 161; *Brant Investments Ltd. v. KeepRite Inc.* (1991), 3 O.R. (3d) 289, [1991] O.J. No. 683, 45 O.A.C. 320, 80 D.L.R. (4th) 161, 1 B.L.R. (2d) 225 (C.A.); *Catalyst Fund General Partner I Inc. v. Hollinger Inc.*, [2004] O.J. No. 4722, 1 B.L.R. (4th) 186 (S.C.J.); *Chef Ready Foods Ltd. v. Hongkong Bank of Canada*, [1990] B.C.J. No. 2384, 51 B.C.L.R. (2d) 84, [1991] 2 W.W.R. 136, 4 C.B.R. (3d) 311 (C.A.); *Clear Creek Contracting Ltd. v. Skeena Cellulose Inc.* [2003] B.C.J. No. 1335, 43 C.B.R. (4th) 187, 2003 BCCA 344, 13 B.C.L.R. (4th) 236 (C.A.); *Country Style Foods Services Inc. (Re)*, [2002] O.J. No. 1377, 158 O.A.C. 30 (C.A.); *Dylex Ltd. (Re)*, [1995] O.J. No. 595, 31 C.B.R. (3d) 106 (Gen. Div.); *Ivaco Inc. (Re)*, [2004] O.J. No. 2483, 3 C.B.R. (5th) 33 (S.C.J.); *Lehndorff General Partner Ltd. (Re)*, [1993] O.J. No. 14, 9 B.L.R. (2d) 275, 17 C.B.R. (3d) 24 (Gen. Div.); *London Finance Corp. Ltd. v. Banking Service Corp. Ltd.*, [1922] O.J. No. 378, 23 O.W.N. 138 (H.C.); *Olympia & York Developments Ltd. (Re)* (1993), 12 O.R. (3d) 500, [1993] O.J. No. 545, 17 C.B.R. (3d) 1 (Gen. Div.) (*sub nom. Olympia & York Dev. v. Royal Trust Co.*); *Peoples Department Stores Inc. (Trustee of) v. Wise*, [2004] 3 S.C.R. 461, [2004] S.C.J. No. 64, 244 D.L.R. (4th) 564, 2004 SCC 68, 49 B.L.R. (3d) 165, 4 C.B.R. (5th) 215; *R. v. Sharpe*, [2001] 1 S.C.R. 45, [2001]

S.C.J. No. 3, 88 B.C.L.R. (3d) 1, 194 D.L.R. (4th) 1, [2001] 6 W.W.R. 1, 86 C.R.R. (2d) 1, 150 C.C.C. (3d) 321, 39 C.R. (5th) 72, [2001] SCC 2; *Richtree Inc. (Re)* (2005), 74 O.R. (3d) 174, [2005] O.J. No. 251, 7 C.B.R. (5th) 294 (S.C.J.); *Rizzo & Rizzo Shoes Ltd. (Re)*, [1998] 1 S.C.R. 27, [1998] S.C.J. No. 2, 36 O.R. (3d) 418n, 154 D.L.R. (4th) 193, 221 N.R. 241, 50 C.B.R. (3d) 163, 33 C.C.E.L. (2d) 173, 98 CLLC 210-006 (sub nom. *Ontario Ministry of Labour v. Rizzo & Rizzo Shoes Ltd.*, *Adrien v. Ontario Ministry of Labour*); *Royal Oak Mines Inc. (Re)*, [1999] O.J. No. 864, 7 C.B.R. (4th) 293, 96 O.T.C. 279 (Gen. Div.); *Sammi Atlas Inc. (Re)*, [1998] O.J. No. 1089, 3 C.B.R. (4th) 171 (Gen. Div.); *Stephenson v. Vokes* (1896), 27 O.R. 691, [1896] O.J. No. 191 (H.C.J.); *Westar Mining Ltd. (Re)*, [1992] B.C.J. No. 1360, 14 C.B.R. (3d) 88, 70 B.C.L.R. (2d) 6, [1992] 6 W.W.R. 331 (S.C.)

Statutes referred to

Canada Business Corporations Act, R.S.C. 1985, c. C-44, ss. 2 [as am.], 102 [as am.], 106(3) [as am.], 109(1) [as am.], 111 [as am.], 122(1) [as am.], 145 [as am.], 241 [as am.]

Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act, R.S.C. 1985, c. C-36, ss. 11 [as am.], 20 [as am.]

Authorities referred to

Driedger, E.A., *The Construction of Statutes*, 2nd ed. (Toronto: Butterworths, 1983)

Halsbury's Laws of England, 4th ed. (London: LexisNexis UK, 1973-)

Jacob, I.H., "The Inherent Jurisdiction of the Court" (1970) 23 *Current Legal Problems* 27-28

Peterson, D.H., *Shareholder Remedies in Canada*, looseleaf (Markham: LexisNexis—Butterworths, 1989)

Sullivan, R., *Sullivan and Driedger on the Construction of Statutes*, 4th ed. (Toronto: Butterworths, 2002)

APPLICATION for leave to appeal and, if leave is granted, an appeal from the order of Farley J., reported at [2005] O.J. No. 729, 7 C.B.R. (5th) 307 (S.C.J.), removing two directors from the board of directors of Stelco Inc.

Jeffrey S. Leon and Richard B. Swan, for appellants Michael Woollcombe and Roland Keiper.

Kenneth T. Rosenberg and Robert A. Centa, for respondent United Steelworkers of America.

Murray Gold and Andrew J. Hatnay, for respondent Retired Salaried Beneficiaries of Stelco Inc., CHT Steel Company Inc., Stelpipe Ltd., Stelwire Ltd. And Welland Pipe Ltd.

Michael C.P. McCreary and Carrie L. Clynick, for USWA Locals 5328 and 8782.

John R. Varley, for Active Salaried Employee Representative.

Michael Barrack, for Stelco Inc.

Peter Griffin, for Board of Directors of Stelco Inc.

K. Mahar, for Monitor.

David R. Byers, for CIT Business Credit, Agent for DIP Lender.

The judgment of the court was delivered by

BLAIR J.A.: —

Part I — Introduction

[1] Stelco Inc. and four of its wholly-owned subsidiaries obtained protection from their creditors under the *Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act* (the "CCAA")¹ on January 29, 2004. Since that time, the Stelco Group has been engaged in a high profile, and sometimes controversial, process of economic restructuring. Since October 2004, the restructuring has revolved around a court-approved capital raising process which, by February 2005, had generated a number of competitive bids for the Stelco Group.

[2] Farley J., an experienced judge of the Superior Court Commercial List in Toronto, has been supervising the CCAA process from the outset.

[3] The appellants, Michael Woollcombe and Roland Keiper, are associated with two companies — Clearwater Capital Management Inc. and Equilibrium Capital Management Inc. — which, respectively, hold approximately 20 per cent of the outstanding publicly traded common shares of Stelco. Most of these shares have been acquired while the CCAA process has been ongoing, and Messrs. Woollcombe and Keiper have made it clear publicly that they believe there is good shareholder value in Stelco in spite of the restructuring. The reason they are able to take this position is that there has been a solid turn around in worldwide steel markets, as a result of which Stelco, although remaining in insolvency protection, is earning annual operating profits.

[4] The Stelco board of directors (the "Board") has been depleted as a result of resignations, and in January of this year Messrs. Woollcombe and Keiper expressed an interest in being appointed to the Board. They were supported in this request by other shareholders who, together with Clearwater and Equilibrium, represent about 40 per cent of the Stelco common shareholders. On February 18, 2005, the Board appointed the appellants directors. In announcing the appointments publicly, Stelco said in a press release:

After careful consideration, and given potential recoveries at the end of the company's restructuring process, the Board responded favourably to the requests by making the appointments announced today.

Richard Drouin, Chairman of Stelco's Board of Directors, said: "I'm pleased to welcome Roland Keiper and Michael Woollcombe to the Board. Their

¹ R.S.C. 1985, c. C-36, as amended.

experience and their perspective will assist the Board as it strives to serve the best interests of all our stakeholders. We look forward to their positive contribution."

[5] On the same day, the Board began its consideration of the various competing bids that had been received through the capital raising process.

[6] The appointments of the appellants to the Board incensed the employee stakeholders of Stelco (the "Employees"), represented by the respondent Retired Salaried Beneficiaries of Stelco and the respondent United Steelworkers of America ("USWA"). Outstanding pension liabilities to current and retired employees are said to be Stelco's largest long-term liability — exceeding several billion dollars. The Employees perceive they do not have the same, or very much, economic leverage in what has sometimes been referred to as "the bare knuckled arena" of the restructuring process. At the same time, they are amongst the most financially vulnerable stakeholders in the piece. They see the appointments of Messrs. Woollcombe and Keiper to the Board as a threat to their well being in the restructuring process because the appointments provide the appellants, and the shareholders they represent, with direct access to sensitive information relating to the competing bids to which other stakeholders (including themselves) are not privy.

[7] The Employees fear that the participation of the two major shareholder representatives will tilt the bid process in favour of maximizing shareholder value at the expense of bids that might be more favourable to the interests of the Employees. They sought and obtained an order from Farley J. removing Messrs. Woollcombe and Keiper from their short-lived position of directors, essentially on the basis of that apprehension.

[8] The Employees argue that there is a reasonable apprehension the appellants would not be able to act in the best interests of the corporation — as opposed to their own best interests as shareholders — in considering the bids. They say this is so because of prior public statements by the appellants about enhancing shareholder value in Stelco, because of the appellants' linkage to such a large shareholder group, because of their earlier failed bid in the restructuring, and because of their opposition to a capital proposal made in the proceeding by Deutsche Bank (known as the "Stalking Horse Bid"). They submit further that the appointments have poisoned the atmosphere of the restructuring process, and that the Board made the appointments under threat of facing a potential shareholders' meeting where the members of the Board would be replaced en masse.

[9] On the other hand, Messrs. Woollcombe and Keiper seek to set aside the order of Farley J. on the grounds that (a) he did not have the jurisdiction to make the order under the provisions of the CCAA, (b) even if he did have jurisdiction, the reasonable apprehension of bias test applied by the motion judge has no application to the removal of directors, (c) the motion judge erred in interfering with the exercise by the Board of its business judgment in filling the vacancies on the Board, and (d) the facts do not meet any test that would justify the removal of directors by a court in any event.

[10] For the reasons that follow, I would grant leave to appeal, allow the appeal and order the reinstatement of the applicants to the Board.

Part II — Additional Facts

[11] Before the initial CCAA order on January 29, 2004, the shareholders of Stelco had last met at their annual general meeting on April 29, 2003. At that meeting they elected 11 directors to the Board. By the date of the initial order, three of those directors had resigned, and on November 30, 2004, a fourth did as well, leaving the company with only seven directors.

[12] Stelco's articles provide for the Board to be made up of a minimum of ten and a maximum of 20 directors. Consequently, after the last resignation, the company's corporate governance committee began to take steps to search for new directors. They had not succeeded in finding any prior to the approach by the appellants in January 2005.

[13] Messrs. Woollcombe and Keiper had been accumulating shares in Stelco and had been participating in the CCAA proceedings for some time before their request to be appointed to the Board, through their companies, Clearwater and Equilibrium. Clearwater and Equilibrium are privately held, Ontario-based investment management firms. Mr. Keiper is the president of Equilibrium and associated with Clearwater. Mr. Woollcombe is a consultant to Clearwater. The motion judge found that they "come as a package".

[14] In October 2004, Stelco sought court approval of its proposed method of raising capital. On October 19, 2004, Farley J. issued what has been referred to as the Initial Capital Process Order. This order set out a process by which Stelco, under the direction of the Board, would solicit bids, discuss the bids with stakeholders, evaluate the bids and report on the bids to the court.

[15] On November 9, 2004, Clearwater and Equilibrium announced they had formed an investor group and had made a

capital proposal to Stelco. The proposal involved the raising of \$125 million through a rights offering. Mr. Keiper stated at the time that he believed "the value of Stelco's equity would have the opportunity to increase substantially if Stelco emerged from CCAA while minimizing dilution of its shareholders." The Clearwater proposal was not accepted.

[16] A few days later, on November 14, 2004, Stelco approved the Stalking Horse Bid. Clearwater and Equilibrium opposed the Deutsche Bank proposal. Mr. Keiper criticized it for not providing sufficient value to existing shareholders. However, on November 29, 2004, Farley J. approved the Stalking Horse Bid and amended the Initial Capital Process Order accordingly. The order set out the various channels of communication between Stelco, the monitor, potential bidders and the stakeholders. It provided that members of the Board were to see the details of the different bids before the Board selected one or more of the offers.

[17] Subsequently, over a period of two and a half months, the shareholding position of Clearwater and Equilibrium increased from approximately five per cent as at November 19, to 14.9 per cent as at January 25, 2005, and finally to approximately 20 per cent on a fully diluted basis as at January 31, 2005. On January 25, Clearwater and Equilibrium announced that they had reached an understanding jointly to pursue efforts to maximize shareholder value at Stelco. A press release stated:

Such efforts will include seeking to ensure that the interests of Stelco's equity holders are appropriately protected by its board of directors and, ultimately, that Stelco's equity holders have an appropriate say, by vote or otherwise, in determining the future course of Stelco.

[18] On February 1, 2005, Messrs. Keiper and Woollcombe and other representatives of Clearwater and Equilibrium met with Mr. Drouin and other Board members to discuss their views of Stelco and a fair outcome for all stakeholders in the proceedings. Mr. Keiper made a detailed presentation, as Mr. Drouin testified, "encouraging the Board to examine how Stelco might improve its value through enhanced disclosure and other steps". Mr. Keiper expressed confidence that "there was value to the equity of Stelco", and added that he had backed this view up by investing millions of dollars of his own money in Stelco shares. At that meeting, Clearwater and Equilibrium requested that Messrs. Woollcombe and Keiper be added to the Board and to Stelco's restructuring committee. In this respect, they were supported by other shareholders holding about another 20 per cent of the company's common shares.

[19] At paras. 17 and 18 of his affidavit, Mr. Drouin, summarized his appraisal of the situation:

17. It was my assessment that each of Mr. Keiper and Mr. Woollcombe had personal qualities which would allow them to make a significant contribution to the Board in terms of their backgrounds and their knowledge of the steel industry generally and Stelco in particular. In addition I was aware that their appointment to the Board was supported by approximately 40 per cent of the shareholders. In the event that these shareholders successfully requisitioned a shareholders meeting they were in a position to determine the composition of the entire Board.

18. I considered it essential that there be continuity of the Board through the CCAA process. I formed the view that the combination of existing Board members and these additional members would provide Stelco with the most appropriate board composition in the circumstances. The other members of the Board also shared my views.

[20] In order to ensure that the appellants understood their duties as potential Board members and, particularly that "they would no longer be able to consider only the interests of shareholders alone but would have fiduciary responsibilities as a Board member to the corporation as a whole", Mr. Drouin and others held several further meetings with Mr. Woollcombe and Mr. Keiper. These discussions "included areas of independence, standards, fiduciary duties, the role of the Board Restructuring Committee and confidentiality matters". Mr. Woollcombe and Mr. Keiper gave their assurances that they fully understood the nature and extent of their prospective duties, and would abide by them. In addition, they agreed and confirmed that:

- (a) Mr. Woollcombe would no longer be an advisor to Clearwater and Equilibrium with respect to Stelco;
- (b) Clearwater and Equilibrium would no longer be represented by counsel in the CCAA proceedings; and
- (c) Clearwater and Equilibrium then had no involvement in, and would have no future involvement, in any bid for Stelco.

[21] On the basis of the foregoing — and satisfied "that Messrs. Keiper and Woollcombe would make a positive contribution to the various issues before the Board both in [the] restructuring and the ongoing operation of the business" — the Board made the appointments on February 18, 2005.

[22] Seven days later, the motion judge found it "appropriate, just, necessary and reasonable to declare" those appointments "to be of no force and effect" and to remove Messrs. Woollcombe and Keiper from the Board. He did so not on the basis of any actual conduct on the part of the appellants as directors of Stelco but

because there was some risk of anticipated conduct in the future. The gist of the motion judge's rationale is found in the following passage from his reasons (at para. 23):

In these particular circumstances and aside from the Board feeling coerced into the appointments for the sake of continuing stability, I am not of the view that it would be appropriate to wait and see if there was any explicit action on behalf of K and W while conducting themselves as Board members which would demonstrate that they had not lived up to their obligations to be "neutral". They may well conduct themselves beyond reproach. But if they did not, the fallout would be very detrimental to Stelco and its ability to successfully emerge. What would happen to the bids in such a dogfight? I fear that it would be trying to put Humpty Dumpty back together again. The same situation would prevail even if K and W conducted themselves beyond reproach but with the Board continuing to be concerned that they not do anything seemingly offensive to the bloc. The risk to the process and to Stelco in its emergence is simply too great to risk the wait and see approach.

Part III — Leave to Appeal

[23] Because of the "real time" dynamic of this restructuring project, Laskin J.A. granted an order on March 4, 2005, expediting the appellants' motion for leave to appeal, directing that it be heard orally and, if leave be granted, directing that the appeal be heard at the same time. The leave motion and the appeal were argued together, by order of the panel, on March 18, 2005.

[24] This court has said that it will only sparingly grant leave to appeal in the context of a CCAA proceeding and will only do so where there are "serious and arguable grounds that are of real and significant interest to the parties": *Country Style Food Services Inc. (Re)*, [2002] O.J. No. 1377, 158 O.A.C. 30 (C.A.), at para. 15. This criterion is determined in accordance with a four-pronged test, namely,

- (a) whether the point on appeal is of significance to the practice;
- (b) whether the point is of significance to the action;
- (c) whether the appeal is *prima facie* meritorious or frivolous;
- (d) whether the appeal will unduly hinder the progress of the action.

[25] Counsel agree that (d) above is not relevant to this proceeding, given the expedited nature of the hearing. In my view, the tests set out in (a) – (c) are met in the circumstances, and as such, leave should be granted. The issue of the court's jurisdiction to intervene in corporate governance issues during a CCAA restructuring, and the scope of its discretion in doing so, are questions of considerable importance to the practice and on

which there is little appellate jurisprudence. While Messrs. Woollcombe and Keiper are pursuing their remedies in their own right, and the company and its directors did not take an active role in the proceedings in this court, the Board and the company did stand by their decision to appoint the new directors at the hearing before the motion judge and in this court, and the question of who is to be involved in the Board's decision-making process continues to be of importance to the CCAA proceedings. From the reasons that follow it will be evident that in my view the appeal has merit.

[26] Leave to appeal is therefore granted.

Part IV — The Appeal

The Positions of the Parties

[27] The appellants submit that,

- (a) in exercising its discretion under the CCAA, the court is not exercising its "inherent jurisdiction" as a superior court;
- (b) there is no jurisdiction under the CCAA to remove duly elected or appointed directors, notwithstanding the broad discretion provided by s. 11 of that Act; and that,
- (c) even if there is jurisdiction, the motion judge erred:
 - (i) by relying upon the administrative law test for reasonable apprehension of bias in determining that the directors should be removed;
 - (ii) by rejecting the application of the "business judgment" rule to the unanimous decision of the Board to appoint two new directors; and,
 - (iii) by concluding that Clearwater and Equilibrium, the shareholders with whom the appellants are associated, were focussed solely on a short-term investment horizon, without any evidence to that effect, and therefore concluding that there was a tangible risk that the appellants would not be neutral and act in the best interests of Stelco and all stakeholders in carrying out their duties as directors.

[28] The respondents' arguments are rooted in fairness and process. They say, first, that the appointment of the appellants as directors has poisoned the atmosphere of the CCAA proceedings and, second, that it threatens to undermine the even-handedness and integrity of the capital raising process, thus jeopardizing the

ability of the court at the end of the day to approve any compromise or arrangement emerging from that process. The respondents contend that Farley J. had jurisdiction to ensure the integrity of the CCAA process, including the capital raising process Stelco had asked him to approve, and that this court should not interfere with his decision that it was necessary to remove Messrs. Woollcombe and Keiper from the Board in order to ensure the integrity of that process. A judge exercising a supervisory function during a CCAA proceeding is owed considerable deference: *Re Algoma Steel Inc.*, [2001] O.J. No. 1943, 25 C.B.R. (4th) 194 (C.A.), at para. 8.

[29] The crux of the respondents' concern is well-articulated in the following excerpt from para. 72 of the factum of the Retired Salaried Beneficiaries:

The appointments of Keiper and Woollcombe violated every tenet of fairness in the restructuring process that is supposed to lead to a plan of arrangement. One stakeholder group — particular investment funds that have acquired Stelco shares during the CCAA itself — have been provided with privileged access to the capital raising process, and voting seats on the Corporation's Board of Directors and Restructuring Committee. No other stakeholder has been treated in remotely the same way. To the contrary, the salaried retirees have been completely excluded from the capital raising process and have no say whatsoever in the Corporation's decision-making process.

[30] The respondents submit that fairness, and the perception of fairness, underpin the CCAA process, and depend upon effective judicial supervision: see *Re Olympia & York Development Ltd.* (1993), 12 O.R. (3d) 500, [1993] O.J. No. 545 (Gen. Div.); *Re Ivaco Inc.*, [2004] O.J. No. 2483, 3 C.B.R. (5th) 33 (S.C.J.), at paras. 15-16. The motion judge reasonably decided to remove the appellants as directors in the circumstances, they say, and this court should not interfere.

Jurisdiction

[31] The motion judge concluded that he had the power to rescind the appointments of the two directors on the basis of his "inherent jurisdiction" and "the discretion given to the court pursuant to the CCAA". He was not asked to, nor did he attempt to rest his jurisdiction on other statutory powers imported into the CCAA.

[32] The CCAA is remedial legislation and is to be given a liberal interpretation to facilitate its objectives: *Babcock & Wilcox Canada Ltd. (Re)*, [2000] O.J. No. 786, 5 B.L.R. (3d) 75 (S.C.J.), at para. 11. See also, *Chef Ready Foods Ltd. v. Hong Kong Bank of Canada*, [1990] B.C.J. No. 2384, 4 C.B.R. (3d) 311 (C.A.), at p. 320 C.B.R.; *Re Lehndorff General Partners Ltd.*, [1993] O.J. No. 14,

17 C.B.R. (3d) 24 (Gen. Div.). Courts have adopted this approach in the past to rely on inherent jurisdiction, or alternatively on the broad jurisdiction under s. 11 of the CCAA, as the source of judicial power in a CCAA proceeding to “fill in the gaps” or to “put flesh on the bones” of that Act: see *Re Dylex Ltd.*, [1995] O.J. No. 595, 31 C.B.R. (3d) 106 (Gen. Div. (Commercial List)), *Royal Oak Mines Inc. (Re)*, [1999] O.J. No. 864, 7 C.B.R. (4th) 293 (Gen. Div. (Commercial List)); and *Westar Mining Ltd. (Re)*, [1992] B.C.J. No. 1360, 70 B.C.L.R. (2d) 6 (S.C.).

[33] It is not necessary, for purposes of this appeal, to determine whether inherent jurisdiction is excluded for all supervisory purposes under the CCAA, by reason of the existence of the statutory discretionary regime provided in that Act. In my opinion, however, the better view is that in carrying out his or her supervisory functions under the legislation, the judge is not exercising inherent jurisdiction but rather the statutory discretion provided by s. 11 of the CCAA and supplemented by other statutory powers that may be imported into the exercise of the s. 11 discretion from other statutes through s. 20 of the CCAA.

Inherent jurisdiction

[34] Inherent jurisdiction is a power derived “from the very nature of the court as a superior court of law”, permitting the court “to maintain its authority and to prevent its process being obstructed and abused”. It embodies the authority of the judiciary to control its own process and the lawyers and other officials connected with the court and its process, in order “to uphold, to protect and to fulfill the judicial function of administering justice according to law in a regular, orderly and effective manner”. See I.H. Jacob, “The Inherent Jurisdiction of the Court” (1970) 23 *Current Legal Problems* 27-28. In *Halsbury’s Laws of England*, 4th ed. (London: LexisNexis UK, 1973–), vol. 37, at para. 14, the concept is described as follows:

In sum, it may be said that the inherent jurisdiction of the court is a virile and viable doctrine, and has been defined as being the reserve or fund of powers, a residual source of powers, which the court may draw upon as necessary whenever it is just or equitable to do so, in particular to ensure the observation of the due process of law, to prevent improper vexation or oppression, to do justice between the parties and to secure a fair trial between them.

[35] In spite of the expansive nature of this power, inherent jurisdiction does not operate where Parliament or the legislature has acted. As Farley J. noted in *Royal Oak Mines, supra*, inherent jurisdiction is “not limitless; if the legislative body has not left a functional gap or vacuum, then inherent jurisdiction should

not be brought into play" (para. 4). See also, *Baxter Student Housing Ltd. v. College Housing Co-operative Ltd.*, [1976] 2 S.C.R. 475, 57 D.L.R. (3d) 1, at p. 480 S.C.R.; *Richtree Inc. (Re)* (2005), 74 O.R. (3d) 174, [2005] O.J. No. 251 (S.C.J.).

[36] In the CCAA context, Parliament has provided a statutory framework to extend protection to a company while it holds its creditors at bay and attempts to negotiate a compromised plan of arrangement that will enable it to emerge and continue as a viable economic entity, thus benefiting society and the company in the long run, along with the company's creditors, shareholders, employees and other stakeholders. The s. 11 discretion is the engine that drives this broad and flexible statutory scheme, and that for the most part supplants the need to resort to inherent jurisdiction. In that regard, I agree with the comment of Newbury J.A. in *Clear Creek Contracting Ltd. v. Skeena Cellulose Inc.*, [2003] B.C.J. No. 1335, 43 C.B.R. (4th) 187 (C.A.), at para. 46, that:

... the court is not exercising a power that arises from its nature as a superior court of law, but is exercising the discretion given to it by the CCAA. . . . This is the discretion, given by s. 11, to stay proceedings against the debtor corporation and the discretion, given by s. 6, to approve a plan which appears to be reasonable and fair, to be in accord with the requirements and objects of the statute, and to make possible the continuation of the corporation as a viable entity. It is these considerations the courts have been concerned with in the cases discussed above,² rather than the integrity of their own process.

[37] As Jacob observes, in his article "The Inherent Jurisdiction of the Court", *supra*, at p. 25:

The inherent jurisdiction of the court is a concept which must be distinguished from the exercise of judicial discretion. These two concepts resemble each other, particularly in their operation, and they often appear to overlap, and are therefore sometimes confused the one with the other. There is nevertheless a vital juridical distinction between jurisdiction and discretion, which must always be observed.

[38] I do not mean to suggest that inherent jurisdiction can never apply in a CCAA context. The court retains the ability to control its own process, should the need arise. There is a distinction, however — difficult as it may be to draw — between the *court's* process with respect to the restructuring, on the one hand, and the course of action involving the negotiations and corporate actions accompanying them, which are the *company's* process, on the other hand. The court simply supervises the latter

² The reference is to the decisions in *Dyle*, *Royal Oak Mines* and *Westar*, cited above.

process through its ability to stay, restrain or prohibit proceedings against the company during the plan negotiation period “on such terms as it may impose”.³ Hence the better view is that a judge is generally exercising the court’s statutory discretion under s. 11 of the Act when supervising a CCAA proceeding. The order in this case could not be founded on inherent jurisdiction because it is designed to supervise the company’s process, not the court’s process.

The section 11 discretion

[39] This appeal involves the scope of a supervisory judge’s discretion under s. 11 of the CCAA, in the context of corporate governance decisions made during the course of the plan negotiating and approval process and, in particular, whether that discretion extends to the removal of directors in that environment. In my view, the s. 11 discretion — in spite of its considerable breadth and flexibility — does not permit the exercise of such a power in and of itself. There may be situations where a judge in a CCAA proceeding would be justified in ordering the removal of directors pursuant to the oppression remedy provisions found in s. 241 of the *Canada Business Corporation Act*, R.S.C. 1985, c. C-44 (“CBCA”), and imported into the exercise of the s. 11 discretion through s. 20 of the CCAA. However, this was not argued in the present case, and the facts before the court would not justify the removal of Messrs. Woolcombe and Keiper on oppression remedy grounds.

[40] The pertinent portions of s. 11 of the CCAA provide as follows:

Powers of court

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.

Initial application court orders

(3) A court may, on an initial application in respect of a company, make an order on such terms as it may impose, effective for such period as the court deems necessary not exceeding thirty days.

- (a) staying, until otherwise ordered by the court, all proceedings taken or that might be taken in respect of the company under an Act referred to in subsection (1);

³ See para. 43, *infra*, where I elaborate on this distinction.

- (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.

Other than initial application court orders

- (4) 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.

Burden of proof on application

- (6) 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 satisfied the court that the applicant has acted, and is acting, in good faith and with due diligence.

[41] The rule of statutory interpretation that has now been accepted by the Supreme Court of Canada, in such cases as *R. v. Sharpe*, [2001] 1 S.C.R. 45, [2001] S.C.J. No. 3, at para. 33, and *Rizzo & Rizzo Shoes Ltd. (Re)*, [1998] 1 S.C.R. 27, [1998] S.C.J. No. 2, at para. 21, is articulated in E.A. Driedger, *The Construction of Statutes*, 2nd ed. (Toronto: Butterworths, 1983) as follows:

Today, there is only one principle or approach, namely, the words of an Act are to be read in their entire context and in their grammatical and ordinary sense harmoniously with the scheme of the Act, the object of the Act, and the intention of Parliament.

See also Ruth Sullivan, *Sullivan and Driedger on the Construction of Statutes*, 4th ed. (Toronto: Butterworths, 2002), at p. 262.

[42] The interpretation of s. 11 advanced above is true to these principles. It is consistent with the purpose and scheme of the CCAA, as articulated in para. 38 above, and with the fact that corporate governance matters are dealt with in other statutes. In addition, it honours the historical reluctance of courts to intervene in such matters, or to second-guess the business decisions

made by directors and officers in the course of managing the business and affairs of the corporation.

[43] Mr. Leon and Mr. Swan argue that matters relating to the removal of directors do not fall within the court's discretion under s. 11 because they fall outside of the parameters of the court's role in the restructuring process, in contrast to the company's role in the restructuring process. The court's role is defined by the "on such terms as may be imposed" jurisdiction under subparas. 11(3)(a)–(c) and 11(4)(a)–(c) of the CCAA to stay, or restrain, or prohibit proceedings against the company during the "breathing space" period for negotiations and a plan. I agree.

[44] What the court does under s. 11 is to establish the boundaries of the playing field and act as a referee in the process. The company's role in the restructuring, and that of its stakeholders, is to work out a plan or compromise that a sufficient percentage of creditors will accept and the court will approve and sanction. The corporate activities that take place in the course of the workout are governed by the legislation and legal principles that normally apply to such activities. In the course of acting as referee, the court has great leeway, as Farley J. observed in *Lehndorff, supra*, at para. 5, "to make order[s] so as to effectively maintain the status quo in respect of an insolvent company while it attempts to gain the approval of its creditors for the proposed compromise or arrangement which will be to the benefit of both the company and its creditors". But the s. 11 discretion is not open-ended and unfettered. Its exercise must be guided by the scheme and object of the Act and by the legal principles that govern corporate law issues. Moreover, the court is not entitled to usurp the role of the directors and management in conducting what are in substance *the company's* restructuring efforts.

[45] With these principles in mind, I turn to an analysis of the various factors underlying the interpretation of the s. 11 discretion.

[46] I start with the proposition that at common law directors could not be removed from office during the term for which they were elected or appointed: *London Finance Corp. Ltd. v. Banking Service Corp. Ltd.*, [1922] O.J. No. 378, 23 O.W.N. 138 (H.C.); *Stephenson v. Vokes*, [1896] O.J. No. 191, 27 O.R. 691 (H.C.J.). The authority to remove must therefore be found in statute law.

[47] In Canada, the CBCA and its provincial equivalents govern the election, appointment and removal of directors, as well as providing for their duties and responsibilities. Shareholders elect directors, but the directors may fill vacancies that occur on the board of directors pending a further shareholders meeting:

CBCA, ss. 106(3) and 111.⁴ The specific power to remove directors is vested in the shareholders by s. 109(1) of the *CBCA*. However, s. 241 empowers the court — where it finds that oppression as therein defined exists — to “make any interim or final order it thinks fit”, including (s. 241(3)(e)) “an order appointing directors in place of or in addition to all or any of the directors then in office”. This power has been utilized to remove directors, but in very rare cases, and only in circumstances where there has been actual conduct rising to the level of misconduct required to trigger oppression remedy relief: see, for example, *Catalyst Fund General Partner I Inc. v. Hollinger Inc.*, [2004] O.J. No. 4722, 1 B.L.R. (4th) 186 (S.C.J.).

[48] There is therefore a statutory scheme under the *CBCA* (and similar provincial corporate legislation) providing for the election, appointment and removal of directors. Where another applicable statute confers jurisdiction with respect to a matter, a broad and undefined discretion provided in one statute cannot be used to supplant or override the other applicable statute. There is no legislative “gap” to fill. See *Baxter Student Housing Ltd. v. College Housing Cooperative Ltd.*, *supra*, at p. 480 S.C.R.; *Royal Oak Mines Inc. (Re)*, *supra*; and *Richtree Inc. (Re)*, *supra*.

[49] At para. 7 of his reasons, the motion judge said:

The board is charged with the standard duty of “manage[ing], [sic] or supervising the management, of the business and affairs of the corporation”: s. 102(1) *CBCA*. *Ordinarily the Court will not interfere with the composition of the board of directors. However, if there is good and sufficient valid reason to do so, then the Court must not hesitate to do so to correct a problem.* The directors should not be required to constantly look over their shoulders for this would be the sure recipe for board paralysis which would be so detrimental to a restructuring process; thus interested parties should only initiate a motion where it is reasonably obvious that there is a problem, actual or poised to become actual.

(Emphasis added)

[50] Respectfully, I see no authority in s. 11 of the *CCAA* for the court to interfere with the composition of a board of directors on such a basis.

[51] Court removal of directors is an exceptional remedy, and one that is rarely exercised in corporate law. This reluctance is rooted in the historical unwillingness of courts to interfere with the internal management of corporate affairs and in the court’s well-established deference to decisions made by directors and officers in

⁴ It is the latter authority that the directors of Stelco exercised when appointing the appellants to the Stelco Board.

the exercise of their business judgment when managing the business and affairs of the corporation. These factors also bolster the view that where the *CCAA* is silent on the issue, the court should not read into the s. 11 discretion an extraordinary power — which the courts are disinclined to exercise in any event — except to the extent that that power may be introduced through the application of other legislation, and on the same principles that apply to the application of the provisions of the other legislation.

The oppression remedy gateway

[52] The fact that s. 11 does not itself provide the authority for a *CCAA* judge to order the removal of directors does not mean that the supervising judge is powerless to make such an order, however. Section 20 of the *CCAA* offers a gateway to the oppression remedy and other provisions of the *CBCA* and similar provincial statutes. Section 20 states:

20. 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.

[53] The *CBCA* is legislation that “makes provision for the sanction of compromises or arrangements between a company and its shareholders or any class of them”. Accordingly, the powers of a judge under s. 11 of the *CCAA* may be applied together with the provisions of the *CBCA*, including the oppression remedy provisions of that statute. I do not read s. 20 as limiting the application of outside legislation to the provisions of such legislation dealing specifically with the sanctioning of compromises and arrangements between the company and its shareholders. The grammatical structure of s. 20 mandates a broader interpretation and the oppression remedy is, therefore, available to a supervising judge in appropriate circumstances.

[54] I do not accept the respondents’ argument that the motion judge had the authority to order the removal of the appellants by virtue of the power contained in s. 145(2)(b) of the *CBCA* to make an order “declaring the result of the disputed election or appointment” of directors. In my view, s. 145 relates to the procedures underlying disputed elections or appointments, and not to disputes over the composition of the board of directors itself. Here, it is conceded that the appointment of Messrs. Woollcombe and Keiper as directors complied with all relevant statutory requirements. Farley J. quite properly did not seek to base his jurisdiction on any such authority.

The level of conduct required

[55] Colin Campbell J. recently invoked the oppression remedy to remove directors, without appointing anyone in their place, in *Catalyst Fund General Partner I Inc. v. Hollinger Inc.*, *supra*. The bar is high. In reviewing the applicable law, C. Campbell J. said (para. 68):

Director removal is *an extraordinary remedy* and certainly should be imposed *most sparingly*. As a starting point, I accept the basic proposition set out in Peterson, "Shareholder Remedies in Canada".⁵

SS. 18.172 *Removing and appointing directors to the board is an extreme form of judicial intervention*. The board of directors is elected by the shareholders, vested with the power to manage the corporation, and appoints the officers of the company who undertake to conduct the day-to-day affairs of the corporation. [Footnote omitted.] It is clear that the board of directors has control over policymaking and management of the corporation. *By tampering with a board, a court directly affects the management of the corporation*. If a reasonable balance between protection of corporate stakeholders and the freedom of management to conduct the affairs of the business in an efficient manner is desired, altering the board of directors should be *a measure of last resort*. The order could be suitable where the continuing presence of the incumbent directors is harmful to both the company and the interests of corporate stakeholders, and where the appointment of a new director or directors would remedy the oppressive conduct without a receiver or receiver-manager.

(Emphasis added)

[56] C. Campbell J. found that the continued involvement of the Ravelston directors in the *Hollinger* situation would "significantly impede" the interests of the public shareholders and that those directors were "motivated by putting their interests first, not those of the company" (paras. 82-83). The evidence in this case is far from reaching any such benchmark, however, and the record would not support a finding of oppression, even if one had been sought.

[57] Everyone accepts that there is no evidence the appellants have conducted themselves, as directors — in which capacity they participated over two days in the bid consideration exercise — in anything but a neutral fashion, having regard to the best interests of Stelco and all of the stakeholders. The motion judge acknowledged that the appellants "may well conduct themselves beyond reproach". However, he simply decided there was a risk — a reasonable apprehension — that Messrs. Woollcombe and Keiper would not live up to their obligations to be neutral in the future.

⁵ Dennis H. Peterson, *Shareholder Remedies in Canada*, looseleaf (Markham: LexisNexis — Butterworths, 1989), at 18-47.

[58] The risk or apprehension appears to have been founded essentially on three things: (1) the earlier public statements made by Mr. Keiper about “maximizing shareholder value”; (2) the conduct of Clearwater and Equilibrium in criticizing and opposing the Stalking Horse Bid; and (3) the motion judge’s opinion that Clearwater and Equilibrium — the shareholders represented by the appellants on the Board — had a “vision” that “usually does not encompass any significant concern for the long-term competitiveness and viability of an emerging corporation”, as a result of which the appellants would approach their directors’ duties looking to liquidate their shares on the basis of a “short-term hold” rather than with the best interests of Stelco in mind. The motion judge transposed these concerns into anticipated predisposed conduct on the part of the appellants as directors, despite their apparent understanding of their duties as directors and their assurances that they would act in the best interests of Stelco. He therefore concluded that “the risk to the process and to Stelco in its emergence [was] simply too great to risk the wait and see approach”.

[59] Directors have obligations under s. 122(1) of the *CBCA* (a) to act honestly and in good faith with a view to the best interest of the corporation (the “statutory fiduciary duty” obligation), and (b) to exercise the care, diligence and skill that a reasonably prudent person would exercise in comparable circumstances (the “duty of care” obligation). They are also subject to control under the oppression remedy provisions of s. 241. The general nature of these duties does not change when the company approaches, or finds itself in, insolvency: *Peoples Department Stores Inc. (Trustee of) v. Wise*, [2004] 3 S.C.R. 461, [2004] S.C.J. No. 64, at paras. 42-49.

[60] In *Peoples* the Supreme Court noted that “the interests of the corporation are not to be confused with the interests of the creditors or those of any other stakeholders” (para. 43), but also accepted “as an accurate statement of the law that in determining whether [directors] are acting with a view to the best interests of the corporation it may be legitimate, given all the circumstances of a given case, for the board of directors to consider, *inter alia*, the interests of shareholders, employees, suppliers, creditors, consumers, governments and the environment” (para. 42). Importantly as well — in the context of “the shifting interest and incentives of shareholders and creditors” — the court stated (para. 47):

In resolving these competing interests, it is incumbent upon the directors to act honestly and in good faith with a view to the best interests of the corporation. In using their skills for the benefit of the corporation when it is in troubled waters financially, the directors must be careful to attempt to act in

its best interests by creating a "better" corporation, and not to favour the interests of any one group of stakeholders.

[61] In determining whether directors have fallen foul of those obligations, however, more than some risk of anticipated misconduct is required before the court can impose the extraordinary remedy of removing a director from his or her duly elected or appointed office. Although the motion judge concluded that there was a risk of harm to the Stelco process if Messrs. Woollcombe and Keiper remained as directors, he did not assess the level of that risk. The record does not support a finding that there was a sufficient risk of sufficient misconduct to warrant a conclusion of oppression. The motion judge was not asked to make such a finding, and he did not do so.

[62] The respondents argue that this court should not interfere with the decision of the motion judge on grounds of deference. They point out that the motion judge has been case-managing the restructuring of Stelco under the CCAA for over 14 months and is intimately familiar with the circumstances of Stelco as it seeks to restructure itself and emerge from court protection.

[63] There is no question that the decisions of judges acting in a supervisory role under the CCAA, and particularly those of experienced commercial list judges, are entitled to great deference: see *Algoma Steel Inc. v. Union Gas Ltd.* (2003), 63 O.R. (3d) 78, [2003] O.J. No. 71 (C.A.), at para. 16. The discretion must be exercised judicially and in accordance with the principles governing its operation. Here, respectfully, the motion judge misconstrued his authority, and made an order that he was not empowered to make in the circumstances.

[64] The appellants argued that the motion judge made a number of findings without any evidence to support them. Given my decision with respect to jurisdiction, it is not necessary for me to address that issue.

The business judgment rule

[65] The appellants argue as well that the motion judge erred in failing to defer to the unanimous decision of the Stelco directors in deciding to appoint them to the Stelco Board. It is well-established that judges supervising restructuring proceedings — and courts in general — will be very hesitant to second-guess the business decisions of directors and management. As the Supreme Court of Canada said in *Peoples, supra*, at para. 67:

Courts are ill-suited and should be reluctant to second-guess the application of business expertise to the considerations that are involved in corporate decision making . . .

[66] In *Brant Investments Ltd. v. KeepRite Inc.* (1991), 3 O.R. (3d) 289, [1991] O.J. No. 683 (C.A.), at p. 320 O.R., this court adopted the following statement by the trial judge, Anderson J.:

Business decisions, honestly made, should not be subjected to microscopic examination. There should be no interference simply because a decision is unpopular with the minority.⁶

[67] McKinlay J.A. then went on to say [at p. 320 O.R.]:

There can be no doubt that on an application under s. 234⁷ the trial judge is required to consider the nature of the impugned acts and the method in which they were carried out. That does not mean that the trial judge should substitute his own business judgment for that of managers, directors, or a committee such as the one involved in assessing this transaction. Indeed, it would generally be impossible for him to do so, regardless of the amount of evidence before him. He is dealing with the matter at a different time and place; it is unlikely that he will have the background knowledge and expertise of the individuals involved; he could have little or no knowledge of the background and skills of the persons who would be carrying out any proposed plan; and it is unlikely that he would have any knowledge of the specialized market in which the corporation operated. In short, he does not know enough to make the business decision required.

[68] Although a judge supervising a CCAA proceeding develops a certain "feel" for the corporate dynamics and a certain sense of direction for the restructuring, this caution is worth keeping in mind. See also *Clear Creek Contracting Ltd. v. Skeena Cellulose Inc.*, *supra*; *Sammi Atlas Inc. (Re)*, [1998] O.J. No. 1089, 3 C.B.R. (4th) 171 (Gen. Div.); *Olympia & York Developments Ltd. (Re)*, *supra*; *Re Alberta Pacific Terminals Ltd.*, [1991] B.C.J. No. 1065, 8 C.B.R. (4th) 99 (S.C.). The court is not catapulted into the shoes of the board of directors, or into the seat of the chair of the board, when acting in its supervisory role in the restructuring.

[69] Here, the motion judge was alive to the "business judgment" dimension in the situation he faced. He distinguished the application of the rule from the circumstances, however, stating at para. 18 of his reasons:

With respect I do not see the present situation as involving the "management of the business and affairs of the corporation", but rather as a quasi-constitutional aspect of the corporation entrusted albeit to the Board pursuant to s. 111(1) of the CBCA. I agree that where a board is actually engaged in the business of a judgment situation, the board should be given appropriate deference. However, to the contrary in this situation, I do not see it as a

⁶ Or, I would add, unpopular with other stakeholders.

⁷ Now s. 241.

situation calling for (as asserted) more deference, but rather considerably less than that. With regard to this decision of the Board having impact upon the capital raising process, as I conclude it would, then similarly deference ought not to be given.

[70] I do not see the distinction between the directors' role in "the management of the business and affairs of the corporation" (*CBCA*, s. 102) — which describes the directors' overall responsibilities — and their role with respect to a "quasi-constitutional aspect of the corporation" (*i.e.*, in filling out the composition of the board of directors in the event of a vacancy). The "affairs" of the corporation are defined in s. 2 of the *CBCA* as meaning "the relationships among a corporation, its affiliates and the shareholders, directors and officers of such bodies corporate but does not include the business carried on by such bodies corporate". Corporate governance decisions relate directly to such relationships and are at the heart of the Board's business decision-making role regarding the corporation's business *and* affairs. The dynamics of such decisions, and the intricate balancing of competing interests and other corporate-related factors that goes into making them, are no more within the purview of the court's knowledge and expertise than other business decisions, and they deserve the same deferential approach. Respectfully, the motion judge erred in declining to give effect to the business judgment rule in the circumstances of this case.

[71] This is not to say that the conduct of the Board in appointing the appellants as directors may never come under review by the supervising judge. The court must ultimately approve and sanction the plan of compromise or arrangement as finally negotiated and accepted by the company and its creditors and stakeholders. The plan must be found to be fair and reasonable before it can be sanctioned. If the Board's decision to appoint the appellants has somehow so tainted the capital raising process that those criteria are not met, any eventual plan that is put forward will fail.

[72] The respondents submit that it makes no sense for the court to have jurisdiction to declare the process flawed only after the process has run its course. Such an approach to the restructuring process would be inefficient and a waste of resources. While there is some merit in this argument, the court cannot grant itself jurisdiction where it does not exist. Moreover, there are a plethora of checks and balances in the negotiating process itself that moderate the risk of the process becoming irretrievably tainted in this fashion — not the least of which is the restraining effect of the prospect of such a consequence. I do not think that this argument can prevail. In addition, the court at all times retains its broad and

flexible supervisory jurisdiction — a jurisdiction which feeds the creativity that makes the CCAA work so well — in order to address fairness and process concerns along the way. This case relates only to the court's exceptional power to order the removal of directors.

The reasonable apprehension of bias analogy

[73] In exercising what he saw as his discretion to remove the appellants as directors, the motion judge thought it would be useful to “borrow the concept of reasonable apprehension of bias . . . with suitable adjustments for the nature of the decision making involved” (para. 8). He stressed that “there was absolutely no allegation against [Mr. Woollcombe and Mr. Keiper] of any actual ‘bias’ or its equivalent” (para. 8). He acknowledged that neither was alleged to have done anything wrong since their appointments as directors, and that at the time of their appointments the appellants had confirmed to the Board that they understood and would abide by their duties and responsibilities as directors, including the responsibility to act in the best interests of the corporation and not in their own interests as shareholders. In the end, however, he concluded that because of their prior public statements that they intended to “pursue efforts to maximize shareholder value at Stelco”, and because of the nature of their business and the way in which they had been accumulating their shareholding position during the restructuring, and because of their linkage to 40 per cent of the common shareholders, there was a risk that the appellants would not conduct themselves in a neutral fashion in the best interests of the corporation as directors.

[74] In my view, the administrative law notion of apprehension of bias is foreign to the principles that govern the election, appointment and removal of directors, and to corporate governance considerations in general. Apprehension of bias is a concept that ordinarily applies to those who preside over judicial or quasi-judicial decision-making bodies, such as courts, administrative tribunals or arbitration boards. Its application is inapposite in the business decision-making context of corporate law. There is nothing in the *CBCA* or other corporate legislation that envisages the screening of directors in advance for their ability to act neutrally, in the best interests of the corporation, as a prerequisite for appointment.

[75] Instead, the conduct of directors is governed by their common law and statutory obligations to act honestly and in good faith with a view to the best interests of the corporation, and to exercise the care, diligence and skill that a reasonably

prudent person would exercise in comparable circumstances (CBCA, s. 122(1)(a) and (b)). The directors also have fiduciary obligations to the corporation, and they are liable to oppression remedy proceedings in appropriate circumstances. These remedies are available to aggrieved complainants — including the respondents in this case — but they depend for their applicability on the director having engaged in conduct justifying the imposition of a remedy.

[76] If the respondents are correct, and reasonable apprehension that directors may not act neutrally because they are aligned with a particular group of shareholders or stakeholders is sufficient for removal, all nominee directors in Canadian corporations, and all management directors, would automatically be disqualified from serving. No one suggests this should be the case. Moreover, as Iacobucci J. noted in *Blair v. Consolidated Enfield Corp.*, [1995] 4 S.C.R. 5, [1995] S.C.J. No. 29, at para. 35, “persons are assumed to act in good faith unless proven otherwise”. With respect, the motion judge approached the circumstances before him from exactly the opposite direction. It is commonplace in corporate/commercial affairs that there are connections between directors and various stakeholders and that conflicts will exist from time to time. Even where there are conflicts of interest, however, directors are not removed from the board of directors; they are simply obliged to disclose the conflict and, in appropriate cases, to abstain from voting. The issue to be determined is not whether there is a connection between a director and other shareholders or stakeholders, but rather whether there has been some conduct on the part of the director that will justify the imposition of a corrective sanction. An apprehension of bias approach does not fit this sort of analysis.

Part V — Disposition

[77] For the foregoing reasons, then, I am satisfied that the motion judge erred in declaring the appointment of Messrs. Woollcombe and Keiper as directors of Stelco of no force and effect.

[78] I would grant leave to appeal, allow the appeal and set aside the order of Farley J. dated February 25, 2005.

[79] Counsel have agreed that there shall be no costs of the appeal.

Order accordingly.

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

Court File No.: M38600

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

COURT OF APPEAL FOR ONTARIO

**BOOK OF AUTHORITIES OF THE
RESPONDING PARTY,
THE AD HOC COMMITTEE**

GOODMANS LLP

Barristers & Solicitors
250 Yonge Street, Suite 2400
Toronto, Canada M5B 2M6

Benjamin Zarnett LSUC#: 17247M
Robert J. Chadwick LSUC#: 35165K
Logan Willis LSUC#: 53894K
Tel: 416-979-2211
Fax: 416-979-1234

Lawyers for the Ad Hoc Committee