

**ONTARIO
SUPERIOR COURT OF JUSTICE
COMMERCIAL LIST**

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

AND IN THE MATTER OF A PLAN OF COMPROMISE OR ARRANGEMENT
OF TIMMINCO LIMITED AND BÉCANCOUR SILICON INC.

Applicants

BOOK OF AUTHORITIES OF THE APPLICANTS
(Motion returnable April 27, 2012)
(Re Stay Extension)

Date: April 25, 2012

STIKEMAN ELLIOTT LLP
Barristers & Solicitors
5300 Commerce Court West
199 Bay Street
Toronto, Canada M5L 1B9

Ashley John Taylor LSUC#: 39932E
Tel: (416) 869-5236

Maria Konyukhova LSUC#: 52880V
Tel: (416) 869-5230

Kathryn Esaw LSUC#: 58264F
Tel: (416) 869-6820
Fax: (416) 947-0866

Lawyers for the Applicants

TO: The Attached Service List

**ONTARIO
SUPERIOR COURT OF JUSTICE
COMMERCIAL LIST**

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

AND IN THE MATTER OF A PLAN OF COMPROMISE OR ARRANGEMENT
OF TIMMINCO LIMITED AND BÉCANCOUR SILICON INC.

Applicants

**SERVICE LIST
(as at April 20, 2012)**

GENERAL	
<p>TIMMINCO LIMITED AND BÉCANCOUR SILICON INC. Sun Life Financial Tower 150 King Street West, Suite 2401 Toronto ON M5H 1J9</p> <p>Applicants</p>	<p>Peter A.M. Kalins Tel: (416) 364-5171 x340 Fax: (416) 364-3451 Email: pkalins@timminco.com</p> <p>Doug Fastuca Tel: (416) 364-5171 Email: dfastuca@timminco.com</p>
<p>STIKEMAN ELLIOTT LLP 5300 Commerce Court West 199 Bay Street Toronto, ON M5L 1B9</p> <p>Lawyers for the Applicants</p>	<p>Ashley J. Taylor Tel: (416) 869-5236 Fax: (416) 947-0866 Email: ataylor@stikeman.com</p> <p>Daphne MacKenzie Tel: (416) 869-5695 Email: dmackenzie@stikeman.com</p> <p>Pat O'Kelly Tel: (416) 869-5633 Email: pokelly@stikeman.com</p> <p>Dan Murdoch Tel: (416) 869-5529 Email: dmurdoch@stikeman.com</p> <p>Maria Konyukhova Tel: (416) 869-5230 Email: mkonyukhova@stikeman.com</p> <p>Kathryn Esaw Tel: (416) 869-6820 Email: kesaw@stikeman.com</p>

<p>FTI CONSULTING CANADA INC. TD Waterhouse Tower 79 Wellington Street, Suite 2010 Toronto, ON M5K 1G8</p> <p>Monitor</p>	<p>Nigel D. Meakin Tel: (416) 649-8065 Fax: (416) 649-8101 Email: nigel.meakin@fticonsulting.com</p> <p>Toni Vanderlaan Tel: (416) 649-8075 Email: toni.vanderlaan@fticonsulting.com</p>
<p>BLAKE, CASSELS & GRAYDON LLP 199 Bay Street Suite 4000, Commerce Court West Toronto ON M5L 1A9</p> <p>Lawyers for the Monitor</p>	<p>Steven J. Weisz Tel: (416) 863-2616 Email: steven.weisz@blakes.com</p> <p>Linc Rogers Tel: (416) 863-4168 Email: linc.rogers@blakes.com</p>
<p>BANK OF AMERICA, N.A. 20975 Swenson Drive, Suite 200 Waukesha, WI 53186</p> <p>Canada Branch 200 Front Street, Suite 2700 Toronto, ON M5V 3L2</p>	<p>Client Manager Fax: (262) 207-3347</p> <p>Medina Sales De Andrade Fax: (416) 349-4282</p>
<p>INVESTISSEMENT QUÉBEC 393 Rue Saint-Jaques, Suite 500 Montréal, QC H2Y 1N9</p>	<p>Danièle Leroux Tel: (514) 873-0439 Fax: (514) 873-9917 Email: daniele.leroux@invest-quebec.com</p> <p>Iya Toure Email: iya.toure@invest-quebec.com</p> <p>François Lamothe Email: francois.lamothe@invest-quebec.com</p> <p>Christine Fillion Email: christine.fillion@invest-quebec.com</p> <p>Liliane Monier Email: liliane.monier@invest-quebec.com</p>

<p>FASKEN MARTINEAU DUMOULIN LLP 140 Grande Allee Est, Suite 800 Quebec City, QC G1R 5M8</p> <p>333 Bay Street, Suite 2400 Toronto, ON M5H 2T6</p> <p>Lawyers for Investissement Quebec</p>	<p>Charles Mercier Tel: (418) 640-2046 Fax: (418) 647-2455 Email: cmercier@fasken.com</p> <p>Claude Girard Tel: (418) 640-2050 Fax: (418) 647-2455 Email: cgirard@fasken.com</p> <p>Aubrey Kauffman Tel: (416) 868-3538 Fax: (416) 364-7813 Email: akauffman@fasken.com</p>
<p>MCCARTHY TÉTRAULT LLP Toronto Dominion Bank Tower Suite 5300 Toronto, ON M5K 1E6</p> <p>Lawyers for AMG Advanced Metallurgical Group N.V.</p>	<p>James Gage Tel: (416) 601-7539 Fax: (416) 868-0673 Email: jgage@mccarthy.ca</p>
<p>RAYMOND CHABOT GRANT THORNTON 140 Grande Allée Est, Suite 200 Québec City, QC G1R 5P7</p>	<p>Jean Chiasson Tel: (418) 647-3204 Fax: (418) 647-9279 Email: chiasson.jean@rcgt.com</p>
<p>QUÉBEC SILICON LIMITED PARTNERSHIP 6500 Rue Yvon Trudeau Bécancour, QC G9H 2V8</p>	<p>Rene Boisvert Fax: (819) 294-9001 Email: rene.boisvert@quebecsilicium.com</p>
<p>QUÉBEC SILICON GENERAL PARTNER INC. 6500 Rue Yvon Trudeau Bécancour, QC G9H 2V8</p>	<p>Rene Boisvert Fax: (819) 294-9001 Email: rene.boisvert@quebecsilicium.com</p>
<p>DOW CORNING CORPORATION 2200 West Salzburg Road Midland, MI 48686-0994</p>	<p>Sue K. McDonnell Fax: (989) 496-8307 Email: sue.mcdonnell@dowcorning.com</p> <p>John Tierney Email: john.tierney@dowcorning.com</p>

<p>MCCARTHY TÉTRAULT 1000 De La Gauchetière Street West, Suite 2500 Montréal QC H3B 0A2</p> <p>Toronto Dominion Bank Tower Suite 5300 Toronto, ON M5K 1E6</p> <p>Counsel to Dow Corning Corporation</p>	<p>Sylvain A. Vauclair Tel: (514) 397-4102 Fax: (514) 875-6246 Email: savaclair@mccarthy.ca</p> <p>Barbara Boake Tel: (416) 601-7557 Fax: (416) 875-6246 Email: bboake@mccarthy.ca</p> <p>Sharon Kour Tel: (416) 601-8305 Email: skour@mccarthy.ca</p>
<p>SKADDEN, ARPS, SLATE, MEAGHER & FLOM LLP Four Times Square New York, NY 10036</p> <p>Counsel to Dow Corning Corporation</p>	<p>David J. Friedman Fax: (212) 735-2000 Email: david.friedman@skadden.com</p>
<p>CANADIAN IMPERIAL BANK OF COMMERCE Commerce Court 11th Floor Toronto, ON M5L 1A2</p>	
<p>LAURENTIAN BANK OF CANADA 1981 McGill College Avenue Montréal, QC H3A 3K3</p>	
<p>TORYS LLP TD Centre 79 Wellington Street West, Suite 3000 Toronto, ON M5K 1N2</p> <p>Counsel to QSI Partners Ltd.</p>	<p>David Bish Tel: (416) 865-7353 Fax: (416) 865-7380 Email: dbish@torys.com</p>
<p>KIM ORR BARRISTERS 200 Front Street West, Suite 2300 Toronto, ON M5V 3K2</p>	<p>James C. Orr Tel: (416) 349-6571 Fax: (416) 598-0601 Email: jo@kimorr.ca</p>

<p>BAKER & MCKENZIE LLP Brookfield Place 181 Bay Street, Suite 2100 Toronto, Ontario M5J 2T3</p>	<p>Chris Besant Tel: (416) 865-2318 Fax: (416) 863-6275 Email: chris.besant@bakermckenzie.com</p> <p>Frank Spizzirri Tel: (416) 865-6940 Email: frank.spizzirri@bakermckenzie.com</p>
<p>OSLER HOSKIN & HARCOURT LLP 1 First Canadian Place Toronto, Ontario M5X 1B8</p> <p>Lawyers for Wacker Chemie AG</p>	<p>Steven Golick Tel: (416) 862-6704 Fax: (416) 862-6666 Email: sgolick@osler.com</p> <p>Andrea Lockhart Tel: (416) 862-6829 Email: alockhart@osler.com</p>
<p>BENNETT JONES LLP One First Canadian Place Suite 3400 Toronto, Ontario M5X 1A4</p> <p>Lawyers for John Walsh</p>	<p>Derek J. Bell Tel: (416) 777-4638 Fax: (416) 863-1716 Email: belld@bennettjones.com</p>
<p>GOWLING LAFLEUR HENDERSON LLP 1 Place Ville Marie, Suite 3700 Montréal, Québec H3B 3P4</p> <p>Lawyers for Wajax Equipment</p>	<p>Geneviève Cloutier Tel: (514) 392-9448 Fax: (514) 876-9048 Email: genevieve.cloutier@gowlings.com</p>
<p>DAVIES WARD PHILLIPS & VINEBERG LLP First Canadian Place, Suite 44 Toronto, Ontario M5X 1B1</p>	<p>Jay Swartz Tel: (416) 863-5520 Fax: (416) 863-0871 Email: jswartz@dwpv.com</p>
<p>DAVIES WARD PHILLIPS & VINEBERG LLP First Canadian Place, Suite 44 Toronto, Ontario M5X 1B1</p> <p>Lawyers for J. Thomas Timmins</p>	<p>Robin Schwill Tel: (416) 863-5502 Fax: (416) 863-0871 Email: rschwill@dwpv.com</p>

PENSION PLANS REPRESENTATIVES

BSI Non-Union Employee Pension Committee

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Maria Spensieri

[REDACTED]

Email: maria.spensieri@quebecsilicium.com

René Boisvert

[REDACTED]

Email: rene.boisvert@quebecsilicium.com

Carl Rivard

[REDACTED]

Email: carl.rivard@quebecsilicium.com

Clément Albert

[REDACTED]

Patrick Gauthier

[REDACTED]

Email: patrick.gauthier@quebecsilicium.com

Denis Bourassa

[REDACTED]

<p>BSI Union Employee Pension Committee</p> <p>[REDACTED]</p> <p>[REDACTED]</p> <p>[REDACTED]</p> <p>[REDACTED]</p> <p>[REDACTED]</p> <p>[REDACTED]</p> <p>[REDACTED]</p> <p>[REDACTED]</p>	<p>Maria Spensieri [REDACTED] Email: maria.spensieri@quebecsilicium.com</p> <p>René Boisvert [REDACTED] Email: rene.boisvert@quebecsilicium.com</p> <p>Carl Rivard [REDACTED] Email: carl.rivard@quebecsilicium.com</p> <p>Gérald Brodeur [REDACTED]</p> <p>Luc Ducharme [REDACTED]</p> <p>Laurent Milette [REDACTED]</p> <p>Louis-Gilles Baron [REDACTED]</p> <p>Clément Albert [REDACTED]</p>
<p>SUPERINTENDENT OF FINANCIAL SERVICES 5160 Yonge Street PO Box 85 Toronto, ON M2N 6L9</p>	<p>Mark Bailey Tel: (416) 590-7555 Email: mark.bailey@fsco.gov.on.ca</p> <p>Deborah McPhail Tel: (416) 226-7764 Email: dmcphail@fsco.gov.on.ca</p> <p>Stephen Scharbach Tel: (416) 590-7244 Fax: (416) 590-7070 Email: stephen.scharbach@fsco.gov.on.ca</p>

<p>RÉGIE DES RENTES DU QUÉBEC Direction des régimes de retraite Régies de rentes du Québec Case postale 5200 Québec, QC G1K 7S9</p>	<p>Mario Marchand Tel: (418) 657-8715 ext. 3927 Fax: (418) 643-9590 Email: mario.marchand@rrq.gouv.qc.ca</p>
<p>KOSKIE MINKSY LLP 20 Queen Street West, Suite 900 Toronto, ON M5H 3R3</p> <p>Lawyers for Mercer (Canada) Limited, the administration of the Haley Pension Plan</p>	<p>Andrew Hatnay Tel: (416) 595-2083 Fax: (416) 204-2872 Email: ahatnay@kmlaw.ca</p> <p>Demetrios Yiokaris Tel: (416) 595-2130 Email: dyiokaris@kmlaw.ca</p>
<p>UNIONS</p>	
<p>LA SECTION LOCALE 184 DE SYNDICAT CANADIEN DES COMMUNICATIONS, DE L'ÉNERGIE ET DU PAPIER 6500, rue Yvon-Trudeau Bécancour, QC G9H 2V8</p> <p>7080, boul. Marion Trois-Rivières, QC G9A 6G4</p>	<p>Jean Simoneau Email: scep184@gmail.com</p> <p>René Gauthier Tel: (819) 378-4696 Email: rgauthier@scep.ca</p>
<p>CALEYWRAY 65 Queen Street West, Suite 1600 Toronto, ON M5H 2M5</p> <p>Lawyers for La Section Locale 184 de Syndicat Canadien des communications, de l'Énergie et du Papier</p>	<p>Denis W. Ellickson Tel: (416) 775-4678 Fax: (416) 366-4678 Email: ellicksond@caleywrap.com</p> <p>Jesse B. Kugler Tel: (416) 775-4677 Fax: (416) 366-3673 Email: kuglerj@caleywrap.com</p>
<p>THE UNITED STEEL, PAPER AND FORESTRY, RUBBER, MANUFACTURING, ENERGY, ALLIED INDUSTRIAL AND SERVICE WORKERS INTERNATIONAL UNION 2285 Saint-Laurent Boulevard Suite D-11 Ottawa, ON K1G 4Z7</p>	<p>David Lipton Tel: (613) 260-7205 ext. 232 Email: dlipton@usw.ca</p>

<p>SACK GOLDBLATT MITCHELL LLP 20 Dundas Street West, Suite 1100 Toronto, ON M5G 2G8</p> <p>Lawyers for the United Steel, Paper And Forestry, Rubber, Manufacturing, Energy, Allied Industrial and Service Workers International Union</p>	<p>Charles Sinclair Tel: (416) 979-4234 Fax: (416) 591-7333 Email: csinclair@sgmlaw.com</p>
<p>PPSA CREDITORS</p>	
<p>PRODAIR CANADA LTEE 7475 Boulevard Newman, Suite 311 La Salle, QC H8N 1X3</p>	
<p>SERVICES FINANCIERS CIT LTÉE 5035 South Service Road Burlington, ON L7R 4C8</p>	
<p>GE VFS CANADA LIMITED PARTNERSHIP 2300 Meadowvale Boulevard, Suite 200 Mississauga, ON L5N 5P9</p>	
<p>SERVICES FINANCIERS CATERPILLAR LTEE 5575 North Service Road Suite 600 Burlington, ON L7C 6M1</p>	<p>Kellie Wellenreiter Tel: (289) 313-1238 Email: kellie.wellenreiter@cat.com</p>
<p>SERVICES FINANCIERS DE LAGE LANDEN CANADA INC. 1235 North Service Road West, Suite 100 Oakville, ON L6M 2W2</p>	
<p>DCFS CANADA CORP 2680 Matheson Boulevard East Suite 500 Mississauga, ON L4W 0A5</p>	
<p>SERVICES FINANCIERS MERCEDES-BENZ 2680 Matheson Boulevard East Suite 500 Mississauga, ON L4W 0A5</p>	
<p>JOHN DEERE LIMITED 1001 Champlain Ave, Suite 401 Burlington, ON L7L 5Z4</p>	

GE CAPITAL VEHICLE AND EQUIPMENT LEASING INC. 2300 Meadowvale Boulevard 2nd Floor Mississauga, ON L5N 5P9	
ENDRAS BMW 100 Achilles Rd. Ajax, On L1Z 0C5	
DOCUMENT DIRECTION 100-1235 North Service Road West Oakville, ON L6M 2W2	
BMW CANADA INC. 50 Ultimate Drive Richmond Hill, ON L4S 0C8	
TOYOTA CREDIT CANADA INC. 80 Micro Court, Suite 200 Markham, ON L3R 9Z5	
GOVERNMENT AGENCIES	
DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE ONTARIO REGIONAL OFFICE 130 King Street West, Suite 3400 Toronto, ON M5X 1K6 Attorney General of Canada	Diane Winters Tel: (416) 973-3172 Fax: (416) 973-0810 Email: diane.winters@justice.gc.ca
CANADA REVENUE AGENCY 130 King Street West, Suite 3400 Toronto, ON M5X 1K6 Solicitor for Canada Revenue Agency	Diane Winters Tel: (416) 973-3172 Fax: (416) 973-0810 Email: diane.winters@justice.gc.ca
CANADA REVENUE AGENCY GST Interim Processing Centre (GST/HST) 333 Laurier Avenue West Ottawa, ON K1A 1J8	

<p>AGENCY OF REVENUE DU QUEBEC 1600 Boulevard René Levesque Ouest, 3^e étage Sector R23 CPF Montréal, QC H3H 2V2</p>	
<p>MINISTÈRE DE LA JUSTICE DU QUEBEC 1200, route de l'Église, 6^e étage Québec City, QC G1V 4M1</p>	
<p>MINISTÈRE DU DÉVELOPPEMENT DURABLE, DE L'ENVIRONNEMENT ET DES PARCS Édifice Marie-Guyart, 5^e étage 675 boulevard René-Lévesque Est Québec, QC G1R 5V7</p>	<p>Tel: (418) 521-3816 Fax: (418) 646-0908</p>
<p>MINISTRY OF REVENUE (ONTARIO) 33 King Street West Oshawa, ON L1H 8H5</p>	
<p>MINISTRY OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL (ONTARIO) McMurtry-Scott Building 720 Bay Street, 11th Floor Toronto, ON M7A 2S9</p>	
<p>MINISTRY OF THE ENVIRONMENT Legal Services Branch 135 St Clair Avenue West Toronto, ON M4V 1P5</p>	<p>Mario Faieta Tel: (416) 314-6482 Fax: (416) 314-6579 Email: mario.faieta@ontario.ca</p>
<p>ONTARIO MINISTRY OF NORTHERN DEVELOPMENT, MINES AND FORESTRY Rm. M2-24, Macdonald Block 900 Bay Street Toronto, ON M7A 1C3</p> <p>Ministry of Northern Development, Mines and Forestry 933 Ramsey Lake Road, B4, Sudbury, Ontario P3E 6B5</p>	<p>Ms. C. Blancher-Smith, Director of Mine Rehabilitation Tel: (705) 670-5784</p>

INDEX

**ONTARIO
SUPERIOR COURT OF JUSTICE
COMMERCIAL LIST**

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

AND IN THE MATTER OF A PLAN OF COMPROMISE OR ARRANGEMENT OF
TIMMINCO LIMITED AND BECANCOUR SILICON INC.

Applicants

**BOOK OF AUTHORITIES OF THE APPLICANTS
(Motion Returnable April 27, 2012 re Stay Extension)**

INDEX

Tab	Document
1.	<i>Century Services Inc. v. Canada (Attorney General)</i> , 2010 SCC 60
2.	<i>Re Lehndorff General Partner Ltd.</i> (1993), 17 C.B.R. (3rd) 24 (Ont. Gen. Div. [Comm. List])
3.	<i>Re Canwest Global Communications Corp.</i> , [2009] O.J. No. 4788 (Ont. S.C.J.) [Comm. List])

TAB 1

Indexed as:

Century Services Inc. v. Canada (Attorney General)

**Century Services Inc. Appellant;
v.
Attorney General of Canada on behalf of Her Majesty The Queen
in Right of Canada Respondent.**

[2010] 3 S.C.R. 379

[2010] 3 R.C.S. 379

[2010] S.C.J. No. 60

[2010] A.C.S. no 60

2010 SCC 60

File No.: 33239.

Supreme Court of Canada

Heard: May 11, 2010;
Judgment: December 16, 2010.

**Present: McLachlin C.J. and Binnie, LeBel, Deschamps, Fish,
Abella, Charron, Rothstein and Cromwell JJ.**

(136 paras.)

Appeal From:

ON APPEAL FROM THE COURT OF APPEAL FOR BRITISH COLUMBIA

Catchwords:

Bankruptcy and Insolvency -- Priorities -- Crown applying on eve of bankruptcy of debtor company to have GST monies held in trust paid to Receiver General of Canada -- Whether deemed trust in favour of Crown under Excise Tax Act prevails over provisions of Companies' Creditors Arrange-

ment Act purporting to nullify deemed trusts in favour of Crown -- Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act, R.S.C. 1985, c. C-36, s. 18.3(1) -- Excise Tax Act, R.S.C. 1985, c. E-15, s. 222(3).

Bankruptcy and insolvency -- Procedure -- Whether chambers judge had authority to make order partially lifting stay of proceedings to allow debtor company to make assignment in bankruptcy and to stay Crown's right to enforce GST deemed trust -- Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act, R.S.C. 1985, c. C-36, s. 11.

Trusts -- Express trusts -- GST collected but unremitted to Crown -- Judge ordering that GST be held by Monitor in trust account -- Whether segregation of Crown's GST claim in Monitor's account created an express trust in favour of Crown.

[page380]

Summary:

The debtor company commenced proceedings under the *Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act* ("CCAA"), obtaining a stay of proceedings to allow it time to reorganize its financial affairs. One of the debtor company's outstanding debts at the commencement of the reorganization was an amount of unremitted Goods and Services Tax ("GST") payable to the Crown. Section 222(3) of the *Excise Tax Act* ("ETA") created a deemed trust over unremitted GST, which operated despite any other enactment of Canada except the *Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act* ("BIA"). However, s. 18.3(1) of the CCAA provided that any statutory deemed trusts in favour of the Crown did not operate under the CCAA, subject to certain exceptions, none of which mentioned GST.

Pursuant to an order of the CCAA chambers judge, a payment not exceeding \$5 million was approved to the debtor company's major secured creditor, Century Services. However, the chambers judge also ordered the debtor company to hold back and segregate in the Monitor's trust account an amount equal to the unremitted GST pending the outcome of the reorganization. On concluding that reorganization was not possible, the debtor company sought leave of the court to partially lift the stay of proceedings so it could make an assignment in bankruptcy under the BIA. The Crown moved for immediate payment of unremitted GST to the Receiver General. The chambers judge denied the Crown's motion, and allowed the assignment in bankruptcy. The Court of Appeal allowed the appeal on two grounds. First, it reasoned that once reorganization efforts had failed, the chambers judge was bound under the priority scheme provided by the ETA to allow payment of unremitted GST to the Crown and had no discretion under s. 11 of the CCAA to continue the stay against the Crown's claim. Second, the Court of Appeal concluded that by ordering the GST funds segregated in the Monitor's trust account, the chambers judge had created an express trust in favour of the Crown.

Held (Abella J. dissenting): The appeal should be allowed.

Per McLachlin C.J. and Binnie, LeBel, Deschamps, Charron, Rothstein and Cromwell JJ.: The apparent conflict between s. 222(3) of the ETA and s. 18.3(1) of the CCAA can be resolved through an interpretation that properly recognizes the history of the CCAA, its function amidst the body of insolvency legislation enacted by [page381] Parliament and the principles for interpreting the CCAA that have been recognized in the jurisprudence. The history of the CCAA distinguishes it from the

BIA because although these statutes share the same remedial purpose of avoiding the social and economic costs of liquidating a debtor's assets, the *CCAA* offers more flexibility and greater judicial discretion than the rules-based mechanism under the *BIA*, making the former more responsive to complex reorganizations. Because the *CCAA* is silent on what happens if reorganization fails, the *BIA* scheme of liquidation and distribution necessarily provides the backdrop against which creditors assess their priority in the event of bankruptcy. The contemporary thrust of legislative reform has been towards harmonizing aspects of insolvency law common to the *CCAA* and the *BIA*, and one of its important features has been a cutback in Crown priorities. Accordingly, the *CCAA* and the *BIA* both contain provisions nullifying statutory deemed trusts in favour of the Crown, and both contain explicit exceptions exempting source deductions deemed trusts from this general rule. Meanwhile, both Acts are harmonious in treating other Crown claims as unsecured. No such clear and express language exists in those Acts carving out an exception for GST claims.

When faced with the apparent conflict between s. 222(3) of the *ETA* and s. 18.3(1) of the *CCAA*, courts have been inclined to follow *Ottawa Senators Hockey Club Corp. (Re)* and resolve the conflict in favour of the *ETA*. *Ottawa Senators* should not be followed. Rather, the *CCAA* provides the rule. Section 222(3) of the *ETA* evinces no explicit intention of Parliament to repeal *CCAA* s. 18.3. Where Parliament has sought to protect certain Crown claims through statutory deemed trusts and intended that these deemed trusts continue in insolvency, it has legislated so expressly and elaborately. Meanwhile, there is no express statutory basis for concluding that GST claims enjoy a preferred treatment under the *CCAA* or the *BIA*. The internal logic of the *CCAA* appears to subject a GST deemed trust to the waiver by Parliament of its priority. A strange asymmetry would result if differing treatments of GST deemed trusts under the *CCAA* and the *BIA* were found to exist, as this would encourage statute shopping, undermine the *CCAA*'s remedial purpose and invite the very social ills that the statute was enacted to avert. The later in time enactment of the more general s. 222(3) of the *ETA* does not require application of the doctrine of implied repeal to the earlier and more specific s. 18.3(1) of the *CCAA* in the circumstances of this case. In any event, [page382] recent amendments to the *CCAA* in 2005 resulted in s. 18.3 of the Act being renumbered and reformulated, making it the later in time provision. This confirms that Parliament's intent with respect to GST deemed trusts is to be found in the *CCAA*. The conflict between the *ETA* and the *CCAA* is more apparent than real.

The exercise of judicial discretion has allowed the *CCAA* to adapt and evolve to meet contemporary business and social needs. As reorganizations become increasingly complex, *CCAA* courts have been called upon to innovate. In determining their jurisdiction to sanction measures in a *CCAA* proceeding, courts should first interpret the provisions of the *CCAA* before turning to their inherent or equitable jurisdiction. Noteworthy in this regard is the expansive interpretation the language of the *CCAA* is capable of supporting. The general language of the *CCAA* should not be read as being restricted by the availability of more specific orders. The requirements of appropriateness, good faith and due diligence are baseline considerations that a court should always bear in mind when exercising *CCAA* authority. The question is whether the order will usefully further efforts to avoid the social and economic losses resulting from liquidation of an insolvent company, which extends to both the purpose of the order and the means it employs. Here, the chambers judge's order staying the Crown's GST claim was in furtherance of the *CCAA*'s objectives because it blunted the impulse of creditors to interfere in an orderly liquidation and fostered a harmonious transition from the *CCAA* to the *BIA*, meeting the objective of a single proceeding that is common to both statutes. The transition from the *CCAA* to the *BIA* may require the partial lifting of a stay of proceedings under

the *CCAA* to allow commencement of *BIA* proceedings, but no gap exists between the two statutes because they operate in tandem and creditors in both cases look to the *BIA* scheme of distribution to foreshadow how they will fare if the reorganization is unsuccessful. The breadth of the court's discretion under the *CCAA* is sufficient to construct a bridge to liquidation under the *BIA*. Hence, the chambers judge's order was authorized.

[page383]

No express trust was created by the chambers judge's order in this case because there is no certainty of object inferable from his order. Creation of an express trust requires certainty of intention, subject matter and object. At the time the chambers judge accepted the proposal to segregate the monies in the Monitor's trust account there was no certainty that the Crown would be the beneficiary, or object, of the trust because exactly who might take the money in the final result was in doubt. In any event, no dispute over the money would even arise under the interpretation of s. 18.3(1) of the *CCAA* established above, because the Crown's deemed trust priority over GST claims would be lost under the *CCAA* and the Crown would rank as an unsecured creditor for this amount.

Per Fish J.: The GST monies collected by the debtor are not subject to a deemed trust or priority in favour of the Crown. In recent years, Parliament has given detailed consideration to the Canadian insolvency scheme but has declined to amend the provisions at issue in this case, a deliberate exercise of legislative discretion. On the other hand, in upholding deemed trusts created by the *ETA* notwithstanding insolvency proceedings, courts have been unduly protective of Crown interests which Parliament itself has chosen to subordinate to competing prioritized claims. In the context of the Canadian insolvency regime, deemed trusts exist only where there is a statutory provision creating the trust and a *CCAA* or *BIA* provision explicitly confirming its effective operation. The *Income Tax Act*, the *Canada Pension Plan* and the *Employment Insurance Act* all contain deemed trust provisions that are strikingly similar to that in s. 222 of the *ETA* but they are all also confirmed in s. 37 of the *CCAA* and in s. 67(3) of the *BIA* in clear and unmistakable terms. The same is not true of the deemed trust created under the *ETA*. Although Parliament created a deemed trust in favour of the Crown to hold unremitted GST monies, and although it purports to maintain this trust notwithstanding any contrary federal or provincial legislation, it did not confirm the continued operation of the trust in either the *BIA* or the *CCAA*, reflecting Parliament's intention to allow the deemed trust to lapse with the commencement of insolvency proceedings.

[page384]

Per Abella J. (dissenting): Section 222(3) of the *ETA* gives priority during *CCAA* proceedings to the Crown's deemed trust in unremitted GST. This provision unequivocally defines its boundaries in the clearest possible terms and excludes only the *BIA* from its legislative grasp. The language used reflects a clear legislative intention that s. 222(3) would prevail if in conflict with any other law except the *BIA*. This is borne out by the fact that following the enactment of s. 222(3), amendments to the *CCAA* were introduced, and despite requests from various constituencies, s. 18.3(1) was not amended to make the priorities in the *CCAA* consistent with those in the *BIA*. This indicates a deliberate legislative choice to protect the deemed trust in s. 222(3) from the reach of s. 18.3(1) of the *CCAA*.

The application of other principles of interpretation reinforces this conclusion. An earlier, specific provision may be overruled by a subsequent general statute if the legislature indicates, through its language, an intention that the general provision prevails. Section 222(3) achieves this through the use of language stating that it prevails despite any law of Canada, of a province, or "any other law" other than the *BIA*. Section 18.3(1) of the *CCAA* is thereby rendered inoperative for purposes of s. 222(3). By operation of s. 44(f) of the *Interpretation Act*, the transformation of s. 18.3(1) into s. 37(1) after the enactment of s. 222(3) of the *ETA* has no effect on the interpretive queue, and s. 222(3) of the *ETA* remains the "later in time" provision. This means that the deemed trust provision in s. 222(3) of the *ETA* takes precedence over s. 18.3(1) during *CCAA* proceedings. While s. 11 gives a court discretion to make orders notwithstanding the *BIA* and the *Winding-up Act*, that discretion is not liberated from the operation of any other federal statute. Any exercise of discretion is therefore circumscribed by whatever limits are imposed by statutes other than the *BIA* and the *Winding-up Act*. That includes the *ETA*. The chambers judge in this case was, therefore, required to respect the priority regime set out in s. 222(3) of the *ETA*. Neither s. 18.3(1) nor s. 11 of the *CCAA* gave him the authority to ignore it. He could not, as a result, deny the Crown's request for payment of the GST funds during the *CCAA* proceedings.

[page385]

Cases Cited

By Deschamps J.

Overruled: *Ottawa Senators Hockey Club Corp. (Re)* (2005), 73 O.R. (3d) 737; **distinguished:** *Doré v. Verdun (City)*, [1997] 2 S.C.R. 862; **referred to:** *Reference re Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act*, [1934] S.C.R. 659; *Quebec (Revenue) v. Caisse populaire Desjardins de Montmagny*, 2009 SCC 49, [2009] 3 S.C.R. 286; *Deputy Minister of Revenue v. Rainville*, [1980] 1 S.C.R. 35; *Gauntlet Energy Corp., Re*, 2003 ABQB 894, 30 Alta. L.R. (4) 192; *Komunik Corp. (Arrangement relatif à)*, 2009 QCCS 6332 (CanLII), leave to appeal granted, 2010 QCCA 183 (CanLII); *Royal Bank of Canada v. Sparrow Electric Corp.*, [1997] 1 S.C.R. 411; *First Vancouver Finance v. M.N.R.*, 2002 SCC 49, [2002] 2 S.C.R. 720; *Solid Resources Ltd., Re* (2002), 40 C.B.R. (4) 219; *Metcalf & Mansfield Alternative Investments II Corp. (Re)*, 2008 ONCA 587, 92 O.R. (3d) 513; *Dylex Ltd., Re* (1995), 31 C.B.R. (3d) 106; *Elan Corp. v. Comiskey* (1990), 41 O.A.C. 282; *Chef Ready Foods Ltd. v. Hongkong Bank of Can.* (1990), 51 B.C.L.R. (2d) 84; *Pacific National Lease Holding Corp., Re* (1992), 19 B.C.A.C. 134; *Canadian Airlines Corp., Re*, 2000 ABQB 442, 84 Alta. L.R. (3d) 9; *Air Canada, Re* (2003), 42 C.B.R. (4) 173; *Air Canada, Re*, 2003 CanLII 49366; *Canadian Red Cross Society/Société Canadienne de la Croix Rouge, Re* (2000), 19 C.B.R. (4) 158; *Skydome Corp., Re* (1998), 16 C.B.R. (4) 118; *United Used Auto & Truck Parts Ltd., Re*, 2000 BCCA 146, 135 B.C.A.C. 96, aff'g (1999), 12 C.B.R. (4) 144; *Skeena Cellulose Inc., Re*, 2003 BCCA 344, 13 B.C.L.R. (4) 236; *Stelco Inc. (Re)* (2005), 75 O.R. (3d) 5; *Philip's Manufacturing Ltd., Re* (1992), 9 C.B.R. (3d) 25; *Ivaco Inc. (Re)* (2006), 83 O.R. (3d) 108.

By Fish J.

Referred to: *Ottawa Senators Hockey Club Corp. (Re)* (2005), 73 O.R. (3d) 737.

By Abella J. (dissenting)

Ottawa Senators Hockey Club Corp. (Re) (2005), 73 O.R. (3d) 737; *Tele-Mobile Co. v. Ontario*, 2008 SCC 12, [2008] 1 S.C.R. 305; *Doré v. Verdun (City)*, [1997] 2 S.C.R. 862; *Attorney General of Canada v. Public Service Staff Relations Board*, [1977] 2 F.C. 663.

Statutes and Regulations Cited

An Act to establish the Wage Earner Protection Program Act, to amend the Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act and [page386] the Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act and to make consequential amendments to other Acts, S.C. 2005, c. 47, ss. 69, 128, 131.

Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act, R.S.C. 1985, c. B-3, ss. 67, 81.1, 81.2, 86 [am. 1992, c. 27, s. 39; 1997, c. 12, s. 73; 2000, c. 30, s. 148; 2005, c. 47, s. 69; 2009, c. 33, s. 25].

Canada Pension Plan, R.S.C. 1985, c. C-8, s. 23.

Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act, R.S.C. 1985, c. C-36, ss. 11 [am. 2005, c. 47, s. 128], 11.02 [ad. *idem*], 11.09 [ad. *idem*], 11.4 [am. *idem*], 18.3 [ad. 1997, c. 12, s. 125; rep. 2005, c. 47, s. 131], 18.4 [*idem*], 20 [am. 2005, c. 47, s. 131], 21 [ad. 1997, c. 12, s. 126; am. 2005, c. 47, s. 131], s. 37 [ad. 2005, c. 47, s. 131].

Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act, 1933, S.C. 1932-33, c. 36 [am. 1952-53, c. 3].

Employment Insurance Act, S.C. 1996, c. 23, ss. 86(2), (2.1).

Excise Tax Act, R.S.C. 1985, c. E-15, s. 222.

Income Tax Act, R.S.C. 1985, c. 1 (5 Supp.), ss. 227(4), (4.1).

Interpretation Act, R.S.C. 1985, c. I-21, ss. 2 "enactment", 44(f).

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

Authors Cited

Canada. Advisory Committee on Bankruptcy and Insolvency. *Proposed Bankruptcy Act Amendments: Report of the Advisory Committee on Bankruptcy and Insolvency*. Ottawa: Minister of Supply and Services Canada, 1986.

Canada. House of Commons. *Minutes of Proceedings and Evidence of the Standing Committee on Consumer and Corporate Affairs and Government Operations*, Issue No. 15, 3 Sess., 34 Parl., October 3, 1991, 15:15.

Canada. Industry Canada. Marketplace Framework Policy Branch. *Report on the Operation and Administration of the Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act and the Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act*. Ottawa: Corporate and Insolvency Law Policy Directorate, 2002.

Canada. Senate. *Debates of the Senate*, vol. 142, 1 Sess., 38 Parl., November 23, 2005, p. 2147.

Canada. Senate. Standing Committee on Banking, Trade and Commerce. *Debtors and Creditors Sharing the Burden: A Review of the Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act and the Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act*. Ottawa: Senate of Canada, 2003.

Canada. Study Committee on Bankruptcy and Insolvency Legislation. *Bankruptcy and Insolvency: Report of [page387] the Study Committee on Bankruptcy and Insolvency Legislation*. Ottawa: Information Canada, 1970.

Côté, Pierre-André. *The Interpretation of Legislation in Canada*, 3 ed. Scarborough, Ont.: Carswell, 2000.

Côté, Pierre-André, avec la collaboration de Stéphane Beaulac et Mathieu Devinat. *Interprétation des lois*, 4e éd. Montréal: Thémis, 2009.

Edwards, Stanley E. "Reorganizations Under the Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act" (1947), 25 *Can. Bar Rev.* 587.

Insolvency Institute of Canada and Canadian Association of Insolvency and Restructuring Professionals. Joint Task Force on Business Insolvency Law Reform. *Report* (2002) (online: <http://www.cairp.ca/publications/submissions-to-government/law-reform/index.php>).

Insolvency Institute of Canada and Canadian Association of Insolvency and Restructuring Professionals. Legislative Review Task Force (Commercial). *Report on the Commercial Provisions of Bill C-55* (2005).

Jackson, Georgina R. and Janis Sarra. "Selecting the Judicial Tool to get the Job Done: An Examination of Statutory Interpretation, Discretionary Power and Inherent Jurisdiction in Insolvency Matters", in Janis P. Sarra, ed., *Annual Review of Insolvency Law 2007*. Toronto: Thomson Carswell, 2008, 41.

Jones, Richard B. "The Evolution of Canadian Restructuring: Challenges for the Rule of Law", in Janis P. Sarra, ed., *Annual Review of Insolvency Law 2005*. Toronto: Thomson Carswell, 2006, 481.

Lamer, Francis L. *Priority of Crown Claims in Insolvency*. Toronto: Carswell, 1996 (loose-leaf updated 2010, release 1).

Morgan, Barbara K. "Should the Sovereign be Paid First? A Comparative International Analysis of the Priority for Tax Claims in Bankruptcy" (2000), 74 *Am. Bankr. L.J.* 461.

Sarra, Janis. *Creditor Rights and the Public Interest: Restructuring Insolvent Corporations*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2003.

Sarra, Janis P. *Rescue! The Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act*. Toronto: Thomson Carswell, 2007.

Sullivan, Ruth. *Sullivan on the Construction of Statutes*, 5 ed. Markham, Ont.: LexisNexis, 2008.

Waters, Donovan W. M., Mark R. Gillen and Lionel D. Smith, eds. *Waters' Law of Trusts in Canada*, 3 ed. Toronto: Thomson Carswell, 2005.

Wood, Roderick J. *Bankruptcy and Insolvency Law*. Toronto: Irwin Law, 2009.

[page388]

History and Disposition:

APPEAL from a judgment of the British Columbia Court of Appeal (Newbury, Tysoe and Smith JJ.A.), 2009 BCCA 205, 98 B.C.L.R. (4) 242, 270 B.C.A.C. 167, 454 W.A.C. 167, [2009] 12 W.W.R. 684, [2009] G.S.T.C. 79, [2009] B.C.J. No. 918 (QL), 2009 CarswellBC 1195, reversing a judgment of Brenner C.J.S.C., 2008 BCSC 1805, [2008] G.S.T.C. 221, [2008] B.C.J. No. 2611

(QL), 2008 CarswellBC 2895, dismissing a Crown application for payment of GST monies. Appeal allowed, Abella J. dissenting.

Counsel:

Mary I. A. Buttery, Owen J. James and Matthew J. G. Curtis, for the appellant.

Gordon Bourgard, David Jacyk and Michael J. Lema, for the respondent.

The judgment of McLachlin C.J. and Binnie, LeBel, Deschamps, Charron, Rothstein and Cromwell JJ. was delivered by

1 DESCHAMPS J.:-- For the first time this Court is called upon to directly interpret the provisions of the *Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act*, R.S.C. 1985, c. C-36 ("*CCAA*"). In that respect, two questions are raised. The first requires reconciliation of provisions of the *CCAA* and the *Excise Tax Act*, R.S.C. 1985, c. E-15 ("*ETA*"), which lower courts have held to be in conflict with one another. The second concerns the scope of a court's discretion when supervising reorganization. The relevant statutory provisions are reproduced in the Appendix. On the first question, having considered the evolution of Crown priorities in the context of insolvency and the wording of the various statutes creating Crown priorities, I conclude that it is the *CCAA* and not the *ETA* that provides the rule. On the second question, I conclude that the broad discretionary jurisdiction conferred on the supervising judge must be interpreted having regard to the remedial nature of the *CCAA* and insolvency legislation generally. Consequently, the court had the discretion to partially lift a stay of proceedings to allow the debtor to make an assignment under the *Bankruptcy and Insolvency [page389] Act*, R.S.C. 1985, c. B-3 ("*BIA*"). I would allow the appeal.

1. Facts and Decisions of the Courts Below

2 Ted LeRoy Trucking Ltd. ("*LeRoy Trucking*") commenced proceedings under the *CCAA* in the Supreme Court of British Columbia on December 13, 2007, obtaining a stay of proceedings with a view to reorganizing its financial affairs. LeRoy Trucking sold certain redundant assets as authorized by the order.

3 Amongst the debts owed by LeRoy Trucking was an amount for Goods and Services Tax ("*GST*") collected but unremitted to the Crown. The *ETA* creates a deemed trust in favour of the Crown for amounts collected in respect of GST. The deemed trust extends to any property or proceeds held by the person collecting GST and any property of that person held by a secured creditor, requiring that property to be paid to the Crown in priority to all security interests. The *ETA* provides that the deemed trust operates despite any other enactment of Canada except the *BIA*. However, the *CCAA* also provides that subject to certain exceptions, none of which mentions GST, deemed trusts in favour of the Crown do not operate under the *CCAA*. Accordingly, under the *CCAA* the Crown ranks as an unsecured creditor in respect of GST. Nonetheless, at the time LeRoy Trucking commenced *CCAA* proceedings the leading line of jurisprudence held that the *ETA* took precedence over the *CCAA* such that the Crown enjoyed priority for GST claims under the *CCAA*, even though it would have lost that same priority under the *BIA*. The *CCAA* underwent substantial amendments in 2005 in which some of the provisions at issue in this appeal were renumbered and reformulated

(S.C. 2005, c. 47). However, these amendments only came into force on September 18, 2009. I will refer to the amended provisions only where relevant.

[page390]

4 On April 29, 2008, Brenner C.J.S.C., in the context of the *CCAA* proceedings, approved a payment not exceeding \$5 million, the proceeds of redundant asset sales, to Century Services, the debtor's major secured creditor. LeRoy Trucking proposed to hold back an amount equal to the GST monies collected but unremitted to the Crown and place it in the Monitor's trust account until the outcome of the reorganization was known. In order to maintain the *status quo* while the success of the reorganization was uncertain, Brenner C.J.S.C. agreed to the proposal and ordered that an amount of \$305,202.30 be held by the Monitor in its trust account.

5 On September 3, 2008, having concluded that reorganization was not possible, LeRoy Trucking sought leave to make an assignment in bankruptcy under the *BIA*. The Crown sought an order that the GST monies held by the Monitor be paid to the Receiver General of Canada. Brenner C.J.S.C. dismissed the latter application. Reasoning that the purpose of segregating the funds with the Monitor was "to facilitate an ultimate payment of the GST monies which were owed pre-filing, but only if a viable plan emerged", the failure of such a reorganization, followed by an assignment in bankruptcy, meant the Crown would lose priority under the *BIA* (2008 BCSC 1805, [2008] G.S.T.C. 221).

6 The Crown's appeal was allowed by the British Columbia Court of Appeal (2009 BCCA 205, 270 B.C.A.C. 167). Tysoe J.A. for a unanimous court found two independent bases for allowing the Crown's appeal.

7 First, the court's authority under s. 11 of the *CCAA* was held not to extend to staying the Crown's application for immediate payment of the GST funds subject to the deemed trust after it was clear that reorganization efforts had failed and [page391] that bankruptcy was inevitable. As restructuring was no longer a possibility, staying the Crown's claim to the GST funds no longer served a purpose under the *CCAA* and the court was bound under the priority scheme provided by the *ETA* to allow payment to the Crown. In so holding, Tysoe J.A. adopted the reasoning in *Ottawa Senators Hockey Club Corp. (Re)* (2005), 73 O.R. (3d) 737 (C.A.), which found that the *ETA* deemed trust for GST established Crown priority over secured creditors under the *CCAA*.

8 Second, Tysoe J.A. concluded that by ordering the GST funds segregated in the Monitor's trust account on April 29, 2008, the judge had created an express trust in favour of the Crown from which the monies in question could not be diverted for any other purposes. The Court of Appeal therefore ordered that the money held by the Monitor in trust be paid to the Receiver General.

2. Issues

9 This appeal raises three broad issues which are addressed in turn:

- (1) Did s. 222(3) of the *ETA* displace s. 18.3(1) of the *CCAA* and give priority to the Crown's *ETA* deemed trust during *CCAA* proceedings as held in *Ottawa Senators*?

- (2) Did the court exceed its *CCAA* authority by lifting the stay to allow the debtor to make an assignment in bankruptcy?
- (3) Did the court's order of April 29, 2008 requiring segregation of the Crown's GST claim in the Monitor's trust account create an express trust in favour of the Crown in respect of those funds?

[page392]

3. Analysis

10 The first issue concerns Crown priorities in the context of insolvency. As will be seen, the *ETA* provides for a deemed trust in favour of the Crown in respect of GST owed by a debtor "[d]espite ... any other enactment of Canada (except the *Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act*)" (s. 222(3)), while the *CCAA* stated at the relevant time that "notwithstanding any provision in federal or provincial legislation that has the effect of deeming property to be held in trust for Her Majesty, property of a debtor company shall not be [so] regarded" (s. 18.3(1)). It is difficult to imagine two statutory provisions more apparently in conflict. However, as is often the case, the apparent conflict can be resolved through interpretation.

11 In order to properly interpret the provisions, it is necessary to examine the history of the *CCAA*, its function amidst the body of insolvency legislation enacted by Parliament, and the principles that have been recognized in the jurisprudence. It will be seen that Crown priorities in the insolvency context have been significantly pared down. The resolution of the second issue is also rooted in the context of the *CCAA*, but its purpose and the manner in which it has been interpreted in the case law are also key. After examining the first two issues in this case, I will address Tysoe J.A.'s conclusion that an express trust in favour of the Crown was created by the court's order of April 29, 2008.

3.1 *Purpose and Scope of Insolvency Law*

12 Insolvency is the factual situation that arises when a debtor is unable to pay creditors (see generally, R. J. Wood, *Bankruptcy and Insolvency Law* (2009), at p. 16). Certain legal proceedings become available upon insolvency, which typically allow a debtor to obtain a court order staying its creditors' enforcement actions and attempt to obtain [page393] a binding compromise with creditors to adjust the payment conditions to something more realistic. Alternatively, the debtor's assets may be liquidated and debts paid from the proceeds according to statutory priority rules. The former is usually referred to as reorganization or restructuring while the latter is termed liquidation.

13 Canadian commercial insolvency law is not codified in one exhaustive statute. Instead, Parliament has enacted multiple insolvency statutes, the main one being the *BIA*. The *BIA* offers a self-contained legal regime providing for both reorganization and liquidation. Although bankruptcy legislation has a long history, the *BIA* itself is a fairly recent statute -- it was enacted in 1992. It is characterized by a rules-based approach to proceedings. The *BIA* is available to insolvent debtors owing \$1000 or more, regardless of whether they are natural or legal persons. It contains mechanisms for debtors to make proposals to their creditors for the adjustment of debts. If a proposal fails,

the *BIA* contains a bridge to bankruptcy whereby the debtor's assets are liquidated and the proceeds paid to creditors in accordance with the statutory scheme of distribution.

14 Access to the *CCAA* is more restrictive. A debtor must be a company with liabilities in excess of \$5 million. Unlike the *BIA*, the *CCAA* contains no provisions for liquidation of a debtor's assets if reorganization fails. There are three ways of exiting *CCAA* proceedings. The best outcome is achieved when the stay of proceedings provides the debtor with some breathing space during which solvency is restored and the *CCAA* process terminates without reorganization being needed. The second most desirable outcome occurs when the debtor's compromise or arrangement is accepted by its creditors and the reorganized company emerges from the *CCAA* proceedings as a going concern. Lastly, if the compromise or arrangement fails, either [page394] the company or its creditors usually seek to have the debtor's assets liquidated under the applicable provisions of the *BIA* or to place the debtor into receivership. As discussed in greater detail below, the key difference between the reorganization regimes under the *BIA* and the *CCAA* is that the latter offers a more flexible mechanism with greater judicial discretion, making it more responsive to complex reorganizations.

15 As I will discuss at greater length below, the purpose of the *CCAA* -- Canada's first reorganization statute -- is to permit the debtor to continue to carry on business and, where possible, avoid the social and economic costs of liquidating its assets. Proposals to creditors under the *BIA* serve the same remedial purpose, though this is achieved through a rules-based mechanism that offers less flexibility. Where reorganization is impossible, the *BIA* may be employed to provide an orderly mechanism for the distribution of a debtor's assets to satisfy creditor claims according to predetermined priority rules.

16 Prior to the enactment of the *CCAA* in 1933 (S.C. 1932-33, c. 36), practice under existing commercial insolvency legislation tended heavily towards the liquidation of a debtor company (J. Sarra, *Creditor Rights and the Public Interest: Restructuring Insolvent Corporations* (2003), at p. 12). The battering visited upon Canadian businesses by the Great Depression and the absence of an effective mechanism for reaching a compromise between debtors and creditors to avoid liquidation required a legislative response. The *CCAA* was innovative as it allowed the insolvent debtor to attempt reorganization under judicial supervision outside the existing insolvency legislation which, once engaged, almost invariably resulted in liquidation (*Reference re Companies' Creditors [page395] Arrangement Act*, [1934] S.C.R. 659, at pp. 660-61; Sarra, *Creditor Rights*, at pp. 12-13).

17 Parliament understood when adopting the *CCAA* that liquidation of an insolvent company was harmful for most of those it affected -- notably creditors and employees -- and that a workout which allowed the company to survive was optimal (Sarrra, *Creditor Rights*, at pp. 13-15).

18 Early commentary and jurisprudence also endorsed the *CCAA*'s remedial objectives. It recognized that companies retain more value as going concerns while underscoring that intangible losses, such as the evaporation of the companies' goodwill, result from liquidation (S. E. Edwards, "Reorganizations Under the Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act" (1947), 25 *Can. Bar Rev.* 587, at p. 592). Reorganization serves the public interest by facilitating the survival of companies supplying goods or services crucial to the health of the economy or saving large numbers of jobs (*ibid.*, at p. 593). Insolvency could be so widely felt as to impact stakeholders other than creditors and employees. Variants of these views resonate today, with reorganization justified in terms of rehabili-

tating companies that are key elements in a complex web of interdependent economic relationships in order to avoid the negative consequences of liquidation.

19 The *CCAA* fell into disuse during the next several decades, likely because amendments to the Act in 1953 restricted its use to companies issuing bonds (S.C. 1952-53, c. 3). During the economic downturn of the early 1980s, insolvency lawyers and courts adapting to the resulting wave of insolvencies resurrected the statute and deployed it in response to new economic challenges. Participants in insolvency proceedings grew to recognize and appreciate the statute's distinguishing feature: a grant of broad and flexible authority to the supervising court to make [page396] the orders necessary to facilitate the reorganization of the debtor and achieve the *CCAA*'s objectives. The manner in which courts have used *CCAA* jurisdiction in increasingly creative and flexible ways is explored in greater detail below.

20 Efforts to evolve insolvency law were not restricted to the courts during this period. In 1970, a government-commissioned panel produced an extensive study recommending sweeping reform but Parliament failed to act (see *Bankruptcy and Insolvency: Report of the Study Committee on Bankruptcy and Insolvency Legislation* (1970)). Another panel of experts produced more limited recommendations in 1986 which eventually resulted in enactment of the *Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act* of 1992 (S.C. 1992, c. 27) (see *Proposed Bankruptcy Act Amendments: Report of the Advisory Committee on Bankruptcy and Insolvency* (1986)). Broader provisions for reorganizing insolvent debtors were then included in Canada's bankruptcy statute. Although the 1970 and 1986 reports made no specific recommendations with respect to the *CCAA*, the House of Commons committee studying the *BIA*'s predecessor bill, C-22, seemed to accept expert testimony that the *BIA*'s new reorganization scheme would shortly supplant the *CCAA*, which could then be repealed, with commercial insolvency and bankruptcy being governed by a single statute (*Minutes of Proceedings and Evidence of the Standing Committee on Consumer and Corporate Affairs and Government Operations*, Issue No. 15, 3rd Sess., 34th Parl., October 3, 1991, at 15:15-15:16).

21 In retrospect, this conclusion by the House of Commons committee was out of step with reality. It overlooked the renewed vitality the *CCAA* enjoyed in contemporary practice and the advantage that a [page397] flexible judicially supervised reorganization process presented in the face of increasingly complex reorganizations, when compared to the stricter rules-based scheme contained in the *BIA*. The "flexibility of the *CCAA* [was seen as] a great benefit, allowing for creative and effective decisions" (Industry Canada, Marketplace Framework Policy Branch, *Report on the Operation and Administration of the Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act and the Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act* (2002), at p. 41). Over the past three decades, resurrection of the *CCAA* has thus been the mainspring of a process through which, one author concludes, "the legal setting for Canadian insolvency restructuring has evolved from a rather blunt instrument to one of the most sophisticated systems in the developed world" (R. B. Jones, "The Evolution of Canadian Restructuring: Challenges for the Rule of Law", in J. P. Sarra, ed., *Annual Review of Insolvency Law 2005* (2006), 481, at p. 481).

22 While insolvency proceedings may be governed by different statutory schemes, they share some commonalities. The most prominent of these is the single proceeding model. The nature and purpose of the single proceeding model are described by Professor Wood in *Bankruptcy and Insolvency Law*:

They all provide a collective proceeding that supersedes the usual civil process available to creditors to enforce their claims. The creditors' remedies are collectivized in order to prevent the free-for-all that would otherwise prevail if creditors were permitted to exercise their remedies. In the absence of a collective process, each creditor is armed with the knowledge that if they do not strike hard and swift to seize the debtor's assets, they will be beat out by other creditors. [pp. 2-3]

The single proceeding model avoids the inefficiency and chaos that would attend insolvency if each creditor initiated proceedings to recover its debt. Grouping all possible actions against the debtor into a single proceeding controlled in a single forum facilitates negotiation with creditors because it places them all on an equal footing, [page398] rather than exposing them to the risk that a more aggressive creditor will realize its claims against the debtor's limited assets while the other creditors attempt a compromise. With a view to achieving that purpose, both the *CCAA* and the *BIA* allow a court to order all actions against a debtor to be stayed while a compromise is sought.

23 Another point of convergence of the *CCAA* and the *BIA* relates to priorities. Because the *CCAA* is silent about what happens if reorganization fails, the *BIA* scheme of liquidation and distribution necessarily supplies the backdrop for what will happen if a *CCAA* reorganization is ultimately unsuccessful. In addition, one of the important features of legislative reform of both statutes since the enactment of the *BIA* in 1992 has been a cutback in Crown priorities (S.C. 1992, c. 27, s. 39; S.C. 1997, c. 12, ss. 73 and 125; S.C. 2000, c. 30, s. 148; S.C. 2005, c. 47, ss. 69 and 131; S.C. 2009, c. 33, s. 25; see also *Quebec (Revenue) v. Caisse populaire Desjardins de Montmagny*, 2009 SCC 49, [2009] 3 S.C.R. 286; *Deputy Minister of Revenue v. Rainville*, [1980] 1 S.C.R. 35; *Proposed Bankruptcy Act Amendments: Report of the Advisory Committee on Bankruptcy and Insolvency*).

24 With parallel *CCAA* and *BIA* restructuring schemes now an accepted feature of the insolvency law landscape, the contemporary thrust of legislative reform has been towards harmonizing aspects of insolvency law common to the two statutory schemes to the extent possible and encouraging reorganization over liquidation (see *An Act to establish the Wage Earner Protection Program Act, to amend the Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act and the Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act and to make consequential amendments to other Acts*, S.C. 2005, c. 47; *Gauntlet Energy Corp., Re*, 2003 ABQB 894, 30 Alta. L.R. (4th) 192, at para. 19).

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

[page399]

3.2 GST Deemed Trust Under the *CCAA*

26 The Court of Appeal proceeded on the basis that the *ETA* precluded the court from staying the Crown's enforcement of the GST deemed trust when partially lifting the stay to allow the debtor to enter bankruptcy. In so doing, it adopted the reasoning in a line of cases culminating in *Ottawa Senators*, which held that an *ETA* deemed trust remains enforceable during *CCAA* reorganization despite language in the *CCAA* that suggests otherwise.

27 The Crown relies heavily on the decision of the Ontario Court of Appeal in *Ottawa Senators* and argues that the later in time provision of the *ETA* creating the GST deemed trust trumps the provision of the *CCAA* purporting to nullify most statutory deemed trusts. The Court of Appeal in this case accepted this reasoning but not all provincial courts follow it (see, e.g., *Komunik Corp. (Arrangement relatif à)*, 2009 QCCS 6332 (CanLII), leave to appeal granted, 2010 QCCA 183 (CanLII)). Century Services relied, in its written submissions to this Court, on the argument that the court had authority under the *CCAA* to continue the stay against the Crown's claim for unremitted GST. In oral argument, the question of whether *Ottawa Senators* was correctly decided nonetheless arose. After the hearing, the parties were asked to make further written submissions on this point. As appears evident from the reasons of my colleague Abella J., this issue has become prominent before this Court. In those circumstances, this Court needs to determine the correctness of the reasoning in *Ottawa Senators*.

28 The policy backdrop to this question involves the Crown's priority as a creditor in insolvency situations which, as I mentioned above, has evolved considerably. Prior to the 1990s, Crown claims [page400] largely enjoyed priority in insolvency. This was widely seen as unsatisfactory as shown by both the 1970 and 1986 insolvency reform proposals, which recommended that Crown claims receive no preferential treatment. A closely related matter was whether the *CCAA* was binding at all upon the Crown. Amendments to the *CCAA* in 1997 confirmed that it did indeed bind the Crown (see *CCAA*, s. 21, as added by S.C. 1997, c. 12, s. 126).

29 Claims of priority by the state in insolvency situations receive different treatment across jurisdictions worldwide. For example, in Germany and Australia, the state is given no priority at all, while the state enjoys wide priority in the United States and France (see B. K. Morgan, "Should the Sovereign be Paid First? A Comparative International Analysis of the Priority for Tax Claims in Bankruptcy" (2000), 74 *Am. Bankr. L.J.* 461, at p. 500). Canada adopted a middle course through legislative reform of Crown priority initiated in 1992. The Crown retained priority for source deductions of income tax, Employment Insurance ("EI") and Canada Pension Plan ("CPP") premiums, but ranks as an ordinary unsecured creditor for most other claims.

30 Parliament has frequently enacted statutory mechanisms to secure Crown claims and permit their enforcement. The two most common are statutory deemed trusts and powers to garnish funds third parties owe the debtor (see F. L. Lamer, *Priority of Crown Claims in Insolvency* (loose-leaf), at s.2).

31 With respect to GST collected, Parliament has enacted a deemed trust. The *ETA* states that every person who collects an amount on account of GST is deemed to hold that amount in trust for the Crown (s. 222(1)). The deemed trust extends to other property of the person collecting the tax equal in value to the amount deemed to be in trust if that amount has not been remitted in accordance with the *ETA*. The deemed trust also extends to property [page401] held by a secured creditor that, but for the security interest, would be property of the person collecting the tax (s. 222(3)).

32 Parliament has created similar deemed trusts using almost identical language in respect of source deductions of income tax, EI premiums and CPP premiums (see s. 227(4) of the *Income Tax Act*, R.S.C. 1985, c. 1 (5th Supp.) ("*ITA*"), ss. 86(2) and (2.1) of the *Employment Insurance Act*, S.C. 1996, c. 23, and ss. 23(3) and (4) of the *Canada Pension Plan*, R.S.C. 1985, c. C-8). I will refer to income tax, EI and CPP deductions as "source deductions".

33 In *Royal Bank of Canada v. Sparrow Electric Corp.*, [1997] 1 S.C.R. 411, this Court addressed a priority dispute between a deemed trust for source deductions under the *ITA* and security interests taken under both the *Bank Act*, S.C. 1991, c. 46, and the *Alberta Personal Property Security Act*, S.A. 1988, c. P-4.05 ("*PPSA*"). As then worded, an *ITA* deemed trust over the debtor's property equivalent to the amount owing in respect of income tax became effective at the time of liquidation, receivership, or assignment in bankruptcy. *Sparrow Electric* held that the *ITA* deemed trust could not prevail over the security interests because, being fixed charges, the latter attached as soon as the debtor acquired rights in the property such that the *ITA* deemed trust had no property on which to attach when it subsequently arose. Later, in *First Vancouver Finance v. M.N.R.*, 2002 SCC 49, [2002] 2 S.C.R. 720, this Court observed that Parliament had legislated to strengthen the statutory deemed trust in the *ITA* by deeming it to operate from the moment the deductions were not paid to the Crown as required by the *ITA*, and by granting the Crown priority over all security interests (paras. 27-29) (the "*Sparrow Electric* amendment").

[page402]

34 The amended text of s. 227(4.1) of the *ITA* and concordant source deductions deemed trusts in the *Canada Pension Plan* and the *Employment Insurance Act* state that the deemed trust operates notwithstanding any other enactment of Canada, except ss. 81.1 and 81.2 of the *BIA*. The *ETA* deemed trust at issue in this case is similarly worded, but it excepts the *BIA* in its entirety. The provision reads as follows:

222... .

...

(3) Despite any other provision of this Act (except subsection (4)), any other enactment of Canada (except the *Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act*), any enactment of a province or any other law, if at any time an amount deemed by subsection (1) to be held by a person in trust for Her Majesty is not remitted to the Receiver General or withdrawn in the manner and at the time provided under this Part, property of the person and property held by any secured creditor of the person that, but for a security interest, would be property of the person, equal in value to the amount so deemed to be held in trust, is deemed

35 The Crown submits that the *Sparrow Electric* amendment, added by Parliament to the *ETA* in 2000, was intended to preserve the Crown's priority over collected GST under the *CCAA* while subordinating the Crown to the status of an unsecured creditor in respect of GST only under the *BIA*. This is because the *ETA* provides that the GST deemed trust is effective "despite" any other enactment except the *BIA*.

36 The language used in the *ETA* for the GST deemed trust creates an apparent conflict with the *CCAA*, which provides that subject to certain exceptions, property deemed by statute to be held in trust for the Crown shall not be so regarded.

37 Through a 1997 amendment to the *CCAA* (S.C. 1997, c. 12, s. 125), Parliament appears to have, [page403] subject to specific exceptions, nullified deemed trusts in favour of the Crown once reorganization proceedings are commenced under the Act. The relevant provision reads:

18.3 (1) Subject to subsection (2), notwithstanding any provision in federal or provincial legislation that has the effect of deeming property to be held in trust for Her Majesty, property of a debtor company shall not be regarded as held in trust for Her Majesty unless it would be so regarded in the absence of that statutory provision.

This nullification of deemed trusts was continued in further amendments to the *CCAA* (S.C. 2005, c. 47), where s. 18.3(1) was renumbered and reformulated as s. 37(1):

37. (1) Subject to subsection (2), despite any provision in federal or provincial legislation that has the effect of deeming property to be held in trust for Her Majesty, property of a debtor company shall not be regarded as being held in trust for Her Majesty unless it would be so regarded in the absence of that statutory provision.

38 An analogous provision exists in the *BIA*, which, subject to the same specific exceptions, nullifies statutory deemed trusts and makes property of the bankrupt that would otherwise be subject to a deemed trust part of the debtor's estate and available to creditors (S.C. 1992, c. 27, s. 39; S.C. 1997, c. 12, s. 73; *BIA*, s. 67(2)). It is noteworthy that in both the *CCAA* and the *BIA*, the exceptions concern source deductions (*CCAA*, s. 18.3(2); *BIA*, s. 67(3)). The relevant provision of the *CCAA* reads:

18.3 ...

(2) Subsection (1) does not apply in respect of amounts deemed to be held in trust under subsection 227(4) or (4.1) of the *Income Tax Act*, subsection 23(3) or (4) of the *Canada Pension Plan* or subsection 86(2) or (2.1) of the *Employment Insurance Act*...

Thus, the Crown's deemed trust and corresponding priority in source deductions remain effective both in reorganization and in bankruptcy.

[page404]

39 Meanwhile, in both s. 18.4(1) of the *CCAA* and s. 86(1) of the *BIA*, other Crown claims are treated as unsecured. These provisions, establishing the Crown's status as an unsecured creditor, explicitly exempt statutory deemed trusts in source deductions (*CCAA*, s. 18.4(3); *BIA*, s. 86(3)). The *CCAA* provision reads as follows:

18.4 ...

...

(3) Subsection (1) [Crown ranking as unsecured creditor] does not affect the operation of

(a) subsections 224(1.2) and (1.3) of the *Income Tax Act*,

(b) any provision of the *Canada Pension Plan* or of the *Employment Insurance Act* that refers to subsection 224(1.2) of the *Income Tax Act* and provides for the collection of a contribution

Therefore, not only does the *CCAA* provide that Crown claims do not enjoy priority over the claims of other creditors (s. 18.3(1)), but the exceptions to this rule (i.e., that Crown priority is maintained for source deductions) are repeatedly stated in the statute.

40 The apparent conflict in this case is whether the rule in the *CCAA* first enacted as s. 18.3 in 1997, which provides that subject to certain explicit exceptions, statutory deemed trusts are ineffective under the *CCAA*, is overridden by the one in the *ETA* enacted in 2000 stating that GST deemed trusts operate despite any enactment of Canada except the *BIA*. With respect for my colleague Fish J., I do not think the apparent conflict can be resolved by denying it and creating a rule requiring both a statutory provision enacting the deemed trust, and a second statutory provision confirming it. Such a rule is unknown to the law. Courts must recognize [page405] conflicts, apparent or real, and resolve them when possible.

41 A line of jurisprudence across Canada has resolved the apparent conflict in favour of the *ETA*, thereby maintaining GST deemed trusts under the *CCAA*. *Ottawa Senators*, the leading case, decided the matter by invoking the doctrine of implied repeal to hold that the later in time provision of the *ETA* should take precedence over the *CCAA* (see also *Solid Resources Ltd., Re* (2002), 40 C.B.R. (4th) 219 (Alta. Q.B.); *Gauntlet*).

42 The Ontario Court of Appeal in *Ottawa Senators* rested its conclusion on two considerations. First, it was persuaded that by explicitly mentioning the *BIA* in *ETA* s. 222(3), but not the *CCAA*, Parliament made a deliberate choice. In the words of MacPherson J.A.:

The *BIA* and the *CCAA* are closely related federal statutes. I cannot conceive that Parliament would specifically identify the *BIA* as an exception, but accidentally fail to consider the *CCAA* as a possible second exception. In my view, the omission of the *CCAA* from s. 222(3) of the *ETA* was almost certainly a considered omission. [para. 43]

43 Second, the Ontario Court of Appeal compared the conflict between the *ETA* and the *CCAA* to that before this Court in *Doré v. Verdun (City)*, [1997] 2 S.C.R. 862, and found them to be "identical" (para. 46). It therefore considered *Doré* binding (para. 49). In *Doré*, a limitations provision in the more general and recently enacted *Civil Code of Québec*, S.Q. 1991, c. 64 ("*C.C.Q.*"), was held to have repealed a more specific provision of the earlier Quebec *Cities and Towns Act*, R.S.Q., c. C-19, with which it conflicted. By analogy, [page406] the Ontario Court of Appeal held that the later in time and more general provision, s. 222(3) of the *ETA*, impliedly repealed the more specific and earlier in time provision, s. 18.3(1) of the *CCAA* (paras. 47-49).

44 Viewing this issue in its entire context, several considerations lead me to conclude that neither the reasoning nor the result in *Ottawa Senators* can stand. While a conflict may exist at the level of the statutes' wording, a purposive and contextual analysis to determine Parliament's true intent yields the conclusion that Parliament could not have intended to restore the Crown's deemed trust priority in GST claims under the *CCAA* when it amended the *ETA* in 2000 with the *Sparrow Electric* amendment.

45 I begin by recalling that Parliament has shown its willingness to move away from asserting priority for Crown claims in insolvency law. Section 18.3(1) of the *CCAA* (subject to the s. 18.3(2) exceptions) provides that the Crown's deemed trusts have no effect under the *CCAA*. Where Parliament has sought to protect certain Crown claims through statutory deemed trusts and intended that these deemed trusts continue in insolvency, it has legislated so explicitly and elaborately. For example, s. 18.3(2) of the *CCAA* and s. 67(3) of the *BIA* expressly provide that deemed trusts for source deductions remain effective in insolvency. Parliament has, therefore, clearly carved out exceptions from the general rule that deemed trusts are ineffective in insolvency. The *CCAA* and *BIA* are in harmony, preserving deemed trusts and asserting Crown priority only in respect of source deductions. Meanwhile, there is no express statutory basis for concluding that GST claims enjoy a preferred treatment under the *CCAA* or the *BIA*. Unlike source deductions, which are clearly and expressly dealt with under both these insolvency statutes, no such clear and express language exists [page407] in those Acts carving out an exception for GST claims.

46 The internal logic of the *CCAA* also militates against upholding the *ETA* deemed trust for GST. The *CCAA* imposes limits on a suspension by the court of the Crown's rights in respect of source deductions but does not mention the *ETA* (s. 11.4). Since source deductions deemed trusts are granted explicit protection under the *CCAA*, it would be inconsistent to afford a better protection to the *ETA* deemed trust absent explicit language in the *CCAA*. Thus, the logic of the *CCAA* appears to subject the *ETA* deemed trust to the waiver by Parliament of its priority (s. 18.4).

47 Moreover, a strange asymmetry would arise if the interpretation giving the *ETA* priority over the *CCAA* urged by the Crown is adopted here: the Crown would retain priority over GST claims during *CCAA* proceedings but not in bankruptcy. As courts have reflected, this can only encourage statute shopping by secured creditors in cases such as this one where the debtor's assets cannot satisfy both the secured creditors' and the Crown's claims (*Gauntlet*, at para. 21). If creditors' claims were better protected by liquidation under the *BIA*, creditors' incentives would lie overwhelmingly with avoiding proceedings under the *CCAA* and not risking a failed reorganization. Giving a key player in any insolvency such skewed incentives against reorganizing under the *CCAA* can only undermine that statute's remedial objectives and risk inviting the very social ills that it was enacted to avert.

[page408]

48 Arguably, the effect of *Ottawa Senators* is mitigated if restructuring is attempted under the *BIA* instead of the *CCAA*, but it is not cured. If *Ottawa Senators* were to be followed, Crown priority over GST would differ depending on whether restructuring took place under the *CCAA* or the *BIA*. The anomaly of this result is made manifest by the fact that it would deprive companies of the

option to restructure under the more flexible and responsive *CCAA* regime, which has been the statute of choice for complex reorganizations.

49 Evidence that Parliament intended different treatments for GST claims in reorganization and bankruptcy is scant, if it exists at all. Section 222(3) of the *ETA* was enacted as part of a wide-ranging budget implementation bill in 2000. The summary accompanying that bill does not indicate that Parliament intended to elevate Crown priority over GST claims under the *CCAA* to the same or a higher level than source deductions claims. Indeed, the summary for deemed trusts states only that amendments to existing provisions are aimed at "ensuring that employment insurance premiums and Canada Pension Plan contributions that are required to be remitted by an employer are fully recoverable by the Crown in the case of the bankruptcy of the employer" (Summary to S.C. 2000, c. 30, at p. 4a). The wording of GST deemed trusts resembles that of statutory deemed trusts for source deductions and incorporates the same overriding language and reference to the *BIA*. However, as noted above, Parliament's express intent is that only source deductions deemed trusts remain operative. An exception for the *BIA* in the statutory language establishing the source deductions deemed trusts accomplishes very little, because the explicit language of the *BIA* itself (and the *CCAA*) carves out these source deductions deemed trusts and maintains their effect. It is however noteworthy that no equivalent language maintaining GST deemed trusts exists under either the *BIA* or the *CCAA*.

[page409]

50 It seems more likely that by adopting the same language for creating GST deemed trusts in the *ETA* as it did for deemed trusts for source deductions, and by overlooking the inclusion of an exception for the *CCAA* alongside the *BIA* in s. 222(3) of the *ETA*, Parliament may have inadvertently succumbed to a drafting anomaly. Because of a statutory lacuna in the *ETA*, the GST deemed trust could be seen as remaining effective in the *CCAA*, while ceasing to have any effect under the *BIA*, thus creating an apparent conflict with the wording of the *CCAA*. However, it should be seen for what it is: a facial conflict only, capable of resolution by looking at the broader approach taken to Crown priorities and by giving precedence to the statutory language of s. 18.3 of the *CCAA* in a manner that does not produce an anomalous outcome.

51 Section 222(3) of the *ETA* evinces no explicit intention of Parliament to repeal *CCAA* s. 18.3. It merely creates an apparent conflict that must be resolved by statutory interpretation. Parliament's intent when it enacted *ETA* s. 222(3) was therefore far from unambiguous. Had it sought to give the Crown a priority for GST claims, it could have done so explicitly as it did for source deductions. Instead, one is left to infer from the language of *ETA* s. 222(3) that the GST deemed trust was intended to be effective under the *CCAA*.

52 I am not persuaded that the reasoning in *Doré* requires the application of the doctrine of implied repeal in the circumstances of this case. The main issue in *Doré* concerned the impact of the adoption of the *C.C.Q.* on the administrative law rules with respect to municipalities. While Gonthier J. concluded in that case that the limitation provision in art. 2930 *C.C.Q.* had repealed by implication a limitation provision in the *Cities and Towns Act*, he did so on the basis of more than a textual analysis. The conclusion in *Doré* was reached after thorough [page410] contextual analysis of both pieces of legislation, including an extensive review of the relevant legislative history (paras.

31-41). Consequently, the circumstances before this Court in *Doré* are far from "identical" to those in the present case, in terms of text, context and legislative history. Accordingly, *Doré* cannot be said to require the automatic application of the rule of repeal by implication.

53 A noteworthy indicator of Parliament's overall intent is the fact that in subsequent amendments it has not displaced the rule set out in the *CCAA*. Indeed, as indicated above, the recent amendments to the *CCAA* in 2005 resulted in the rule previously found in s. 18.3 being renumbered and reformulated as s. 37. Thus, to the extent the interpretation allowing the GST deemed trust to remain effective under the *CCAA* depends on *ETA* s. 222(3) having impliedly repealed *CCAA* s. 18.3(1) because it is later in time, we have come full circle. Parliament has renumbered and reformulated the provision of the *CCAA* stating that, subject to exceptions for source deductions, deemed trusts do not survive the *CCAA* proceedings and thus the *CCAA* is now the later in time statute. This confirms that Parliament's intent with respect to GST deemed trusts is to be found in the *CCAA*.

54 I do not agree with my colleague Abella J. that s. 44(f) of the *Interpretation Act*, R.S.C. 1985, c. I-21, can be used to interpret the 2005 amendments as having no effect. The new statute can hardly be said to be a mere re-enactment of the former statute. Indeed, the *CCAA* underwent a substantial review in 2005. Notably, acting consistently with its goal of treating both the *BIA* and the *CCAA* as sharing the same approach to insolvency, Parliament made parallel amendments to both statutes with respect to corporate proposals. In addition, new provisions were introduced regarding [page411] the treatment of contracts, collective agreements, interim financing and governance agreements. The appointment and role of the Monitor was also clarified. Noteworthy are the limits imposed by *CCAA* s. 11.09 on the court's discretion to make an order staying the Crown's source deductions deemed trusts, which were formerly found in s. 11.4. No mention whatsoever is made of GST deemed trusts (see Summary to S.C. 2005, c. 47). The review went as far as looking at the very expression used to describe the statutory override of deemed trusts. The comments cited by my colleague only emphasize the clear intent of Parliament to maintain its policy that only source deductions deemed trusts survive in *CCAA* proceedings.

55 In the case at bar, the legislative context informs the determination of Parliament's legislative intent and supports the conclusion that *ETA* s. 222(3) was not intended to narrow the scope of the *CCAA*'s override provision. Viewed in its entire context, the conflict between the *ETA* and the *CCAA* is more apparent than real. I would therefore not follow the reasoning in *Ottawa Senators* and affirm that *CCAA* s. 18.3 remained effective.

56 My conclusion is reinforced by the purpose of the *CCAA* as part of Canadian remedial insolvency legislation. As this aspect is particularly relevant to the second issue, I will now discuss how courts have interpreted the scope of their discretionary powers in supervising a *CCAA* reorganization and how Parliament has largely endorsed this interpretation. Indeed, the interpretation courts have given to the *CCAA* helps in understanding how the *CCAA* grew to occupy such a prominent role in Canadian insolvency law.

[page412]

3.3 Discretionary Power of a Court Supervising a *CCAA* Reorganization

57 Courts frequently observe that "[t]he *CCAA* is skeletal in nature" and does not "contain a comprehensive code that lays out all that is permitted or barred" (*Metcalf & Mansfield Alternative Investments II Corp. (Re)*, 2008 ONCA 587, 92 O.R. (3d) 513, at para. 44, *per* Blair J.A.). Accordingly, "[t]he history of *CCAA* law has been an evolution of judicial interpretation" (*Dylex Ltd., Re* (1995), 31 C.B.R. (3d) 106 (Ont. Ct. (Gen. Div.)), at para. 10, *per* Farley J.).

58 *CCAA* decisions are often based on discretionary grants of jurisdiction. The incremental exercise of judicial discretion in commercial courts under conditions one practitioner aptly describes as "the hothouse of real-time litigation" has been the primary method by which the *CCAA* has been adapted and has evolved to meet contemporary business and social needs (see Jones, at p. 484).

59 Judicial discretion must of course be exercised in furtherance of the *CCAA*'s purposes. The remedial purpose I referred to in the historical overview of the Act is recognized over and over again in the jurisprudence. To cite one early example:

The legislation is remedial in the purest sense in that it provides a means whereby the devastating social and economic effects of bankruptcy or creditor initiated termination of ongoing business operations can be avoided while a court-supervised attempt to reorganize the financial affairs of the debtor company is made.

(*Elan Corp. v. Comiskey* (1990), 41 O.A.C. 282
, at para. 57, *per* Doherty J.A., dissenting)

60 Judicial decision making under the *CCAA* takes many forms. A court must first of all provide the conditions under which the debtor can attempt to reorganize. This can be achieved by [page413] staying enforcement actions by creditors to allow the debtor's business to continue, preserving the *status quo* while the debtor plans the compromise or arrangement to be presented to creditors, and supervising the process and advancing it to the point where it can be determined whether it will succeed (see, e.g., *Chef Ready Foods Ltd. v. Hongkong Bank of Can.* (1990), 51 B.C.L.R. (2d) 84 (C.A.), at pp. 88-89; *Pacific National Lease Holding Corp., Re* (1992), 19 B.C.A.C. 134, at para. 27). In doing so, the court must often be cognizant of the various interests at stake in the reorganization, which can extend beyond those of the debtor and creditors to include employees, directors, shareholders, and even other parties doing business with the insolvent company (see, e.g., *Canadian Airlines Corp., Re*, 2000 ABQB 442, 84 Alta. L.R. (3d) 9, at para. 144, *per* Paperny J. (as she then was); *Air Canada, Re* (2003), 42 C.B.R. (4th) 173 (Ont. S.C.J.), at para. 3; *Air Canada, Re*, 2003 CanLII 49366 (Ont. S.C.J.), at para. 13, *per* Farley J.; Sarra, *Creditor Rights*, at pp. 181-92 and 217-26). In addition, courts must recognize that on occasion the broader public interest will be engaged by aspects of the reorganization and may be a factor against which the decision of whether to allow a particular action will be weighed (see, e.g., *Canadian Red Cross Society/Soci t  Canadienne de la Croix Rouge, Re* (2000), 19 C.B.R. (4th) 158 (Ont. S.C.J.), at para. 2, *per* Blair J. (as he then was); Sarra, *Creditor Rights*, at pp. 195-214).

61 When large companies encounter difficulty, reorganizations become increasingly complex. *CCAA* courts have been called upon to innovate accordingly in exercising their jurisdiction beyond merely staying proceedings against the debtor to allow breathing room for reorganization. They have been asked to sanction measures for which there is no explicit authority in the *CCAA*. Without

exhaustively cataloguing the various measures taken under the authority of the *CCAA*, it is useful to refer briefly to a few examples to illustrate the flexibility the statute affords supervising courts.

[page414]

62 Perhaps the most creative use of *CCAA* authority has been the increasing willingness of courts to authorize post-filing security for debtor in possession financing or super-priority charges on the debtor's assets when necessary for the continuation of the debtor's business during the reorganization (see, e.g., *Skydome Corp., Re* (1998), 16 C.B.R. (4th) 118 (Ont. Ct. (Gen. Div.)); *United Used Auto & Truck Parts Ltd., Re*, 2000 BCCA 146, 135 B.C.A.C. 96, aff'g (1999), 12 C.B.R. (4th) 144 (S.C.); and generally, J. P. Sarra, *Rescue! The Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act* (2007), at pp. 93-115). The *CCAA* has also been used to release claims against third parties as part of approving a comprehensive plan of arrangement and compromise, even over the objections of some dissenting creditors (see *Metcalfe & Mansfield*). As well, the appointment of a Monitor to oversee the reorganization was originally a measure taken pursuant to the *CCAA*'s supervisory authority; Parliament responded, making the mechanism mandatory by legislative amendment.

63 Judicial innovation during *CCAA* proceedings has not been without controversy. At least two questions it raises are directly relevant to the case at bar: (1) What are the sources of a court's authority during *CCAA* proceedings? (2) What are the limits of this authority?

64 The first question concerns the boundary between a court's statutory authority under the *CCAA* and a court's residual authority under its inherent and equitable jurisdiction when supervising a reorganization. In authorizing measures during *CCAA* proceedings, courts have on occasion purported to rely upon their equitable jurisdiction to advance the purposes of the Act or their inherent jurisdiction to fill gaps in the statute. Recent appellate decisions have counselled against [page415] purporting to rely on inherent jurisdiction, holding that the better view is that courts are in most cases simply construing the authority supplied by the *CCAA* itself (see, e.g., *Skeena Cellulose Inc., Re*, 2003 BCCA 344, 13 B.C.L.R. (4th) 236, at paras. 45-47, *per* Newbury J.A.; *Stelco Inc. (Re)* (2005), 75 O.R. (3d) 5 (C.A.), at paras. 31-33, *per* Blair J.A.).

65 I agree with Justice Georgina R. Jackson and Professor Janis Sarra that the most appropriate approach is a hierarchical one in which courts rely first on an interpretation of the provisions of the *CCAA* text before turning to inherent or equitable jurisdiction to anchor measures taken in a *CCAA* proceeding (see G. R. Jackson and J. Sarra, "Selecting the Judicial Tool to get the Job Done: An Examination of Statutory Interpretation, Discretionary Power and Inherent Jurisdiction in Insolvency Matters", in J. P. Sarra, ed., *Annual Review of Insolvency Law 2007* (2008), 41, at p. 42). The authors conclude that when given an appropriately purposive and liberal interpretation, the *CCAA* will be sufficient in most instances to ground measures necessary to achieve its objectives (p. 94).

66 Having examined the pertinent parts of the *CCAA* and the recent history of the legislation, I accept that in most instances the issuance of an order during *CCAA* proceedings should be considered an exercise in statutory interpretation. Particularly noteworthy in this regard is the expansive interpretation the language of the statute at issue is capable of supporting.

67 The initial grant of authority under the *CCAA* empowered a court "where an application is made under this Act in respect of a company ... on the application of any person interested in the

[page416] matter, ... subject to this Act, [to] make an order under this section" (*CCAA*, s. 11(1)). The plain language of the statute was very broad.

68 In this regard, though not strictly applicable to the case at bar, I note that Parliament has in recent amendments changed the wording contained in s. 11(1), making explicit the discretionary authority of the court under the *CCAA*. Thus, in s. 11 of the *CCAA* as currently enacted, a court may, "subject to the restrictions set out in this Act, ... make any order that it considers appropriate in the circumstances" (S.C. 2005, c. 47, s. 128). Parliament appears to have endorsed the broad reading of *CCAA* authority developed by the jurisprudence.

69 The *CCAA* also explicitly provides for certain orders. Both an order made on an initial application and an order on subsequent applications may stay, restrain, or prohibit existing or new proceedings against the debtor. The burden is on the applicant to satisfy the court that the order is appropriate in the circumstances and that the applicant has been acting in good faith and with due diligence (*CCAA*, ss. 11(3), (4) and (6)).

70 The general language of the *CCAA* should not be read as being restricted by the availability of more specific orders. However, the requirements of appropriateness, good faith, and due diligence are baseline considerations that a court should always bear in mind when exercising *CCAA* authority. Appropriateness under the *CCAA* is assessed by inquiring whether the order sought advances the policy objectives underlying the *CCAA*. The question is whether the order will usefully further efforts to achieve the remedial purpose of the *CCAA* -- avoiding the social and economic losses resulting from liquidation of an insolvent company. I would add that appropriateness extends not only to the purpose of the order, but also to the means it employs. Courts should be mindful that chances for successful reorganizations are enhanced where participants achieve common ground and all [page417] stakeholders are treated as advantageously and fairly as the circumstances permit.

71 It is well established that efforts to reorganize under the *CCAA* can be terminated and the stay of proceedings against the debtor lifted if the reorganization is "doomed to failure" (see *Chef Ready*, at p. 88; *Philip's Manufacturing Ltd., Re* (1992), 9 C.B.R. (3d) 25 (B.C.C.A.), at paras. 6-7). However, when an order is sought that does realistically advance the *CCAA*'s purposes, the ability to make it is within the discretion of a *CCAA* court.

72 The preceding discussion assists in determining whether the court had authority under the *CCAA* to continue the stay of proceedings against the Crown once it was apparent that reorganization would fail and bankruptcy was the inevitable next step.

73 In the Court of Appeal, Tysoe J.A. held that no authority existed under the *CCAA* to continue staying the Crown's enforcement of the GST deemed trust once efforts at reorganization had come to an end. The appellant submits that in so holding, Tysoe J.A. failed to consider the underlying purpose of the *CCAA* and give the statute an appropriately purposive and liberal interpretation under which the order was permissible. The Crown submits that Tysoe J.A. correctly held that the mandatory language of the *ETA* gave the court no option but to permit enforcement of the GST deemed trust when lifting the *CCAA* stay to permit the debtor to make an assignment under the *BIA*. Whether the *ETA* has a mandatory effect in the context of a *CCAA* proceeding has already been discussed. I will now address the question of whether the order was authorized by the *CCAA*.

74 It is beyond dispute that the *CCAA* imposes no explicit temporal limitations upon proceedings commenced under the Act that would prohibit ordering a continuation of the stay of the Crown's GST claims while lifting the general stay of proceedings temporarily to allow the debtor to make an assignment in bankruptcy.

75 The question remains whether the order advanced the underlying purpose of the *CCAA*. The Court of Appeal held that it did not because the reorganization efforts had come to an end and the *CCAA* was accordingly spent. I disagree.

76 There is no doubt that had reorganization been commenced under the *BIA* instead of the *CCAA*, the Crown's deemed trust priority for the GST funds would have been lost. Similarly, the Crown does not dispute that under the scheme of distribution in bankruptcy under the *BIA* the deemed trust for GST ceases to have effect. Thus, after reorganization under the *CCAA* failed, creditors would have had a strong incentive to seek immediate bankruptcy and distribution of the debtor's assets under the *BIA*. In order to conclude that the discretion does not extend to partially lifting the stay in order to allow for an assignment in bankruptcy, one would have to assume a gap between the *CCAA* and the *BIA* proceedings. Brenner C.J.S.C.'s order staying Crown enforcement of the GST claim ensured that creditors would not be disadvantaged by the attempted reorganization under the *CCAA*. The effect of his order was to blunt any impulse of creditors to interfere in an orderly liquidation. His order was thus in furtherance of the *CCAA*'s objectives to the extent that it allowed a bridge between the *CCAA* and *BIA* proceedings. This interpretation of the tribunal's discretionary power is buttressed by s. 20 of the *CCAA*. That section provides that the *CCAA* "may be applied together with the provisions of any Act of Parliament ... that authorizes or makes provision for the sanction of compromises or arrangements between a company and its shareholders or any class of them", such as [page419] the *BIA*. Section 20 clearly indicates the intention of Parliament for the *CCAA* to operate *in tandem* with other insolvency legislation, such as the *BIA*.

77 The *CCAA* creates conditions for preserving the *status quo* while attempts are made to find common ground amongst stakeholders for a reorganization that is fair to all. Because the alternative to reorganization is often bankruptcy, participants will measure the impact of a reorganization against the position they would enjoy in liquidation. In the case at bar, the order fostered a harmonious transition between reorganization and liquidation while meeting the objective of a single collective proceeding that is common to both statutes.

78 Tysoe J.A. therefore erred in my view by treating the *CCAA* and the *BIA* as distinct regimes subject to a temporal gap between the two, rather than as forming part of an integrated body of insolvency law. Parliament's decision to maintain two statutory schemes for reorganization, the *BIA* and the *CCAA*, reflects the reality that reorganizations of differing complexity require different legal mechanisms. By contrast, only one statutory scheme has been found to be needed to liquidate a bankrupt debtor's estate. The transition from the *CCAA* to the *BIA* may require the partial lifting of a stay of proceedings under the *CCAA* to allow commencement of the *BIA* proceedings. However, as Laskin J.A. for the Ontario Court of Appeal noted in a similar competition between secured creditors and the Ontario Superintendent of Financial Services seeking to enforce a deemed trust, "[t]he two statutes are related" and no "gap" exists between the two statutes which would allow the enforcement of property interests at the conclusion of *CCAA* proceedings that would be [page420] lost in bankruptcy (*Ivaco Inc. (Re)* (2006), 83 O.R. (3d) 108, at paras. 62-63).

79 The Crown's priority in claims pursuant to source deductions deemed trusts does not undermine this conclusion. Source deductions deemed trusts survive under both the *CCAA* and the *BIA*. Accordingly, creditors' incentives to prefer one Act over another will not be affected. While a court has a broad discretion to stay source deductions deemed trusts in the *CCAA* context, this discretion is nevertheless subject to specific limitations applicable only to source deductions deemed trusts (*CCAA*, s. 11.4). Thus, if *CCAA* reorganization fails (e.g., either the creditors or the court refuse a proposed reorganization), the Crown can immediately assert its claim in unremitted source deductions. But this should not be understood to affect a seamless transition into bankruptcy or create any "gap" between the *CCAA* and the *BIA* for the simple reason that, regardless of what statute the reorganization had been commenced under, creditors' claims in both instances would have been subject to the priority of the Crown's source deductions deemed trust.

80 Source deductions deemed trusts aside, the comprehensive and exhaustive mechanism under the *BIA* must control the distribution of the debtor's assets once liquidation is inevitable. Indeed, an orderly transition to liquidation is mandatory under the *BIA* where a proposal is rejected by creditors. The *CCAA* is silent on the transition into liquidation but the breadth of the court's discretion under the Act is sufficient to construct a bridge to liquidation under the *BIA*. The court must do so in a manner that does not subvert the scheme of distribution under the *BIA*. Transition [page421] to liquidation requires partially lifting the *CCAA* stay to commence proceedings under the *BIA*. This necessary partial lifting of the stay should not trigger a race to the courthouse in an effort to obtain priority unavailable under the *BIA*.

81 I therefore conclude that Brenner C.J.S.C. had the authority under the *CCAA* to lift the stay to allow entry into liquidation.

3.4 *Express Trust*

82 The last issue in this case is whether Brenner C.J.S.C. created an express trust in favour of the Crown when he ordered on April 29, 2008, that proceeds from the sale of LeRoy Trucking's assets equal to the amount of unremitted GST be held back in the Monitor's trust account until the results of the reorganization were known. Tysoe J.A. in the Court of Appeal concluded as an alternative ground for allowing the Crown's appeal that it was the beneficiary of an express trust. I disagree.

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

84 Here, there is no certainty to the object (i.e. the beneficiary) inferrable from the court's order of April 29, 2008 sufficient to support an express trust.

[page422]

85 At the time of the order, there was a dispute between Century Services and the Crown over part of the proceeds from the sale of the debtor's assets. The court's solution was to accept LeRoy

Trucking's proposal to segregate those monies until that dispute could be resolved. Thus, there was no certainty that the Crown would actually be the beneficiary, or object, of the trust.

86 The fact that the location chosen to segregate those monies was the Monitor's trust account has no independent effect such that it would overcome the lack of a clear beneficiary. In any event, under the interpretation of *CCAA* s. 18.3(1) established above, no such priority dispute would even arise because the Crown's deemed trust priority over GST claims would be lost under the *CCAA* and the Crown would rank as an unsecured creditor for this amount. However, Brenner C.J.S.C. may well have been proceeding on the basis that, in accordance with *Ottawa Senators*, the Crown's GST claim would remain effective if reorganization was successful, which would not be the case if transition to the liquidation process of the *BIA* was allowed. An amount equivalent to that claim would accordingly be set aside pending the outcome of reorganization.

87 Thus, uncertainty surrounding the outcome of the *CCAA* restructuring eliminates the existence of any certainty to permanently vest in the Crown a beneficial interest in the funds. That much is clear from the oral reasons of Brenner C.J.S.C. on April 29, 2008, when he said: "Given the fact that [*CCAA* proceedings] are known to fail and filings in bankruptcy result, it seems to me that maintaining the status quo in the case at bar supports the proposal to have the monitor hold these funds in trust." Exactly who might take the money in the final result was therefore evidently in doubt. Brenner C.J.S.C.'s subsequent order of September 3, 2008 denying the Crown's application to enforce the trust once it was clear [page423] that bankruptcy was inevitable, confirms the absence of a clear beneficiary required to ground an express trust.

4. Conclusion

88 I conclude that Brenner C.J.S.C. had the discretion under the *CCAA* to continue the stay of the Crown's claim for enforcement of the GST deemed trust while otherwise lifting it to permit LeRoy Trucking to make an assignment in bankruptcy. My conclusion that s. 18.3(1) of the *CCAA* nullified the GST deemed trust while proceedings under that Act were pending confirms that the discretionary jurisdiction under s. 11 utilized by the court was not limited by the Crown's asserted GST priority, because there is no such priority under the *CCAA*.

89 For these reasons, I would allow the appeal and declare that the \$305,202.30 collected by LeRoy Trucking in respect of GST but not yet remitted to the Receiver General of Canada is not subject to deemed trust or priority in favour of the Crown. Nor is this amount subject to an express trust. Costs are awarded for this appeal and the appeal in the court below.

The following are the reasons delivered by

FISH J. --

I

90 I am in general agreement with the reasons of Justice Deschamps and would dispose of the appeal as she suggests.

91 More particularly, I share my colleague's interpretation of the scope of the judge's discretion under s. 11 of the *Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act*, R.S.C. 1985, c. C-36 ("*CCAA*"). [page424] And I share my colleague's conclusion that Brenner C.J.S.C. did not create an express trust in favour of the Crown when he segregated GST funds into the Monitor's trust account (2008 BCSC 1805, [2008] G.S.T.C. 221).

92 I nonetheless feel bound to add brief reasons of my own regarding the interaction between the *CCAA* and the *Excise Tax Act*, R.S.C. 1985, c. E-15 ("*ETA*").

93 In upholding deemed trusts created by the *ETA* notwithstanding insolvency proceedings, *Ottawa Senators Hockey Club Corp. (Re)* (2005), 73 O.R. (3d) 737 (C.A.), and its progeny have been unduly protective of Crown interests which Parliament itself has chosen to subordinate to competing prioritized claims. In my respectful view, a clearly marked departure from that jurisprudential approach is warranted in this case.

94 Justice Deschamps develops important historical and policy reasons in support of this position and I have nothing to add in that regard. I do wish, however, to explain why a comparative analysis of related statutory provisions adds support to our shared conclusion.

95 Parliament has in recent years given detailed consideration to the Canadian insolvency scheme. It has declined to amend the provisions at issue in this case. Ours is not to wonder why, but rather to treat Parliament's preservation of the relevant provisions as a deliberate exercise of the legislative discretion that is Parliament's alone. With respect, I reject any suggestion that we should instead characterize the apparent conflict between s. 18.3(1) (now s. 37(1)) of the *CCAA* and s. 222 of the *ETA* as a drafting anomaly or statutory lacuna properly subject to judicial correction or repair.

[page425]

II

96 In the context of the Canadian insolvency regime, a deemed trust will be found to exist only where two complementary elements co-exist: first, a statutory provision *creating* the trust; and second, a *CCAA* or *Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act*, R.S.C. 1985, c. B-3 ("*BIA*") provision *confirming* -- or explicitly preserving -- its effective operation.

97 This interpretation is reflected in three federal statutes. Each contains a deemed trust provision framed in terms strikingly similar to the wording of s. 222 of the *ETA*.

98 The first is the *Income Tax Act*, R.S.C. 1985, c. 1 (5th Supp.) ("*ITA*"), where s. 227(4) *creates* a deemed trust:

(4) Every person who deducts or withholds an amount under this Act is deemed, notwithstanding any security interest (as defined in subsection 224(1.3)) in the amount so deducted or withheld, to hold the amount separate and apart from the property of the person and from property held by any secured creditor (as defined in subsection 224(1.3)) of that person that but for the security interest would be property of the person, in trust for Her Majesty and for payment to Her Majesty in the manner and at the time provided under this Act. [Here and below, the emphasis is of course my own.]

99 In the next subsection, Parliament has taken care to make clear that this trust is unaffected by federal or provincial legislation to the contrary:

(4.1) Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, the *Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act* (except sections 81.1 and 81.2 of that Act), any other enactment of Canada, any enactment of a province or any other law, where at any time an

amount deemed by subsection 227(4) to be held by a person in trust for Her Majesty is not paid to Her Majesty in the manner and at the time provided under this Act, property of the person ... equal in value to the amount so deemed to be held in trust is deemed

(a) to be held, from the time the amount was deducted or withheld by the person, separate and [page426] apart from the property of the person, in trust for Her Majesty whether or not the property is subject to such a security interest, ...

...

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

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

18.3 (1) Subject to subsection (2), notwithstanding any provision in federal or provincial legislation that has the effect of deeming property to be held in trust for Her Majesty, property of a debtor company shall not be regarded as held in trust for Her Majesty unless it would be so regarded in the absence of that statutory provision.

(2) Subsection (1) does not apply in respect of amounts deemed to be held in trust under subsection 227(4) or (4.1) of the *Income Tax Act*, subsection 23(3) or (4) of the *Canada Pension Plan* or subsection 86(2) or (2.1) of the *Employment Insurance Act*

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

(2) Subject to subsection (3), notwithstanding any provision in federal or provincial legislation that has the effect of deeming property to be held in trust for Her Majesty, property of a bankrupt shall not be regarded as held in trust for Her Majesty for the purpose of paragraph (1)(a) unless it would be so regarded in the absence of that statutory provision.

(3) Subsection (2) does not apply in respect of amounts deemed to be held in trust under subsection 227(4) or (4.1) of the *Income Tax Act*, subsection 23(3) or (4) of the *Canada Pension Plan* or subsection 86(2) or (2.1) of the *Employment Insurance Act*

102 Thus, Parliament has first *created* and then *confirmed the continued operation* of the Crown's *ITA* deemed trust under *both* the *CCAA* and the *BIA* regimes.

[page427]

103 The second federal statute for which this scheme holds true is the *Canada Pension Plan*, R.S.C. 1985, c. C-8 ("*CPP*"). At s. 23, Parliament creates a deemed trust in favour of the Crown and specifies that it exists despite all contrary provisions in any other Canadian statute. Finally, and in almost identical terms, the *Employment Insurance Act*, S.C. 1996, c. 23 ("*EIA*"), creates a deemed trust in favour of the Crown: see ss. 86(2) and (2.1).

104 As we have seen, the survival of the deemed trusts created under these provisions of the *ITA*, the *CPP* and the *EIA* is confirmed in s. 18.3(2) of the *CCAA* and in s. 67(3) of the *BIA*. In all three cases, Parliament's intent to enforce the Crown's deemed trust through insolvency proceedings is expressed in clear and unmistakable terms.

105 The same is not true with regard to the deemed trust created under the *ETA*. Although Parliament creates a deemed trust in favour of the Crown to hold unremitted GST monies, and although it purports to maintain this trust notwithstanding any contrary federal or provincial legislation, it does not *confirm* the trust -- or expressly provide for its continued operation -- in either the *BIA* or the *CCAA*. The second of the two mandatory elements I have mentioned is thus absent reflecting Parliament's intention to allow the deemed trust to lapse with the commencement of insolvency proceedings.

106 The language of the relevant *ETA* provisions is identical in substance to that of the *ITA*, *CPP*, and *EIA* provisions:

222. (1) Subject to subsection (1.1), every person who collects an amount as or on account of tax under Division II is deemed, for all purposes and despite any security interest in the amount, to hold the amount in trust for Her Majesty in right of Canada, separate and apart from the property of the person and from property held by any secured creditor of the person that, but for a [page428] security interest, would be property of the person, until the amount is remitted to the Receiver General or withdrawn under subsection (2).

...

(3) Despite any other provision of this Act (except subsection (4)), any other enactment of Canada (except the *Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act*), any enactment of a province or any other law, if at any time an amount deemed by subsection (1) to be held by a person in trust for Her Majesty is not remitted to the Receiver General or withdrawn in the manner and at the time provided under this Part, property of the person and property held by any secured creditor of the person that, but for a security interest, would be property of the person, equal in value to the amount so deemed to be held in trust, is deemed

(a) to be held, from the time the amount was collected by the person, in trust for Her Majesty, separate and apart from the property of the person, whether or not the property is subject to a security interest, ...

...

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

107 Yet no provision of the *CCAA* provides for the continuation of this deemed trust after the *CCAA* is brought into play.

108 In short, Parliament has imposed *two* explicit conditions, or "building blocks", for survival under the *CCAA* of deemed trusts created by the *ITA*, *CPP*, and *EIA*. Had Parliament intended to likewise preserve under the *CCAA* deemed trusts created by the *ETA*, it would have included in the *CCAA* the sort of confirmatory provision that explicitly preserves other deemed trusts.

109 With respect, unlike Tysoe J.A., I do not find it "inconceivable that Parliament would specifically identify the *BIA* as an exception when enacting the current version of s. 222(3) of the *ETA* without considering the *CCAA* as a possible second exception" (2009 BCCA 205, 98 B.C.L.R. (4th) 242, at para. 37). *All* of the deemed trust [page429] provisions excerpted above make explicit reference to the *BIA*. Section 222 of the *ETA* does not break the pattern. Given the near-identical wording of the four deemed trust provisions, it would have been surprising indeed had Parliament not addressed the *BIA* at all in the *ETA*.

110 Parliament's evident intent was to render GST deemed trusts inoperative upon the institution of insolvency proceedings. Accordingly, s. 222 mentions the *BIA* so as to *exclude* it from its ambit -- rather than to *include* it, as do the *ITA*, the *CPP*, and the *EIA*.

111 Conversely, I note that *none* of these statutes mentions the *CCAA* expressly. Their specific reference to the *BIA* has no bearing on their interaction with the *CCAA*. Again, it is the confirmatory provisions *in the insolvency statutes* that determine whether a given deemed trust will subsist during insolvency proceedings.

112 Finally, I believe that chambers judges should not segregate GST monies into the Monitor's trust account during *CCAA* proceedings, as was done in this case. The result of Justice Deschamps's reasoning is that GST claims become unsecured under the *CCAA*. Parliament has deliberately chosen to nullify certain Crown super-priorities during insolvency; this is one such instance.

III

113 For these reasons, like Justice Deschamps, I would allow the appeal with costs in this Court and in the courts below and order that the \$305,202.30 collected by LeRoy Trucking in respect of GST but not yet remitted to the Receiver General of Canada [page430] be subject to no deemed trust or priority in favour of the Crown.

The following are the reasons delivered by

114 ABELLA J. (dissenting):-- The central issue in this appeal is whether s. 222 of the *Excise Tax Act*, R.S.C. 1985, c. E-15 ("*ETA*"), and specifically s. 222(3), gives priority during *Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act*, R.S.C. 1985, c. C-36 ("*CCAA*"), proceedings to the Crown's deemed trust in unremitted GST. I agree with Tysoe J.A. that it does. It follows, in my respectful view, that a court's discretion under s. 11 of the *CCAA* is circumscribed accordingly.

115 Section 11' of the *CCAA* stated:

11. (1) Notwithstanding anything in the *Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act* or the *Winding-up Act*, where an application is made under this Act in respect of a company, the court, on the application of any person interested in the matter, may, subject to this Act, on notice to any other person or without notice as it may see fit, make an order under this section.

To decide the scope of the court's discretion under s. 11, it is necessary to first determine the priority issue. Section 222(3), the provision of the *ETA* at issue in this case, states:

[page431]

(3) Despite any other provision of this Act (except subsection (4)), any other enactment of Canada (except the *Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act*), any enactment of a province or any other law, if at any time an amount deemed by subsection (1) to be held by a person in trust for Her Majesty is not remitted to the Receiver General or withdrawn in the manner and at the time provided under this Part, property of the person and property held by any secured creditor of the person that, but for a security interest, would be property of the person, equal in value to the amount so deemed to be held in trust, is deemed

(a) to be held, from the time the amount was collected by the person, in trust for Her Majesty, separate and apart from the property of the person, whether or not the property is subject to a security interest, and

(b) to form no part of the estate or property of the person from the time the amount was collected, whether or not the property has in fact been kept separate and apart from the estate or property of the person and whether or not the property is subject to a security interest

and is property beneficially owned by Her Majesty in right of Canada despite any security interest in the property or in the proceeds thereof and the proceeds of the property shall be paid to the Receiver General in priority to all security interests.

116 Century Services argued that the *CCAA*'s general override provision, s. 18.3(1), prevailed, and that the deeming provisions in s. 222 of the *ETA* were, accordingly, inapplicable during *CCAA* proceedings. Section 18.3(1) states:

18.3 (1) ... [N]otwithstanding any provision in federal or provincial legislation that has the effect of deeming property to be held in trust for Her Majesty, property of a debtor company shall not be regarded as held in trust for Her Majesty unless it would be so regarded in the absence of that statutory provision.

117 As MacPherson J.A. correctly observed in *Ottawa Senators Hockey Club Corp. (Re)* (2005), 73 O.R. (3d) 737 (C.A.), s. 222(3) of the *ETA* is in "clear conflict" with s. 18.3(1) of the

CCAA (para. 31). Resolving the conflict between the two provisions is, essentially, what seems to me to be a relatively uncomplicated exercise in statutory [page432] interpretation: Does the language reflect a clear legislative intention? In my view it does. The deemed trust provision, s. 222(3) of the *ETA*, has unambiguous language stating that it operates notwithstanding any law except the *Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act*, R.S.C. 1985, c. B-3 ("*BIA*").

118 By expressly excluding only one statute from its legislative grasp, and by unequivocally stating that it applies despite any other law anywhere in Canada *except* the *BIA*, s. 222(3) has defined its boundaries in the clearest possible terms. I am in complete agreement with the following comments of MacPherson J.A. in *Ottawa Senators*:

The legislative intent of s. 222(3) of the *ETA* is clear. If there is a conflict with "any other enactment of Canada (except the *Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act*)", s. 222(3) prevails. In these words Parliament did two things: it decided that s. 222(3) should trump all other federal laws and, importantly, it addressed the topic of exceptions to its trumping decision and identified a single exception, the *Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act*... . The *BIA* and the *CCAA* are closely related federal statutes. I cannot conceive that Parliament would specifically identify the *BIA* as an exception, but accidentally fail to consider the *CCAA* as a possible second exception. In my view, the omission of the *CCAA* from s. 222(3) of the *ETA* was almost certainly a considered omission. [para. 43]

119 MacPherson J.A.'s view that the failure to exempt the *CCAA* from the operation of the *ETA* is a reflection of a clear legislative intention, is borne out by how the *CCAA* was subsequently changed after s. 18.3(1) was enacted in 1997. In 2000, when s. 222(3) of the *ETA* came into force, amendments were also introduced to the *CCAA*. Section 18.3(1) was not amended.

120 The failure to amend s. 18.3(1) is notable because its effect was to protect the legislative *status quo*, notwithstanding repeated requests from [page433] various constituencies that s. 18.3(1) be amended to make the priorities in the *CCAA* consistent with those in the *BIA*. In 2002, for example, when Industry Canada conducted a review of the *BIA* and the *CCAA*, the Insolvency Institute of Canada and the Canadian Association of Insolvency and Restructuring Professionals recommended that the priority regime under the *BIA* be extended to the *CCAA* (Joint Task Force on Business Insolvency Law Reform, *Report* (March 15, 2002), Sch. B, proposal 71). The same recommendations were made by the Standing Senate Committee on Banking, Trade and Commerce in its 2003 report, *Debtors and Creditors Sharing the Burden: A Review of the Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act and the Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act*; by the Legislative Review Task Force (Commercial) of the Insolvency Institute of Canada and the Canadian Association of Insolvency and Restructuring Professionals in its 2005 *Report on the Commercial Provisions of Bill C-55*; and in 2007 by the Insolvency Institute of Canada in a submission to the Standing Senate Committee on Banking, Trade and Commerce commenting on reforms then under consideration.

121 Yet the *BIA* remains the only exempted statute under s. 222(3) of the *ETA*. Even after the 2005 decision in *Ottawa Senators* which confirmed that the *ETA* took precedence over the *CCAA*, there was no responsive legislative revision. I see this lack of response as relevant in this case, as it was in *Tele-Mobile Co. v. Ontario*, 2008 SCC 12, [2008] 1 S.C.R. 305, where this Court stated:

While it cannot be said that legislative silence is necessarily determinative of legislative intention, in this case the silence is Parliament's answer to the consistent urging of Telus and other affected businesses and organizations that there be express language in the legislation to ensure that businesses can be reimbursed for the reasonable costs of complying with evidence-gathering orders. I see the legislative history as reflecting Parliament's intention that compensation not be paid for compliance with production orders. [para. 42]

[page434]

122 All this leads to a clear inference of a deliberate legislative choice to protect the deemed trust in s. 222(3) from the reach of s. 18.3(1) of the *CCAA*.

123 Nor do I see any "policy" justification for interfering, through interpretation, with this clarity of legislative intention. I can do no better by way of explaining why I think the policy argument cannot succeed in this case, than to repeat the words of Tysoe J.A. who said:

I do not dispute that there are valid policy reasons for encouraging insolvent companies to attempt to restructure their affairs so that their business can continue with as little disruption to employees and other stakeholders as possible. It is appropriate for the courts to take such policy considerations into account, but only if it is in connection with a matter that has not been considered by Parliament. Here, Parliament must be taken to have weighed policy considerations when it enacted the amendments to the *CCAA* and *ETA* described above. As Mr. Justice MacPherson observed at para. 43 of *Ottawa Senators*, it is inconceivable that Parliament would specifically identify the *BIA* as an exception when enacting the current version of s. 222(3) of the *ETA* without considering the *CCAA* as a possible second exception. I also make the observation that the 1992 set of amendments to the *BIA* enabled proposals to be binding on secured creditors and, while there is more flexibility under the *CCAA*, it is possible for an insolvent company to attempt to restructure under the auspices of the *BIA*. [para. 37]

124 Despite my view that the clarity of the language in s. 222(3) is dispositive, it is also my view that even the application of other principles of interpretation reinforces this conclusion. In their submissions, the parties raised the following as being particularly relevant: the Crown relied on the principle that the statute which is "later in time" prevails; and Century Services based its argument on the principle that the general provision gives way to the specific (*generalia specialibus non derogant*).

[page435]

125 The "later in time" principle gives priority to a more recent statute, based on the theory that the legislature is presumed to be aware of the content of existing legislation. If a new enactment is

inconsistent with a prior one, therefore, the legislature is presumed to have intended to derogate from the earlier provisions (Ruth Sullivan, *Sullivan on the Construction of Statutes* (5th ed. 2008), at pp. 346-47; Pierre-André Côté, *The Interpretation of Legislation in Canada* (3rd ed. 2000), at p. 358).

126 The exception to this presumptive displacement of pre-existing inconsistent legislation, is the *generalia specialibus non derogant* principle that "[a] more recent, general provision will not be construed as affecting an earlier, special provision" (Côté, at p. 359). Like a Russian Doll, there is also an exception within this exception, namely, that an earlier, specific provision may in fact be "overruled" by a subsequent general statute if the legislature indicates, through its language, an intention that the general provision prevails (*Doré v. Verdun (City)*, [1997] 2 S.C.R. 862).

127 The primary purpose of these interpretive principles is to assist in the performance of the task of determining the intention of the legislature. This was confirmed by MacPherson J.A. in *Ottawa Senators*, at para. 42:

... the overarching rule of statutory interpretation is that statutory provisions should be interpreted to give effect to the intention of the legislature in enacting the law. This primary rule takes precedence over all maxims or canons or aids relating to statutory interpretation, including the maxim that the specific prevails over the general (*generalia specialibus non derogant*). As expressed by Hudson J. in *Canada v. Williams*, [1944] S.C.R. 226, ... at p. 239 ... :

The maxim *generalia specialibus non derogant* is relied on as a rule which should dispose of the question, but the maxim is not a rule of law but a rule of construction and bows to the intention of the [page436] legislature, if such intention can reasonably be gathered from all of the relevant legislation.

(See also Côté, at p. 358, and Pierre-André Côté, with the collaboration of S. Beaulac and M. Devinat, *Interprétation des lois* (4th ed. 2009), at para. 1335.)

128 I accept the Crown's argument that the "later in time" principle is conclusive in this case. Since s. 222(3) of the *ETA* was enacted in 2000 and s. 18.3(1) of the *CCAA* was introduced in 1997, s. 222(3) is, on its face, the later provision. This chronological victory can be displaced, as Century Services argues, if it is shown that the more recent provision, s. 222(3) of the *ETA*, is a general one, in which case the earlier, specific provision, s. 18.3(1), prevails (*generalia specialibus non derogant*). But, as previously explained, the prior specific provision does not take precedence if the subsequent general provision appears to "overrule" it. This, it seems to me, is precisely what s. 222(3) achieves through the use of language stating that it prevails despite any law of Canada, of a province, or "any other law" *other than the BIA*. Section 18.3(1) of the *CCAA* is thereby rendered inoperative for purposes of s. 222(3).

129 It is true that when the *CCAA* was amended in 2005,² s. 18.3(1) was re-enacted as s. 37(1) (S.C. 2005, c. 47, s. 131). Deschamps J. suggests that this makes s. 37(1) the new, "later in time" provision. With respect, her observation is refuted by the operation of s. 44(f) of the *Interpretation Act*, R.S.C. 1985, c. I-21, which expressly deals with the (non) effect of re-enacting, without significant substantive changes, a repealed provision (see *Attorney General of Canada v. Public Service*

Staff Relations Board, [1977] 2 F.C. 663, dealing with the predecessor provision to s. 44(f)). It directs that new enactments not be construed as [page437] "new law" unless they differ in substance from the repealed provision:

44. Where an enactment, in this section called the "former enactment", is repealed and another enactment, in this section called the "new enactment", is substituted therefor,

...

(f) except to the extent that the provisions of the new enactment are not in substance the same as those of the former enactment, the new enactment shall not be held to operate as new law, but shall be construed and have effect as a consolidation and as declaratory of the law as contained in the former enactment;

Section 2 of the *Interpretation Act* defines an "enactment" as "an Act or regulation or any portion of an Act or regulation".

130 Section 37(1) of the current *CCAA* is almost identical to s. 18.3(1). These provisions are set out for ease of comparison, with the differences between them underlined:

37. (1) Subject to subsection (2), despite any provision in federal or provincial legislation that has the effect of deeming property to be held in trust for Her Majesty, property of a debtor company shall not be regarded as being held in trust for Her Majesty unless it would be so regarded in the absence of that statutory provision.

18.3 (1) Subject to subsection (2), notwithstanding any provision in federal or provincial legislation that has the effect of deeming property to be held in trust for Her Majesty, property of a debtor company shall not be regarded as held in trust for Her Majesty unless it would be so regarded in the absence of that statutory provision.

131 The application of s. 44(f) of the *Interpretation Act* simply confirms the government's clearly expressed intent, found in Industry Canada's clause-by-clause review of Bill C-55, where s. 37(1) was identified as "a technical amendment to re-order the provisions of this Act". During second reading, the Hon. Bill Rompkey, then the Deputy Leader of the Government in the [page438] Senate, confirmed that s. 37(1) represented only a technical change:

On a technical note relating to the treatment of deemed trusts for taxes, the bill [*sic*] makes no changes to the underlying policy intent, despite the fact that in the case of a restructuring under the *CCAA*, sections of the act [*sic*] were repealed and substituted with renumbered versions due to the extensive reworking of the *CCAA*.

(*Debates of the Senate*, vol. 142, 1st Sess., 38th Parl., November 23, 2005, at p. 2147)

132 Had the substance of s. 18.3(1) altered in any material way when it was replaced by s. 37(1), I would share Deschamps J.'s view that it should be considered a new provision. But since s. 18.3(1) and s. 37(1) are the same in substance, the transformation of s. 18.3(1) into s. 37(1) has no effect on the interpretive queue, and s. 222(3) of the *ETA* remains the "later in time" provision (Sullivan, at p. 347).

133 This means that the deemed trust provision in s. 222(3) of the *ETA* takes precedence over s. 18.3(1) during *CCAA* proceedings. The question then is how that priority affects the discretion of a court under s. 11 of the *CCAA*.

134 While s. 11 gives a court discretion to make orders notwithstanding the *BIA* and the *Winding-up Act*, R.S.C. 1985, c. W-11, that discretion is not liberated from the operation of any other federal statute. Any exercise of discretion is therefore circumscribed by whatever limits are imposed by statutes *other* than the *BIA* and the *Winding-up Act*. That includes the *ETA*. The chambers judge in this case was, therefore, required to respect the priority regime set out in s. 222(3) of the *ETA*. Neither s. 18.3(1) nor s. 11 of the *CCAA* gave him the authority to ignore it. He could not, as a result, deny the Crown's request [page439] for payment of the GST funds during the *CCAA* proceedings.

135 Given this conclusion, it is unnecessary to consider whether there was an express trust.

136 I would dismiss the appeal.

* * * * *

APPENDIX

Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act, R.S.C. 1985, c. C-36 (as at December 13, 2007)

11. (1) [Powers of court] Notwithstanding anything in the *Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act* or the *Winding-up Act*, where an application is made under this Act in respect of a company, the court, on the application of any person interested in the matter, may, subject to this Act, on notice to any other person or without notice as it may see fit, make an order under this section.

...

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

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

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

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

(4) [Other than initial application court orders] A court may, on an application in respect of a company other than an initial application, make an order on such terms as it may impose,

[page440]

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

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

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

...

(6) [Burden of proof on application] The court shall not make an order under subsection (3) or (4) unless

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

(b) in the case of an order under subsection (4), the applicant also satisfies the court that the applicant has acted, and is acting, in good faith and with due diligence.

11.4 (1) [Her Majesty affected] An order made under section 11 may provide that

(a) Her Majesty in right of Canada may not exercise rights under subsection 224(1.2) of the *Income Tax Act* or any provision of the *Canada Pension Plan* or of the *Employment Insurance Act* that refers to subsection 224(1.2) of the *Income Tax Act* and provides for the collection of a contribution, as defined in the *Canada Pension Plan*, or an employee's premium, or employer's premium, as defined in the *Employment Insurance Act*, and of any related interest, penalties or other amounts, in respect of the company if the company is a tax debtor under that subsection or provision, for such period as the court considers appropriate but ending not later than

- (i) the expiration of the order,
- (ii) the refusal of a proposed compromise by the creditors or the court,
- (iii) six months following the court sanction of a compromise or arrangement,

[page441]

- (iv) the default by the company on any term of a compromise or arrangement, or
- (v) the performance of a compromise or arrangement in respect of the company; and

(b) Her Majesty in right of a province may not exercise rights under any provision of provincial legislation in respect of the company where the company is a debtor under that legislation and the provision has a similar purpose to subsection 224(1.2) of the *Income Tax Act*, or refers to that subsection, to the extent that it provides for the collection of a sum, and of any related interest, penalties or other amounts, where the sum

- (i) has been withheld or deducted by a person from a payment to another person and is in respect of a tax similar in nature to the income tax imposed on individuals under the *Income Tax Act*, or
- (ii) is of the same nature as a contribution under the *Canada Pension Plan* if the province is a "province providing a comprehensive pension plan" as defined in subsection 3(1) of the *Canada Pension Plan* and the provincial legislation establishes a "provincial pension plan" as defined in that subsection,

for such period as the court considers appropriate but ending not later than the occurrence or time referred to in whichever of subparagraphs (a)(i) to (v) may apply.

(2) [When order ceases to be in effect] An order referred to in subsection (1) ceases to be in effect if

- (a) the company defaults on payment of any amount that becomes due to Her Majesty after the order is made and could be subject to a demand under
 - (i) subsection 224(1.2) of the *Income Tax Act*,
 - (ii) any provision of the *Canada Pension Plan* or of the *Employment Insurance Act* that refers to subsection 224(1.2) of the *Income Tax Act* and provides for the collection of a contribution, as defined in the *Canada Pension Plan*, or an employee's premium, or employer's premium, [page442] as defined in the *Employment Insurance Act*, and of any related interest, penalties or other amounts, or
 - (iii) under any provision of provincial legislation that has a similar purpose to subsection 224(1.2) of the *Income Tax Act*, or that refers to that subsection, to the extent that it provides for the collection of a sum, and of any related interest, penalties or other amounts, where the sum
 - (A) has been withheld or deducted by a person from a payment to another person and is in respect of a tax similar in nature to the income tax imposed on individuals under the *Income Tax Act*, or

- (B) is of the same nature as a contribution under the *Canada Pension Plan* if the province is a "province providing a comprehensive pension plan" as defined in subsection 3(1) of the *Canada Pension Plan* and the provincial legislation establishes a "provincial pension plan" as defined in that subsection; or

(b) any other creditor is or becomes entitled to realize a security on any property that could be claimed by Her Majesty in exercising rights under

- (i) subsection 224(1.2) of the *Income Tax Act*,
- (ii) any provision of the *Canada Pension Plan* or of the *Employment Insurance Act* that refers to subsection 224(1.2) of the *Income Tax Act* and provides for the collection of a contribution, as defined in the *Canada Pension Plan*, or an employee's premium, or employer's premium, as defined in the *Employment Insurance Act*, and of any related interest, penalties or other amounts, or
- (iii) any provision of provincial legislation that has a similar purpose to subsection 224(1.2) of the *Income Tax Act*, or that refers to that subsection, to the extent that it provides for the collection of a sum, and of any related interest, penalties or other amounts, where the sum

- (A) has been withheld or deducted by a person from a payment to another person [page443] and is in respect of a tax similar in nature to the income tax imposed on individuals under the *Income Tax Act*, or
- (B) is of the same nature as a contribution under the *Canada Pension Plan* if the province is a "province providing a comprehensive pension plan" as defined in subsection 3(1) of the *Canada Pension Plan* and the provincial legislation establishes a "provincial pension plan" as defined in that subsection.

(3) [Operation of similar legislation] An order made under section 11, other than an order referred to in subsection (1) of this section, does not affect the operation of

(a) subsections 224(1.2) and (1.3) of the *Income Tax Act*,

(b) any provision of the *Canada Pension Plan* or of the *Employment Insurance Act* that refers to subsection 224(1.2) of the *Income Tax Act* and provides for the collection of a contribution, as defined in the *Canada Pension Plan*, or an employee's premium, or employer's premium, as defined in the *Employment Insurance Act*, and of any related interest, penalties or other amounts, or

(c) any provision of provincial legislation that has a similar purpose to subsection 224(1.2) of the *Income Tax Act*, or that refers to that subsection, to the extent that it provides for the collection of a sum, and of any related interest, penalties or other amounts, where the sum

- (i) has been withheld or deducted by a person from a payment to another person and is in respect of a tax similar in nature to the income tax imposed on individuals under the *Income Tax Act*, or
- (ii) is of the same nature as a contribution under the *Canada Pension Plan* if the province is a "province providing a comprehensive pension plan" as defined in subsection 3(1) of the *Canada Pension Plan* and the provincial legislation establishes a "provincial pension plan" as defined in that subsection,

and for the purpose of paragraph (c), the provision of provincial legislation is, despite any Act of Canada or of a province or any other law, deemed to have the same [page444] effect and scope against any creditor, however secured, as subsection 224(1.2) of the *Income Tax Act* in respect of a sum referred to in subparagraph (c)(i), or as subsection 23(2) of the *Canada Pension Plan* in respect of a sum referred to in subparagraph (c)(ii), and in respect of any related interest, penalties or other amounts.

18.3 (1) [Deemed trusts] Subject to subsection (2), notwithstanding any provision in federal or provincial legislation that has the effect of deeming property to be held in trust for Her Majesty, property of a debtor company shall not be regarded as held in trust for Her Majesty unless it would be so regarded in the absence of that statutory provision.

(2) [Exceptions] Subsection (1) does not apply in respect of amounts deemed to be held in trust under subsection 227(4) or (4.1) of the *Income Tax Act*, subsection 23(3) or (4) of the *Canada Pension Plan* or subsection 86(2) or (2.1) of the *Employment Insurance Act* (each of which is in this subsection referred to as a "federal provision") nor in respect of amounts deemed to be held in trust under any law of a province that creates a deemed trust the sole purpose of which is to ensure remittance to Her Majesty in right of the province of amounts deducted or withheld under a law of the province where

(a) that law of the province imposes a tax similar in nature to the tax imposed under the *Income Tax Act* and the amounts deducted or withheld under that law of the province are of the same nature as the amounts referred to in subsection 227(4) or (4.1) of the *Income Tax Act*, or

(b) the province is a "province providing a comprehensive pension plan" as defined in subsection 3(1) of the *Canada Pension Plan*, that law of the province establishes a "provincial pension plan" as defined in that subsection and the amounts deducted or withheld under that law of the province are of the same nature as amounts referred to in subsection 23(3) or (4) of the *Canada Pension Plan*,

and for the purpose of this subsection, any provision of a law of a province that creates a deemed trust is, notwithstanding any Act of Canada or of a province or any other law, deemed to have the same effect and scope against any creditor, however secured, as the corresponding federal provision.

18.4 (1) [Status of Crown claims] In relation to a proceeding under this Act, all claims, including secured claims, of Her Majesty in right of Canada or a province or any body under an enactment respecting workers' compensation, in this section and in section 18.5 called a "workers' compensation body", rank as unsecured claims.

...

(3) [Operation of similar legislation] Subsection (1) does not affect the operation of

(a) subsections 224(1.2) and (1.3) of the *Income Tax Act*,

(b) any provision of the *Canada Pension Plan* or of the *Employment Insurance Act* that refers to subsection 224(1.2) of the *Income Tax Act* and provides for the collection of a contribution, as defined in the *Canada Pension Plan*, or an employee's premium, or employer's premium, as defined in the *Employment Insurance Act*, and of any related interest, penalties or other amounts, or

(c) any provision of provincial legislation that has a similar purpose to subsection 224(1.2) of the *Income Tax Act*, or that refers to that subsection, to the extent that it provides for the collection of a sum, and of any related interest, penalties or other amounts, where the sum

- (i) has been withheld or deducted by a person from a payment to another person and is in respect of a tax similar in nature to the income tax imposed on individuals under the *Income Tax Act*, or
- (ii) is of the same nature as a contribution under the *Canada Pension Plan* if the province is a "province providing a comprehensive pension plan" as defined in subsection 3(1) of the *Canada Pension Plan* and the provincial legislation establishes a "provincial pension plan" as defined in that subsection,

and for the purpose of paragraph (c), the provision of provincial legislation is, despite any Act of Canada or of a province or any other law, deemed to have the same effect and scope against any creditor, however secured, as subsection 224(1.2) of the *Income Tax Act* in respect of a sum referred to in subparagraph (c)(i), or as subsection 23(2) of the *Canada Pension Plan* in respect of a sum referred to in subparagraph (c)(ii), and [page446] in respect of any related interest, penalties or other amounts.

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

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

11. [General power of court] Despite anything in the *Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act* or the *Winding-up and Restructuring Act*, if an application is made under this Act in respect of a debtor company, the court, on the application of any person interested in the matter, may, subject to the

restrictions set out in this Act, on notice to any other person or without notice as it may see fit, make any order that it considers appropriate in the circumstances.

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

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

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

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

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

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

[page447]

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

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

(3) [Burden of proof on application] The court shall not make the order unless

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

...

11.09 (1) [Stay -- Her Majesty] An order made under section 11.02 may provide that

(a) Her Majesty in right of Canada may not exercise rights under subsection 224(1.2) of the *Income Tax Act* or any provision of the *Canada Pension Plan* or of the *Employment Insurance Act* that refers to subsection 224(1.2) of the *Income*

Tax Act and provides for the collection of a contribution, as defined in the *Canada Pension Plan*, or an employee's premium, or employer's premium, as defined in the *Employment Insurance Act*, and of any related interest, penalties or other amounts, in respect of the company if the company is a tax debtor under that subsection or provision, for the period that the court considers appropriate but ending not later than

- (i) the expiry of the order,
- (ii) the refusal of a proposed compromise by the creditors or the court,
- (iii) six months following the court sanction of a compromise or an arrangement,
- (iv) the default by the company on any term of a compromise or an arrangement, or
 - (v) the performance of a compromise or an arrangement in respect of the company; and

(b) Her Majesty in right of a province may not exercise rights under any provision of provincial legislation in respect of the company if the company is a debtor under that legislation and the provision has a purpose similar to subsection 224(1.2) of the *Income [page448] Tax Act*, or refers to that subsection, to the extent that it provides for the collection of a sum, and of any related interest, penalties or other amounts, and the sum

- (i) has been withheld or deducted by a person from a payment to another person and is in respect of a tax similar in nature to the income tax imposed on individuals under the *Income Tax Act*, or
- (ii) is of the same nature as a contribution under the *Canada Pension Plan* if the province is a "province providing a comprehensive pension plan" as defined in subsection 3(1) of the *Canada Pension Plan* and the provincial legislation establishes a "provincial pension plan" as defined in that subsection,

for the period that the court considers appropriate but ending not later than the occurrence or time referred to in whichever of subparagraphs (a)(i) to (v) that may apply.

(2) [When order ceases to be in effect] The portions of an order made under section 11.02 that affect the exercise of rights of Her Majesty referred to in paragraph (1)(a) or (b) cease to be in effect if

- (a) the company defaults on the payment of any amount that becomes due to Her Majesty after the order is made and could be subject to a demand under
 - (i) subsection 224(1.2) of the *Income Tax Act*,
 - (ii) any provision of the *Canada Pension Plan* or of the *Employment Insurance Act* that refers to subsection 224(1.2) of the *Income Tax Act* and provides for the collection of a contribution, as defined in the *Canada Pension Plan*, or an employee's premium, or employer's premium, as defined in the *Em-*

ployment Insurance Act, and of any related interest, penalties or other amounts, or

- (iii) any provision of provincial legislation that has a purpose similar to subsection 224(1.2) of the *Income Tax Act*, or that refers to that subsection, to the extent that it provides for the [page449] collection of a sum, and of any related interest, penalties or other amounts, and the sum
 - (A) has been withheld or deducted by a person from a payment to another person and is in respect of a tax similar in nature to the income tax imposed on individuals under the *Income Tax Act*, or
 - (B) is of the same nature as a contribution under the *Canada Pension Plan* if the province is a "province providing a comprehensive pension plan" as defined in subsection 3(1) of the *Canada Pension Plan* and the provincial legislation establishes a "provincial pension plan" as defined in that subsection; or

(b) any other creditor is or becomes entitled to realize a security on any property that could be claimed by Her Majesty in exercising rights under

- (i) subsection 224(1.2) of the *Income Tax Act*,
- (ii) any provision of the *Canada Pension Plan* or of the *Employment Insurance Act* that refers to subsection 224(1.2) of the *Income Tax Act* and provides for the collection of a contribution, as defined in the *Canada Pension Plan*, or an employee's premium, or employer's premium, as defined in the *Employment Insurance Act*, and of any related interest, penalties or other amounts, or
- (iii) any provision of provincial legislation that has a purpose similar to subsection 224(1.2) of the *Income Tax Act*, or that refers to that subsection, to the extent that it provides for the collection of a sum, and of any related interest, penalties or other amounts, and the sum
 - (A) has been withheld or deducted by a person from a payment to another person and is in respect of a tax similar in nature to the income tax imposed on individuals under the *Income Tax Act*, or
 - (B) is of the same nature as a contribution under the *Canada Pension Plan* if the province is a "province providing a comprehensive pension plan" as defined in subsection [page450] 3(1) of the *Canada Pension Plan* and the provincial legislation establishes a "provincial pension plan" as defined in that subsection.

(3) [Operation of similar legislation] An order made under section 11.02, other than the portions of that order that affect the exercise of rights of Her Majesty referred to in paragraph (1)(a) or (b), does not affect the operation of

- (a) subsections 224(1.2) and (1.3) of the *Income Tax Act*,

(b) any provision of the *Canada Pension Plan* or of the *Employment Insurance Act* that refers to subsection 224(1.2) of the *Income Tax Act* and provides for the collection of a contribution, as defined in the *Canada Pension Plan*, or an employee's premium, or employer's premium, as defined in the *Employment Insurance Act*, and of any related interest, penalties or other amounts, or

(c) any provision of provincial legislation that has a purpose similar to subsection 224(1.2) of the *Income Tax Act*, or that refers to that subsection, to the extent that it provides for the collection of a sum, and of any related interest, penalties or other amounts, and the sum

- (i) has been withheld or deducted by a person from a payment to another person and is in respect of a tax similar in nature to the income tax imposed on individuals under the *Income Tax Act*, or
- (ii) is of the same nature as a contribution under the *Canada Pension Plan* if the province is a "province providing a comprehensive pension plan" as defined in subsection 3(1) of the *Canada Pension Plan* and the provincial legislation establishes a "provincial pension plan" as defined in that subsection,

and for the purpose of paragraph (c), the provision of provincial legislation is, despite any Act of Canada or of a province or any other law, deemed to have the same effect and scope against any creditor, however secured, as subsection 224(1.2) of the *Income Tax Act* in respect of a sum referred to in subparagraph (c)(i), or as subsection 23(2) of the *Canada Pension Plan* in respect of a sum referred to in subparagraph (c)(ii), and in respect of any related interest, penalties or other amounts.

[page451]

37. (1) [Deemed trusts] Subject to subsection (2), despite any provision in federal or provincial legislation that has the effect of deeming property to be held in trust for Her Majesty, property of a debtor company shall not be regarded as being held in trust for Her Majesty unless it would be so regarded in the absence of that statutory provision.

(2) [Exceptions] Subsection (1) does not apply in respect of amounts deemed to be held in trust under subsection 227(4) or (4.1) of the *Income Tax Act*, subsection 23(3) or (4) of the *Canada Pension Plan* or subsection 86(2) or (2.1) of the *Employment Insurance Act* (each of which is in this subsection referred to as a "federal provision"), nor does it apply in respect of amounts deemed to be held in trust under any law of a province that creates a deemed trust the sole purpose of which is to ensure remittance to Her Majesty in right of the province of amounts deducted or withheld under a law of the province if

- (a) that law of the province imposes a tax similar in nature to the tax imposed under the *Income Tax Act* and the amounts deducted or withheld under that law of the province are of the same nature as the amounts referred to in subsection 227(4) or (4.1) of the *Income Tax Act*, or

(b) the province is a "province providing a comprehensive pension plan" as defined in subsection 3(1) of the *Canada Pension Plan*, that law of the province establishes a "provincial pension plan" as defined in that subsection and the amounts deducted or withheld under that law of the province are of the same nature as amounts referred to in subsection 23(3) or (4) of the *Canada Pension Plan*,

and for the purpose of this subsection, any provision of a law of a province that creates a deemed trust is, despite any Act of Canada or of a province or any other law, deemed to have the same effect and scope against any creditor, however secured, as the corresponding federal provision.

Excise Tax Act, R.S.C. 1985, c. E-15 (as at December 13, 2007)

222. (1) [Trust for amounts collected] Subject to subsection (1.1), every person who collects an amount as or on account of tax under Division II is deemed, for all purposes and despite any security interest in the amount, to hold the amount in trust for Her Majesty in right of Canada, separate and apart from the property of the person and from property held by any secured [page452] creditor of the person that, but for a security interest, would be property of the person, until the amount is remitted to the Receiver General or withdrawn under subsection (2).

(1.1) [Amounts collected before bankruptcy] Subsection (1) does not apply, at or after the time a person becomes a bankrupt (within the meaning of the *Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act*), to any amounts that, before that time, were collected or became collectible by the person as or on account of tax under Division II.

...

(3) [Extension of trust] Despite any other provision of this Act (except subsection (4)), any other enactment of Canada (except the *Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act*), any enactment of a province or any other law, if at any time an amount deemed by subsection (1) to be held by a person in trust for Her Majesty is not remitted to the Receiver General or withdrawn in the manner and at the time provided under this Part, property of the person and property held by any secured creditor of the person that, but for a security interest, would be property of the person, equal in value to the amount so deemed to be held in trust, is deemed

(a) to be held, from the time the amount was collected by the person, in trust for Her Majesty, separate and apart from the property of the person, whether or not the property is subject to a security interest, and

(b) to form no part of the estate or property of the person from the time the amount was collected, whether or not the property has in fact been kept separate and apart from the estate or property of the person and whether or not the property is subject to a security interest

and is property beneficially owned by Her Majesty in right of Canada despite any security interest in the property or in the proceeds thereof and the proceeds of the property shall be paid to the Receiver General in priority to all security interests.

Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act, R.S.C. 1985, c. B-3 (as at December 13, 2007)

67. (1) [Property of bankrupt] The property of a bankrupt divisible among his creditors shall not comprise

[page453]

(a) property held by the bankrupt in trust for any other person,

(b) any property that as against the bankrupt is exempt from execution or seizure under any laws applicable in the province within which the property is situated and within which the bankrupt resides, or

(b.1) such goods and services tax credit payments and prescribed payments relating to the essential needs of an individual as are made in prescribed circumstances and are not property referred to in paragraph (a) or (b),

but it shall comprise

(c) all property wherever situated of the bankrupt at the date of his bankruptcy or that may be acquired by or devolve on him before his discharge, and

(d) such powers in or over or in respect of the property as might have been exercised by the bankrupt for his own benefit.

(2) [Deemed trusts] Subject to subsection (3), notwithstanding any provision in federal or provincial legislation that has the effect of deeming property to be held in trust for Her Majesty, property of a bankrupt shall not be regarded as held in trust for Her Majesty for the purpose of paragraph (1)(a) unless it would be so regarded in the absence of that statutory provision.

(3) [Exceptions] Subsection (2) does not apply in respect of amounts deemed to be held in trust under subsection 227(4) or (4.1) of the *Income Tax Act*, subsection 23(3) or (4) of the *Canada Pension Plan* or subsection 86(2) or (2.1) of the *Employment Insurance Act* (each of which is in this subsection referred to as a "federal provision") nor in respect of amounts deemed to be held in trust under any law of a province that creates a deemed trust the sole purpose of which is to ensure remittance to Her Majesty in right of the province of amounts deducted or withheld under a law of the province where

(a) that law of the province imposes a tax similar in nature to the tax imposed under the *Income Tax Act* and the amounts deducted or withheld under that law of the province are of the same nature as the amounts referred to in subsection 227(4) or (4.1) of the *Income Tax Act*, or

[page454]

(b) the province is a "province providing a comprehensive pension plan" as defined in subsection 3(1) of the *Canada Pension Plan*, that law of the province establishes a "provincial pension plan" as defined in that subsection and the amounts deducted or withheld under that law of the province are of the same nature as amounts referred to in subsection 23(3) or (4) of the *Canada Pension Plan*,

and for the purpose of this subsection, any provision of a law of a province that creates a deemed trust is, notwithstanding any Act of Canada or of a province or any other law, deemed to have the same effect and scope against any creditor, however secured, as the corresponding federal provision.

86. (1) [Status of Crown claims] In relation to a bankruptcy or proposal, all provable claims, including secured claims, of Her Majesty in right of Canada or a province or of any body under an Act respecting workers' compensation, in this section and in section 87 called a "workers' compensation body", rank as unsecured claims.

...

(3) [Exceptions] Subsection (1) does not affect the operation of

(a) subsections 224(1.2) and (1.3) of the *Income Tax Act*;

(b) any provision of the *Canada Pension Plan* or of the *Employment Insurance Act* that refers to subsection 224(1.2) of the *Income Tax Act* and provides for the collection of a contribution, as defined in the *Canada Pension Plan*, or an employee's premium, or employer's premium, as defined in the *Employment Insurance Act*, and of any related interest, penalties or other amounts; or

(c) any provision of provincial legislation that has a similar purpose to subsection 224(1.2) of the *Income Tax Act*, or that refers to that subsection, to the extent that it provides for the collection of a sum, and of any related interest, penalties or other amounts, where the sum

(i) has been withheld or deducted by a person from a payment to another person and is in respect of a tax similar in nature to the income tax imposed on individuals under the *Income Tax Act*, or

[page455]

(ii) is of the same nature as a contribution under the *Canada Pension Plan* if the province is a "province providing a comprehensive pension plan" as defined in subsection 3(1) of the *Canada Pension Plan* and the provincial legislation establishes a "provincial pension plan" as defined in that subsection,

and for the purpose of paragraph (c), the provision of provincial legislation is, despite any Act of Canada or of a province or any other law, deemed to have the same effect and scope against any creditor, however secured, as subsection 224(1.2) of the *Income Tax Act* in respect of a sum referred to in subparagraph (c)(i), or as subsection 23(2) of the *Canada Pension Plan* in respect of a sum referred to in subparagraph (c)(ii), and in respect of any related interest, penalties or other amounts.

Appeal allowed with costs, ABELLA J. dissenting.

Solicitors:

Solicitors for the appellant: Fraser Milner Casgrain, Vancouver.

Solicitor for the respondent: Attorney General of Canada, Vancouver.

cp/e/qlhbb

1 Section 11 was amended, effective September 18, 2009, and now states:

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

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

TAB 2

Indexed as:

Lehndorff General Partner Ltd. (Re)

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

**AND IN THE MATTER OF The Courts of Justice Act, R.S.O. 1990,
c. C. 43**

**AND IN THE MATTER OF a plan of compromise in respect of
Lehndorff General Partner Ltd., in its own capacity and in
its capacity as general partner of**

Lehndorff United Properties (Canada)

Lehndorff Properties (Canada)

- and -

Lehndorff Properties (Canada) II

and in respect of certain of their nominees

Lehndorff United Properties (Canada) Ltd.,

Lehndorff Canadian Holdings Ltd.,

Lehndorff Canadian Holdings II Ltd.,

Baytemp Properties Limited and

102 Bloor Street West Limited

and in respect of

The Lehndorff Vermögensverwaltung GmbH in

in its capacity as limited partner of

Lehndorff United Properties (Canada)

Applicants

[1993] O.J. No. 14

9 B.L.R. (2d) 275

17 C.B.R. (3d) 24

37 A.C.W.S. (3d) 847

Court File No. B366/92

Ontario Court of Justice - General Division
Toronto, Ontario

Farley J.

Heard: December 24, 1992

Judgment: January 6, 1993

(36 pp.)

Alfred Apps, Robert Harrison and Melissa J. Kennedy, for the Applicants.
L. Crozier, for the Royal Bank of Canada.
R.C. Heintzman, for the Bank of Montreal.
J. Hodgson, Susan Lundy and James Hilton, for Canada Trustco Mortgage Corporation.
Jay Schwartz, for Citibank Canada.
Stephen Golick, for Peat Marwick Thorne Inc., proposed monitor.
John Teolis, for the Fuji Bank Canada.
Robert Thorton for certain of the advisory boards.

FARLEY J.:-- These are my written reasons relating to the relief granted the applicants on December 24, 1992 pursuant to their application under the Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act, R.S.C. 1985, c. C-36 ("CCAA") and the Courts of Justice Act, R.S.O. 1990, c. C. 43 ("CJA"). The relief sought was as follows:

- (a) short service of the notice of application;
- (b) a declaration that the applicants were companies to which the CCAA applies;
- (c) authorization for the applicants to file a consolidated plan of compromise;
- (d) authorization for the applicants to call meetings of their secured and unsecured creditors to approve the consolidated plan of compromise;
- (e) A stay of all proceedings taken or that might be taken either in respect of the applicants in their own capacity or on account of their interest in Lehndorff United Properties (Canada) ("LUPC"), Lehndorff Properties (Canada) ("LPC") and Lehndorff Properties (Canada) II ("LPC II") and collectively (the "Limited Partnerships") whether as limited partner, as general partner or as registered titleholder to certain of their assets as bare trustee and nominee; and
- (f) certain other ancillary relief.

The applicants are a number of companies within the larger Lehndorff group ("Group") which operates in Canada and elsewhere. The group appears to have suffered in the same way that a number of other property developers and managers which have also sought protection under the CCAA in recent years. The applicants are insolvent; they each have outstanding debentures issued under trust deeds; and they propose a plan of compromise among themselves and the holders of these debentures as well as those others of their secured and unsecured creditors as they deemed appropriate in the circumstances. Each applicant except THG Lehndorff Vermögensverwaltung GmbH ("GmbH") is an Ontario corporation. GmbH is a company incorporated under the laws of Germany. Each of the applicants has assets or does business in Canada. Therefore each is a "company" within the definition of s. 2 of the CCAA. The applicant Lehndorff General Partner Ltd. ("General Partner

Company") is the sole general partner of the Limited Partnerships. The General Partner Company has sole control over the property and businesses of the Limited Partnerships. All major decisions concerning the applicants (and the Limited Partnerships) are made by management operating out of the Lehndorff Toronto Office. The applicants aside from the General Partner Company have as their sole purpose the holding of title to properties as bare trustee or nominee on behalf of the Limited Partnerships. LUPC is a limited partnership registered under the Limited Partnership Act, R.S.O. 1990, c. L.16 ("Ontario LPA"). LPC and LPC II are limited partnerships registered under Part 2 of the Partnership Act, R.S.A. 1980, c. P-2 ("Alberta PA") and each is registered in Ontario as an extra provincial limited partnership. LUPC has over 2,000 beneficial limited partners, LPC over 500 and LPC II over 250, most of whom are residents of Germany. As at March 31, 1992 LUPC had outstanding indebtedness of approximately \$370 million, LPC \$45 million and LPC II \$7 million. Not all of the members of the Group are making an application under the CCAA. Taken together the Group's indebtedness as to Canadian matters (including that of the applicants) was approximately \$543 million. In the summer of 1992 various creditors (Canada Trustco Mortgage Company, Bank of Montreal, Royal Bank of Canada, Canadian Imperial Bank of Commerce and the Bank of Tokyo Canada) made demands for repayment of their loans. On November 6, 1992 Funtanua Investments Limited, a minor secured lender also made a demand. An interim standstill agreement was worked out following a meeting of July 7, 1992. In conjunction with Peat Marwick Thorne Inc. which has been acting as an informal monitor to date and Fasken Campbell Godfrey the applicants have held multiple meetings with their senior secured creditors over the past half year and worked on a restructuring plan. The business affairs of the applicants (and the Limited Partnerships) are significantly intertwined as there are multiple instances of intercorporate debt, cross-default provisions and guarantees and they operated a centralized cash management system.

This process has now evolved to a point where management has developed a consolidated restructuring plan which plan addresses the following issues:

- (a) The compromise of existing conventional, term and operating indebtedness, both secured and unsecured.
- (b) The restructuring of existing project financing commitments.
- (c) New financing, by way of equity or subordinated debt.
- (d) Elimination or reduction of certain overhead.
- (e) Viability of existing businesses of entities in the Lehndorff Group.
- (f) Restructuring of income flows from the limited partnerships.
- (g) Disposition of further real property assets aside from those disposed of earlier in the process.
- (h) Consolidation of entities in the Group; and
- (i) Rationalization of the existing debt and security structure in the continuing entities in the Group.

Formal meetings of the beneficial limited partners of the Limited Partnerships are scheduled for January 20 and 21, 1993 in Germany and an information circular has been prepared and at the time of hearing was being translated into German. This application was brought on for hearing at this time for two general reasons: (a) it had now ripened to the stage of proceeding with what had been distilled out of the strategic and consultative meetings; and (b) there were creditors other than senior secured lenders who were in a position to enforce their rights against assets of some of the applicants (and Limited Partnerships) which if such enforcement did take place would result in an un-

dermining of the overall plan. Notice of this hearing was given to various creditors: Barclays Bank of Canada, Barclays Bank PLC, Bank of Montreal, Citibank Canada, Canada Trustco Mortgage Corporation, Royal Trust Corporation of Canada, Royal Bank of Canada, the Bank of Tokyo Canada, Funtauna Investments Limited, Canadian Imperial Bank of Commerce, Fuji Bank Canada and First City Trust Company. In this respect the applicants have recognized that although the initial application under the CCAA maybe made on an ex parte basis (s. 11 of the CCAA; *Re Langley's Ltd.*, (1938) O.R. 123, (1938) 3 D.L.R. 230 (C.A.); *Re Kennoch Development Ltd.* (1991), 8 C.B.R. (3d) 95 (N.S.S.C.T.D.). The court will be concerned when major creditors have not been alerted even in the most minimal fashion (*Re Inducon Development Corporation* (1992), 8 C.B.R. (3d) 306 (Ont. Gen. Div.) at p. 310). The application was either supported or not opposed.

"Instant" debentures are now well recognized and respected by the courts: see *Re United Maritime Fisherman Co-Op* (1988), 67 C.B.R. (N.S.) 44, at pp. 55-6, varied on reconsideration (1988), 68 C.B.R. (N.S.) 170, reversed on different grounds (1988), 69 C.B.R. (N.S.) 161 at pp. 165-6; *Re Stephanie's Fashions Ltd.* (1990), 1 C.B.R. (3d) 248 (B.C.S.C.) at pp. 250-1; *Elan Corp. v. Comiskey* (1990), 1 O.R. (3d) 289, 1 C.B.R. (3d) 101 (C.A.) per Doherty J.A., dissenting on another point, at pp. 306-310 (O.R.); *Ultracare Management Inc. v. Gammon* (1990), 1 O.R. (3d) 321 (Gen. Div.) at p. 327. The applicants would appear to me to have met the technical hurdle of s. 3 and as defined s. 2) of the CCAA in that they are debtor companies since they are insolvent, they have outstanding an issue of debentures under a trust deed and the compromise or arrangement that is proposed includes that compromise between the applicants and the holders of those trust deed debentures. I am also satisfied that because of the significant intertwining of the applicants it would be appropriate to have a consolidated plan. I would also understand that this court (Ontario Court of Justice (General Division)) is the appropriate court to hear this application since all the applicants except GmbH have their head office or their chief place of business in Ontario and GmbH, although it does not have a place of business within Canada, does have assets located within Ontario.

The CCAA is intended to facilitate compromises and arrangements between companies and their creditors as an alternative to bankruptcy and, as such, is remedial legislation entitled to a liberal interpretation. It seems to me that the purpose of the statute is to enable insolvent companies to carry on business in the ordinary course or otherwise deal with their assets so as to enable plan of compromise or arrangement to be prepared, filed and considered by their creditors and the court. In the interim, a judge has great discretion under the CCAA to make order 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. See the preamble to and sections 4, 5, 6, 7, 8 and 11 of the CCAA; in *Re Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act*; *A.G. Can. v. A.G. Que.*, (1934) S.C.R. 659 at p. 661; 16 C.B.R. 1; (1934) 4 D.L.R. 75; *Meridian Developments Inc. v. Toronto-Dominion Bank*; *Meridian Developments Inc. v. Nu-West Group Ltd.*, (1984) 5 W.W.R. 215 at pp. 219-20; *Norcen Energy Resources v. Oakwood Petroleum Limited et al.* (1988), 72 C.B.R. (N.S.) 1, 63 Alta. L.R. (2d) 361 (Alta., Q.B.), at pp. 12-13 (C.B.R.); *Re Quintette Coal Limited* (1990), 2 C.B.R.(3d) 303 (B.C.C.A), at pp. 310-1, affirming *Quintette Coal Limited v. Nippon Steel Corporation et al.* (1990) 2 C.B.R. (3d) 291, 47 B.C.L.R. 193 (B.C.S.C.), leave to appeal to S.C.C. dismissed (1991), 7 C.B.R. (3d) 164 (S.C.C.); *Elan*, supra at p. 307 (O.R.); *Fine's Flowers v. Creditors of Fine's Flowers* (1992), 7 O.R. (3d) 193 (Gen. Div.), at p. 199 and "*Re-Organizations under the Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act*", Stanley E. Edwards, (1947), 25 Cdn. Bar Rev. 587 at p. 592.

The CCAA is intended to provide a structured environment for the negotiation of compromises between a debtor company and its creditors for the benefit of both. Where a debtor company realistically plans to continue operating or to otherwise deal with its assets but it requires the protection of the court in order to do so and it is otherwise too early for the court to determine whether the debtor company will succeed, relief should be granted under the CCAA. See *Elan*, supra at pp. 297 and p. 316; *Stephanie's*, supra, at pp. 251-2 and *Ultracare*, supra, at p. 328 and p. 330. It has been held that the intention of the CCAA is to prevent any manoeuvres for positioning among the creditors during the period required to develop a plan and obtain approval of creditors. Such manoeuvres could give an aggressive creditor an advantage to the prejudice of others who are less aggressive and would undermine the company's financial position making it even less likely that the plan will succeed: see *Meridian*, supra, at p. 220 (W.W.R.). The possibility that one or more creditors may be prejudiced should not affect the court's exercise of its authority to grant a stay of proceedings under the CCAA because this affect is offset by the benefit to all creditors and to the company of facilitating a reorganization. The court's primary concerns under the CCAA must be for the debtor and all of the creditors: see *Quintette*, supra, at pp. 108-110; *Chef Ready Foods Ltd. v. Hongkong Bank of Canada* (1990), 4 C.B.R. (3d) 311, 51 B.C.L.R. (2d) 84 (B.C.C.A.), at pp. 315-318, (C.B.R.) and *Stephanie's*, supra, at pp. 251-2.

One of the purposes of the CCAA is to facilitate ongoing operations of a business where its assets have a greater value as part of an integrated system than individually. The CCAA facilitates reorganization of a company where the alternative, sale of the property piecemeal, is likely to yield far less satisfaction to the creditors. Unlike the Bankruptcy Act, R.S.C. 1985, c. B-3, before the amendments effective November 30, 1992 to transform it into the Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act ("BIA"), it is possible under the CCAA to bind secured creditors it has been generally speculated that the CCAA will be resorted to by companies that are generally larger and have a more complicated capital structure and that those companies which make an application under the CCAA will be generally smaller and have a less complicated structure. Reorganization may include partial liquidation where it is intended as part of the process of a return to long term viability and profitability. See *Chef Ready*, supra, at p. 318 and *Re Assoc. Investors of Can. Ltd.* (1987), 67 C.B.R. (N.S.) 237 at pp. 245; rev'd on other grounds at (1988), 71 C.B.R. 72. It appears to me that the purpose of the CCAA is also to protect the interests of creditors and to enable an orderly distribution of the debtor company's affairs. This may involve a winding-up or liquidation of a company or simply a substantial downsizing of its business operations, provided the same is proposed in the best interests of the creditors generally. See *Assoc. Investors*, supra, at p. 318; *Re Amirault Co.* (1951), 32 C.B.R. 1986, (1951) 5 D.L.R. 203 (N.S.S.C.) at pp. 187-8 (C.B.R.).

It strikes me that each of the applicants in this case has a realistic possibility of being able to continue operating, although each is currently unable to meet all of its expenses albeit on a reduced scale. This is precisely the sort of circumstance in which all of the creditors are likely to benefit from the application of the CCAA and in which it is appropriate to grant an order staying proceedings so as to allow the applicant to finalize preparation of and file a plan of compromise and arrangement.

Let me now review the aspect of the stay of proceedings. Section 11 of the CCAA provides as follows:

11. Notwithstanding anything in the Bankruptcy Act or the Winding-up Act, whenever an application has been made under this Act in respect of any

- company, the court, on the application of any person interested in the matter, may, on notice to any other person or without notice as it may see fit,
- (a) make an order staying, until such time as the court may prescribe or until any further order, all proceedings taken or that might be taken in respect of the company under the Bankruptcy Act and the Winding-up Act or either or them;
 - (b) restrain further proceedings in any action, suit or proceeding against the company on such terms as the court sees fit; and
 - (c) make an order that no suit, action or other proceeding shall be proceeded with or commenced against the company except with the leave of the court and subject to such terms as the court imposes.

The power to grant a stay of proceeding should be construed broadly in order to permit the CCAA to accomplish its legislative purpose and in particular to enable continuance of the company seeking CCAA protection. The power to grant a stay therefore extends to a stay which affects the position not only of the company's secured and unsecured creditors, but also all non-creditors and other parties who could potentially jeopardize the success of the plan and thereby the continuance of the company. See *Norcen*, supra at pp. 12-7 (C.B.R.) and *Ouintette*, supra, at pp. 296-8 (B.C.S.C.) and pp. 312-4 (B.C.C.A.) and *Meridian*, supra, at pp. 219 ff. Further the court has the power to order a stay that is effective in respect of the rights arising in favour of secured creditors under all forms of commercial security: see *Chef Ready*, supra, at p. 320 where Gibbs J.A. for the Court stated:

The trend which emerges from this sampling will be given effect here by holding that where the word "security" occurs in the C.C.A.A., it includes s. 178 security and, where the word creditor occurs, it includes a bank holding s. 178 security. To the extent that there may be conflict between the two statutes, therefore, the broad scope of the C.C.A.A. prevails.

The power to grant a stay may also extend to preventing persons seeking to terminate or cancel executory contracts, including, without limitation agreements with the applying companies for the supply of goods or services, from doing so: see *Wynden Canada Inc. v. Gaz Métropolitain Inc.* (1982), 44 C.B.R. (N.S.) 285 (Que. S.C. in Bankruptcy) at pp. 290-1 and *Ouintette*, supra, at pp. 311-2 (B.C.C.A.). The stay may also extend to prevent a mortgagee from proceeding with foreclosure proceedings (see *Re Northland Properties Limited et al.* (1988), 73 C.B.R. (N.S.) 141 (B.C.S.C.) or to prevent landlords from terminating leases, or otherwise enforcing their rights thereunder (see *In Re Nathan Feifer et al. v. Frame Manufacturing Corporation* (1947), 28 C.B.R. 124 (Qué. C.A.)). Amounts owing to landlords in respect of arrears of rent or unpaid rent for the unexpired portion of lease terms are properly dealt with in a plan of compromise or arrangement: see *Sklar-Peppler Furniture Corporation* (1992), 8 C.B.R. (3d) 312 (Ont. Gen. Div.) especially at p. 318. The jurisdiction of the court to make orders under the CCAA in the interest of protecting the debtor company so as to enable it to prepare and file a plan is effective notwithstanding the terms of any contract or instrument to which the debtor company is a party. Section 8 of the CCAA provides:

8. This act extends and does not limit the provisions of any instrument now or hereafter existing that governs the rights of creditors or any class of them

and has full force and effect notwithstanding anything to the contrary contained in that instrument.

The power to grant a stay may also extend to prevent persons from exercising any right of set off in respect of the amounts owed by such a person to the debtor company, irrespective of whether the debtor company has commenced any action in respect of which the defense of set off might be formally asserted: see *Quintette*, supra, at pp. 312-4 (B.C.C.A.).

It was submitted by the applicants that the power to grant a stay of proceedings may also extend to a stay of proceedings against non-applicants who are not companies and accordingly do not come within the express provisions of the CCAA. In support thereof they cited a CCAA order which was granted staying proceedings against individuals who guaranteed the obligations of a debtor-applicant which was a qualifying company under the terms of the CCAA: see *In the Matter of the Proposal of Norman Slavik*, unreported, [1992] B.C.J. No. 341. However in the Slavik situation the individual guarantors were officers and shareholders of two companies which had sought and obtained CCAA protection. *Vickers J.* in that case indicated that the facts of that case included the following unexplained and unamplified fact:

5. The order provided further that all creditors of Norvik Timber Inc. be enjoined from making demand for payment upon that firm or upon any guarantor of an obligation of the firm until further order of the Court.

The CCAA reorganization plan involved an assignment of the claims of the creditors to "Newco" in exchange for cash and shares. However the basis of the stay order originally granted was not set forth in this decision.

It appears to me that *Dickson J.* in *International Donut Corp. v. 050863 N.B. Ltd.*, unreported, (1992) N.B.J. No. 339 (N.B.Q.B.T.D.) was focusing only on the stay arrangements of the CCAA when concerning a limited partnership situation he indicated:

In August 1991 the limited partnership, through its general partner the plaintiff, applied to the Court under the Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act, R.S.C., c. C-36 for an order delaying the assertion of claims by creditors until an opportunity could be gained to work out with the numerous and sizable creditors a compromise of their claims. An order was obtained but it in due course expired without success having been achieved in arranging with creditors a compromise. That effort may have been wasted, because it seems questionable that the federal Act could have any application to a limited partnership in circumstances such as these. (Emphasis added).

I am not persuaded that the words of s. 11 which are quite specific as relating as to a company can be enlarged to encompass something other than that. However it appears to me that *Blair J.* was clearly in the right channel in his analysis in *Campeau v. Olympia & York Developments Ltd.* unreported, (1992) O.J. No. 1946 at pp. 4-7.

The Power to Stay

The Court has always had an inherent jurisdiction to grant a stay of proceedings whenever it is just and convenient to do so, in order to control its process or prevent an abuse of that process: see *Canada Systems Group (Est) Ltd. v. Allendale Mutual Insurance Co.* (1982), 29 C.P.C. 60 (H.C.), and cases referred to therein. In the civil context, this general power is also embodied in the very broad terms of s. 106 of the Courts of Justice Act, R.S.O. 1990, Chap. C. 43, which provides as follows:

- s. 106 A court, on its own initiative or on motion by any person, whether or not a party, may stay any proceeding in the court on such terms as are considered just.

Recently, Mr. Justice O'Connell has observed that this discretionary power is "highly dependent on the facts of each particular case": *Arab Monetary Fund v. Hashim* (unreported), [1992] O.J. No. 1330.

Apart from this inherent and general jurisdiction to stay proceedings, there are many instances where the Court is specifically granted the power to stay in a particular context, by virtue of statute or under the Rules of Civil Procedure. The authority to prevent multiplicity of proceedings in the same court, under Rule 6.01(1), is an example of the latter. The power to stay judicial and extra-judicial proceedings under s. 11 of the CCAA, is an example of the former. Section 11 of the CCAA provides as follows:

...

The Power to Stay in the Context of CCAA Proceedings:

By its formal title the CCAA is known as "An Act to facilitate compromises and arrangements between companies and their creditors". To ensure the effective nature of such a "facilitative" process it is essential that the debtor company be afforded a respite from the litigious and other rights being exercised by creditors, while it attempts to carry on as a going concern and to negotiate an acceptable corporate restructuring arrangement with such creditors.

In this respect it has been observed that the CCAA is "to be used as a practical and effective way of restructuring corporate indebtedness.": see the case comment following the report of *Norcen Energy Resources Ltd. v. Oakwood Petroleum Ltd.* (1988), 72 C.B.R. (N.S.) 1 (Q.B.), and the approval of that remark as "a perceptive observation about the attitude of the courts" by Gibbs J.A. in *Quintette Coal Ltd. v. Nippon Steel Corp.* (1990), 51 B.C.L.R. (2d) 105 at p. 113 (B.C.C.A.).

Gibbs J.A. continued with this comment:

To the extent that a general principle can be extracted from the new cases directly on point, and the others in which there is persuasive obiter, it would appear to be that the courts have concluded that under s. 11 there is a discretionary power to restrain judicial or extra judicial conduct against the debtor company the effect of which is, or would be, seriously to impair the ability of the debtor company to continue in business during the compromise or arrangement negotiating period (emphasis added).

I agree with those sentiments and would simply add that, in my view, the restraining power extends as well to conduct which could seriously impair the debtor's ability to focus and concentrate its efforts on the business purpose of negotiating the compromise or arrangement. (In this respect, see also *Sairex GmbH v. Prudential Steel Ltd.* (1991), 8 C.B.R. (3d) 62 (Ont. Gen. Div.) at p. 77).

I must have regard to these foregoing factors while I consider, as well, the general principles which have historically governed the Court's exercise of its power to stay proceedings. These principles were reviewed by Mr. Justice Montgomery in *Canada Systems Group (EST) Ltd. v. Allendale Mutual Insurance*, supra (a "Mississauga Derailment" case), at pp. 65-66. The balance of convenience must weigh significantly in favour of granting the stay, as a party's right to have access to the courts must not be lightly interfered with. The Court must be satisfied that a continuance of the proceeding would serve as an injustice to the party seeking the stay, in the sense that it would be oppressive or vexatious or an abuse of the process of the court in some other way. The stay must not cause an injustice to the plaintiff.

It is quite clear from *Empire-Universal Films Limited et al. v. Rank et al.*, (1947) O.R. 775 (H.C.) that McRuer C.J.H.C. considered that the Judicature Act then [and now the CJA] merely confirmed a statutory right that previously had been considered inherent in the jurisdiction of the court with respect to its authority to grant a stay of proceedings. See also *McCordic et al. v. Township of Bosanquet* (1974) 5 O.R. (2d) 53 (H.C.) and *Canada Systems Group (Est) Ltd. v. Allendale Mutual Insurance Co.* (1982) 29 C.P.C. 60 (H.C.) at pp. 65-6.

Montgomery J. in *Canada Systems*, supra, at pp. 65-6 indicated:

Goodman J. (as he then was) in *McCordic v. Bosanquet* (1974), 5 O.R. (2d) 53 in granting a stay reviewed the authorities and concluded that the inherent jurisdiction of the Court to grant a stay of proceedings may be made whenever it is just and reasonable to do so. "This court has ample jurisdiction to grant a stay whenever it is just and reasonable to do so." (Per

Lord Denning M.R. in *Edmeades v. Thames Board Mills Ltd.*, [1969] 2 Q.B. 67 at 71, [1969] 2 All E.R. 127 (C.A.). Lord Denning's decision in *Edmeades* was approved by Lord Justice Davies in *Lane v. Willis; Lane v. Beach (Executor of Estate of George William Willis)*, [1972] 1 All E.R. 430, [1972] 1 W.L.R. 326 (sub nom. *Lane v. Willis; Lane v. Beach*) (C.A.).

...

In *Weight Watchers Int. Inc. v. Weight Watchers of Ont. Ltd.* (1972), 25 D.L.R. (3d) 419, 5 C.P.R. (2d) 122, appeal allowed by consent without costs (sub nom. *Weight Watchers of Ont. Ltd. v. Weight Watchers Inc. Inc.*) 42 D.L.R. (3d) 320n, 10 C.P.R. (2d) 96n (Fed. C.A.), Mr. Justice Heald on an application for stay said at p. 426 [25 D.L.R.]:

"The principles which must govern in these matters are clearly stated in the case of *Empire Universal Films Ltd. et al. v. Rank et al.*, [1947] O.R. 775 at p. 779, as follows [quoting *St. Pierre et al. v. South American Stores (Gath & Chaves), Ltd. et al.*, [1936] 1 K.B. 382 at p. 398]:

'(1.) A mere balance of convenience is not a sufficient ground for depriving a plaintiff of the advantages of prosecuting his action in an English Court if it is otherwise properly brought. The right of access to the King's Court must not be lightly refused. (2.) In order to justify a stay two conditions must be satisfied, one positive and the other negative: (a) the defendant must satisfy the Court that the continuance of the action would work an injustice because it would be oppressive or vexatious to him or would be an abuse of the process of the Court in some other way; and (b) the stay must not cause an injustice to the plaintiff. On both the burden of proof is on the defendant.'"

Thus it appears to me that the inherent power of this court to grant stays can be used to supplement s. 11 of the CCAA when it is just and reasonable to do so. Is it appropriate to do so in the circumstances? Clearly there is jurisdiction under s. 11 of the CCAA to grant a stay in respect of any of the applicants which are all companies which fit the criteria of the CCAA. However the stay requested also involved the limited partnerships to some degree either (i) with respect to the applicants acting on behalf of the Limited Partnerships or (ii) the stays being effective vis-a-vis any proceedings taken by any party against the property assets and Undertaking of the Limited Partnerships in respect of which they hold a direct interest (collectively the "Property") as set out in the terms of the stay provisions of the order paragraphs 4 through 18 inclusive attached as an appendix to these reasons. I believe that an analysis of the operations of a limited partnership in this context would be beneficial to an understanding of how there is a close inter-relationship to the applicants involved in this CCAA proceedings and how the Limited Partnerships and their Property are an integral part of the operations previously conducted and the proposed restructuring.

A limited partnership is a creation of statute, consisting of one or more general partners and one or more limited partners. The limited partnership is an investment vehicle for passive investment by limited partners. It in essence combines the flow through concept of tax depreciation or credits available to "ordinary" partners under general partnership law with limited liability available to shareholders under corporate law. See Ontario LPA sections 2(2) and 3(1) and Lyle R. Depburn, *Limited Partnerships*, De Boo (1991), at p. 1-2 and 1-12. I would note here that the limited partnership provisions of the Alberta PA are roughly equivalent to those found in the Ontario LPA with the interesting side aspect that the Alberta legislation in s. 75 does allow for judgment against a limited partner to be charged against the limited partner's interest in the limited partnership. A general partner has all the rights and powers and is subject to all the restrictions and liabilities of a partner in a partnership. In particular a general partner is fully liable to each creditor of the business of the limited partnership. The general partner has sole control over the property and business of the limited partnership: see Ontario LPA ss. 8 and 13. Limited partners have no liability to the creditors of the limited partnership's business; the limited partners' financial exposure is limited to their contribution. The limited partners do not have any "independent" ownership rights in the property of the limited partnership. The entitlement of the limited partners is limited to their contribution plus any profits thereon, after satisfaction of claims of the creditors. See Ontario LPA sections 9, 11, 12(1), 13, 15(2) and 24. The process of debtor and creditor relationships associated with the limited partnership's business are between the general partner and the creditors of the business. In the event of the creditors collecting on debt and enforcing security, the creditors can only look to the assets of the limited partnership together with the assets of the general partner including the general partner's interest in the limited partnership. This relationship is recognized under the Bankruptcy Act (now the BIA) sections 85 and 142.

A general partner is responsible to defend proceedings against the limited partnership in the firm name, so in procedural law and in practical effect, a proceeding against a limited partnership is a proceeding against the general partner. See Ontario Rules of Civil Procedure, O. Reg. 560/84 Rules 8.01 and 8.02.

It appears that the preponderance of case law supports the contention that a partnership including a limited partnership is not a separate legal entity. See Lindley on Partnership, 15th ed. (1984), at p. 33-5; *Seven Mile Dam Contractors v. R. in Right of British Columbia* (1979), 13 B.C.L.R. 137 (S.C.) affirmed (1980), 25 B.C.L.R. 183 (C.A.) and "Extra-Provincial Liability of the Limited Partner", Brad E. Milne, (1985) 23 Alta. Law Rev. 345, at p. 350-1. Milne in that article made the following observations:

The preponderance of case law therefore supports the contention that a limited partnership is not a separate legal entity. It appears, nevertheless, that the distinction made in *Re Thorne* between partnerships and trade unions could not be applied to limited partnerships which, like trade unions, must rely on statute for their validity. The mere fact that limited partnerships owe their existence to the statutory provision is probably not sufficient to endow the limited partnership with the attribute of legal personality as suggested in *Ruzicks* unless it appeared that the Legislature clearly intended that the limited partnership should have a separate legal existence. A review of the various provincial statutes does not reveal any procedural advantages, rights or powers that are fundamentally different from those

advantages enjoyed by ordinary partnerships. The legislation does not contain any provision resembling section 15 of the Canada Business Corporation Act [S.C. 1974-75, c. 33] which expressly states that a corporation has the capacity, both in and outside of Canada, of a natural person. It is therefore difficult to imagine that the Legislature intended to create a new category of legal entity.

It appears to me that the operations of a limited partnership in the ordinary course are that the limited partners take a completely passive role (they must or they will otherwise lose their limited liability protection which would have been their sole reason for choosing a limited partnership vehicle as opposed to an "ordinary" partnership vehicle). For a lively discussion of the question of "control" in a limited partnership as contrasted with shareholders in a corporation, see R. Flannigan, *The Control Test of Investor Liability in Limited Partnerships* (1983), 21 *Alta L. Rev.* 303; E. Apps, *Limited Partnerships and the "Control" Prohibition: Assessing the Liability of Limited Partners* (1991), 70 *Can. Bar. Rev.* 611; R. Flannigan, *Limited Partner Liability: A Response* (1992), 11 *Can. Bar Rev.* 552. The limited partners leave the running of the business to the general partner and in that respect the care, custody and the maintenance of the property, assets and undertaking of the limited partnership in which the limited partners and the general partner hold an interest. The ownership of this limited partnership property, assets and undertaking is an undivided interest which cannot be segregated for the purpose of legal process. It seems to me that there must be afforded a protection of the whole since the applicants' individual interest therein cannot be segregated without in effect dissolving the partnership arrangement. The limited partners have two courses of action to take if they are dissatisfied with the general partner or the operation of the limited partnership as carried on by the general partner - the limited partners can vote to (a) remove the general partner and replace it with another or (b) dissolve the limited partnership. However Flannigan strongly argues that an unfettered right to remove the general partner would attach general liability for the limited partners (and especially as to the question of continued enjoyment of favourable tax deductions) so that it is prudent to provide this as a conditional right: *Control Test*, (1992), *supra*, at pp. 524-5. Since the applicants are being afforded the protection of a stay of proceedings in respect to allowing them time to advance a reorganization plan and complete it if the plan finds favour, there should be a stay of proceedings (*vis-a-vis*) any action which the limited partners may wish to take as to replacement or dissolution) through the period of allowing the limited partners to vote on the reorganization plan itself.

It seems to me that using the inherent jurisdiction of this court to supplement the statutory stay provisions of s. 11 of the CCAA would be appropriate in the circumstances; it would be just and reasonable to do so. The business operations of the applicants are so intertwined with the limited partnerships that it would be impossible for relief as to a stay to be granted to the applicants which would affect their business without at the same time extending that stay to the undivided interests of the limited partners in such. It also appears that the applicants are well on their way to presenting a reorganization plan for consideration and a vote; this is scheduled to happen within the month so there would not appear to be any significant time inconvenience to any person interested in pursuing proceedings. While it is true that the provisions of the CCAA allow for a cramdown of a creditor's claim (as well as an interest of any other person), those who wish to be able to initiate or continue proceedings against the applicants may utilize the comeback clause in the order to persuade the court that it would not be just and reasonable to maintain that particular stay. I seems to

me that in such a comeback motion the onus would be upon the applicants to show that in the circumstances it was appropriate to continue the stay.

The order is therefore granted as to the relief requested including the proposed stay provisions.

FARLEY J.

* * * * *

APPENDIX A

THE STAY

4. THIS COURT ORDERS that each of the Applicants shall remain in possession of its property, assets and undertaking and of the property, assets and undertaking of the Limited Partnerships in which they hold a direct interest (collectively the "Property") until March 15, 1993 (the "Stay Date") and shall be authorized, but not required, to make payment to Conventional Mortgage Creditors and to trade creditors incurred in the ordinary course prior to this Order including, without limitation, fees owing to professional advisors, wages, salaries, employee benefits, crown claims, unremitted source deductions in respect of income tax payable, Canada Pension Plan contributions payable, unemployment insurance contributions payable, realty taxes, and other taxes, if any, owing to any taxing authority and shall continue to carry on its business in the ordinary course, except as otherwise specifically authorized or directed by this Order, or as this Court may in future authorize or direct.
5. THIS COURT ORDERS that without in any way restricting the generality of paragraph 4 hereof, each of the Applicants, whether on behalf of a Limited Partnership or otherwise, be and is hereby authorized and empowered, subject to the existing rights of Creditors and any security granted in their favour, to:
 - (a) borrow such additional sums as it may deem necessary,
 - (b) grant such additional security as it may deem necessary to any lender providing new advances subsequent to the date of this Order provided that such additional security expressly states that it ranks subsequent in priority to all then existing security including all floating charges, whether crystallized or uncrystallized,
 - (c) grant such additional security as it may deem necessary to any lender providing new advances subsequent to the date of this Order which may rank ahead of existing security if the consent is obtained of all secured creditors having an interest in the collateral in respect of which the additional security is granted to the granting of the additional security, and
 - (d) dispose of any of its Property subject, however, to the terms of any security affecting same, provided that no disposition of any Property charged in favour of any secured lender shall be made unless such secured lender

consents to such disposition and to the manner in which the proceeds derived from such disposition are distributed,

the whole on at least three (3) business days' prior notice to all of the Senior Creditors and the Monitor and on such terms as to notice to any other affected creditor as this Court may direct, but nothing in this Order shall prevent any Applicant, whether on behalf of a Limited Partnership or otherwise, from borrowing further funds or granting further security against the Londonderry Mall substantially in accordance with any existing agreements in order to fund the project completion and leasing costs of the Londonderry Mall and nothing in this Order shall prevent any Senior Creditor from advancing further funds to any of the Applicants or the Limited Partnerships under any existing security, subject to the existing rights of such Senior Creditor and any subordinate creditor including pursuant to any postponements or subordinations as may be extant in respect thereof.

6. THIS COURT ORDERS that, until the Stay Date, the General Partner Company and LUPC shall cause the monthly interest and, as applicable, amortization owing by LUPC under CT1 and CT3, but not the arrears thereof, to be paid as and when due and to cause LUPC to perform all of its obligations to CT in respect of CT2 under its existing arrangement in respect of the segregation and application of the net operating income of the Northgate Mall.
7. THIS COURT ORDERS that, subject to paragraphs 4 and 6 and to subparagraph 5(d) hereof, the Applicants and Limited Partnerships be and are hereby directed, until further Order of this Court:
 - (a) to make no payments, whether of capital, interest thereon or otherwise, on account of amounts owing by the Applicants to the Affected Creditors, as defined in the Plan, as of this date; and
 - (b) to grant no mortgages, charges or other security upon or in respect of the Property other than for the specific purpose of borrowing new funds as provided for in paragraph 5 hereof.

but nothing in this Order shall prevent the General Partner Company or LUPC from making payments to Senior Creditors of interest and/or principal in accordance with existing agreements and nothing in this Order shall prevent the General Partner Company or the Limited Partnerships from making any funded monthly interest payments for loans secured against the Londonderry Mall.

8. THIS COURT ORDERS that until the Stay Date, the existing collateral position of Creditors in respect of marketable securities loans or credit facilities shall be frozen as at the date of this Order and all margin requirements in respect of such loans or credit facilities shall be suspended.
9. THIS COURT ORDERS that the Applicants shall be authorized to continue to retain and employ the agents, servants, solicitors and other assistants and consultants currently in its employ with liberty to retain such further assistants and

consultants as they acting reasonably deem necessary or desirable in the ordinary course of their business or for the purpose of carrying out the terms of this Order or, subject to the approval of this Court.

10. THIS COURT ORDERS that, subject to paragraph 13 hereof, until the Stay Date or further Order of this Court:
 - (a) any and all proceedings taken or that may be taken by any of the Creditors, any other creditors, customers, clients, suppliers, lessors (including ground lessors), tenants, co-tenants, governments, limited partners, co-venturers, partners or by any other person, firm, corporation or entity against or in respect of any of the Applicants or the Property, as the case may be, whether pursuant to the Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act, S.C. 1992, c. 27, the Winding up Act, R.S.C. 1985, c. W-11 or otherwise shall be stayed and suspended;
 - (b) the right of any person, firm, corporation or other entity to take possession of, foreclose upon or otherwise deal with any of the Property, or to continue such actions or proceedings if commenced prior to the date of this Order, is hereby restrained;
 - (c) the right of any person, firm, corporation or other entity to commence or continue realization in respect of any encumbrance, lien, charge, mortgage, attornment of rents or other security held in relation to the Property, including the right of any Creditor to take any step in asserting or perfecting any right against any Applicant or Limited Partnership, is hereby restrained, but the foregoing shall not prevent any Creditor from effecting any registrations with respect to existing security granted or agreed to prior to the date of this Order or from obtaining any third party consents in relation thereto;
 - (d) the right of any person, firm, corporation or other entity to assert, enforce or exercise any right, option or remedy available to it under any agreement with any of the Applicants or in respect of any of the Property, as the case may be, arising out of, relating to or triggered by the making or filing of these proceedings, or any allegation contained in these proceedings including, without limitation, the making of any demand, the sending of any notice or the issuance of any margin call is hereby restrained;
 - (e) no suit, action or other proceeding shall be proceeded with or commenced against any of the Applicants or in respect of any of the Property, as the case may be;
 - (f) all persons, firms, corporations and other entities are restrained from exercising any extra-judicial right or remedy against any of the Applicants or in respect of any of the Property, as the case may be;
 - (g) all persons, firms, corporations and other entities are restrained from registering or re-registering any of the Property which constitutes securities into the name of such persons, firms, corporations or other entities or their nominees, the exercise of any voting rights attaching to such securities, any right of distress, repossession, set off or consolidation of accounts in rela-

tion to amounts due or accruing due in respect of or arising from any indebtedness or obligation as at the date hereof; and

- (h) notwithstanding paragraph 9(g) hereof, a Creditor may set off against its indebtedness to an Applicant, as the case may be, pursuant to any existing interest rate swap agreement any corresponding indebtedness of such Applicant, as the case may be, to such Creditor under the same interest rate swap agreement,

but nothing in this Order shall prevent suppliers of goods and services involved in completing the construction of the Londonderry Mall from commencing or continuing with any construction lien claims they may have in relation to the Londonderry Mall and nothing in this Order shall prevent the Bank of Montreal ("BMO") and the Applicants from continuing to operate the existing bank accounts of the Applicants and of the Limited Partnerships maintained with BMO, in the same manner as those bank accounts were operated prior to the date of this Order including any rights of set off in relation to monies deposited therein and nothing in this Order shall prevent CIBC from realizing upon its security in respect of CIBC1 and nothing in this Order shall prevent or affect either FB or CT in the enforcement of the security it holds on the Sutton Place Hotel and the Carleton Place Hotel, respectively.

11. THIS COURT ORDERS that no Creditor shall be under any obligation to advance or re-advance any monies after the date of this Order to any of the Applicants or to any of the Limited Partnerships, as the case may be, provided, however, that cash placed on deposit by any Applicant with any Creditor from and after this date, whether in an operating account or otherwise and whether for its own account or for the account of a Limited Partnership, shall not be applied by such Creditor, other than in accordance with the terms of this Order, in reduction or repayment of amounts owing as of the date of this Order or which may become due on or before the Stay Date or in satisfaction of any interest or charges accruing in respect thereof.
12. THIS COURT ORDERS that all persons, firms, corporations and other entities having agreements with an Applicant or with a Limited Partnership, as the case may be, whether written or oral, for the supply or purchase of goods and/or services to such Applicant or Limited Partnerships, as the case may be, including, without limitation, ground leases, commercial leases, supply contracts, and service contracts, are hereby restrained from accelerating, terminating, suspending, modifying or cancelling such agreements without the written consent of such Applicant or Limited Partnership, as the case may be, or with the leave of this Court. All persons, firms, corporations and other entities are hereby restrained until further order of this Court from discontinuing, interfering or cutting off any utility (including telephone service at the present numbers used by any of the Applicants or Limited Partnerships, as the case may be, whether such telephone services are listed in the name of one or more of such Applicants or Limited Partnerships, as the case may be, or in the name of some other person), the furnishing of oil, gas, water, heat or electricity, the supply of equipment or other

services so long as such Applicant or Limited Partnerships, as the case may be, pays the normal prices or charges for such goods and services received after the date of this Order, as the same become due in accordance with such payment terms or as may be hereafter negotiated by such Applicant or Limited Partnerships, as the case may be, from time to time. All such persons, firms, corporations or other entities shall continue to perform and observe the terms and conditions contained in any agreements entered into with an Applicant or Limited Partnerships, as the case may be, and, without further limiting the generality of the foregoing, all persons, firms, corporations and other entities including tenants of premises owned or operated by any of the Applicants or Limited Partnerships, as the case may be, be and they are hereby restrained until further order of this Court from terminating, amending, suspending or withdrawing any agreements, licenses, permits, approvals or supply of services and from pursuing any rights or remedies arising thereunder.

13. THIS COURT ORDERS that, upon the failure by any of the Applicants to perform their obligations pursuant to this Order, any Creditor affected by such failure may, on at least one day's notice to each of the Applicants and to all Senior Creditors and the Monitor, bring a motion to have the provisions of paragraphs 10, 11 or 12 of this Order set aside or varied, either in whole or in part.
14. THIS COURT ORDERS that from 9:00 o'clock a.m. on December 24, 1992 to the time of the granting of this Order, any act or action taken or notice given by any Creditors receiving such Notice of Application in furtherance of their rights to commence or continue realization, will be deemed not to have been taken or given, as the case may be, subject to the right of such Creditors to further apply to this Court in respect of such act or action or notice given, provided that the foregoing shall not apply to prevent any Creditor who, during such period, effected any registrations with respect to security granted prior to the date of this Order or who obtained third party consents in relation thereto.
15. THIS COURT ORDERS that all floating charges granted by any of the Applicants prior to the date of this Order, whether granted on behalf of any of the Limited Partnerships or otherwise, shall be crystallized, and shall be deemed to be crystallized, effective for all purposes immediately prior to the granting of this Order.
16. THIS COURT ORDERS that the Applicants shall be entitled to take such steps as may be necessary or appropriate to discharge any construction, builders, mechanics or similar liens registered against any of their property including, without limitation, the posting of letters of credit or the making of payments into Court, as the case may be, and no lender to any Applicant shall be prevented from doing likewise or from making such protective advances as may be necessary or appropriate, in which case such lender, in respect of such advances, shall be entitled to the benefit of any existing security in its favour as of the date of this Order in accordance with its terms.
17. THIS COURT ORDERS that the Applicants on or before January 1, 1993, shall provide the Senior Creditors with projections as to the monthly general, administrative and restructuring ("GAR") costs for the months of January, February and

March, 1993, together with a cash-flow projection for LUPC for the period commencing on January 1, 1993 through to April 30, 1993 inclusive.

18. THIS COURT ORDERS that, notwithstanding the terms of this Order, the gross operating cash flow generated during the period commencing on the date of this Order to and until the Stay Date (the "Interim Period") by the Londonderry Mall shall be reserved and expended on the property in accordance with existing agreements, but all property management or other similar fees payable to any Applicant shall continue to be paid therefrom subject to the terms of any existing loan agreements affecting same.

TAB 3

Case Name:

Canwest Global Communications Corp. (Re)

**IN THE MATTER OF the Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act, R.S.C. 1985, C-36, as amended
AND IN THE MATTER OF a Proposed Plan of Compromise or Arrangement of Canwest Global Communications Corp. and the other applicants listed on Schedule "A"**

[2009] O.J. No. 4788

Court File No. CV-09-8241-OOCL

Ontario Superior Court of Justice
Commercial List

S.E. Pepall J.

November 12, 2009.

(43 paras.)

Bankruptcy and insolvency law -- Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act (CCAA) matters -- Compromises and arrangements -- Applications -- Sanction by court -- Application by a group of debtor companies for approval of an agreement that would enable them to restructure their business affairs, allowed -- Applicants were under the protection of the Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act -- Agreement was approved because it facilitated the restructuring of the applicants to enable them to become viable and competitive industry participants and it was fair -- Related transaction regarding the transfer of the business and assets of a newspaper that the applicants had an interest in did not require Court approval under s. 36 of the Act because it was an internal corporate reorganization which was in the ordinary course of business -- Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act, R.S.C. 1985, c. C-36, s. 36.

Application by a group of debtor companies and entities for an order approving a Transition and Reorganization Agreement between them and other related parties. The applicants were granted protection under the Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act on October 6, 2009. They were engaged in the newspaper, digital media and television business. The Agreement pertained to the restructuring of the applicants' business affairs. It was an internal reorganization transaction that was designed to realign shared services and assets within the corporate family that the applicants belonged to. The Agreement was entered into after extensive negotiations between the parties who

were affected by it. The Monitor, who was appointed under the Act, concluded that this transaction had several advantages over a liquidation.

HELD: Application allowed. Court approval under s. 36 of the Act was required if a debtor company under the protection of the Act proposed to sell or dispose of assets outside the ordinary course of business. It did not apply to a transaction regarding the transfer of the assets and business of a newspaper that the applicants had an interest in because it was an internal corporate reorganization which was in the ordinary course of business. The Agreement was approved because it facilitated the restructuring of the applicants to enable them to become viable and competitive industry participants and it was fair. It also allowed a substantial number of the businesses operated by the applicants to continue as going concerns. The Agreement did not prejudice the applicants' major creditors. In the absence of the Agreement the newspaper would have to shut down and most of its employees would lose their employment. The stay that was granted under the Act was extended to enable the applicants to continue to work with their various stakeholders on the preparation and filing of a proposed plan of arrangement.

Statutes, Regulations and Rules Cited:

Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act,

Bulk Sales Act, R.S.O. 1990, c. B.14,

Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act, R.S.C. 1985, c. C-36, s. 2(1), s. 2(1), s. 36, s. 36(1), s. 36(4), s. 36(7)

Counsel:

Lyndon Barnes and Jeremy Dacks for the Applicants.

Alan Merskey for the Special Committee of the Board of Directors of Canwest.

David Byers and Maria Konyukhova for the Monitor, FTI Consulting Canada Inc.

Benjamin Zarnett for the Ad Hoc Committee of Noteholders.

Peter J. Osborne for Proposed Management Directors of National Post.

Andrew Kent and Hilary Clarke for Bank of Nova Scotia, Agent for Senior Secured Lenders to LP Entities.

Steve Weisz for CIT Business Credit Canada Inc.

Amanda Darroch for Communication Workers of America.

Alena Thouin for Superintendent of Financial Services.

REASONS FOR DECISION

S.E. PEPALL J.:--

Relief Requested

1 The CMI Entities move for an order approving the Transition and Reorganization Agreement by and among Canwest Global Communications Corporation ("Canwest Global"), Canwest Limited Partnership/Canwest Societe en Commandite (the "Limited Partnership"), Canwest Media Inc. ("CMI"), Canwest Publishing Inc./Publications Canwest Inc ("CPI"), Canwest Television Limited Partnership ("CTLP") and The National Post Company/La Publication National Post (the "National Post Company") dated as of October 26, 2009, and which includes the New Shared Services Agreement and the National Post Transition Agreement.

2 In addition they ask for a vesting order with respect to certain assets of the National Post Company and a stay extension order.

3 At the conclusion of oral argument, I granted the order requested with reasons to follow.

Background Facts

(a) Parties

4 The CMI Entities including Canwest Global, CMI, CTLP, the National Post Company, and certain subsidiaries were granted *Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act* ("CCAA") protection on Oct 6, 2009. Certain others including the Limited Partnership and CPI did not seek such protection. The term Canwest will be used to refer to the entire enterprise.

5 The National Post Company is a general partnership with units held by CMI and National Post Holdings Ltd. (a wholly owned subsidiary of CMI). The National Post Company carries on business publishing the National Post newspaper and operating related on line publications.

(b) History

6 To provide some context, it is helpful to briefly review the history of Canwest. In general terms, the Canwest enterprise has two business lines: newspaper and digital media on the one hand and television on the other. Prior to 2005, all of the businesses that were wholly owned by Canwest Global were operated directly or indirectly by CMI using its former name, Canwest Mediaworks Inc. As one unified business, support services were shared. This included such things as executive services, information technology, human resources and accounting and finance.

7 In October, 2005, as part of a planned income trust spin-off, the Limited Partnership was formed to acquire Canwest Global's newspaper publishing and digital media entities as well as certain of the shared services operations. The National Post Company was excluded from this acquisition due to its lack of profitability and unsuitability for inclusion in an income trust. The Limited Partnership entered into a credit agreement with a syndicate of lenders and the Bank of Nova Scotia as administrative agent. The facility was guaranteed by the Limited Partner's general partner, Canwest (Canada) Inc. ("CCI"), and its subsidiaries, CPI and Canwest Books Inc. (CBI") (collectively with the Limited Partnership, the "LP Entities"). The Limited Partnership and its subsidiaries then operated for a couple of years as an income trust.

8 In spite of the income trust spin off, there was still a need for the different entities to continue to share services. CMI and the Limited Partnership entered into various agreements to govern the provision and cost allocation of certain services between them. The following features characterized these arrangements:

- the service provider, be it CMI or the Limited Partnership, would be entitled to reimbursement for all costs and expenses incurred in the provision of services;
- shared expenses would be allocated on a commercially reasonable basis consistent with past practice; and
- neither the reimbursement of costs and expenses nor the payment of fees was intended to result in any material financial gain or loss to the service provider.

9 The multitude of operations that were provided by the LP Entities for the benefit of the National Post Company rendered the latter dependent on both the shared services arrangements and on the operational synergies that developed between the National Post Company and the newspaper and digital operations of the LP Entities.

10 In 2007, following the Federal Government's announcement on the future of income fund distributions, the Limited Partnership effected a going-private transaction of the income trust. Since July, 2007, the Limited Partnership has been a 100% wholly owned indirect subsidiary of Canwest Global. Although repatriated with the rest of the Canwest enterprise in 2007, the LP Entities have separate credit facilities from CMI and continue to participate in the shared services arrangements. In spite of this mutually beneficial interdependence between the LP Entities and the CMI Entities, given the history, there are misalignments of personnel and services.

(c) Restructuring

11 Both the CMI Entities and the LP Entities are pursuing independent but coordinated restructuring and reorganization plans. The former have proceeded with their *CCAA* filing and pre-packaged recapitalization transaction and the latter have entered into a forbearance agreement with certain of their senior lenders. Both the recapitalization transaction and the forbearance agreement contemplate a disentanglement and/or a realignment of the shared services arrangements. In addition, the term sheet relating to the CMI recapitalization transaction requires a transfer of the assets and business of the National Post Company to the Limited Partnership.

12 The CMI Entities and the LP Entities have now entered into the Transition and Reorganization Agreement which addresses a restructuring of these inter-entity arrangements. By agreement, it is subject to court approval. The terms were negotiated amongst the CMI Entities, the LP Entities, their financial and legal advisors, their respective chief restructuring advisors, the Ad Hoc Committee of Noteholders, certain of the Limited Partnership's senior lenders and their respective financial and legal advisors.

13 Schedule A to that agreement is the New Shared Services Agreement. It anticipates a cessation or renegotiation of the provision of certain services and the elimination of certain redundancies. It also addresses a realignment of certain employees who are misaligned and, subject to approval of the relevant regulator, a transfer of certain misaligned pension plan participants to pension plans

that are sponsored by the appropriate party. The LP Entities, the CMI Chief Restructuring Advisor and the Monitor have consented to the entering into of the New Shared Services Agreement.

14 Schedule B to the Transition and Reorganization Agreement is the National Post Transition Agreement.

15 The National Post Company has not generated a profit since its inception in 1998 and continues to suffer operating losses. It is projected to suffer a net loss of \$9.3 million in fiscal year ending August 31, 2009 and a net loss of \$0.9 million in September, 2009. For the past seven years these losses have been funded by CMI and as a result, the National Post Company owes CMI approximately \$139.1 million. The members of the Ad Hoc Committee of Noteholders had agreed to the continued funding by CMI of the National Post Company's short-term liquidity needs but advised that they were no longer prepared to do so after October 30, 2009. Absent funding, the National Post, a national newspaper, would shut down and employment would be lost for its 277 non-unionized employees. Three of its employees provide services to the LP Entities and ten of the LP Entities' employees provide services to the National Post Company. The National Post Company maintains a defined benefit pension plan registered under the Ontario Pension Benefits Act. It has a solvency deficiency as of December 31, 2006 of \$1.5 million and a wind up deficiency of \$1.6 million.

16 The National Post Company is also a guarantor of certain of CMI's and Canwest Global's secured and unsecured indebtedness as follows:

Irish Holdco Secured Note -- \$187.3 million

CIT Secured Facility -- \$10.7 million

CMI Senior Unsecured Subordinated Notes -- US\$393.2 million

Irish Holdco Unsecured Note -- \$430.6 million

17 Under the National Post Transition Agreement, the assets and business of the National Post Company will be transferred as a going concern to a new wholly-owned subsidiary of CPI (the "Transferee"). Assets excluded from the transfer include the benefit of all insurance policies, corporate charters, minute books and related materials, and amounts owing to the National Post Company by any of the CMI Entities.

18 The Transferee will assume the following liabilities: accounts payable to the extent they have not been due for more than 90 days; accrued expenses to the extent they have not been due for more than 90 days; deferred revenue; and any amounts due to employees. The Transferee will assume all liabilities and/or obligations (including any unfunded liability) under the National Post pension plan and benefit plans and the obligations of the National Post Company under contracts, licences and permits relating to the business of the National Post Company. Liabilities that are not expressly assumed are excluded from the transfer including the debt of approximately \$139.1 million owed to CMI, all liabilities of the National Post Company in respect of borrowed money including any related party or third party debt (but not including approximately \$1,148,365 owed to the LP Entities) and contingent liabilities relating to existing litigation claims.

19 CPI will cause the Transferee to offer employment to all of the National Post Company's employees on terms and conditions substantially similar to those pursuant to which the employees are currently employed.

20 The Transferee is to pay a portion of the price or cost in cash: (i) \$2 million and 50% of the National Post Company's negative cash flow during the month of October, 2009 (to a maximum of \$1 million), less (ii) a reduction equal to the amount, if any, by which the assumed liabilities estimate as defined in the National Post Transition Agreement exceeds \$6.3 million.

21 The CMI Entities were of the view that an agreement relating to the transfer of the National Post could only occur if it was associated with an agreement relating to shared services. In addition, the CMI Entities state that the transfer of the assets and business of the National Post Company to the Transferee is necessary for the survival of the National Post as a going concern. Furthermore, there are synergies between the National Post Company and the LP Entities and there is also the operational benefit of reintegrating the National Post newspaper with the other newspapers. It cannot operate independently of the services it receives from the Limited Partnership. Similarly, the LP Entities estimate that closure of the National Post would increase the LP Entities' cost burden by approximately \$14 million in the fiscal year ending August 31, 2010.

22 In its Fifth Report to the Court, the Monitor reviewed alternatives to transitioning the business of the National Post Company to the LP Entities. RBC Dominion Securities Inc. who was engaged in December, 2008 to assist in considering and evaluating recapitalization alternatives, received no expressions of interest from parties seeking to acquire the National Post Company. Similarly, the Monitor has not been contacted by anyone interested in acquiring the business even though the need to transfer the business of the National Post Company has been in the public domain since October 6, 2009, the date of the Initial Order. The Ad Hoc Committee of Noteholders will only support the short term liquidity needs until October 30, 2009 and the National Post Company is precluded from borrowing without the Ad Hoc Committee's consent which the latter will not provide. The LP Entities will not advance funds until the transaction closes. Accordingly, failure to transition would likely result in the forced cessation of operations and the commencement of liquidation proceedings. The estimated net recovery from a liquidation range from a negative amount to an amount not materially higher than the transfer price before costs of liquidation. The senior secured creditors of the National Post Company, namely the CIT Facility lenders and Irish Holdco, support the transaction as do the members of the Ad Hoc Committee of Noteholders.

23 The Monitor has concluded that the transaction has the following advantages over a liquidation:

- it facilitates the reorganization and orderly transition and subsequent termination of the shared services arrangements between the CMI Entities and the LP Entities;
- it preserves approximately 277 jobs in an already highly distressed newspaper publishing industry;

- it will help maintain and promote competition in the national daily newspaper market for the benefit of Canadian consumers; and
- the Transferee will assume substantially all of the National Post Company's trade payables (including those owed to various suppliers) and various employment costs associated with the transferred employees.

Issues

24 The issues to consider are whether:

- (a) the transfer of the assets and business of the National Post is subject to the requirements of section 36 of the *CCAA*;
- (b) the Transition and Reorganization Agreement should be approved by the Court; and
- (c) the stay should be extended to January 22, 2010.

Discussion

(a) Section 36 of the *CCAA*

25 Section 36 of the *CCAA* was added as a result of the amendments which came into force on September 18, 2009. Counsel for the CMI Entities and the Monitor outlined their positions on the impact of the recent amendments to the *CCAA* on the motion before me. As no one challenged the order requested, no opposing arguments were made.

26 Court approval is required under section 36 if:

- (a) a debtor company under *CCAA* protection
- (b) proposes to sell or dispose of assets outside the ordinary course of business.

27 Court approval under this section of the Act¹ is only required if those threshold requirements are met. If they are met, the court is provided with a list of non-exclusive factors to consider in determining whether to approve the sale or disposition. Additionally, certain mandatory criteria must be met for court approval of a sale or disposition of assets to a related party. Notice is to be given to secured creditors likely to be affected by the proposed sale or disposition. The court may only grant authorization if satisfied that the company can and will make certain pension and employee related payments.

28 Specifically, section 36 states:

- (1) Restriction on disposition of business assets -- A debtor company in respect of which an order has been made under this Act may not sell or otherwise dispose of assets outside the ordinary course of business unless authorized to do so by a court. Despite any requirement for shareholder approval, including one under federal or provincial law, the court may authorize the sale or disposition even if shareholder approval was not obtained.

- (2) Notice to creditors -- A company that applies to the court for an authorization is to give notice of the application to the secured creditors who are likely to be affected by the proposed sale or disposition.
- (3) Factors to be considered -- In deciding whether to grant the authorization, the court is to consider, among other things,
 - (a) whether the process leading to the proposed sale or disposition was reasonable in the circumstances;
 - (b) whether the monitor approved the process leading to the proposed sale or disposition;
 - (c) whether the monitor filed with the court a report stating that in their opinion the sale or disposition would be more beneficial to the creditors than a sale or disposition under a bankruptcy;
 - (d) the extent to which the creditors were consulted;
 - (e) the effects of the proposed sale or disposition on the creditors and other interested parties; and
 - (f) whether the consideration to be received for the assets is reasonable and fair, taking into account their market value.
- (4) Additional factors -- related persons -- If the proposed sale or disposition is to a person who is related to the company, the court may, after considering the factors referred to in subsection (3), grant the authorization only if it is satisfied that
 - (a) good faith efforts were made to sell or otherwise dispose of the assets to persons who are not related to the company; and
 - (b) the consideration to be received is superior to the consideration that would be received under any other offer made in accordance with the process leading to the proposed sale or disposition.
- (5) Related persons -- For the purpose of subsection (4), a person who is related to the company includes
 - (a) a director or officer of the company;
 - (b) a person who has or has had, directly or indirectly, control in fact of the company; and
 - (c) a person who is related to a person described in paragraph (a) or (b).

- (6) Assets may be disposed of free and clear -- The court may authorize a sale or disposition free and clear of any security, charge or other restriction and, if it does, it shall also order that other assets of the company or the proceeds of the sale or disposition be subject to a security, charge or other restriction in favour of the creditor whose security, charge or other restriction is to be affected by the order.
- (7) Restriction -- employers -- The court may grant the authorization only if the court is satisfied that the company can and will make the payments that would have been required under paragraphs 6(4)(a) and (5)(a) if the court had sanctioned the compromise or arrangement.²

29 While counsel for the CMI Entities states that the provisions of section 36 have been satisfied, he submits that section 36 is inapplicable to the circumstances of the transfer of the assets and business of the National Post Company because the threshold requirements are not met. As such, the approval requirements are not triggered. The Monitor supports this position.

30 In support, counsel for the CMI Entities and for the Monitor firstly submit that section 36(1) makes it clear that the section only applies to a debtor company. The terms "debtor company" and "company" are defined in section 2(1) of the *CCAA* and do not expressly include a partnership. The National Post Company is a general partnership and therefore does not fall within the definition of debtor company. While I acknowledge these facts, I do not accept this argument in the circumstances of this case. Relying on case law and exercising my inherent jurisdiction, I extended the scope of the Initial Order to encompass the National Post Company and the other partnerships such that they were granted a stay and other relief. In my view, it would be inconsistent and artificial to now exclude the business and assets of those partnerships from the ambit of the protections contained in the statute.

31 The CMI Entities' and the Monitor's second argument is that the Transition and Reorganization Agreement represents an internal corporate reorganization that is not subject to the requirements of section 36. Section 36 provides for court approval where a debtor under *CCAA* protection proposes to sell or otherwise dispose of assets "outside the ordinary course of business". This implies, so the argument goes, that a transaction that is in the ordinary course of business is not captured by section 36. The Transition and Reorganization Agreement is an internal corporate reorganization which is in the ordinary course of business and therefore section 36 is not triggered state counsel for the CMI Entities and for the Monitor. Counsel for the Monitor goes on to submit that the subject transaction is but one aspect of a larger transaction. Given the commitments and agreements entered into with the Ad Hoc Committee of Noteholders and the Bank of Nova Scotia as agent for the senior secured lenders to the LP Entities, the transfer cannot be treated as an independent sale divorced from its rightful context. In these circumstances, it is submitted that section 36 is not engaged.

32 The *CCAA* is remedial legislation designed to enable insolvent companies to restructure. As mentioned by me before in this case, the amendments do not detract from this objective. In discussing section 36, the Industry Canada Briefing Book³ on the amendments states that "The reform is intended to provide the debtor company with greater flexibility in dealing with its property while limiting the possibility of abuse."⁴

33 The term "ordinary course of business" is not defined in the *CCAA* or in the *Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act*. As noted by Cullity J. in *Millgate Financial Corp. v. BCED Holdings Ltd.*⁶, authorities that have considered the use of the term in various statutes have not provided an exhaustive definition. As one author observed in a different context, namely the *Bulk Sales Act*⁷, courts have typically taken a common sense approach to the term "ordinary course of business" and have considered the normal business dealings of each particular seller⁸. In *Pacific Mobile Corp.*⁹, the Supreme Court of Canada stated:

It is not wise to attempt to give a comprehensive definition of the term "ordinary course of business" for all transactions. Rather, it is best to consider the circumstances of each case and to take into account the type of business carried on by the debtor and creditor.

We approve of the following passage from Monet J.A.'s reasons, [1982] C.A. 501, discussing the phrase "ordinary course of business" ...

'It is apparent from these authorities, it seems to me, that the concept we are concerned with is an abstract one and that it is the function of the courts to consider the circumstances of each case in order to determine how to characterize a given transaction. This in effect reflects the constant interplay between law and fact.'

34 In arguing that section 36 does not apply to an internal corporate reorganization, the CMI Entities rely on the commentary of Industry Canada as being a useful indicator of legislative intent and descriptive of the abuse the section was designed to prevent. That commentary suggests that section 36(4), which deals with dispositions of assets to a related party, was intended to:

... prevent the possible abuse by "phoenix corporations". Prevalent in small business, particularly in the restaurant industry, phoenix corporations are the result of owners who engage in serial bankruptcies. A person incorporates a business and proceeds to cause it to become bankrupt. The person then purchases the assets of the business at a discount out of the estate and incorporates a "new" business using the assets of the previous business. The owner continues their original business basically unaffected while creditors are left unpaid.¹⁰

35 In my view, not every internal corporate reorganization escapes the purview of section 36. Indeed, a phoenix corporation to one may be an internal corporate reorganization to another. As suggested by the decision in *Pacific Mobile Corp.*¹¹, a court should in each case examine the circumstances of the subject transaction within the context of the business carried on by the debtor.

36 In this case, the business of the National Post Company and the CP Entities are highly integrated and interdependent. The Canwest business structure predated the insolvency of the CMI Entities and reflects in part an anomaly that arose as a result of an income trust structure driven by tax considerations. The Transition and Reorganization Agreement is an internal reorganization transaction that is designed to realign shared services and assets within the Canwest corporate family so as to rationalize the business structure and to better reflect the appropriate business model. Furthermore, the realignment of the shared services and transfer of the assets and business of the National Post Company to the publishing side of the business are steps in the larger reorganization of the relationship between the CMI Entities and the LP Entities. There is no ability to proceed with either

the Shared Services Agreement or the National Post Transition Agreement alone. The Transition and Reorganization Agreement provides a framework for the CMI Entities and the LP Entities to properly restructure their inter-entity arrangements for the benefit of their respective stakeholders. It would be commercially unreasonable to require the CMI Entities to engage in the sort of third party sales process contemplated by section 36(4) and offer the National Post for sale to third parties before permitting them to realign the shared services arrangements. In these circumstances, I am prepared to accept that section 36 is inapplicable.

(b) Transition and Reorganization Agreement

37 As mentioned, the Transition and Reorganization Agreement is by its terms subject to court approval. The court has a broad jurisdiction to approve agreements that facilitate a restructuring: *Re Stelco Inc.*¹² Even though I have accepted that in this case section 36 is inapplicable, court approval should be sought in circumstances where the sale or disposition is to a related person and there is an apprehension that the sale may not be in the ordinary course of business. At that time, the court will confirm or reject the ordinary course of business characterization. If confirmed, at minimum, the court will determine whether the proposed transaction facilitates the restructuring and is fair. If rejected, the court will determine whether the proposed transaction meets the requirements of section 36. Even if the court confirms that the proposed transaction is in the ordinary course of business and therefore outside the ambit of section 36, the provisions of the section may be considered in assessing fairness.

38 I am satisfied that the proposed transaction does facilitate the restructuring and is fair and that the Transition and Reorganization Agreement should be approved. In this regard, amongst other things, I have considered the provisions of section 36. I note the following. The CMI recapitalization transaction which prompted the Transition and Reorganization Agreement is designed to facilitate the restructuring of CMI into a viable and competitive industry participant and to allow a substantial number of the businesses operated by the CMI Entities to continue as going concerns. This preserves value for stakeholders and maintains employment for as many employees of the CMI Entities as possible. The Transition and Reorganization Agreement was entered into after extensive negotiation and consultation between the CMI Entities, the LP Entities, their respective financial and legal advisers and restructuring advisers, the Ad Hoc Committee and the LP senior secured lenders and their respective financial and legal advisers. As such, while not every stakeholder was included, significant interests have been represented and in many instances, given the nature of their interest, have served as proxies for unrepresented stakeholders. As noted in the materials filed by the CMI Entities, the National Post Transition Agreement provides for the transfer of assets and certain liabilities to the publishing side of the Canwest business and the assumption of substantially all of the operating liabilities by the Transferee. Although there is no guarantee that the Transferee will ultimately be able to meet its liabilities as they come due, the liabilities are not stranded in an entity that will have materially fewer assets to satisfy them.

39 There is no prejudice to the major creditors of the CMI Entities. Indeed, the senior secured lender, Irish Holdco., supports the Transition and Reorganization Agreement as does the Ad Hoc Committee and the senior secured lenders of the LP Entities. The Monitor supports the Transition and Reorganization Agreement and has concluded that it is in the best interests of a broad range of stakeholders of the CMI Entities, the National Post Company, including its employees, suppliers and customers, and the LP Entities. Notice of this motion has been given to secured creditors likely to be affected by the order.

40 In the absence of the Transition and Reorganization Agreement, it is likely that the National Post Company would be required to shut down resulting in the consequent loss of employment for most or all the National Post Company's employees. Under the National Post Transition Agreement, all of the National Post Company employees will be offered employment and as noted in the affidavit of the moving parties, the National Post Company's obligations and liabilities under the pension plan will be assumed, subject to necessary approvals.

41 No third party has expressed any interest in acquiring the National Post Company. Indeed, at no time did RBC Dominion Securities Inc. who was assisting in evaluating recapitalization alternatives ever receive any expression of interest from parties seeking to acquire it. Similarly, while the need to transfer the National Post has been in the public domain since at least October 6, 2009, the Monitor has not been contacted by any interested party with respect to acquiring the business of the National Post Company. The Monitor has approved the process leading to the sale and also has conducted a liquidation analysis that caused it to conclude that the proposed disposition is the most beneficial outcome. There has been full consultation with creditors and as noted by the Monitor, the Ad Hoc Committee serves as a good proxy for the unsecured creditor group as a whole. I am satisfied that the consideration is reasonable and fair given the evidence on estimated liquidation value and the fact that there is no other going concern option available.

42 The remaining section 36 factor to consider is section 36(7) which provides that the court should be satisfied that the company can and will make certain pension and employee related payments that would have been required if the court had sanctioned the compromise or arrangement. In oral submissions, counsel for the CMI Entities confirmed that they had met the requirements of section 36. It is agreed that the pension and employee liabilities will be assumed by the Transferee. Although present, the representative of the Superintendent of Financial Services was unopposed to the order requested. If and when a compromise and arrangement is proposed, the Monitor is asked to make the necessary inquiries and report to the court on the status of those payments.

Stay Extension

43 The CMI Entities are continuing to work with their various stakeholders on the preparation and filing of a proposed plan of arrangement and additional time is required. An extension of the stay of proceedings is necessary to provide stability during that time. The cash flow forecast suggests that the CMI Entities have sufficient available cash resources during the requested extension period. The Monitor supports the extension and nobody was opposed. I accept the statements of the CMI Entities and the Monitor that the CMI Entities have acted, and are continuing to act, in good faith and with due diligence. In my view it is appropriate to extend the stay to January 22, 2010 as requested.

S.E. PEPALL J.

cp/e/qlrxg/qljxr/qlced/qlaxw

¹ Court approval may nonetheless be required by virtue of the terms of the Initial or other court order or at the request of a stakeholder.

2 The reference to paragraph 6(4)a should presumably be 6(6)a.

3 Industry Canada "Bill C-55: Clause by Clause Analysis-Bill Clause No. 131-CCAA Section 36".

4 Ibid.

5 *R.S.C. 1985, c. C-36 as amended.*

6 (2003), 47 C.B.R. (4th) 278 at para. 52.

7 R.S.O. 1990, c. B.14, as amended.

8 D.J. Miller "Remedies under the Bulk Sales Act: (Necessary, or a Nuisance?)", Ontario Bar Association, October, 2007.

9 [1985] 1 S.C.R. 290.

10 *Supra*, note 3.

11 *Supra*, note 9.

12 (2005), 15 C.B.R. (5th) 288 (Ont. C.A.).

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

Court File No: CV-12-9539-00CL

AND IN THE MATTER OF A PLAN OF COMPROMISE OR ARRANGEMENT OF TIMMINCO
LIMITED AND BECANCOUR SILICON INC.

ONTARIO
SUPERIOR COURT OF JUSTICE - COMMERCIAL
LIST

Proceeding commenced at Toronto

BOOK OF AUTHORITIES OF THE APPLICANTS
(RETURNABLE APRIL 27, 2012)

STIKEMAN ELLIOTT LLP
Barristers & Solicitors
5300 Commerce Court West
199 Bay Street
Toronto, Canada M5L 1B9

Ashley J. Taylor LSUC#: 39932E
Tel: (416) 869- 5246

Maria Konyukhova LSUC#: 52880V
Tel: (416) 869-5230

Kathryn Esaw LSUC# 58264F
Tel: (416) 869-6820
Fax: (416) 947-0866

Lawyers for Applicants