

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

