

**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 January 27, 2012)**  
**(Re Approval of the DIP Facility and Stay Extension)**

Dated: January 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

# 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 BÉCANCOUR SILICON INC.

**(Applicants)**

**INDEX**

<b>Tab</b>	<b>Document</b>
1.	<i>Canwest Global Communications Corp. (Re)</i> (2009), 59 C.B.R. (5th) 72 (Ont. S.C.J. [Comm. List]).
2.	<i>Collins &amp; Aikman Automotive Canada Inc. (Re)</i> (2007), 37 C.B.R. (5th) 282 (Ont. S.C.J.).
3.	<i>ATB Financial v. Metcalf &amp; Mansfield Alternative Investment II Corp.</i> (2008), 45 C.B.R. (5th) 163 (Ont. C.A.).
4.	<i>Nortel Networks Corp. (Re)</i> , (2009), 59 C.B.R. (5th) 23 (Ont. C.A.).
5.	<i>Nortel Networks Corp. (Re)</i> , (2009), 55 C.B.R. (5th) 229 (Ont. S.C.J. [Comm. List]).
6.	<i>Lehndorff General Partner Ltd. (Re)</i> , (1993), 17 C.B.R. (3d) 24 (Ont. Gen. Div.).
7.	<i>Indalex Ltd. (Re)</i> , (2011), 75 C.B.R. (5th) 19 (Ont. C.A.).
8.	<i>Re Timminco Limited et al.</i> , Toronto CV-12-9539-00CL (Ont. S.C.J. [Comm. List]), Endorsement of Justice Morawetz dated January 16, 2012.
9.	<i>Re Canwest Global Communications Corp.</i> , [2009] O.J. No. 4788 (Ont. S.C.J.) [Comm. List]).

# TAB 1

*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"**

[Editor's note:  
Schedule "A" was not attached to the copy received by  
LexisNexis Canada and therefore is not included in the  
judgment.]

[2009] O.J. No. 4286

59 C.B.R. (5th) 72

2009 CanLII 55114

2009 CarswellOnt 6184

Court File No. CV-09-8241-OOCL

Ontario Superior Court of Justice  
Commercial List

**S.E. Pepall J.**

October 13, 2009.

(60 paras.)

*Bankruptcy and insolvency law -- Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act (CCAA) matters -- Application of Act -- Affiliated debtor companies -- Application by Canwest Global for relief under the Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act and to have the stay of proceedings and other provisions extend to several partnerships allowed -- Applicant Canwest Global owned CMI which was insolvent -- CMI Entities and Ad Hoc Committee of noteholders had agreed on terms of a going concern recapitalization transaction -- Stay under Act was extended to several partnerships that were intertwined with the applicants' ongoing operations -- DIP and administration charges approved -- Applicants were also permitted to pay pre-filing liabilities to their critical suppliers.*

Application by Canwest Global for relief under the Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act and to have the stay of proceedings and other provisions extend to several partnerships. The applicants were affiliated debtor companies with total claims against them exceeding \$5 million. The partnerships were intertwined with the applicants' ongoing operations. Canwest was a leading Canadian media company. Canwest Global owned 100 per cent of CMI. CMI had direct or indirect ownership interests in all of the other CMI Entities. The CMI Entities generated the majority of their revenue from the sale of advertising. Fuelled by a deteriorating economic environment, they experienced a decline in their advertising revenues. This caused problems with cash flow and circumstances were exacerbated by their high fixed operating costs. CMI breached certain of the financial covenants in its secured credit facility. The stay of proceedings was sought so as to allow the CMI Entities to proceed to develop a plan of arrangement or compromise to implement a consensual pre-packaged recapitalization transaction. The CMI Entities and an Ad Hoc Committee of noteholders had agreed on the terms of a going concern recapitalization transaction which was intended to form the basis of the plan. The applicants anticipated that a substantial number of the businesses operated by the CMI Entities would continue as going concerns thereby preserving enterprise value for stakeholders and maintaining employment for as many as possible. Certain steps designed to implement the recapitalization transaction had already been taken prior to the commencement of these proceedings.

HELD: Application allowed. The CMI Entities were unable to satisfy their debts as they come due and were insolvent. Absent these proceedings, the applicants would lack liquidity and would be unable to continue as going concerns. It was just and convenient to grant the relief requested with respect to the partnerships. The operations and obligations of the partnerships were so intertwined with those of the applicants that irreparable harm would ensue if the requested stay were not granted. The DIP charge for up to \$100 million was appropriate and required having regard to the debtors' cash-flow statement. The administration charge was also approved. Notice had been given to the secured creditors likely to be affected by the charge, the amount was appropriate, and the charge should extend to all of the proposed beneficiaries. The applicants were also permitted to pay pre-filing liabilities to their critical suppliers.

**Statutes, Regulations and Rules Cited:**

Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act, R.S.C. 1985, c. c. 36, s. 11, s. 11(2), s. 11.2, s. 11.2(1), s. 11.52

**Counsel:**

Lyndon Barnes, Edward Sellers and Jeremy Dacks, for the Applicants.

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

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

Benjamin Zarnett and Robert Chadwick, for Ad Hoc Committee of Noteholders.

Edmond Lamek, for the Asper Family.

Peter H. Griffin and Peter J. Osborne, for the Management Directors and Royal Bank of Canada.

Hilary Clarke, for Bank of Nova Scotia,

Steve Weisz, for CIT Business Credit Canada Inc.

---

## REASONS FOR DECISION

S.E. PEPALL J.:--

### Relief Requested

1 Canwest Global Communications Corp. ("Canwest Global"), its principal operating subsidiary, Canwest Media Inc. ("CMI"), and the other applicants listed on Schedule "A" of the Notice of Application apply for relief pursuant to the *Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act*.<sup>1</sup> The applicants also seek to have the stay of proceedings and other provisions extend to the following partnerships: Canwest Television Limited Partnership ("CTLP"), Fox Sports World Canada Partnership and The National Post Company/La Publication National Post ("The National Post Company"). The businesses operated by the applicants and the aforementioned partnerships include (i) Canwest's free-to-air television broadcast business (ie. the Global Television Network stations); (ii) certain subscription-based specialty television channels that are wholly owned and operated by CTLP; and (iii) the National Post.

2 The Canwest Global enterprise as a whole includes the applicants, the partnerships and Canwest Global's other subsidiaries that are not applicants. The term Canwest will be used to refer to the entire enterprise. The term CMI Entities will be used to refer to the applicants and the three aforementioned partnerships. The following entities are not applicants nor is a stay sought in respect of any of them: the entities in Canwest's newspaper publishing and digital media business in Canada (other than the National Post Company) namely the Canwest Limited Partnership, Canwest Publishing Inc./Publications Canwest Inc., Canwest Books Inc., and Canwest (Canada) Inc.; the Canadian subscription based specialty television channels acquired from Alliance Atlantis Communications Inc. in August, 2007 which are held jointly with Goldman Sachs Capital Partners and operated by CW Investments Co. and its subsidiaries; and subscription-based specialty television channels which are not wholly owned by CTLP.

3 No one appearing opposed the relief requested.

### Background Facts

4 Canwest is a leading Canadian media company with interests in twelve free-to-air television stations comprising the Global Television Network, subscription-based specialty television channels and newspaper publishing and digital media operations.

5 As of October 1, 2009, Canwest employed the full time equivalent of approximately 7,400 employees around the world. Of that number, the full time equivalent of approximately 1,700 are employed by the CMI Entities, the vast majority of whom work in Canada and 850 of whom work in Ontario.

6 Canwest Global owns 100% of CMI. CMI has direct or indirect ownership interests in all of the other CMI Entities. Ontario is the chief place of business of the CMI Entities.

7 Canwest Global is a public company continued under the *Canada Business Corporations Act*.<sup>2</sup> It has authorized capital consisting of an unlimited number of preference shares, multiple voting shares, subordinate voting shares, and non-voting shares. It is a "constrained-share company" which means that at least 66 2/3% of its voting shares must be beneficially owned by Canadians.

The Asper family built the Canwest enterprise and family members hold various classes of shares. In April and May, 2009, corporate decision making was consolidated and streamlined.

**8** The CMI Entities generate the majority of their revenue from the sale of advertising (approximately 77% on a consolidated basis). Fuelled by a deteriorating economic environment in Canada and elsewhere, in 2008 and 2009, they experienced a decline in their advertising revenues. This caused problems with cash flow and circumstances were exacerbated by their high fixed operating costs. In response to these conditions, the CMI Entities took steps to improve cash flow and to strengthen their balance sheets. They commenced workforce reductions and cost saving measures, sold certain interests and assets, and engaged in discussions with the CRTC and the Federal government on issues of concern.

**9** Economic conditions did not improve nor did the financial circumstances of the CMI Entities. They experienced significant tightening of credit from critical suppliers and trade creditors, a further reduction of advertising commitments, demands for reduced credit terms by newsprint and printing suppliers, and restrictions on or cancellation of credit cards for certain employees.

**10** In February, 2009, CMI breached certain of the financial covenants in its secured credit facility. It subsequently received waivers of the borrowing conditions on six occasions. On March 15, 2009, it failed to make an interest payment of US\$30.4 million due on 8% senior subordinated notes. CMI entered into negotiations with an ad hoc committee of the 8% senior subordinated note-holders holding approximately 72% of the notes (the "Ad Hoc Committee"). An agreement was reached wherein CMI and its subsidiary CTLP agreed to issue US\$105 million in 12% secured notes to members of the Ad Hoc Committee. At the same time, CMI entered into an agreement with CIT Business Credit Canada Inc. ("CIT") in which CIT agreed to provide a senior secured revolving asset based loan facility of up to \$75 million. CMI used the funds generated for operations and to repay amounts owing on the senior credit facility with a syndicate of lenders of which the Bank of Nova Scotia was the administrative agent. These funds were also used to settle related swap obligations.

**11** Canwest Global reports its financial results on a consolidated basis. As at May 31, 2009, it had total consolidated assets with a net book value of \$4.855 billion and total consolidated liabilities of \$5.846 billion. The subsidiaries of Canwest Global that are not applicants or partnerships in this proceeding had short and long term debt totalling \$2.742 billion as at May 31, 2009 and the CMI Entities had indebtedness of approximately \$954 million. For the 9 months ended May 31, 2009, Canwest Global's consolidated revenues decreased by \$272 million or 11% compared to the same period in 2008. In addition, operating income before amortization decreased by \$253 million or 47%. It reported a consolidated net loss of \$1.578 billion compared to \$22 million for the same period in 2008. CMI reported that revenues for the Canadian television operations decreased by \$8 million or 4% in the third quarter of 2009 and operating profit was \$21 million compared to \$39 million in the same period in 2008.

**12** The board of directors of Canwest Global struck a special committee of the board ("the Special Committee") with a mandate to explore and consider strategic alternatives in order to maximize value. That committee appointed Thomas Strike, who is the President, Corporate Development and Strategy Implementation of Canwest Global, as Recapitalization Officer and retained Hap Stephen, who is the Chairman and CEO of Stonecrest Capital Inc., as a Restructuring Advisor ("CRA").

**13** On September 15, 2009, CMI failed to pay US\$30.4 million in interest payments due on the 8% senior subordinated notes.

**14** On September 22, 2009, the board of directors of Canwest Global authorized the sale of all of the shares of Ten Network Holdings Limited (Australia) ("Ten Holdings") held by its subsidiary, Canwest Mediaworks Ireland Holdings ("CMIH"). Prior to the sale, the CMI Entities had consolidated indebtedness totalling US\$939.9 million pursuant to three facilities. CMI had issued 8% unsecured notes in an aggregate principal amount of US\$761,054,211. They were guaranteed by all of the CMI Entities except Canwest Global, and 30109, LLC. CMI had also issued 12% secured notes in an aggregate principal amount of US\$94 million. They were guaranteed by the CMI Entities. Amongst others, Canwest's subsidiary, CMIH, was a guarantor of both of these facilities. The 12% notes were secured by first ranking charges against all of the property of CMI, CTLP and the guarantors. In addition, pursuant to a credit agreement dated May 22, 2009 and subsequently amended, CMI has a senior secured revolving asset-based loan facility in the maximum amount of \$75 million with CIT Business Credit Canada Inc. ("CIT"). Prior to the sale, the debt amounted to \$23.4 million not including certain letters of credit. The facility is guaranteed by CTLP, CMIH and others and secured by first ranking charges against all of the property of CMI, CTLP, CMIH and other guarantors. Significant terms of the credit agreement are described in paragraph 37 of the proposed Monitor's report. Upon a CCAA filing by CMI and commencement of proceedings under Chapter 15 of the Bankruptcy Code, the CIT facility converts into a DIP financing arrangement and increases to a maximum of \$100 million.

**15** Consents from a majority of the 8% senior subordinated noteholders were necessary to allow the sale of the Ten Holdings shares. A Use of Cash Collateral and Consent Agreement was entered into by CMI, CMIH, certain consenting noteholders and others wherein CMIH was allowed to lend the proceeds of sale to CMI.

**16** The sale of CMIH's interest in Ten Holdings was settled on October 1, 2009. Gross proceeds of approximately \$634 million were realized. The proceeds were applied to fund general liquidity and operating costs of CMI, pay all amounts owing under the 12% secured notes and all amounts outstanding under the CIT facility except for certain letters of credit in an aggregate face amount of \$10.7 million. In addition, a portion of the proceeds was used to reduce the amount outstanding with respect to the 8% senior subordinated notes leaving an outstanding indebtedness thereunder of US\$393.25 million.

**17** In consideration for the loan provided by CMIH to CMI, CMI issued a secured intercompany note in favour of CMIH in the principal amount of \$187.3 million and an unsecured promissory note in the principal amount of \$430.6 million. The secured note is subordinated to the CIT facility and is secured by a first ranking charge on the property of CMI and the guarantors. The payment of all amounts owing under the unsecured promissory note are subordinated and postponed in favour of amounts owing under the CIT facility. Canwest Global, CTLP and others have guaranteed the notes. It is contemplated that the debt that is the subject matter of the unsecured note will be compromised.

**18** Without the funds advanced under the intercompany notes, the CMI Entities would be unable to meet their liabilities as they come due. The consent of the noteholders to the use of the Ten Holdings proceeds was predicated on the CMI Entities making this application for an Initial Order under the CCAA. Failure to do so and to take certain other steps constitute an event of default under the Use of Cash Collateral and Consent Agreement, the CIT facility and other agreements. The CMI

Entities have insufficient funds to satisfy their obligations including those under the intercompany notes and the 8% senior subordinated notes.

**19** The stay of proceedings under the CCAA is sought so as to allow the CMI Entities to proceed to develop a plan of arrangement or compromise to implement a consensual "pre-packaged" recapitalization transaction. The CMI Entities and the Ad Hoc Committee of noteholders have agreed on the terms of a going concern recapitalization transaction which is intended to form the basis of the plan. The terms are reflected in a support agreement and term sheet. The recapitalization transaction contemplates amongst other things, a significant reduction of debt and a debt for equity restructuring. The applicants anticipate that a substantial number of the businesses operated by the CMI Entities will continue as going concerns thereby preserving enterprise value for stakeholders and maintaining employment for as many as possible. As mentioned, certain steps designed to implement the recapitalization transaction have already been taken prior to the commencement of these proceedings.

**20** CMI has agreed to maintain not more than \$2.5 million as cash collateral in a deposit account with the Bank of Nova Scotia to secure cash management obligations owed to BNS. BNS holds first ranking security against those funds and no court ordered charge attaches to the funds in the account.

**21** The CMI Entities maintain eleven defined benefit pension plans and four defined contribution pension plans. There is an aggregate solvency deficiency of \$13.3 million as at the last valuation date and a wind up deficiency of \$32.8 million. There are twelve television collective agreements eleven of which are negotiated with the Communications, Energy and Paperworkers Union of Canada. The Canadian Union of Public Employees negotiated the twelfth television collective agreement. It expires on December 31, 2010. The other collective agreements are in expired status. None of the approximately 250 employees of the National Post Company are unionized. The CMI Entities propose to honour their payroll obligations to their employees, including all pre-filing wages and employee benefits outstanding as at the date of the commencement of the CCAA proceedings and payments in connection with their pension obligations.

#### Proposed Monitor

**22** The applicants propose that FTI Consulting Canada Inc. serve as the Monitor in these proceedings. It is clearly qualified to act and has provided the Court with its consent to act. Neither FTI nor any of its representatives have served in any of the capacities prohibited by section of the amendments to the CCAA.

#### Proposed Order

**23** I have reviewed in some detail the history that preceded this application. It culminated in the presentation of the within application and proposed order. Having reviewed the materials and heard submissions, I was satisfied that the relief requested should be granted.

**24** This case involves a consideration of the amendments to the CCAA that were proclaimed in force on September 18, 2009. While these were long awaited, in many instances they reflect practices and principles that have been adopted by insolvency practitioners and developed in the jurisprudence and academic writings on the subject of the CCAA. In no way do the amendments change or detract from the underlying purpose of the CCAA, namely to provide debtor companies with the opportunity to extract themselves from financial difficulties notwithstanding insolvency and to re-

organize their affairs for the benefit of stakeholders. In my view, the amendments should be interpreted and applied with that objective in mind.

(a) Threshold Issues

**25** Firstly, the applicants qualify as debtor companies under the CCAA. Their chief place of business is in Ontario. The applicants are affiliated debtor companies with total claims against them exceeding \$5 million. The CMI Entities are in default of their obligations. CMI does not have the necessary liquidity to make an interest payment in the amount of US\$30.4 million that was due on September 15, 2009 and none of the other CMI Entities who are all guarantors are able to make such a payment either. The assets of the CMI Entities are insufficient to discharge all of the liabilities. The CMI Entities are unable to satisfy their debts as they come due and they are insolvent. They are insolvent both under the *Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act*<sup>3</sup> definition and under the more expansive definition of insolvency used in *Re Stelco*<sup>4</sup>. Absent these CCAA proceedings, the applicants would lack liquidity and would be unable to continue as going concerns. The CMI Entities have acknowledged their insolvency in the affidavit filed in support of the application.

**26** Secondly, the required statement of projected cash-flow and other financial documents required under section 11(2) of the CCAA have been filed.

(b) Stay of Proceedings

**27** Under section 11 of the CCAA, the Court has broad jurisdiction to grant a stay of proceedings and to give a debtor company a chance to develop a plan of compromise or arrangement. In my view, given the facts outlined, a stay is necessary to create stability and to allow the CMI Entities to pursue their restructuring.

(b) Partnerships and Foreign Subsidiaries

**28** The applicants seek to extend the stay of proceedings and other relief to the aforementioned partnerships. The partnerships are intertwined with the applicants' ongoing operations. They own the National Post daily newspaper and Canadian free-to-air television assets and certain of its specialty television channels and some other television assets. These businesses constitute a significant portion of the overall enterprise value of the CMI Entities. The partnerships are also guarantors of the 8% senior subordinated notes.

**29** While the CCAA definition of a company does not include a partnership or limited partnership, courts have repeatedly exercised their inherent jurisdiction to extend the scope of CCAA proceedings to encompass them. See for example *Re Lehndorff General Partners Ltd.*<sup>5</sup>; *Re Smurf-it-Stone Container Canada Inc.*<sup>6</sup>; and *Re Calpine Canada Energy Ltd.*<sup>7</sup>. In this case, the partnerships carry on operations that are integral and closely interrelated to the business of the applicants. The operations and obligations of the partnerships are so intertwined with those of the applicants that irreparable harm would ensue if the requested stay were not granted. In my view, it is just and convenient to grant the relief requested with respect to the partnerships.

**30** Certain applicants are foreign subsidiaries of CMI. Each is a guarantor under the 8% senior subordinated notes, the CIT credit agreement (and therefore the DIP facility), the intercompany notes and is party to the support agreement and the Use of Cash Collateral and Consent Agreement. If the stay of proceedings was not extended to these entities, creditors could seek to enforce their

guarantees. I am persuaded that the foreign subsidiary applicants as that term is defined in the affidavit filed are debtor companies within the meaning of section 2 of the CCAA and that I have jurisdiction and ought to grant the order requested as it relates to them. In this regard, I note that they are insolvent and each holds assets in Ontario in that they each maintain funds on deposit at the Bank of Nova Scotia in Toronto. See in this regard *Re Cadillac Fairview*<sup>8</sup> and *Re Global Light Telecommunications Ltd.*<sup>9</sup>

(c) DIP Financing

**31** Turning to the DIP financing, the premise underlying approval of DIP financing is that it is a benefit to all stakeholders as it allows the debtors to protect going-concern value while they attempt to devise a plan acceptable to creditors. While in the past, courts relied on inherent jurisdiction to approve the terms of a DIP financing charge, the September 18, 2009 amendments to the CCAA now expressly provide jurisdiction to grant a DIP financing charge. Section 11.2 of the Act states:

- (1) On application by a debtor company and on notice to the secured creditors who are likely to be affected by the security or charge, a court may make an order declaring that all or part of the company's property is subject to a security or charge -- in an amount that the court considers appropriate -- in favour of a person specified in the order who agrees to lend to the company an amount approved by the court as being required by the company, having regard to its cash-flow statement. The security or charge may not secure an obligation that exists before the order is made.
- (2) The court may order that the security or charge rank in priority over the claim of any secured creditor of the company.
- (3) The court may order that the security or charge rank in priority over any security or charge arising from a previous order made under subsection (1) only with the consent of the person in whose favour the previous order was made.
- (4) In deciding whether to make an order, the court is to consider, among other things,
  - (a) the period during which the company is expected to be subject to proceedings under this Act;
  - (b) how the company's business and financial affairs are to be managed during the proceedings;
  - (c) whether the company's management has the confidence of its major creditors;
  - (d) whether the loan would enhance the prospects of a viable compromise or arrangement being made in respect of the company;
  - (e) the nature and value of the company's property;
  - (f) whether any creditor would be materially prejudiced as a result of the security or charge; and

(g) the monitor's report referred to in paragraph 23(1)(b), if any.

**32** In light of the language of section 11.2(1), the first issue to consider is whether notice has been given to secured creditors who are likely to be affected by the security or charge. Paragraph 57 of the proposed order affords priority to the DIP charge, the administration charge, the Directors' and Officers' charge and the KERP charge with the following exception: "any validly perfected purchase money security interest in favour of a secured creditor or any statutory encumbrance existing on the date of this order in favour of any person which is a "secured creditor" as defined in the CCAA in respect of any of source deductions from wages, employer health tax, workers compensation, GST/QST, PST payables, vacation pay and banked overtime for employees, and amounts under the Wage Earners' Protection Program that are subject to a super priority claim under the BIA". This provision coupled with the notice that was provided satisfied me that secured creditors either were served or are unaffected by the DIP charge. This approach is both consistent with the legislation and practical.

**33** Secondly, the Court must determine that the amount of the DIP is appropriate and required having regard to the debtors' cash-flow statement. The DIP charge is for up to \$100 million. Prior to entering into the CIT facility, the CMI Entities sought proposals from other third party lenders for a credit facility that would convert to a DIP facility should the CMI Entities be required to file for protection under the CCAA. The CIT facility was the best proposal submitted. In this case, it is contemplated that implementation of the plan will occur no later than April 15, 2010. The total amount of cash on hand is expected to be down to approximately \$10 million by late December, 2009 based on the cash flow forecast. The applicants state that this is an insufficient cushion for an enterprise of this magnitude. The cash-flow statements project the need for the liquidity provided by the DIP facility for the recapitalization transaction to be finalized. The facility is to accommodate additional liquidity requirements during the CCAA proceedings. It will enable the CMI Entities to operate as going concerns while pursuing the implementation and completion of a viable plan and will provide creditors with assurances of same. I also note that the proposed facility is simply a conversion of the pre-existing CIT facility and as such, it is expected that there would be no material prejudice to any of the creditors of the CMI Entities that arises from the granting of the DIP charge. I am persuaded that the amount is appropriate and required.

**34** Thirdly, the DIP charge must not and does not secure an obligation that existed before the order was made. The only amount outstanding on the CIT facility is \$10.7 in outstanding letters of credit. These letters of credit are secured by existing security and it is proposed that that security rank ahead of the DIP charge.

**35** Lastly, I must consider amongst others, the enumerated factors in paragraph 11.2(4) of the Act. I have already addressed some of them. The Management Directors of the applicants as that term is used in the materials filed will continue to manage the CMI Entities during the CCAA proceedings. It would appear that management has the confidence of its major creditors. The CMI Entities have appointed a CRA and a Restructuring Officer to negotiate and implement the recapitalization transaction and the aforementioned directors will continue to manage the CMI Entities during the CCAA proceedings. The DIP facility will enhance the prospects of a completed restructuring. CIT has stated that it will not convert the CIT facility into a DIP facility if the DIP charge is not approved. In its report, the proposed Monitor observes that the ability to borrow funds from a court approved DIP facility secured by the DIP charge is crucial to retain the confidence of the CMI Enti-

ties' creditors, employees and suppliers and would enhance the prospects of a viable compromise or arrangement being made. The proposed Monitor is supportive of the DIP facility and charge.

**36** For all of these reasons, I was prepared to approve the DIP facility and charge.

(d) Administration Charge

**37** While an administration charge was customarily granted by courts to secure the fees and disbursements of the professional advisors who guided a debtor company through the CCAA process, as a result of the amendments to the CCAA, there is now statutory authority to grant such a charge. Section 11.52 of the CCAA states:

(1) On notice to the secured creditors who are likely to be affected by the security or charge, the court may make an order declaring that all or part of the property of a debtor company is subject to a security or charge -- in an amount that the court considers appropriate -- in respect of the fees and expenses of

(a) the monitor, including the fees and expenses of any financial, legal or other experts engaged by the monitor in the performance of the monitor's duties;

(b) any financial, legal or other experts engaged by the company for the purpose of proceedings under this Act; and

(c) any financial, legal or other experts engaged by any other interested person if the court is satisfied that the security or charge is necessary for their effective participation in proceedings under this Act.

(2) The court may order that the security or charge rank in priority over the claim of any secured creditor of the company.

**38** I must therefore be convinced that (1) notice has been given to the secured creditors likely to be affected by the charge; (2) the amount is appropriate; and (3) the charge should extend to all of the proposed beneficiaries.

**39** As with the DIP charge, the issue relating to notice to affected secured creditors has been addressed appropriately by the applicants. The amount requested is up to \$15 million. The beneficiaries of the charge are: the Monitor and its counsel; counsel to the CMI Entities; the financial advisor to the Special Committee and its counsel; counsel to the Management Directors; the CRA; the financial advisor to the Ad Hoc Committee; and RBC Capital Markets and its counsel. The proposed Monitor supports the aforementioned charge and considers it to be required and reasonable in the circumstances in order to preserve the going concern operations of the CMI Entities. The applicants submit that the above-note professionals who have played a necessary and integral role in the restructuring activities to date are necessary to implement the recapitalization transaction.

**40** Estimating quantum is an inexact exercise but I am prepared to accept the amount as being appropriate. There has obviously been extensive negotiation by stakeholders and the restructuring is of considerable magnitude and complexity. I was prepared to accept the submissions relating to the administration charge. I have not included any requirement that all of these professionals be re-

quired to have their accounts scrutinized and approved by the Court but they should not preclude this possibility.

(e) Critical Suppliers

**41** The next issue to consider is the applicants' request for authorization to pay pre-filing amounts owed to critical suppliers. In recognition that one of the purposes of the CCAA is to permit an insolvent corporation to remain in business, typically courts exercised their inherent jurisdiction to grant such authorization and a charge with respect to the provision of essential goods and services. In the recent amendments, Parliament codified the practice of permitting the payment of pre-filing amounts to critical suppliers and the provision of a charge. Specifically, section 11.4 provides:

- (1) On application by a debtor company and on notice to the secured creditors who are likely to be affected by the security or charge, the court may make an order declaring a person to be a critical supplier to the company if the court is satisfied that the person is a supplier of goods or services to the company and that the goods or services that are supplied are critical to the company's continued operation.
- (2) If the court declares a person to be a critical supplier, the court may make an order requiring the person to supply any goods or services specified by the court to the company on any terms and conditions that are consistent with the supply relationship or that the court considers appropriate.
- (3) If the court makes an order under subsection (2), the court shall, in the order, declare that all or part of the property of the company is subject to a security or charge in favour of the person declared to be a critical supplier, in an amount equal to the value of the goods or services supplied under the terms of the order.
- (4) The court may order that the security or charge rank in priority over the claim of any secured creditor of the company.

**42** Under these provisions, the Court must be satisfied that there has been notice to creditors likely to be affected by the charge, the person is a supplier of goods or services to the company, and that the goods or services that are supplied are critical to the company's continued operation. While one might interpret section 11.4 (3) as requiring a charge any time a person is declared to be a critical supplier, in my view, this provision only applies when a court is compelling a person to supply. The charge then provides protection to the unwilling supplier.

**43** In this case, no charge is requested and no additional notice is therefore required. Indeed, there is an issue as to whether in the absence of a request for a charge, section 11.4 is even applicable and the Court is left to rely on inherent jurisdiction. The section seems to be primarily directed to the conditions surrounding the granting of a charge to secure critical suppliers. That said, even if it is applicable, I am satisfied that the applicants have met the requirements. The CMI Entities seek authorization to make certain payments to third parties that provide goods and services integral to their business. These include television programming suppliers given the need for continuous and undisturbed flow of programming, newsprint suppliers given the dependency of the National Post on a continuous and uninterrupted supply of newsprint to enable it to publish and on newspaper distributors, and the American Express Corporate Card Program and Central Billed Accounts that are required for CMI Entity employees to perform their job functions. No payment would be made

without the consent of the Monitor. I accept that these suppliers are critical in nature. The CMI Entities also seek more general authorization allowing them to pay other suppliers if in the opinion of the CMI Entities, the supplier is critical. Again, no payment would be made without the consent of the Monitor. In addition, again no charge securing any payments is sought. This is not contrary to the language of section 11.4 (1) or to its purpose. The CMI Entities seek the ability to pay other suppliers if in their opinion the supplier is critical to their business and ongoing operations. The order requested is facilitative and practical in nature. The proposed Monitor supports the applicants' request and states that it will work to ensure that payments to suppliers in respect of pre-filing liabilities are minimized. The Monitor is of course an officer of the Court and is always able to seek direction from the Court if necessary. In addition, it will report on any such additional payments when it files its reports for Court approval. In the circumstances outlined, I am prepared to grant the relief requested in this regard.

(f) Directors' and Officers' Charge

**44** The applicants also seek a directors' and officers' ("D &O") charge in the amount of \$20 million. The proposed charge would rank after the administration charge, the existing CIT security, and the DIP charge. It would rank *pari passu* with the KERP charge discussed subsequently in this endorsement but postponed in right of payment to the extent of the first \$85 million payable under the secured intercompany note.

**45** Again, the recent amendments to the CCAA allow for such a charge. Section 11.51 provides that:

- (1) On application by a debtor company and on notice to the secured creditors who are likely to be affected by the security or charge, the court may make an order declaring that all or part of the property of the company is subject to a security or charge -- in an amount that the court considers appropriate -- in favour of any director or officer of the company to indemnify the director or officer against obligations and liabilities that they may incur as a director or officer of the company
- (2) The court may order that the security or charge rank in priority over the claim of any secured creditor of the company.
- (3) The court may not make the order if in its opinion the company could obtain adequate indemnification insurance for the director or officer at a reasonable cost.
- (4) The court shall make an order declaring that the security or charge does not apply in respect of a specific obligation or liability incurred by a director or officer if in its opinion the obligation or liability was incurred as a result of the director's or officer's gross negligence or wilful misconduct or, in Quebec, the director's or officer's gross or intentional fault.

**46** I have already addressed the issue of notice to affected secured creditors. I must also be satisfied with the amount and that the charge is for obligations and liabilities the directors and officers may incur after the commencement of proceedings. It is not to extend to coverage of wilful misconduct or gross negligence and no order should be granted if adequate insurance at a reasonable cost could be obtained.

**47** The proposed Monitor reports that the amount of \$20 million was estimated taking into consideration the existing D&O insurance and the potential liabilities which may attach including cer-

tain employee related and tax related obligations. The amount was negotiated with the DIP lender and the Ad Hoc Committee. The order proposed speaks of indemnification relating to the failure of any of the CMI Entities, after the date of the order, to make certain payments. It also excludes gross negligence and wilful misconduct. The D&O insurance provides for \$30 million in coverage and \$10 million in excess coverage for a total of \$40 million. It will expire in a matter of weeks and Canwest Global has been unable to obtain additional or replacement coverage. I am advised that it also extends to others in the Canwest enterprise and not just to the CMI Entities. The directors and senior management are described as highly experienced, fully functional and qualified. The directors have indicated that they cannot continue in the restructuring effort unless the order includes the requested directors' charge.

**48** The purpose of such a charge is to keep the directors and officers in place during the restructuring by providing them with protection against liabilities they could incur during the restructuring: *Re General Publishing Co.*<sup>10</sup> Retaining the current directors and officers of the applicants would avoid destabilization and would assist in the restructuring. The proposed charge would enable the applicants to keep the experienced board of directors supported by experienced senior management. The proposed Monitor believes that the charge is required and is reasonable in the circumstances and also observes that it will not cover all of the directors' and officers' liabilities in the worst case scenario. In all of these circumstances, I approved the request.

(g) Key Employee Retention Plans

**49** Approval of a KERP and a KERP charge are matters of discretion. In this case, the CMI Entities have developed KERPs that are designed to facilitate and encourage the continued participation of certain of the CMI Entities' senior executives and other key employees who are required to guide the CMI Entities through a successful restructuring with a view to preserving enterprise value. There are 20 KERP participants all of whom are described by the applicants as being critical to the successful restructuring of the CMI Entities. Details of the KERPs are outlined in the materials and the proposed Monitor's report. A charge of \$5.9 million is requested. The three Management Directors are seasoned executives with extensive experience in the broadcasting and publishing industries. They have played critical roles in the restructuring initiatives taken to date. The applicants state that it is probable that they would consider other employment opportunities if the KERPs were not secured by a KERP charge. The other proposed participants are also described as being crucial to the restructuring and it would be extremely difficult to find replacements for them.

**50** Significantly in my view, the Monitor who has scrutinized the proposed KERPs and charge is supportive. Furthermore, they have been approved by the Board, the Special Committee, the Human Resources Committee of Canwest Global and the Ad Hoc Committee. The factors enumerated in *Re Grant Forest*<sup>11</sup> have all been met and I am persuaded that the relief in this regard should be granted.

**51** The applicants ask that the Confidential Supplement containing unredacted copies of the KERPs that reveal individually identifiable information and compensation information be sealed. Generally speaking, judges are most reluctant to grant sealing orders. An open court and public access are fundamental to our system of justice. Section 137(2) of the *Courts of Justice Act* provides authority to grant a sealing order and the Supreme Court of Canada's decision in *Sierra Club of Canada v. Canada (Minister of Finance)*<sup>12</sup> provides guidance on the appropriate legal principles to be applied. Firstly, the Court must be satisfied that the order is necessary in order to prevent a seri-

ous risk to an important interest, including a commercial interest, in the context of litigation because reasonable alternative measures will not prevent the risk. Secondly, the salutary effects of the order should outweigh its deleterious effects including the effects on the right to free expression which includes the public interest in open and accessible court proceedings.

**52** In this case, the unredacted KERPs reveal individually identifiable information including compensation information. Protection of sensitive personal and compensation information the disclosure of which could cause harm to the individuals and to the CMI Entities is an important commercial interest that should be protected. The KERP participants have a reasonable expectation that their personal information would be kept confidential. As to the second branch of the test, the aggregate amount of the KERPs has been disclosed and the individual personal information adds nothing. It seems to me that this second branch of the test has been met. The relief requested is granted.

#### Annual Meeting

**53** The CMI Entities seek an order postponing the annual general meeting of shareholders of Canwest Global. Pursuant to section 133 (1)(b) of the CBCA, a corporation is required to call an annual meeting by no later than February 28, 2010, being six months after the end of its preceding financial year which ended on August 31, 2009. Pursuant to section 133 (3), despite subsection (1), the corporation may apply to the court for an order extending the time for calling an annual meeting.

**54** CCAA courts have commonly granted extensions of time for the calling of an annual general meeting. In this case, the CMI Entities including Canwest Global are devoting their time to stabilizing business and implementing a plan. Time and resources would be diverted if the time was not extended as requested and the preparation for and the holding of the annual meeting would likely impede the timely and desirable restructuring of the CMI Entities. Under section 106(6) of the CBCA, if directors of a corporation are not elected, the incumbent directors continue. Financial and other information will be available on the proposed Monitor's website. An extension is properly granted.

#### Other

**55** The applicants request authorization to commence Chapter 15 proceedings in the U.S. Continued timely supply of U.S. network and other programming is necessary to preserve going concern value. Commencement of Chapter 15 proceedings to have the CCAA proceedings recognized as "foreign main proceedings" is a prerequisite to the conversion of the CIT facility into the DIP facility. Authorization is granted.

**56** Canwest's various corporate and other entities share certain business services. They are seeking to continue to provide and receive inter-company services in the ordinary course during the CCAA proceedings. This is supported by the proposed Monitor and FTI will monitor and report to the Court on matters pertaining to the provision of inter-company services.

**57** Section 23 of the amended CCAA now addresses certain duties and functions of the Monitor including the provision of notice of an Initial Order although the Court may order otherwise. Here the financial threshold for notice to creditors has been increased from \$1000 to \$5000 so as to reduce the burden and cost of such a process. The proceedings will be widely published in the media

and the Initial Order is to be posted on the Monitor's website. Other meritorious adjustments were also made to the notice provisions.

**58** This is a "pre-packaged" restructuring and as such, stakeholders have negotiated and agreed on the terms of the requested order. That said, not every stakeholder was before me. For this reason, interested parties are reminded that the order includes the usual come back provision. The return date of any motion to vary, rescind or affect the provisions relating to the CIT credit agreement or the CMI DIP must be no later than November 5, 2009.

**59** I have obviously not addressed every provision in the order but have attempted to address some key provisions. In support of the requested relief, the applicants filed a factum and the proposed Monitor filed a report. These were most helpful. A factum is required under Rule 38.09 of the Rules of Civil Procedure. Both a factum and a proposed Monitor's report should customarily be filed with a request for an Initial Order under the CCAA.

### Conclusion

**60** Weak economic conditions and a high debt load do not a happy couple make but clearly many of the stakeholders have been working hard to produce as desirable an outcome as possible in the circumstances. Hopefully the cooperation will persist.

S.E. PEPALL J.

cp/e/qlafr/qljxr/qljxh/qlaxr/qlaxw/qlcal/qlced

1 *R.S.C. 1985, c. C. 36, as amended*

2 *R.S.C. 1985, c.C.44.*

3 *R.S.C. 1985, c. B-3, as amended.*

4 *(2004), 48 C.B.R. (4th) 299; leave to appeal refused, [2004] O.J. No. 1903, 2004 CarswellOnt 2936 (C.A.).*

5 *(1993), 9 B.L.R. (2d) 275.*

6 *[2009] O.J. No. 349.*

7 *(2006), 19 C.B.R. (5th) 187.*

8 *(1995), 30 C.B.R. (3d) 29.*

9 *(2004), 33 B.C.L.R. (4th) 155.*

10 *(2003), 39 C.B.R. (4th) 216.*

11 [2009] O.J. No. 3344. That said, given the nature of the relationship between a board of directors and senior management, it may not always be appropriate to give undue consideration to the principle of business judgment.

12 [2002] 2 S.C.R. 522.

# TAB 2

*Case Name:*

**Collins & Aikman Automotive Canada Inc. (Re)**

**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 Collins & Aikman Automotive Canada Inc.  
APPLICATION UNDER the Companies Creditors Arrangement  
Act, R.S.C. 1985, c. C-36, as amended**

[2007] O.J. No. 4186

37 C.B.R. (5th) 282

63 C.C.P.B. 125

161 A.C.W.S. (3d) 675

2007 CanLII 45908

2007 CarswellOnt 7014

Court File No. 07-CL-7105

Ontario Superior Court of Justice

**J.M. Spence J.**

Heard: September 20 and 26, 2007.

Judgment: October 31, 2007.

(141 paras.)

*Insolvency law -- Legislation -- Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act -- Motion by Superintendent of Financial Services, United Steelworkers, and CAW - Canada for relief relating to Initial Order made under Companies Creditors Arrangement Act dismissed -- Collins & Aikman Automotive filed for protection under CCAA -- Collins had obtained funding from lender subject to certain terms, which terms were approved in Initial Order -- Court declined to order changes to paragraphs in Initial Order, as moving parties provided insufficient basis for their objections -- Court*

*could not compel Collins to make "special payments" ordinarily required under statutory pension law when terms of financing did not contemplate such payments.*

*Insolvency law -- Receivers, managers and monitors -- Liability -- Motion by Superintendent of Financial Services, United Steelworkers, and CAW - Canada for relief relating to Initial Order made under Companies Creditors Arrangement Act dismissed -- Collins & Aikman Automotive filed for protection under CCAA -- Court declined to alter paragraphs of Initial Order and Order approving engagement of Chief Restructuring Officer that provided limitation of liability for monitor and CRO because moving parties failed to show that Court lacked jurisdiction to make such provision -- Established practice indicated that Court did have authority to grant such protection.*

Motion by Superintendent of Financial Services, United Steelworkers, and CAW - Canada for relief relating to Initial Order made under Companies Creditors Arrangement Act -- Collins & Aikman Automotive filed for protection under CCAA -- Collins had obtained funding from a lender subject to certain terms, which terms were approved in Initial Order of July 19, 2007 -- Moving parties objected to wording of certain paragraphs of Initial Order, and also sought to compel Collins to make "special payments" contemplated under statutory pension law -- HELD: Motion dismissed -- Paragraph 4 of Initial Order allowing Collins to hire further individuals was not altered, since USW provided no basis for its concern that paragraph authorized unilateral contracting out of union positions -- Paragraph 6 of Initial Order stating that Collins was "not required" to make various employee compensation payments was not altered because terms of financing that Collins obtained specifically set out what disbursements were contemplated in cash flow, and "special payments" at issue were not included -- Collins was precluded by terms of financing agreement from making any material disbursements not contemplated in cash flow approved by lender -- Even if the "not required" provision resulted in abrogation of statutory pension plan law by permitting Collins to refrain from making "special payments" ordinarily required by Pension Benefits Act, Court had jurisdiction to approve an order under CCAA which conflicted with, and overrode provincial legislation -- Further, it was a proper exercise of Court's discretion to approve provision because moving parties had opportunity to object to Court's approval of financing terms, but did not do so -- Ordering Collins to make "special payments" would constitute a collateral attack on Initial Order that approved financing because Collins had no alternative funds available and such an order would require it to use funds for a purpose which was not permitted pursuant to Initial Order -- Paragraph 11 of Initial Order allowing Collins to terminate employment arrangements as it deemed appropriate was not altered, since USW did not establish that paragraph would allow Collins to repudiate its collective agreements -- Paragraph 26 of Initial Order providing that monitor was not to be deemed to have become an employer was not altered because if monitor started to act as de facto employer, motion could be brought at that time to consider matter in context of actual fact situation, rather than in current abstract circumstances -- Paragraph 29 of Initial Order providing for limitation of monitor's liability to gross negligence or willful misconduct was not altered because Court did not agree with USW's argument that such provision was beyond Court's jurisdiction to make under CCAA -- Similar limitation of liability that was provided for Chief Restructuring Officer in paragraph 4 of Order approving engagement of CRO was not altered for the same reason, and since established practice showed that Court did have authority to grant such protection to CRO.

**Statutes, Regulations and Rules Cited:**

Companies Creditors Arrangement Act, R.S.C. 1985, c. C-36, s. 11(3), s. 11(4), s. 11(6), s. 11.3, s. 11.8(1)

Labour Relations Act, 1995, S.O. 1995, c. 1, Sched. A, s. 69(1), s. 69(2), s. 69(12), s. 116

Pension Benefits Act, R.S.O. 1990, c. P.8, s. 55(2)

Pension Benefits Act, General Regulation, R.R.O. 1990, Reg.909, s. 4, s. 5

**Counsel:**

**M.E. Bailey**, for the Superintendent of Financial Services (Ontario).

**K.T. Rosenberg and M.C. Starnino**, for the United Steelworkers.

**C.E. Sinclair**, for the National Automobile, Aerospace, Transportation and General Workers Union of Canada (CAW - Canada).

**R.J. Chadwick**, for Ernst & Young Inc., as Monitor of Collins & Aikman Automotive Canada Inc.

**A.J. Taylor and K.L. Mah**, for Collins & Aikman Automotive Canada Inc.

**J.E. Dacks**, for JP Morgan Chase Bank NA.

**C.J. Hill**, for Chrysler LLC.

---

**REASONS FOR DECISION**

**1 J.M. SPENCE J.:**-- Each of the three moving parties, the Superintendent of Financial Services, the USW and the CAW - Canada, seeks relief relating to the Initial Order made by this Court under the *Companies Creditors Arrangement Act*, R.S.C. 1985, c. C-36, as amended (the "CCAA") on July 19, 2007 (the "Initial Order") with respect to Collins & Aikman Automotive Canada Inc. ("Automotive" or the "Applicant").

**2** On July 19, 2007, Collins & Aikman Automotive Canada Inc. ("Automotive") filed for protection from its creditors pursuant to the CCAA. The Applicant is insolvent. It was clear at the time of the CCAA filing that Automotive would not be able to reorganize and the Court was informed by counsel to Automotive and the Monitor that this proceeding is effectively a liquidation. The Court is advised that the CCAA is being utilized by the Applicant to attempt to maximize the potential recovery for the benefit of all creditors by creating the opportunity to attempt to sell some or all of its remaining operating facilities on a going concern basis.

**3** Chrysler LLC (previously known as DaimlerChrysler Company LLC) ("Chrysler") is Automotive's largest remaining customer. In order to provide Automotive with the stability to pursue the sale of its facilities, Automotive, Chrysler, the U.S. Debtors and JPMorgan Chase Bank, N.A. as Agent for the U.S. Debtors' pre-petition secured creditors negotiated a comprehensive funding agreement whereby Chrysler (the "DIP Lender") will fund the costs of this CCAA filing.

**4** The relief sought by the moving parties concerns, *inter alia*, the pension plans of Automotive. The Superintendent advises that Automotive maintains seven pension plans which are registered in Ontario,

## **The Impugned Provisions of the Initial Order**

### ***Paragraph 4***

5 Paragraph 4 of the Initial Order provides as follows:

Applicants shall be authorized and empowered to continue to retain and employ the employees, consultants, agents, experts, accountants, counsel and such other persons (collectively "Assistants") currently retained or employed by it, with liberty to retain such further Assistants as it deems reasonably necessary or desirable in the ordinary course of business or for the carrying out of the terms of this Order.

The USW is concerned that, as presently worded, paragraph 4 of the Initial Order is open to an interpretation that permits the Applicant to employ individuals in a manner inconsistent with the terms of the Collective Agreement, contrary to applicable labour legislation. In particular, paragraph 4 could be taken to authorize the unilateral contracting out of union positions. Accordingly, the USW proposes that the following text should be appended at the end of paragraph 4: ", provided that such further retainers are not in breach of any of its collective agreements."

6 The CAW supports the Superintendent and the USW with respect to their submissions in respect of the above provisions of the Order.

### ***Paragraph 6***

7 Paragraph 6 of the Initial Order provides as follows:

THIS COURT ORDERS that the Applicants shall be entitled but not required to pay the following expenses whether incurred prior to or after this Order:

- (a) all outstanding and future wages, salaries, employee benefits, contributions to pension plans, vacation pay, bonuses and expenses payable on or after the date of this Order, in each case incurred in the ordinary course of business and consistent with existing compensation policies and arrangements

...

8 The Superintendent objects to any provision that would be inconsistent with the Applicant being required to make any and all required employee contributions to its pension plans.

9 The USW objects to the foregoing provision of the Initial Order on the basis that Automotive appears to be interpreting that provision so as to amend the terms of their employment by staying Automotive's obligation to pay compensation accruing due to employees post filing, including, wages, benefits and special payments to the pension plan. Accordingly, the USW proposes that the words "but not required" be struck from paragraph 6.

### ***Paragraph 11***

10 Paragraph 11 of the Initial Order provides as follows:

THIS COURT ORDERS that the Applicants shall, subject to such covenants as may be contained in the Definitive Documents (as hereinafter defined), have the right to:

...

- b. Terminate the employment of such of its employees or temporarily lay off such of its employees as it deems appropriate on such terms as may be agreed upon between the Applicants and such employee, or failing such agreement, to deal with the consequences thereof in any plan of arrangement or compromise filed by the Applicants under the CCAA (the "Plan");
- ...
- d. Repudiate such of its arrangements or agreement of any nature whatsoever, whether oral or written, as the Applicants deem appropriate on such terms as may be agreed upon between the Applicants and such counter-parties, or failing such agreement, to deal with the consequences thereof in the Plan;
- ...

The USW is concerned that these provisions are open to an interpretation that permits Automotive to repudiate its collective agreements with the USW's members. Accordingly, the USW proposes that the following text be added at paragraph 11, following the phrase "(as hereinafter defined)":

"and any and all applicable collective agreements (including, without limitation, all employee benefit, pension and related agreements, compensation policies, and arrangements), and labour laws ...."

**11** The Superintendent seeks an order directing the Applicant to make all required employer contributions to its Pension Plans in accordance with the *Pension Benefits Act*, R.S.O. 1990, c. P.8 (the "PBA") and an order amending the Initial Order as is necessary to reflect this relief.

**12** The CAW seeks an order compelling the Applicant to make the special payments due to the pension plans operated for the benefit of the CAW's members. The special payments that are referred to include the special payments that are provided for under s. 5(1)(b) and section 5(1)(e) of the Regulation under the PBA. These payments are required to be made to liquidate any unfunded liability in the plan by reason of a going concern deficiency and any insolvency deficiency based on actuarial valuation of the plan. The other special payments referred to are those dealt with in s. 31 of the Regulation. These payments are post wind-up special payments owing under s. 75 of the PBA to address a wind-up deficit. Section 31 states that annual special payments are to commence at the "effective date of wind up" and are equal to "the amount required in the year to fund the employer's liabilities under section 75 of the [PBA] in equal payments, payable annually in advance, over not more than five years".

**13** As stated in *Toronto-Dominion Bank v. Usarco Ltd.*, (1991), 42 E.T.R. 235 at paragraph 25 (Ont. Gen. Div.), in the context of going concern special payments, special payments "may fluctuate depending upon the investment results of the pension fund and the employer's ongoing contributions, together with estimated demands on the fund by the beneficiaries" and other factors. The true position of the plan cannot, in fact, be known until the crystallization of all benefits when benefits are settled after a wind-up at which time "it will be known what are the assets in the fund and the liabilities to be set against such funds by those beneficiaries who are then established as being legally entitled to claim".

**14** Accordingly, special payments are better understood as the payments which (in accordance with the PBA and Regulations and actuarial practice) have to be made to a pension plan now to meet the plan's benefit obligations which do not arise until some point in the future (either on retirement or termination for individual members or when benefits are settled in a plan wind up for the plan as a whole).

**15** Likewise, post-wind-up special payments to address a wind up deficit are based on an actuarial estimate of the position of the plan as of the wind up date. Again, the actual liabilities of the pension plan are not determined until benefits are settled and the funds in the plan are used to actually purchase annuities from an insurance company (at then prevailing annuity rates) to provide the monthly pension benefit to the member.

**16** The Applicant has indicated that monthly special payments for the Pension Plans are approximately \$345,000 as of June 2007. The Superintendent is not in a position to confirm this amount precisely but advises that, owing to the funded position of the Plans it is clear that special payments are required for all the Pension Plans on the basis of the actuarial valuation reports last filed with the FSCO. The requirement to make special payments also applies to two of the Pension Plans which have been wound up, the Gananoque and Stratford Plans, although the special payment requirement arises on an annual rather than a monthly basis.

**17** The facts of the USW and the CAW state that the most recently filed valuations for Automotive's various pension plans identify an aggregate wind-up deficiency of approximately \$18.2 million.

***Paragraph 26***

**18** Paragraph 26 provides as follows:

THIS COURT ORDERS that the Monitor shall not take possession of the Property and shall take no part whatsoever in the management or supervision of the management of the Business and shall not, by fulfilling its obligations hereunder, be deemed to have taken or maintained possession or control of the Business or Property, or any part thereof - or be deemed to have been or become an employer of any of the Applicant's employees.

The USW is concerned that this provision usurps the exclusive jurisdiction of the Labour Relations Board (the "Board" or the "OLRB") to determine, on a full factual record, whether someone is a successor employer. Accordingly, the USW proposes that the following text be deleted from paragraph 26: "or be deemed to have been or become an employer of any of the Applicant's employees"; and that the following words be added: ", provided that the foregoing is without prejudice to any rights pursuant to the *Labour Relations Act, 1995*, (Ontario)."

**19** The CAW seeks the same order.

***Paragraph 29***

**20** Paragraph 29 provides as follows:

THIS COURT ORDERS that, in addition to the rights and protections afforded the Monitor under the CCAA or as an officer of this Court, the Monitor shall incur no liability or obligation as a result of its appointment or the carrying out of

the provisions on this Order, save and except for any gross negligence or willful misconduct on its part. Nothing in this Order shall derogate from the protections afforded the Monitor by the CCAA or any applicable legislation.

The USW is concerned that this provision provides the Monitor with a blanket immunity on a prospective basis, and that the court has no jurisdiction to provide this immunity and should not provide this immunity even if it did have such authority. Accordingly, the USW proposes that paragraph 29 be deleted and replaced with the following:

THIS COURT ORDERS that nothing in this Order shall derogate from the protections afforded the Monitor by the CCAA or any other applicable legislation.

### **The CRO Order**

**21** On September 11, 2007, Automotive returned a motion for an order approving its engagement of Axis Consulting Group Inc. ("Axis") and Allan Rutman ("Rutman") as Chief Restructuring Officer of Automotive (the "CRO Approval Motion")

**22** On September 11, 2007, this court made an order approving Automotive and Axis' engagement (the "CRO Order"), subject to a reservation of rights by the USW to challenge paragraph 4 of the CRO Order.

**23** Paragraph 4 of the CRO Order is similar to paragraph 29 of the Automotive Initial Order and the USW objects to it for the same reason. That paragraph provides as follows:

THIS COURT ORDERS that the CRO shall not incur any liability or obligation as a result of the fulfillment of its duties, save and except for any liability or obligation arising from the gross negligence or willful misconduct of the CRO, and no action or other proceedings may be commenced against the CRO relating to its appointment or its conduct as CRO except with the prior leave of this Court obtained on at least seven (7) days' notice to Automotive and the CRO and provided further that any liability of the CRO hereunder shall not in any event exceed the quantum of the fees and disbursements paid to or incurred by the CRO in connection herewith. This last limitation of liability will be effective up until + including Sept. 20/07 + thereafter as directed by the judge hearing the motion on Sept. 20/07.

**24** The USW proposes that this paragraph be deleted and replaced with the following:

THIS COURT ORDERS that no action or other proceedings may be commenced against the CRO relating to its appointment or its conduct as CRO except with the prior leave of this Court obtained on at least seven (7) days' notice to Automotive and the CRO.

### **Relevant Statutory and Regulatory Provisions**

#### ***The Companies Creditors Arrangement Act***

**25** Section 11(1) of the CCAA provides as follows:

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.

**26** Subsections 11(3) and (4) of the CCAA provide as follows:

- (3) A court may, on an initial application in respect of a company, make an order on such terms as it may impose, effective for such period as the court deems necessary not exceeding thirty days,
  - (a) staying, until otherwise ordered by the court, all proceedings taken or that might be taken in respect of the company under an Act referred to in subsection (1);
  - (b) restraining, until otherwise ordered by the court, further proceedings in any action, suit or proceeding against the company; and
  - (c) prohibiting, until otherwise ordered by the court, the commencement of or proceeding with any other action, suit or proceeding against the company.

Other than initial application court orders -

- (4) A court may, on an application in respect of a company other than an initial application, make an order on such terms as it may impose,
  - (a) staying, until otherwise ordered by the court, for such period as the court deems necessary, all proceedings taken or that might be taken in respect of the company under an Act referred to in subsection (1);
  - (b) restraining, until otherwise ordered by the court, further proceedings in any action, suit or proceeding against the company; and
  - (c) prohibiting, until otherwise ordered by the court, the commencement of or proceeding with any other action, suit or proceeding against the company.

**27** Section 11(6) of the CCAA provides as follows:

Burden of Proof on Application -

- (6) The court shall not make an order under subsection (3) or (4) unless
  - (a) the applicant satisfies the court that circumstances exist that make such an order appropriate; and
  - (b) in the case of an order under subsection (4), the applicant also satisfies the court that the applicant has acted, and is acting, in good faith and with due diligence.

**28** Section 11.3 of the CCAA provides as follows:

11.3 No order made under section 11 shall have the effect of

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

**The Pension Benefits Act**

**29** Section 55(2) of the PBA provides as follows:

An employer required to make contributions under a pension plan, or a person or entity required to make contributions under a pension plan on behalf of an employer, shall make the contributions in accordance with the prescribed requirements for funding and shall make the contributions in the prescribed manner and at the prescribed times, ...

**30** The General Regulation to the Act, R.R.O. 1990, Reg. 909, provides in part as follows:

- 4. (2) Subject to subsection (2.1), an employer who is required to make contributions under a pension plan ... shall make payments to the pension fund or to an insurance company, as applicable, that are not less than the sum of,
  - (a) all contributions, including contributions in respect of any going concern unfunded liability and solvency deficiency and money withheld by payroll deduction or otherwise from an employee, that are received from employees as the employees' contributions to the pension plan;
  - (b) all contributions required to pay the normal cost;
  - (c) all special payments determined in accordance with section 5; and
  - (d) all special payments determined in accordance with sections 31, 32 and 35 and all payments determined in accordance with section 31.1.

...
- 5. (1) Except as otherwise provided in this section and in sections 4, 5.1 and 7, the special payments required to be made after the initial valuation date under clause 4(2)(c) shall be not less than the sum of,
  - (b) with respect to any going concern unfunded liability not covered by clause (a), the special payments required to liquidate the liability, with interest at the going concern valuation interest rate, by equal monthly instalments over a period of fifteen years beginning on the valuation date of the report in which the going concern unfunded liability was determined;

...

- (e) with respect to any solvency deficiency arising on or after the Regulation date, the special payments required to liquidate the solvency deficiency, with interest at the rates described in subsection (2), by equal monthly instalments over the period beginning on the valuation date of the report in which the solvency deficiency was determined and ending on the 31st day of December, 2002, or five years, whichever is longer.

**The Labour Relations Act, 1995, S.O. 1995, c. 1, Sched. A (the "LRA")**

**31** Section 69 of the LRA provides in part as follows:

69. (1) In this section,

"business" includes a part or parts thereof; ("enterprise")

"sells" includes leases, transfers and any other manner of disposition, and "sold" and "sale" have corresponding meanings. ("vend", "vendu", "vente")

Successor employer

(2) Where an employer who is bound by or is a party to a collective agreement with a trade union or council of trade unions sells his, her or its business, the person to whom the business has been sold is, until the Board otherwise declares, bound by the collective agreement as if the person had been a party thereto and, where an employer sells his, her or its business while an application for certification or termination of bargaining rights to which the employer is a party is before the Board, the person to whom the business has been sold is, until the Board otherwise declares, the employer for the purposes of the application as if the person were named as the employer in the application.

...

Power of Board to determine whether sale

(12) Where, on any application under this section or in any other proceeding before the Board, a question arises as to whether a business has been sold by one employer to another, the Board shall determine the question and its decision is final and conclusive for the purposes of this Act.

**32** Section 116 of the LRA provides as follows:

Board's orders not subject to review

116. No decision, order, direction, declaration or ruling of the Board shall be questioned or reviewed in any court, and no order shall be made or process entered, or proceedings taken in any court, whether by way of injunction, declaratory judgment, certiorari, mandamus, prohibition, *quo warranto*, or

otherwise, to question, review, prohibit or restrain the Board or any of its proceedings.

### **Jurisdiction of the Court under the *Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act***

**33** In *Canadian Red Cross Society (Re)*, [1998] O.J. No. 3306 (Gen. Div. [Commercial List]), Blair J. adopted, at paragraph 46, the following passage from the decision of Farley J. in *Lehndorff General Partner Ltd. (Re)* (1993), 17 C.B.R. (3d) 24, at p. 31 (Ont. Gen. Div.):

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 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, 7, 8 and 11 of the CCAA (a lengthy list of authorities cited here is omitted).

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 (citations omitted)

[emphasis added]

**34** In *Sulphur Corp. of Canada Ltd. (Re)*, [2002] 35 C.B.R. (4th) 304 (Alta. Q.B.), Lovecchio J. considered the jurisdiction of the Court to make an order under s. 11 of the CCAA with provisions that conflicted with provisions of the *Builders Lien Act* of British Columbia (the "BLA"), a conflict which arose because of the grant under a CCAA order of a priority to the financing charge of a debtor in possession ("DIP financing") over all other creditors of the applicant company. Lovecchio J. decided that the Court has jurisdiction to grant a change under the CCAA to secure DIP financing which ranks in priority to a statutory lien under the BLA of British Columbia (paragraph 16).

**35** After noting that, apart from the circumstances of the case, the lien under the BLA would have priority, Lovecchio J. provided the following analysis under the headings set out below in the following excerpt which addresses the jurisdiction of the Court in helpful detail and is therefore set out fully here:

The Paramountcy Argument and the Jurisdiction of the Courts

para. 23 Sections 11(3) and 11(4) of the CCAA read as follows:

11(3) A Court may, on an initial application in respect of a company, make an order on such terms as it may impose, effective for such a period as the Court deems necessary not exceeding 30 days, ... [staying proceedings, re-

straining proceedings and prohibiting proceedings against the debtor company].

11(4) A court may on application in respect of a company other than an initial application, make an order on such terms as it may impose, ... [staying proceedings, restraining proceedings and prohibiting proceedings against the debtor company].

para. 24 It is clear that the power of the Court to create a charge to support a DIP financing is not mentioned. Are the words "such terms as it may impose" sufficient to give inherent jurisdiction a statutory cloak?

para. 25 The facts at bar are similar to those that were before Associate Chief Justice Wachowich (as he then was) in *Re Hunters Trailer & Marine Ltd.*<sup>3</sup> In that case, Wachowich C.J.Q.B. granted Hunters an *ex parte*, 30 day stay of proceedings under the CCAA and, further, granted a DIP financing and Administrative Charge with a super-priority ranking over the claims of the other creditors.

-----  
Note 3: (2002) 94 Alta. L.R.(3d) 389.  
-----

para. 26 In discussing the objective of the CCAA, Wachowich C.J.Q.B. stated the following at para. 15:

The aim of the CCAA is to maintain the status quo while an insolvent company attempts to bring its creditors on side in terms of a plan of arrangement which will allow the company to remain in business to the mutual benefit of the company and its creditors ...

At para 18:

I agree with the statement made by Mackenzie J.A. in *United Used Auto & Truck Parts Ltd., Re* (2000), 16 C.B.R. (4th) 141 (BCCA), at 146 that: "... the CCAA's effectiveness in achieving its objectives is dependent on a broad and flexible exercise of jurisdiction to facilitate a restructuring and continue the debtor as a going concern in the interim.

Later, at para.32:

Having reviewed the jurisprudence on this issue, I am satisfied that the Court has the inherent or equitable jurisdiction to grant a super-priority for DIP financing and administrative charges, including the fees and disbursements of the professional advisors who guide a debtor company through the CCAA process. Hunters brought its initial CCAA application *ex parte* because it was insolvent and there was a threat of seizure by some of its major floor planners. If super-priority cannot be granted without the consent of secured creditors, the protection of the CCAA effectively would be denied a debtor company in many cases.

...

para. 27 In addressing the Court's jurisdiction to grant an order, the Court of Appeal in *Luscar Ltd. v. Smoky River Coal Ltd.*<sup>4</sup> confirmed the conclusion that s. 11(4) confers broad powers on the Court to exercise a wide discretion to make an order "on such terms as it may impose". At p. 11, para 53 of the decision, Hunt J.A. for the Court wrote:

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

---

Note 4: [1999] A.J. No. 185 (C.A.), online: (AJ).

---

para. 28 As indicated by Wachowich C.J.Q.B., numerous decisions in Canada have supported the proposition that s. 11 provides the courts with broad and liberal power to be used to help achieve the overall objective of the CCAA. It is within this context that my initial Order and the June 19 Order were based.

para. 29 Counsel for the Applicants referred to *Royal Oak Mines Inc., Re*<sup>5</sup> as an authority supporting their submission that the Courts cannot use inherent jurisdiction to override a provincial statute. ...

---

Note 5: (1999), 7 C.B.R. (4th) 293 (Ont. Gen. Div.).

-----

para. 30 In *Royal Oak*, Farley J. also relied on *Baxter Student Housing Ltd. v. College Housing Co-operative Ltd.*<sup>6</sup>, where the Supreme Court of Canada remarked that there is a limit to the inherent jurisdiction of superior courts and, in the circumstances of that particular case, the Court's inherent jurisdiction should not be applied to override an express statutory provision. At p. 480 the Court wrote the following:

Inherent jurisdiction cannot, of course, be exercised so as to conflict with a statute or a Rule. Moreover, because it is a special and extraordinary power, it should be exercised only sparingly and in a clear case.

-----

Note 6: (1975), [1976] 2 S.C.R. 475.

-----

para. 31 *Baxter* may be distinguished from the case at hand since, in that particular case, the contest came down to the Court's inherent jurisdiction pursuant to s. 59 of the *Court of Queen's Bench Act*<sup>7</sup>, a provincial statute which, the Supreme Court of Canada noted, was not intended to empower the Court to negate the unambiguous expression of the legislative will found in s. 11(1) of the *Mechanics' Liens Act*<sup>8</sup>, also a provincial statute.

-----

Note 7: R.S.M. 1970, c. C280.

Note 8: R.S.M. 1970, c. M80.

-----

para. 32 ... In *Smoky*, Hunt J.A. used the words the exercise of discretion - a discretion she found to have been broad and one provided for in the statute.

para. 33 It is clear that the Court's power to attach conditions was envisioned by Parliament. The intent of Parliament, through the enactment of the CCAA, was to help foster restructuring which, in turn, fosters the preservation and enhancement of the insolvent corporation's value.

para. 34 In *Re United Used Auto & Truck Parts Ltd.*<sup>9</sup>, Mackenzie J.A., of the Court of Appeal, wrote the following at p. 152, para. 29:

When, as here, the cash flow from operations is insufficient to assure payment and asset values exceeding secured charges are in doubt, granting a super-priority is the only practical means of securing payment. In such circumstances, if a super-priority cannot be granted without the consent of secured creditors, then those creditors would have an effective veto over CCAA relief. I do not think that Parliament intended that the objects of the Act could be indirectly frustrated by secured creditors.

-----  
Note 9: (2000), 16 C.B.R. (4th) 141 (BCCA).  
-----

para. 35 Parliament's way of ensuring that the CCAA would have the necessary force to meet this objective was to entitle the Courts, pursuant to s. 11, to exercise its discretion and no specific limitations were placed on the exercise of that discretion. There is a logic to the lack of specificity as what is required to be done is often dictated at least in part by the particular circumstances of the case. Whether the Court should exercise that discretion is obviously a different matter and that will be discussed below.

para. 36 For the foregoing reasons, I find that in the circumstances of this case, there is a federal statute versus a provincial statute conflict.

#### Paramountcy

para. 37 Having established that the Court has a statutory basis to use its inherent jurisdiction in the exercise of a discretion granted under the CCAA, the next question is whether this jurisdiction can be used to override an express provincial statutory provision, in this case s. 32 of the BLA.

para. 38 The case of *Pacific National Lease Holding Corp. v. Sun Life Trust Co.*<sup>10</sup> was raised by Sulphur's Counsel to draw an analogy to the paramountcy issue at bar. While the facts are not identical, the case involved a conflict between the Court's power pursuant to the federal CCAA and the Legal Professions Act of British Columbia. In that decision, the Court found that it is within the Court's jurisdiction, pursuant to the CCAA, to exercise broad "power and flexibility", and proceeded to comment on p. 6 that the CCAA "will prevail should a conflict arise between this and another federal or provincial statute". I agree with that conclusion and would apply it in this case.

-----

Note 10: [1995] B.C.J. No. 1535 (C.A.)

-----

**36** More recently, the Court of Appeal, in its decision in its decision in *Stelco Inc. (Re)* (2005), 75 O.R. (3d) 5, considered the jurisdiction of the Court under s. 11 of the CCAA in connection with an order given under that section removing directors from the board of the applicant company. Paragraphs 31ff of the decision dealt first with the jurisdiction of the Court and then with the exercise of its discretion. The following passages from that decision are relevant with respect to the jurisdiction of the Court:

#### Jurisdiction

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

[32] The CCAA is remedial legislation and is to be given a liberal interpretation to facilitate its objectives: *Babcock & Wilcox Canada Ltd. (Re)*, [2000] O.J. No. 786, 5 B.L.R. (3d) 75 (S.C.J.), at para. 11. See also, *Chef Ready Foods Ltd. v. Hong Kong Bank of Canada*, [1990] B.C.J. No. 2384, 4 C.B.R.(3d) 311 (C.A.), at p. 320 C.B.R.; *Re Lehndorff General Partners Ltd.*, [1993] O.J. No. 14, 17 C.B.R.(3d) 24 (Gen. Div.). [page17] Courts have adopted this approach in the past to rely on inherent jurisdiction, or alternatively on the broad jurisdiction under s. 11 of the CCAA, as the source of judicial power in a CCAA proceeding to "fill in the gaps" or to "put flesh on the bones" of that Act: see *Re Dylex Ltd.*, [1995] O.J. No. 595, 31 C.B.R. (3d) 106 (Gen. Div. (Commercial List)), *Royal*

*Oak Mines Inc. (Re)*, [1999] O.J. No. 864, 7 C.B.R. (4th) 293 (Gen. Div. (Commercial List)); and *Westar Mining Ltd. (Re)*, [1992] B.C.J. No. 1360, 70 B.C.L.R. (2d) 6 (S.C.).

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

...

[35] ... [I]nherent jurisdiction does not operate where Parliament or the legislature has acted. As Farley J. noted in *Royal Oak Mines*, supra, inherent jurisdiction is "not limitless; if the legislative body has not left a functional gap or vacuum, then inherent jurisdiction should [page18] not be brought into play" (para. 4). See also, *Baxter Student Housing Ltd. v. College Housing Co-operative Ltd.*, [1976] 2 S.C.R. 475, 57 D.L.R. (3d) 1, at p. 480 S.C.R.; *Richtree Inc. (Re)* (2005), 74 O.R. (3d) 174, [2005] O.J. No. 251 (S.C.J.).

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

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

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

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

[38] I do not mean to suggest that inherent jurisdiction can never apply in a CCAA context. The court retains the ability to control its own process, should the need arise. There is a distinction, however -- difficult as it may be to draw -- between the court's process with respect to the restructuring, on the one hand, and the course of action involving the negotiations and corporate actions accompanying them, which are the company's process, on the other hand. The court simply supervises the latter [page19] process through its ability to stay, restrain or prohibit proceedings against the company during the plan negotiation period "on such terms as it may impose"<sup>3</sup> at the end of the document]. Hence the better view is that a judge is generally exercising the court's statutory discretion under s. 11 of the Act when supervising a CCAA proceeding. The order in this case could not be founded on inherent jurisdiction because it is designed to supervise the company's process, not the court's process.

**37** As to the exercise of the jurisdiction given by s. 11, the Court in *Stelco* said the following at paragraphs 43 and 44:

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

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

Moreover, the court is not entitled to usurp the role of the directors and management in conducting what are in substance the company's restructuring efforts.

**38** The Court in *Stelco* went on to determine that it was not for the Court under s. 11 to usurp the role of the directors and management in conducting the restructuring efforts and found that there was no authority in s. 11 of the CCAA for the Court to interfere with the composition of a board of directors.

In the course of that analysis the Court stated as follows at paragraph 48:

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

**39** It appears to me that in making the analysis set out in the above paragraphs and coming to the conclusion that it reached, the Court was addressing the need to ensure that the "terms" imposed by the Court under its s. 11 powers to do so are terms that are properly related to the jurisdiction given under s. 11 to the Court to grant stays and the purpose of that jurisdiction under the CCAA. In that regard, the Court did not consider that intervening in the composition of the internal management of the company contrary to the applicable laws in that regard was proper. This conclusion is perhaps best understood in the context of the earlier discussion in the decision of the nature of the jurisdiction of the Court under s. 11. In particular, the Court emphasized the role of the Court as a supervisory one which is exercised through its ability "to stay, restrain or prohibit proceedings against the company during the plan negotiation period" on such terms as the Court may impose (paragraph 38). It is not apparent how an order removing directors would be inherently or functionally related to the Court's role to provide a protection against legal proceedings which are potentially adverse to the facilitation of "the continuation of the corporation as a viable entity" (paragraph 36, in the quoted passage from the *Skeena* decision).

**40** On this basis, the limitation expressed by the Court in *Re Stelco* is not to be understood as restricting the jurisdiction of the Court to make orders which carry out that protective function.

**41** Similarly, but in a quite different fact situation, Lax J. of this Court, in her decision in *Richtree Inc. (Re)* (2005), 74 O.R.(3d) 174 dismissed a motion to exempt the applicant company from certain filing requirements with regulatory authorities: see paragraphs 13 to 18 of the decision. In paragraph 18 of the decision, Lax J. said that the order that was sought had nothing to do with the restructuring process of the applicant company.

**42** In view of the reasoning and the decisions in the above cases considered, the Court has a jurisdiction under the CCAA which, in the words of the decision in *Re Sulphur Corp. of Canada Ltd.*, *supra*, at paragraph 37, "can be used to override an express provincial statutory provision" where that would contribute to carrying out the protective function of the CCAA as reflected particularly in the provisions of s. 11 of the CCAA.

43 This analysis is developed further with regard to the special payments in the part of the text below that deals with the issue relating to paragraph 6 of the Initial Order.

#### **The Context of the Initial Order and the CRO Order**

44 On July 19, 2007, the Court issued the Initial Order authorizing, *inter alia*, Automotive to obtain and borrow under a credit facility (the "DIP Facility") from Chrysler as DIP Lender in order to finance certain expenditures contemplated by the cash flows that are approved by the DIP Lender and filed with the Court.

45 The Initial Order provided that the DIP Facility was to be on the terms and subject to the conditions set forth in the DIP Term Sheet and Commitment Letter between Automotive and the DIP Lender dated as of July 18, 2007 (the "Commitment Letter"), filed with the Court.

46 The Commitment Letter provides:

The Borrower covenants as follows:

The Borrower shall not, without the Lender's prior written consent, make any material disbursement unless it is contemplated in the Initial cash flow, attached as Schedule "A" to this DIP Term Sheet and Commitment Letter (the "Initial Cash Flow") or any rolling cash flow approved by the Lender (collectively "Cash Flow Projections") and, for greater certainty, the Borrower shall not issue any cheques or make any disbursements until such point in time as the Lender has approved the same and confirmed sufficient funding of the same in accordance with the terms hereof[.]

47 The Initial Order also stated that rights of the DIP Lender under the Commitment Letter shall not be impaired in any way in Automotive's CCAA proceedings or by any provincial or federal statutes and that the DIP Lender shall not have any liability to any person whatsoever resulting from the breach by Automotive of any agreement caused by Automotive entering into the Commitment Letter.

48 The Initial Order provided that the DIP Lender was entitled to the benefit of the DIP Lender's Charge on all of the property of Automotive (except certain tax refunds).

49 The Affidavit of John Boken, dated July 19, 2007, sworn on behalf of Automotive and filed with the Court in connection with the application for the Initial Order (the "Boken Affidavit") stated the following at paragraph 46 with respect to the pension plans of Automotive:

[Automotive] intends to continue to pay current service costs with respect to benefits accruing from the date of filing. The DIP Loan (as defined below), does not provide for the funding of any special payments.

50 In addition, the initial cash flow approved by Chrysler and filed with the Court on the application for the Initial Order clearly stated that special payments would not be made and that such payments were not included in the cash flow projections.

51 Automotive brought a motion to the Court on July 30, 2007 for, *inter alia*, an Order confirming the terms of the DIP Facility (the "DIP Approval Motion"). The DIP Approval Motion was made on notice to, among others, the USW and the Superintendent. The Boken Affidavit was again

served in connection with the DIP Approval Motion. As noted above, the Boken Affidavit unequivocally indicated that special payments would not be made and were not permitted by the DIP Facility.

**52** In addition, the Monitor filed its First Report with the Court at the return of the DIP Approval Motion and specifically noted that Automotive could not make any payments that were not in the cash flow forecast and that special pension payments were not provided for in the forecast. That point was reiterated in the notes to the cash flow forecast.

**53** On July 30, 2007, the Court issued an Order confirming the terms of the DIP Facility (the "DIP Approval Order"). The DIP Approval Order provided:

3. THIS COURT ORDERS that the DIP Facility provided by DCC to the Applicant in the amount of Cdn.\$13.6 million on the terms and subject to the conditions contained in the DIP Term Sheet and Commitment Letter between the Applicant and DCC dated as of July 18, 2007, all as set forth in the Initial Order, is hereby confirmed and approved.

**54** Based on the First Report of the Monitor and the submissions of all counsel Justice Stinson granted the requested relief and approved the DIP Loan "on the terms and subject to the conditions contained in the DIP Term Sheet and Commitment Letter between the Applicant and the DIP Lender dated as of July 18, 2007, all as set forth in the Initial Order". As noted in Justice Stinson's endorsement in respect of the DIP Approval Order, Mr. Bailey on behalf of FSCO and Mr. Starnino on behalf of the USW requested that the Court "record their respective clients' reservation of rights in relation to the pension fund payments and other matters referenced in paragraphs 6(a), 11(b) and (d) of paragraph 26 of the [Initial] Order". Although the CAW did not attend the hearing on July 30, it did receive notice of Automotive's CCAA proceedings on July 23, 2007.

**55** No party objected to the approval of the DIP Loan, or the terms and conditions set forth therein. No party appealed Justice Stinson's July 30 order approving the DIP Loan. The appeal period expired on August 20, 2007.

**56** The DIP Approval Order was not opposed by the USW or the Superintendent, although they did appear at the DIP Approval Motion.

**57** Automotive brought a motion to the Court on August 23, 2007 for an Order, inter alia, extending the stay of proceedings and increasing the amount of an amended DIP Facility. The motion was made on notice to the Unions and the Superintendent. The revised Cash Flow approved by Chrysler and filed with the Court (as a Schedule to the Monitor's Second Report) clearly stated that special payments would not be made and that such payments were not included in the cash flow projections.

**58** On August 23, 2007, the Court issued an Order (the "August 23 Order") approving the Amended DIP Term Sheet and Commitment letter dated August 21, 2007 (the "Amended Commitment Letter"). The Amended Commitment Letter provides that Automotive shall not, without the DIP Lender's prior written consent, make any material disbursement unless it is contemplated in the cash flows approved by the DIP Lender. The Unions and the Superintendent did not oppose the August 23 Order, and they did not seek leave to appeal it.

**59** The Boken Affidavit filed in support of the Initial Application indicated that:

- (a) Automotive had no other realistic source of DIP funding to continue operations;
- (b) the DIP Loan was the only basis on which funding was available to keep the potential for the preservation of some of the plants as going concerns; and
- (c) the DIP Loan was being provided as a component of a complex multi-party agreement that represented a compromise of the rights of Chrysler, Automotive and the U.S. Debtors, which agreement was approved by the US Bankruptcy Court.

**60** By Order of Justice Pepall dated September 11, 2007, Axis Consulting Group and Allan Rutman was appointed Chief Restructuring Officer ("CRO") of Automotive (the "CRO Order"). Paragraph 4 of that CRO Order states:

THIS COURT ORDERS that the CRO shall not incur any liability or obligation as a result of the fulfilment of its duties, save and except for any liability or obligation arising from the gross negligence or wilful misconduct of the CRO, and no action or other proceedings may be commenced against the CRO relating to its appointment or its conduct as CRO except with the prior leave of this Court obtained on at least seven (7) days' notice to Automotive and the CRO and provided further that any liability of the CRO hereunder shall not in any event exceed the quantum of the fees and disbursements paid to or incurred by the CRO in connection therewith. This last limitation on liability will be effective up until and including Sept. 20, 2007 and thereafter as ordered by the judge hearing the motion on Sept. 20, 2007.

**61** The last sentence in paragraph 4 of the CRO Order was added by Justice Pepall in response to submissions by counsel that the issue of protections for the CRO were to be further addressed on this motion by the USW.

## **The Issues**

### ***Paragraph 4***

**62** The USW states its concern that the provision in paragraph 4 that allows the Applicant to retain further Assistants could be interpreted to allow hiring "in a manner inconsistent with the terms of the Collective Agreement, contrary to applicable labour legislation" (USW Factum, paragraph 43). How in particular that might come about is not explained. It is not suggested that the Applicant has acted or intends to act in such a manner.

**63** Paragraph 4 does not provide that such hirings may be made in the manner that is the cause of concern. No basis was submitted for considering that such a result is implicit in paragraph 4.

**64** Paragraph 4 is, as it is stated, consistent with the protective function of s. 11 because it effectively restrains proceedings that might otherwise be brought against the Applicant for making further hirings. It is conceivable in principle that hirings might be made in a way that would raise issues of the kind raised in *Re Richtree Inc.*, *supra*. In such circumstances, having regard to the approach taken by the Court in *Richtree*, the aggrieved parties would apparently be able to seek appropriate relief from the Court as part of administrative or supervisory jurisdiction in respect of orders made by the Court under the CCAA. That would be an appropriate context in which to address the question of whether there is a conflict between the Collective Agreement and/or the LRA on the

one hand and the CCAA and/or the Initial Order on the other. In the present circumstances, it is unnecessary to address the matter and there is no fact situation before the Court to allow it to be addressed properly.

**Paragraph 6**

**65** The objection taken to the phrase "but not required" in paragraph 6 is that Automotive regards the phrase as staying its obligations to pay various kinds of post-filing employee compensation, including in particular special payments to the pension plan.

**66** Under the DIP Approval Order, the Court approved the DIP Facility on the terms and subject to the conditions contained in the DIP Term Sheet and Commitment Letter dated July 18, 2007. As noted, the Commitment Letter precludes Automotive from making distributions not contemplated in approved cash flows and the cash flow filed with the Court stated that special payments under the pension plans would not be made. These features link the DIP Approval Order to the paragraph 6 provision in the Initial Order that the specified kinds of payments are not required to be made. That is to say, the Initial Order and the DIP Approval Order are an integrated arrangement. The rationale given for this arrangement in the records is that Automotive will not be in a position to carry on business and will not have available funds without the DIP Facility and the terms on which the DIP Lender is prepared to commit to the DIP Facility are as stated.

**67** Automotive states in its factum that it has continued to pay all wages and vacation pay during the course of this CCAA proceeding and intends to continue such payments and that the DIP Loan will, subject to certain conditions, provide advances to facilitate payment of statutory severance obligations.

**68** The Initial Cash Flow provides for certain operating disbursements in respect of "Payroll, Payroll Taxes, Benefits, Severance, Other". The associated note states:

The Forecast [Initial Cash Flow] assumes that payments are made for medical and health benefits and current service pension payments will be made while a plant is operating and then cease on the end of production date. The Forecast does not provide for the payment of any special pension payments as it is assumed these will be stayed in a CCAA filing.

**69** The Court has approved the DIP Facility and, subject to this motion, the Initial Order. It is obvious that the DIP Facility and the Initial Order are integrally related. In consequence, if Automotive were to fail to use the funds available under the DIP Facility for the purposes that have been indicated for those funds in these CCAA proceedings, that would be a matter that might properly found a motion to the Court for relief. So the phrase "but not required" in paragraph 6 does not give Automotive a carte blanche to withhold contemplated payments, contrary to a suggestion that was made against the paragraph in the course of the hearing.

**70** On the other hand, it is clear that the effect of the terms of the DIP Approval and paragraph 6 of the Initial Order is that Automotive, under the Order, is "not required" to make the special payments under its Pension Plans that would otherwise be required.

**71** The requirement for the making of such special payments is a statutory requirement. The special payments are provided for in the pension benefits regime under the PBA and the related regulations, as set out in the relevant provisions excerpted above.

### ***Jurisdiction under the CCAA re the Special Payments***

**72** The USW and the CAW submitted that the obligation under the pension benefits statutory regime to make special payments is an obligation under their respective collective agreements with Automotive. Those agreements require Automotive to maintain pension plans for members having certain specific features, principally relating to the amount of the pension to be earned and paid for the period of employment served by the employee. It was not shown that any provisions in the collective agreements do expressly require Automotive to comply with the statutory regime as to special payments. Rather, the submission seemed to be that because Automotive has an obligation under the Collective Agreement to maintain the pension plan and also has a statutory obligation in respect of pension plans it maintains to make certain special payments, that the contractual obligation impliedly includes the statutory obligations and therefore, any relief from the statutory obligation also constitutes relief from the contractual obligation under the Collective Agreement. Whenever it is argued, as here, that a term should be implied in a contract, the necessary question is why that is so and in this case, no answer is evident from the submissions. The implication was perhaps that it is self-evident but that may be debatable. The pension plan provisions in the collective agreements are addressed to the pension benefits that the plan is required to make available to the members and not to how that is to be done. On this basis, it would seem to be a stretch to say that just because a pension plan is required to conform to the statutory regime, the company sponsoring the plan has impliedly agreed with the bargaining agent to do so. This would suggest that all that the company has agreed to do in the Collective Agreement is to maintain a plan that provides for the benefits contracted for in the collective bargain.

**73** However, that analysis may be unduly technical for purposes of the issues on this motion. The commitment of Automotive in its collective agreement to maintain pension plans would give rise to a reasonable expectation that it would keep those plans in good standing in accordance with applicable regulatory requirements designed to ensure that the plans will be able to meet their payment obligations. Moreover, at least one of the pension plans contains a provision which requires the making of all payments required by the applicable statutes. So the better approach is probably to regard the maintenance of the special payments as effectively contemplated by the collective agreements.

**74** Even so, this consideration would be relevant to the issue of the jurisdiction of the Court to make the impugned order only if this relationship to the collective agreements gives rise to jurisdictional considerations that are different from those that arise by reason of the payments being required pursuant to the PBA.

**75** As observed by the Supreme Court of Canada in its decision in *Health Services and Support-Facilities Subsector Bargaining Association v. British Columbia*, [2007] S.C.J. No. 27, 2007 SCC 27 at paragraph 86, collective bargaining is a fundamental aspect of Canadian society, which has emerged as the most significant collective activity through which the freedom of association protected by s. 2(d) of the Charter is expressed in the labour context. Recognizing that workers have the right to bargain collectively reaffirms the values of dignity, personal autonomy, equality and democracy.

**76** This fundamental process of collective bargaining is entrenched in the laws of Ontario by the LRA, which provides a comprehensive scheme for employment relations. Among other things, that statute directs that:

- (a) there shall only be one collective agreement in force between a trade union and an employer;
- (b) the trade union that is a party to the collective agreement is recognized as the exclusive bargaining agent of the employees in the bargaining unit defined therein;
- (c) the collective agreement is binding upon the employer and the employees;
- (d) the collective agreement shall not be terminated by the parties before it ceases to operate in accordance with its provisions or the statute without the consent of the Labour Board on the joint application of the parties;
- (e) a provision of a collective agreement may only be revised on the mutual consent of the parties;
- (f) no employer and no person acting on behalf of an employer shall interfere with the representation of employees by a trade union; and,
- (g) no employer shall, so long as a trade union continues to be entitled to represent the employees in a bargaining unit, bargain with or enter into a collective agreement with any person on behalf of or purporting, designed or intended to be binding upon the employees in the bargaining unit or any of them.

**77** Based on these elements of the LRA, it appears that the employees cannot legally terminate their employment under their collective agreement before "it ceases to operate in accordance with its provisions or the LRA without consent of the O.L.R.B. on the joint application of the parties". The USW submits that therefore, the employees cannot legally terminate their services. However, whether this is so would depend first on whether the making of the Initial Order or its terms would allow the Collective Agreement to be terminated. No submissions were made that assist on this point.

**78** Secondly, since the LRA provides that the Collective Agreement could be terminated with the consent of the Board, there is a question whether that consent could be obtained - a matter that was not canvassed in the submissions.

**79** The above considerations relating to the LRA do not suggest that the relationship of the PBA requirements for special payments to the collective agreements should be considered to give those requirements any jurisdictional status for the issues in this case that would go beyond the implications that arise from the fact of those requirements being imposed pursuant to statute.

**80** This result is not altered by the Court's recognition that collective bargaining is a fundamental aspect of Canadian society involving the exercise of the freedom of association protected by s. 2(d) of the *Charter*. It was not suggested that the Initial Order constitutes a breach of the *Charter* rights of the employees.

**81** The Moving Parties rely upon the decision of Farley J. in *United Air Lines, Inc. (Re)* (2005), 45 C.C.P.B. 151 (Ont. S.C.J. [Commercial List]) as authority for the proposition that a CCAA debtor must in all circumstances continue to make special payments post-filing. *United Air Lines* involved a motion brought by UAL for an order authorizing it to cease making contributions to its Canadian pension plans. UAL applied for protection from its creditors pursuant to section 18.6 of the CCAA, whereby it sought recognition of a Chapter 11 proceeding in the United States. UAL had filed for bankruptcy protection in the United States in December 2002 and filed under section 18.6 of the CCAA in 2003. The motion was not brought until February 2005.

**82** UAL was a large U.S. corporation that was attempting to restructure. It had an international workforce, including a small Canadian workforce. In its motion, it was seeking authority to cease making all contributions to its Canadian pension plans even though it continued to meet its pension funding commitments in all countries other than the United States and Canada. UAL's U.S. employees and retirees had the benefit of the protections provided by the Pension Benefits Guarantee Corporation, while the Canadian employees, as the beneficiaries of a federally regulated scheme, did not. UAL had not presented any evidence of its inability to make the pension payments.

**83** After reviewing all of the facts, Farley J. summarized as follows at paragraph 7:

As discussed above, the relative size of the Canadian problems *vis-a-vis* the U.S.A. problems is rather insignificant. It would not seem on the evidence before me that payment of funding obligations would in any way cause any particular stress or strain on the U.S. restructuring - given their relatively insignificant amounts in question. UAL had no qualms about making such payments in the other countries internationally. Additionally there is the issue of the U.S. situation having the benefit of the Pension Benefits Guarantee Corp. (as to which UAL would have paid premiums) but there being no such safety net in Canada on the federal level (and thus no previous premium obligation on UAL).

**84** *United Air Lines* does not appear to stand for the proposition that all pension contributions, including special payments, must in all cases be paid by a CCAA debtor absent an agreement with its unions and FSCO. On the contrary, Farley J.'s decision states in paragraph 8 that it was made "on the basis of fairness and equity" after a consideration of the facts and circumstances existing in that case.

**85** Based on the decision of the Court of appeal for Quebec in *Syndicat national de l'amiante d'Asbestos inc. et al. v. Jeffrey Mine Inc.*, [2003] Q.J. No. 264, there is a reason to consider that the "not required" clause does not purport to abrogate the pension plan obligations. It authorizes the company not to make payments on account of its obligations during the currency of the Initial Order. Unpaid obligations would constitute debts of the company to be dealt with at the termination of its protection under the CCAA: see *Jeffrey Mine* paragraphs 60 to 62.

**86** It was submitted that the text of the *Jeffrey Mine* decision at paragraph 57 shows that in that case there was no suspension of the special payments obligation in respect of the employees who continued to work in the post-filing period. The phrase in paragraph 57 that is relied on in this regard is that the monitor was authorized to suspend pension contributions "except for employees whose services are retained by the monitor". This phrase is stated in the text to be a translation. The text of the original version of the initial order in *Jeffrey Mine* is set out at paragraph 9 of the decision. Paragraph [22] of the order authorizes the monitor to suspend "contributions to pension plans made by employees other than those kept by the monitor". At paragraphs 10 and 11 of the decision, the text makes clear that, in respect of the pension plan, the monitor advised that the payments that would continue to be paid were the current service payments, which are described as monthly remuneration to the employees to be paid to them by being paid to the plan. Nothing is said there about making any other payments to the plan. Paragraphs 68 and 70 express the Court's rejection of paragraph 16 of the Court's Order of November 29, 2006 which exempted the monitor from the collective agreements. However, paragraphs 54 and 55 of the decision deal with the suspension by the Court of payments to offset actuarial liability, which would seem to be payments in the nature of

the special payments that are in issue in the present case. At paragraph 55 the Court gave its opinion that it was within the power of the Superior Court to suspend those payments. The Court of Appeal may have been making a distinction between the powers of the monitor and the Court.

**87** Based on the analysis set out earlier in these reasons, even if it is correct to view the "not required" provision as abrogating provisions of pension plan statutory law, the Court has the jurisdiction under the CCAA to make an order under the CCAA which conflicts with, and overrides, provincial legislation. There is no apparent reason why this principle would not apply to an order made under the CCAA which conflicts with the PBA.

**88** Reference was made to s. 11.3(a) of the CCAA, which provides that no order made under s. 11 is to have the effect of prohibiting a person from requiring payment for services provided after the order is made. The Applicant is paying the wages and the current service obligations under the pension plans of the employees who continue to be employed. The special payments do not relate exclusively to the continuing employees. It is not shown (and does not seem to be submitted) that the amounts that might be required under the special payments arise from or are in connection with the current service obligations to the plan (assuming those obligations are paid in due course). The most that can be said on the basis of the material now before the Court is that the fact that Automotive continues to operate with employment services being provided by Plan members may occasion some change in the amounts that were due and the payments that were required to be made as at the time of the CCAA filing, but what that amount might be and how, if at all, it could be attributed materially to the continuing service as opposed to other factors such as plan asset valuation is impossible to determine.

**89** Accordingly, this point does not alter the conclusion that the Court has the jurisdiction to approve the "not required" clause, notwithstanding its effect in respect of the special payments.

***Exercise of the Statutory Discretion under the CCAA***

**90** There is a separate question raised whether it is a proper exercise of the discretion of the court for it to approve the provision in question. That question must be addressed in the context discussed above.

**91** The evidence before this Court is that Automotive is incapable of making the special payments. Automotive does not have the funds necessary to make the special payments. As at July 19, 2007, Automotive had no cash of its own. In the five-week period from July 19, 2007 to August 25, 2007, Automotive had negative cash flow from operations of approximately \$5 million. It is forecast that in the four-week period from August 26, 2007 until September 22, 2007 Automotive will have negative cash flow of approximately an additional \$12 million. Since filing, Automotive has been wholly dependent on the DIP Loan to fund all disbursements.

**92** Two other important considerations are evident in the present case. First, for the reasons given above, the effective suspension of special payments is a feature of the integrated arrangement which was made available by Chrysler as the DIP Lender and which was the arrangement which enabled the company to continue in operation. So there was and is a very good reason for the Court to approve that arrangement.

**93** Secondly, the moving parties each had a full opportunity to object to the approval of the DIP Facility and none of them did so, even though it was clear from the terms of the DIP Facility and the terms of the Initial Order that they are an integrated arrangement. Instead of objecting to the DIP

Facility, they have allowed it to be approved and have objected only to the related provisions of the Initial Order. In proceeding this way, it appears they have avoided facing the question whether if they opposed the DIP Approval Order for the reasons they now advance in respect of the special payments, the DIP Lender might have resisted their demands at the first moment, to the detriment of the continuing employment of members, and they now seek to raise the issue now that the DIP lender is in place and has been advancing funds, in circumstances where the only practical consequence could be to raise the question which would have appropriately been raised at the earlier stage.

**94** Chrysler submitted that this conduct is a collateral attack on the DIP Approval Order and should not be countenanced by the Court.

**95** The Initial Order was approved on July 19, 2007 with a provision in paragraph 3 providing for a further hearing on July 30, 2007 (the "Comeback Date") at which time the Initial Order could be supplemented or otherwise varied. On July 30, 2007 the Court ordered the approval of the DIP Facility. It ordered an extension of the Stay Period to August 24, 2007.

**96** The Court did not make any order to supplement or vary the Initial Order in any other respects. Neither did it make any order to the contrary. Nor does it appear from the recitals in the DIP Approval Order that the Court was asked on that motion to deal with the Initial Order in other respects. Stinson J., in his endorsement of July 30, 2007 approving the issuance of the DIP Approval Order, recorded the requests on behalf of the Superintendent and the USW that he record their respective clients' reservation of rights in relation to the pension fund payment and other matters referenced in paragraphs 6(a), 11(b) and (d) and paragraph 26 of the Initial Order. Since this reservation was recorded at the same time as the DIP Approval Order was granted and without any order being granted at that time to deal with any variations to the Initial Order, this raises a question of whether it is fair to regard the motion now before the Court as a collateral attack on the DIP Approval Order.

**97** It is important that, in the Initial Order at paragraph 34, the DIP Facility was ordered to be on the terms and conditions in the DIP Term Sheet and Commitment Letter dated as of July 18, 2007 which was approved in that paragraph subject to a further hearing on the Comeback Date. Covenant No. 1 in the DIP Term Sheet and Commitment Letter provides that the Borrower shall not without the Lender's prior written consent make any material disbursement unless it is contemplated in the initial cash flow or any subsequent cash flow approved by the Lender.

**98** As noted earlier, on the motion to approve the Initial Order the Court had affidavit information from Automotive that the DIP Loan does not provide for the funding of any special payments, along with a copy of the cash flow which states that no provision is made for the payment of any special pension payments.

**99** So, based on the above analysis, the Court, in the Initial Order, by reason of paragraph 34 (as to which no reservation of a right to object has been made or is now asserted), has ordered that the DIP Loan is not to be applied to special payments except with the consent of the DIP Lender.

**100** The Superintendent seeks an order requiring the Applicant to pay the Special Payments. For the reasons given above, such an order would constitute a collateral attack on DIP Approval because the evidence is that the Applicant has no funds available to it other than the DIP Loan. Consequently, the order the Superintendent requests would effectively order the Applicant to use the DIP Loan for a purpose which, pursuant to paragraph 34 of the Initial Order, is not permitted.

**101** Chrysler's agreement to act as DIP lender is based on the fact that the Applicant's supply is required to maintain Chrysler's own just-in-time vehicle manufacturing operations. The Superintendent submits that if Chrysler has concluded that it requires the output derived from the labour of the employees, then it is only fair and equitable that Chrysler bears the cost, in terms of remuneration to the employees including special payments to the Pension Plans, of that labour.

**102** In the decision in *Ivaco Inc. (Re)* (2005), 47 C.C.P.B. 62 at paragraph 4 (Ont. S.C.J. [Commercial List]) (affirmed (2006) 275 D.L.R. (4th) 132 (Ont. C.A.), leave to appeal granted [2006] S.C.C.A. No. 490) at the first instance, Farley J. characterized the nature of special payments, stating that "notwithstanding that past service contributions could be characterized as functionally a pre-filing obligation, legally the obligation pursuant to the applicable pension legislation is a fresh' obligation".

**103** The amount of the outstanding special payments in the present case appears to have been determined prior to the Initial Order based on information relating to the pre-filing period. It is not apparent that the continuation of the operations of the Applicant in the post-filing period has given rise to an increase in the amount of the special payments from the amount that would otherwise have been applicable by reason of the pre-filing experience. Consequently, it seems tendentious to characterize the outstanding special payments as the costs of operating in the post-filing period.

**104** The Superintendent objects that the approach that has been taken by the Applicant in the present case has been done without the requisite negotiation with the Superintendent and the pension plan stakeholders. In the decision in *United Airlines, Inc.*, *supra*, Farley J. cited the example of a case where the company obtained specific relief from the requirement to make special payments although current service costs were made. The Court, however, concluded that such an arrangement "is not a given right' of the company" and is to be achieved "on a consensual basis after negotiation" with the pension plan stakeholders.

**105** If there had been an objection to paragraph 34 of the Initial Order, that might well have occasioned negotiations of this kind, but there was no such objection. As noted, if there had been, each side could have assessed its own interests *vis-à-vis* the position of the other and the extent to which it would take the risk of insisting on its position or instead seek a compromise. Instead, what has happened is that the DIP Facility has proceeded without objection and the DIP Lender has changed its position on the basis of the Court orders given to date and now, after it has done so, an effort is made to put it in a position where it has no choice but to increase its funding or risk the loss of the continuing operations. This might yield a negotiation but it would be a lopsided one by reason of the DIP Lender already having provided funding in accordance with the Court orders.

**106** The USW contends that its submissions in respect of paragraph 6 of the Initial Order are not in conflict with paragraph 34 because they do not seek an order that the DIP Lender provide the funds that Automotive would require to make the special payments or that Automotive make the payments, but only that it not be ordered that Automotive is not required to make those payments.

**107** Since the material before the Court is to the effect that Automotive had and has no funds and has no expectation of having funds available which could be used to make the special payments, other than the monies available under the DIP Facility, if the Court were now to countenance and make the amendment to paragraph 6 which the moving party seeks, the necessary practical consequence of that amendment would be to allow pressure to be put on the DIP Lender to increase its funding commitment to Automotive and consent to Automotive making the special payments,

because Automotive would otherwise be potentially vulnerable to proceedings to force it to meet its payment obligations and there would inevitably be concerns about the consequences that could flow from default on its part. That situation would be contrary to the expectations which both Automotive and the DIP Lender would reasonably have been entitled to hold in respect of the Initial Order. It might well be different if the moving party had instead sought an order that the "not required" clause in paragraph 6 should be subject to a proviso that it would not apply to the extent that payment of such amounts could be funded out of monies other than from the DIP Facility. There is no alternative request for such a proviso, perhaps because no one expects it would be of any use.

**108** So what remains is a request that the Court, in the exercise of its discretion under s. 11, should make an order that would be contrary to the reasonable expectations of the Applicant and the DIP Lender based on the steps already taken and the orders already granted under the CCAA in this proceeding. That would be unfair and it would not contribute to the fair application of the CCAA in this case or as a precedent for others.

**109** Moreover, the failure of the moving parties to reserve in respect of and then dispute paragraph 34 of the Initial Order has the following unsatisfactory effect. If the moving parties had duly disputed paragraph 34 there would have been an opportunity for the Court to consider what would have been the two opposing positions on whether the DIP terms proposed by the DIP Lender should be accepted. If that question had properly been put in issue, then there would also have been an opportunity for each side to consider whether it would seek to press its position or would compromise for the sake of the respective potential benefits to each side. No such opportunity would exist with the request that is now before the Court. So the request should not be granted.

**110** For the reasons given above, there is no fair way at the present time to put the parties on a level playing field for negotiation about the special payments. For the reasons mentioned at other points above, it is desirable to ensure that there is an opportunity for such negotiation in CCAA circumstances, as an important means of achieving the most satisfactory arrangements for all concerned to the extent possible. With these considerations in mind, it is appropriate to take into account that the period of the application of the Initial Order was extended by Court order and will expire on the date set by the last such Order unless further extended. If a motion is made for a further extension of the Initial Order beyond its present expiry date, there would seem to be no basis in the above reasons to object to the legitimacy of interested parties raising an objection to paragraph 6 at that time, provided they are also prepared to object to paragraph 34.

### ***Paragraph 11***

**111** The objection taken by the USW is that the provisions of s. 11 are open to an interpretation that would permit Automotive to repudiate its collective agreements with the USW's members.

**112** Paragraph 11 is stated to be subject to covenants in the Definitive Documents as defined in the Initial Order. (They appear to be certain security documents.) The provision does not state that the right to terminate is subject only to such covenants. No mention is made in paragraph 11 of other obligations to which the Applicant may or may not be subject.

**113** The USW seeks to have the rights provided for in clauses (b) and (d) of paragraph 11 made subject to all applicable collective agreements and labour laws. Those rights can only be exercised by agreement with the affected employees or other counterparty or under a plan filed under the CCAA, failing which the matters are to be left to be dealt with in any plan of arrangement filed by the Applicant under the CCAA. Nothing in the provision purports to abrogate any applicable collec-

tive agreement or labour laws. No reason was advanced why the authorized bargaining agent could not withhold agreement to any proposed exercise of clause (b) or (d) and if Automotive then sought to deal further with the matter pursuant to the CCAA there is no apparent reason why the matter could not be pursued against Automotive in court under the CCAA.

**114** Reference is made to the discussion set out earlier with respect to the provision in paragraph 4 relating to further hirings. The comments made there are, with appropriate changes, applicable with respect to the issue relating to paragraph 11.

***Paragraph 26***

**115** The USW and the CAW object to the part of paragraph 26 which provides that the monitor, by fulfilling its obligations under the Initial Order, shall not be deemed to have taken control of the business or be deemed to have "been or become an employer of any of the Applicant's employees." [The word "employees" does not appear in the text of the Order in certain of the materials, but it is obviously intended.]

**116** The USW objects to the provision on the basis that the determination of whether the monitor is an employer is within the exclusive jurisdiction of the O.L.R.B. by reason of s. 69, s. 111 and s. 116 of the LRA. Section 69(2) of that Act provides that a person to whom an employer sells its business becomes the employer (the "successor employer") for the purposes specified in that section until the Board declares otherwise.

**117** The Initial Order does not expressly purport to determine the application of s. 69(2) of the LRA, since it does not refer to that Act. The application of paragraph 26 is stated to be limited to the monitor in its limited role under the Initial Order, which leaves the Applicant in possession and control of the business and, therefore, as the employer. This consideration has been regarded as determinative in finding such a provision to be acceptable: see the *Jeffrey Mine* decision at paragraph [76].

**118** The discussion in *Re Jeffrey Mine* about a provision of this kind did not address statutory provisions such as s. 69(2) of the LRA.

**119** As worded, it is not apparent that paragraph 26 warrants the concern expressed by the USW. It seems reasonable to assume that if the monitor were to take action of a kind that would suggest that the monitor has started to act *de facto* as the employer, in breach of paragraph 26, a motion might be brought before the Court under the CCAA and/or to the Ontario Labour Relations Board and the matter would then be considered in the context of an actual fact situation rather than in the present abstract and ill-defined circumstances. No order to give effect to the objection of the USW and the CAW in respect of this feature of paragraph 26 is appropriate at the present time.

***Paragraph 29***

**120** The USW objects that the immunity, or limitation of liability, provided to the monitor in the first sentence of paragraph 29 is not within the jurisdiction of the Court under the CCAA, or if it is, the granting of this immunity is not a proper exercise of the discretion of the Court. The impugned provision limits liability to gross negligence and willful misconduct.

**121** There was no reservation of rights in the endorsement of Stinson J. of July 30, 2007 with respect to this paragraph.

**122** The USW cites no authority that has been decided with respect to the CCAA in support of its contention that the limitation of liability is beyond the jurisdiction of the Court under the CCAA. In view of the stay jurisdiction of s. 11 of the CCAA and taking into account the "on such terms" jurisdiction under that section, it might seem that the better view is that the Court does have the jurisdiction to make such an order and that the only issue is whether the grant of limited liability of the kind specified is a proper exercise of the discretion of the Court.

**123** The USW submits that other court decisions show that the Court does not have the jurisdiction to grant a limitation of liability to the monitor of the kind set out in paragraph 29.

**124** In *GMAC Commercial Credit Corp. - Canada v. T.C.T. Logistics Inc.*, [2006] 2 S.C.R. 123 ("*T.C.T. Logistics*"), the Supreme Court of Canada held that the "boiler plate" immunization of the receiver, though not uncommon in receivership orders, was invalid in the absence of "explicit statutory language" to authorize such an extreme measure:

Flexibility is required to cure the problems in any particular bankruptcy. But guarding that flexibility with boiler plate immunizations that inoculate against the assertion of rights is beyond the therapeutic reach of the Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act.

...

As Major J. stated in *Crystalline Investments Ltd. v. Domgroup Ltd.*, 2004 SCC 3 (CanLII), [2004] 1 S.C.R. 60, 2004 SCC 3:

... explicit statutory language is required to divest persons of rights they otherwise enjoy at law ... [S]o long as the doctrine of paramountcy is not triggered, federally regulated bankruptcy and insolvency proceedings cannot be used to subvert provincially regulated property and civil rights. [para. 43]

**125** The USW also relies on s. 11.8(1) of the CCAA. Indeed, subsection 11.8(1) explicitly exempts a monitor from liability in respect of claims against the company which arise "before or upon the monitor's appointment":

Notwithstanding anything in any federal or provincial law, where a monitor carries on in that position the business of a debtor company or continues the employment of the company's employees, the monitor is not by reason of that fact personally liable in respect of any claim against the company or related to a requirement imposed on the company to pay an amount where the claim arose before or upon the monitor's appointment.

**126** The decision in *T.C.T. Logistics* did not deal with the CCAA. The monitor in that case had been appointed by the Court with a mandate to hire employees and carry on the business, but in the present case the monitor is restricted from hiring any employees and Automotive remains the employer of all of the unionized employees. The statements quoted from the *T.C.T. Logistics* decision are made in the context of a consideration of the issue whether a bankruptcy court judge can deter-

mine successor rights issues relating to the LRA. The immunity given in that case was that no action could be taken against the interim receiver without the leave of the Court.

**127** Section 11.8(1) deals with the situation where a monitor carries on in that position the business of a debtor company or continues the employment of the company's employees and it provides a blanket immunity against claims which arose before or upon the monitor's appointment. It is understandable that in the situation addressed in the section that the immunity would be limited to such claims and that it would be a blanket immunity in respect of such claims. The existence of s. 11.8(1) does not give rise to any implication as to what kind of limitation of liability would be reasonable in respect of a monitor with the limited powers given in the present case.

**128** The specific wording in paragraph 29 of the Initial Order is consistent with the standard limitation of liability protections granted to monitors under the standard-form model CCAA Initial Order, which was authorized and approved by the Commercial List Users' Committee on September 12, 2006.

**129** That is, of course, not determinative but it suggests that the clause has received serious favourable consideration from members of the bar in a context unrelated to particular party interests.

**130** The monitor submitted in its factum a list of twelve recent CCAA proceedings in which orders have been granted with similar provisions to the limitation of liability in this case. This would seem to suggest that in those cases the clause limiting liability was not disputed or, if it was, the Court found the clause to be acceptable.

**131** For these reasons, paragraph 29 is acceptable.

***Paragraph 4 of the CRO Order***

**132** The USW advances the submissions made with respect to jurisdiction as regards the monitor based on *T.C.T. Logistics* against the clause limiting the liability of the CRO.

**133** Automotive does not have D&O insurance in place. The protection set out in paragraph 4 of the CRO Order can reasonably be regarded as a fundamental condition of Axis Consulting Group Inc. and Mr. Rutman's agreement to accept and continue as CRO. Automotive would probably be severely restricted in its ability to appoint a capable and experienced Chief Restructuring Officer without the ability to offer a limitation on potential liability.

**134** The USW's claim that the Court does not have authority to grant this protection to the CRO is contrary to established practice. These protections are consistent with limitations of liability granted to Chief Restructuring Officers in other CCAA proceedings, and are consistent with the protections granted to Monitors under the standard-form CCAA Initial Order. The same or similar language was used in paragraph 19 of the Order of July 29, 2004 in the Stelco Inc. CCAA proceedings and in paragraph 3 of the Order of November 28, 2003 in the Ivaco Inc. CCAA proceeding, both granted by Farley J.

**135** In *ICR Commercial Real Estate (Regina) Ltd. v. Bricore Land Group Ltd.*, [2007] S.J. No. 154 the Saskatchewan Court of Queen's Bench upheld a similar limitation of liability for the Chief Restructuring Officer of Bricore. In dismissing a motion to lift the stay against the Chief Restructuring Officer, Koch J. stated:

The [CCAA] is intended to facilitate restructuring to serve the public interest. In many cases such as the present it is necessary for the Court to appoint officers

whose expertise is required to fulfill its mandate. It is clearly in the public interest that capable people be willing to accept such assignments. It is to be expected that such acceptance be contingent on protective provisions such as are included in the order of May 23, 2006, appointing Mr. Duval. It is important that the Court exercise caution in removing such restrictions; otherwise, the ability of the Court to obtain the assistance of needed experts will necessarily be impaired. Qualified professionals will be less willing to accept assignments absent the protection provisions in the appointing order.

**136** The Saskatchewan Court of Appeal upheld the decision, [2007] S.J. No. 313.

**137** The terms of the limitation of liability given to the CRO are similar to the limitation in the indemnity ordered in paragraph 21 of the Initial Order to be given by the Applicant to the directors and officers of the Applicant. The moving parties have not requested any amendment of that paragraph.

**138** It is hard to imagine how a prospective CRO would be prepared to take on the responsibilities of that position in the context of a situation like the present one, fraught as it is with obvious conflicting interests on the part of the different parties involved and a background of action in the work place and litigation in court, without significant protection against liability.

**139** Paragraph 4 of the CRO Order appears satisfactory for the above reasons.

#### **Conclusion**

**140** For the reasons given above, the motions are dismissed.

**141** Counsel may make written submissions as to costs if necessary.

J.M. SPENCE J.

cp/e/qlaxs/qlmxt/qlhcs/qlisl

# TAB 3

*Case Name:*

**ATB Financial v. Metcalfe & Mansfield Alternative  
Investments II Corp.**

**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 and  
Arrangement involving Metcalfe & Mansfield Alternative  
Investments II Corp., Metcalfe & Mansfield Alternative  
Investments III Corp., Metcalfe & Mansfield  
Alternative Investments V Corp., Metcalfe & Mansfield  
Alternative Investments XI Corp., Metcalfe & Mansfield  
Alternative Investments XII Corp., 4446372 Canada Inc.  
and 6932819 Canada Inc., Trustees of the Conduits  
Listed In Schedule "A" Hereto**

**Between**

**The Investors represented on the Pan-Canadian  
Investors Committee for Third-Party Structured  
Asset-Backed Commercial Paper listed in Schedule "B"  
hereto, Applicants (Respondents in Appeal), and  
Metcalfe & Mansfield Alternative Investments II Corp.,  
Metcalfe & Mansfield Alternative Investments III  
Corp., Metcalfe & Mansfield Alternative Investments V  
Corp., Metcalfe & Mansfield Alternative Investments XI  
Corp., Metcalfe & Mansfield Alternative Investments  
XII Corp., 6932819 Canada Inc. and 4446372 Canada  
Inc., Trustees of the Conduits listed in Schedule "A"  
hereto, Respondents (Respondents in Appeal), and  
Air Transat A.T. Inc., Transat Tours Canada Inc., The  
Jean Coutu Group (PJC) Inc., Aéroports de Montréal  
Inc., Aéroports de Montréal Capital Inc., Pomerleau  
Ontario Inc., Pomerleau Inc., Labopharm Inc., Domtar  
Inc., Domtar Pulp and Paper Products Inc., GIRO Inc.,  
Vêtements de sports R.G.R. Inc., 131519 Canada Inc.,  
Air Jazz LP, Petrifond Foundation Company Limited,  
Petrifond Foundation Midwest Limited, Services  
hypothécaires la patrimoniale Inc., TECSYS Inc.,  
Société générale de financement du Québec, VibroSystM  
Inc., Interquisa Canada L.P., Redcorp Ventures Ltd.,  
Jura Energy Corporation, Ivanhoe Mines Ltd., WebTech  
Wireless Inc., Wynn Capital Corporation Inc., Hy Bloom**

**Inc., Cardacian Mortgage Services, Inc., West Energy  
Ltd., Sabre Energy Ltd., Petrolifera Petroleum Ltd.,  
Vaquero Resources Ltd. and Standard Energy Inc.,  
Respondents (Appellants)**

[2008] O.J. No. 3164

2008 ONCA 587

45 C.B.R. (5th) 163

296 D.L.R. (4th) 135

2008 CarswellOnt 4811

168 A.C.W.S. (3d) 698

240 O.A.C. 245

47 B.L.R. (4th) 123

92 O.R. (3d) 513

Docket: C48969 (M36489)

Ontario Court of Appeal  
Toronto, Ontario

**J.I. Laskin, E.A. Cronk and R.A. Blair JJ.A.**

Heard: June 25-26, 2008.

Judgment: August 18, 2008.

(121 paras.)

*Bankruptcy and insolvency law -- Proceedings in bankruptcy and insolvency -- Practice and procedure -- General principles -- Legislation -- Interpretation -- Courts -- Jurisdiction -- Federal -- Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act -- Application by certain creditors opposed to a Plan of Compromise and Arrangement for leave to appeal sanctioning of that Plan -- Pan-Canadian Investors Committee was formed and ultimately put forward the creditor-initiated Plan of Compromise and Arrangement that formed the subject matter of the proceedings -- Plan dealt with liquidity crisis threatening Canadian market in Asset Backed Commercial Paper -- Plan was sanctioned by court -- Leave to appeal allowed and appeal dismissed -- CCAA permitted the inclusion of third party releases in a plan of compromise or arrangement to be sanctioned by the court -- Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act, ss. 4, 6.*

Application by certain creditors opposed to a Plan of Compromise and Arrangement for leave to appeal the sanctioning of that Plan. In August 2007, a liquidity crisis threatened the Canadian market in Asset Backed Commercial Paper (ABCP). The crisis was triggered by a loss of confidence amongst investors stemming from the news of widespread defaults on US sub-prime mortgages. By agreement amongst the major Canadian participants, the \$32 billion Canadian market in third-party ABCP was frozen on August 13, 2007, pending an attempt to resolve the crisis through a restructuring of that market. The Pan-Canadian Investors Committee was formed and ultimately put forward the creditor-initiated Plan of Compromise and Arrangement that formed the subject matter of the proceedings. The Plan was sanctioned on June 5, 2008. The applicants raised an important point regarding the permissible scope of restructuring under the Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act: could the court sanction a Plan that called for creditors to provide releases to third parties who were themselves insolvent and not creditors of the debtor company? They also argued that if the answer to that question was yes, the application judge erred in holding that the Plan, with its particular releases (which barred some claims even in fraud), was fair and reasonable and therefore in sanctioning it under the CCAA.

HELD: Application for leave to appeal allowed and appeal dismissed. The appeal raised issues of considerable importance to restructuring proceedings under the CCAA Canada-wide. There were serious and arguable grounds of appeal and the appeal would not unduly delay the progress of the proceedings. In the circumstances, the criteria for granting leave to appeal were met. Respecting the appeal, the CCAA permitted the inclusion of third party releases in a plan of compromise or arrangement to be sanctioned by the court where the releases were reasonably connected to the proposed restructuring. The wording of the CCAA, construed in light of the purpose, objects and scheme of the Act, supported the court's jurisdiction and authority to sanction the Plan proposed in this case, including the contested third-party releases contained in it. The Plan was fair and reasonable in all the circumstances.

**Statutes, Regulations and Rules Cited:**

Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act, R.S.C. 1985, c. B-3,

Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act, R.S.C. 1985, c. C-36, s. 4, s. 6

Constitution Act, 1867, R.S.C. 1985, App. II, No. 5, s. 91(21), s. 92(13)

**Appeal From:**

On appeal from the sanction order of Justice Colin L. Campbell of the Superior Court of Justice, dated June 5, 2008, with reasons reported at [2008] O.J. No. 2265.

**Counsel:**

See Schedule "A" for the list of counsel.

---

The judgment of the Court was delivered by

**R.A. BLAIR J.A.:-**

## **A. INTRODUCTION**

**1** In August 2007 a liquidity crisis suddenly threatened the Canadian market in Asset Backed Commercial Paper ("ABCP"). The crisis was triggered by a loss of confidence amongst investors stemming from the news of widespread defaults on U.S. sub-prime mortgages. The loss of confidence placed the Canadian financial market at risk generally and was reflective of an economic volatility worldwide.

**2** By agreement amongst the major Canadian participants, the \$32 billion Canadian market in third-party ABCP was frozen on August 13, 2007 pending an attempt to resolve the crisis through a restructuring of that market. The Pan-Canadian Investors Committee, chaired by Purdy Crawford, C.C., Q.C., was formed and ultimately put forward the creditor-initiated Plan of Compromise and Arrangement that forms the subject-matter of these proceedings. The Plan was sanctioned by Colin L. Campbell J. on June 5, 2008.

**3** Certain creditors who opposed the Plan seek leave to appeal and, if leave is granted, appeal from that decision. They raise an important point regarding the permissible scope of a restructuring under the *Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act*, R.S.C. 1985, c. C-36 as amended ("CCAA"): can the court sanction a Plan that calls for creditors to provide releases to third parties who are themselves solvent and not creditors of the debtor company? They also argue that, if the answer to this question is yes, the application judge erred in holding that this Plan, with its particular releases (which bar some claims even in fraud), was fair and reasonable and therefore in sanctioning it under the CCAA.

### Leave to Appeal

**4** Because of the particular circumstances and urgency of these proceedings, the court agreed to collapse an oral hearing for leave to appeal with the hearing of the appeal itself. At the outset of argument we encouraged counsel to combine their submissions on both matters.

**5** The proposed appeal raises issues of considerable importance to restructuring proceedings under the CCAA Canada-wide. There are serious and arguable grounds of appeal and -- given the expedited time-table -- the appeal will not unduly delay the progress of the proceedings. I am satisfied that the criteria for granting leave to appeal in CCAA proceedings, set out in such cases as *Re Cineplex Odeon Corp.* (2001), 24 C.B.R. (4th) 21 (Ont. C.A.), and *Re Country Style Food Services* (2002), 158 O.A.C. 30, are met. I would grant leave to appeal.

### Appeal

**6** For the reasons that follow, however, I would dismiss the appeal.

## **B. FACTS**

### **The Parties**

**7** The appellants are holders of ABCP Notes who oppose the Plan. They do so principally on the basis that it requires them to grant releases to third party financial institutions against whom they say they have claims for relief arising out of their purchase of ABCP Notes. Amongst them are an airline, a tour operator, a mining company, a wireless provider, a pharmaceuticals retailer, and several holding companies and energy companies.

8 Each of the appellants has large sums invested in ABCP -- in some cases, hundreds of millions of dollars. Nonetheless, the collective holdings of the appellants -- slightly over \$1 billion -- represent only a small fraction of the more than \$32 billion of ABCP involved in the restructuring.

9 The lead respondent is the Pan-Canadian Investors Committee which was responsible for the creation and negotiation of the Plan on behalf of the creditors. Other respondents include various major international financial institutions, the five largest Canadian banks, several trust companies, and some smaller holders of ABCP product. They participated in the market in a number of different ways.

### **The ABCP Market**

10 Asset Backed Commercial Paper is a sophisticated and hitherto well-accepted financial instrument. It is primarily a form of short-term investment -- usually 30 to 90 days -- typically with a low interest yield only slightly better than that available through other short-term paper from a government or bank. It is said to be "asset backed" because the cash that is used to purchase an ABCP Note is converted into a portfolio of financial assets or other asset interests that in turn provide security for the repayment of the notes.

11 ABCP was often presented by those selling it as a safe investment, somewhat like a guaranteed investment certificate.

12 The Canadian market for ABCP is significant and administratively complex. As of August 2007, investors had placed over \$116 billion in Canadian ABCP. Investors range from individual pensioners to large institutional bodies. On the selling and distribution end, numerous players are involved, including chartered banks, investment houses and other financial institutions. Some of these players participated in multiple ways. The Plan in this proceeding relates to approximately \$32 billion of non-bank sponsored ABCP the restructuring of which is considered essential to the preservation of the Canadian ABCP market.

13 As I understand it, prior to August 2007 when it was frozen, the ABCP market worked as follows.

14 Various corporations (the "Sponsors") would arrange for entities they control ("Conduits") to make ABCP Notes available to be sold to investors through "Dealers" (banks and other investment dealers). Typically, ABCP was issued by series and sometimes by classes within a series.

15 The cash from the purchase of the ABCP Notes was used to purchase assets which were held by trustees of the Conduits ("Issuer Trustees") and which stood as security for repayment of the notes. Financial institutions that sold or provided the Conduits with the assets that secured the ABCP are known as "Asset Providers". To help ensure that investors would be able to redeem their notes, "Liquidity Providers" agreed to provide funds that could be drawn upon to meet the demands of maturing ABCP Notes in certain circumstances. Most Asset Providers were also Liquidity Providers. Many of these banks and financial institutions were also holders of ABCP Notes ("Noteholders"). The Asset and Liquidity Providers held first charges on the assets.

16 When the market was working well, cash from the purchase of new ABCP Notes was also used to pay off maturing ABCP Notes; alternatively, Noteholders simply rolled their maturing notes over into new ones. As I will explain, however, there was a potential underlying predicament with this scheme.

### **The Liquidity Crisis**

**17** The types of assets and asset interests acquired to "back" the ABCP Notes are varied and complex. They were generally long-term assets such as residential mortgages, credit card receivables, auto loans, cash collateralized debt obligations and derivative investments such as credit default swaps. Their particular characteristics do not matter for the purpose of this appeal, but they shared a common feature that proved to be the Achilles heel of the ABCP market: because of their long-term nature there was an inherent timing mismatch between the cash they generated and the cash needed to repay maturing ABCP Notes.

**18** When uncertainty began to spread through the ABCP marketplace in the summer of 2007, investors stopped buying the ABCP product and existing Noteholders ceased to roll over their maturing notes. There was no cash to redeem those notes. Although calls were made on the Liquidity Providers for payment, most of the Liquidity Providers declined to fund the redemption of the notes, arguing that the conditions for liquidity funding had not been met in the circumstances. Hence the "liquidity crisis" in the ABCP market.

**19** The crisis was fuelled largely by a lack of transparency in the ABCP scheme. Investors could not tell what assets were backing their notes -- partly because the ABCP Notes were often sold before or at the same time as the assets backing them were acquired; partly because of the sheer complexity of certain of the underlying assets; and partly because of assertions of confidentiality by those involved with the assets. As fears arising from the spreading U.S. sub-prime mortgage crisis mushroomed, investors became increasingly concerned that their ABCP Notes may be supported by those crumbling assets. For the reasons outlined above, however, they were unable to redeem their maturing ABCP Notes.

#### The Montreal Protocol

**20** The liquidity crisis could have triggered a wholesale liquidation of the assets, at depressed prices. But it did not. During the week of August 13, 2007, the ABCP market in Canada froze -- the result of a standstill arrangement orchestrated on the heels of the crisis by numerous market participants, including Asset Providers, Liquidity Providers, Noteholders and other financial industry representatives. Under the standstill agreement -- known as the Montréal Protocol -- the parties committed to restructuring the ABCP market with a view, as much as possible, to preserving the value of the assets and of the notes.

**21** The work of implementing the restructuring fell to the Pan-Canadian Investors Committee, an applicant in the proceeding and respondent in the appeal. The Committee is composed of 17 financial and investment institutions, including chartered banks, credit unions, a pension board, a Crown corporation, and a university board of governors. All 17 members are themselves Noteholders; three of them also participated in the ABCP market in other capacities as well. Between them, they hold about two thirds of the \$32 billion of ABCP sought to be restructured in these proceedings.

**22** Mr. Crawford was named the Committee's chair. He thus had a unique vantage point on the work of the Committee and the restructuring process as a whole. His lengthy affidavit strongly informed the application judge's understanding of the factual context, and our own. He was not cross-examined and his evidence is unchallenged.

**23** Beginning in September 2007, the Committee worked to craft a plan that would preserve the value of the notes and assets, satisfy the various stakeholders to the extent possible, and restore confidence in an important segment of the Canadian financial marketplace. In March 2008, it and the

other applicants sought CCAA protection for the ABCP debtors and the approval of a Plan that had been pre-negotiated with some, but not all, of those affected by the misfortunes in the Canadian ABCP market.

## **The Plan**

### a) Plan Overview

**24** Although the ABCP market involves many different players and kinds of assets, each with their own challenges, the committee opted for a single plan. In Mr. Crawford's words, "all of the ABCP suffers from common problems that are best addressed by a common solution." The Plan the Committee developed is highly complex and involves many parties. In its essence, the Plan would convert the Noteholders' paper -- which has been frozen and therefore effectively worthless for many months -- into new, long-term notes that would trade freely, but with a discounted face value. The hope is that a strong secondary market for the notes will emerge in the long run.

**25** The Plan aims to improve transparency by providing investors with detailed information about the assets supporting their ABCP Notes. It also addresses the timing mismatch between the notes and the assets by adjusting the maturity provisions and interest rates on the new notes. Further, the Plan adjusts some of the underlying credit default swap contracts by increasing the thresholds for default triggering events; in this way, the likelihood of a forced liquidation flowing from the credit default swap holder's prior security is reduced and, in turn, the risk for ABCP investors is decreased.

**26** Under the Plan, the vast majority of the assets underlying ABCP would be pooled into two master asset vehicles (MAV1 and MAV2). The pooling is designed to increase the collateral available and thus make the notes more secure.

**27** The Plan does not apply to investors holding less than \$1 million of notes. However, certain Dealers have agreed to buy the ABCP of those of their customers holding less than the \$1-million threshold, and to extend financial assistance to these customers. Principal among these Dealers are National Bank and Canaccord, two of the respondent financial institutions the appellants most object to releasing. The application judge found that these developments appeared to be designed to secure votes in favour of the Plan by various Noteholders, and were apparently successful in doing so. If the Plan is approved, they also provide considerable relief to the many small investors who find themselves unwittingly caught in the ABCP collapse.

### b) The Releases

**28** This appeal focuses on one specific aspect of the Plan: the comprehensive series of releases of third parties provided for in Article 10.

**29** The Plan calls for the release of Canadian banks, Dealers, Noteholders, Asset Providers, Issuer Trustees, Liquidity Providers, and other market participants -- in Mr. Crawford's words, "virtually all participants in the Canadian ABCP market" -- from any liability associated with ABCP, with the exception of certain narrow claims relating to fraud. For instance, under the Plan as approved, creditors will have to give up their claims against the Dealers who sold them their ABCP Notes, including challenges to the way the Dealers characterized the ABCP and provided (or did not provide) information about the ABCP. The claims against the proposed defendants are mainly in tort: negligence, misrepresentation, negligent misrepresentation, failure to act prudently as a dealer/advisor,

acting in conflict of interest, and in a few cases fraud or potential fraud. There are also allegations of breach of fiduciary duty and claims for other equitable relief.

**30** The application judge found that, in general, the claims for damages include the face value of the Notes, plus interest and additional penalties and damages.

**31** The releases, in effect, are part of a *quid pro quo*. Generally speaking, they are designed to compensate various participants in the market for the contributions they would make to the restructuring. Those contributions under the Plan include the requirements that:

- a) Asset Providers assume an increased risk in their credit default swap contracts, disclose certain proprietary information in relation to the assets, and provide below-cost financing for margin funding facilities that are designed to make the notes more secure;
- b) Sponsors -- who in addition have cooperated with the Investors' Committee throughout the process, including by sharing certain proprietary information -- give up their existing contracts;
- c) The Canadian banks provide below-cost financing for the margin funding facility and,
- d) Other parties make other contributions under the Plan.

**32** According to Mr. Crawford's affidavit, the releases are part of the Plan "because certain key participants, whose participation is vital to the restructuring, have made comprehensive releases a condition for their participation."

#### **The CCAA Proceedings to Date**

**33** On March 17, 2008 the applicants sought and obtained an Initial Order under the CCAA staying any proceedings relating to the ABCP crisis and providing for a meeting of the Noteholders to vote on the proposed Plan. The meeting was held on April 25th. The vote was overwhelmingly in support of the Plan -- 96% of the Noteholders voted in favour. At the instance of certain Noteholders, and as requested by the application judge (who has supervised the proceedings from the outset), the Monitor broke down the voting results according to those Noteholders who had worked on or with the Investors' Committee to develop the Plan and those Noteholders who had not. Re-calculated on this basis the results remained firmly in favour of the proposed Plan -- 99% of those connected with the development of the Plan voted positively, as did 80% of those Noteholders who had not been involved in its formulation.

**34** The vote thus provided the Plan with the "double majority" approval -- a majority of creditors representing two-thirds in value of the claims -- required under s. 6 of the CCAA.

**35** Following the successful vote, the applicants sought court approval of the Plan under s. 6. Hearings were held on May 12 and 13. On May 16, the application judge issued a brief endorsement in which he concluded that he did not have sufficient facts to decide whether all the releases proposed in the Plan were authorized by the CCAA. While the application judge was prepared to approve the releases of negligence claims, he was not prepared at that point to sanction the release of fraud claims. Noting the urgency of the situation and the serious consequences that would result from the Plan's failure, the application judge nevertheless directed the parties back to the bargaining table to try to work out a claims process for addressing legitimate claims of fraud.

**36** The result of this renegotiation was a "fraud carve-out" -- an amendment to the Plan excluding certain fraud claims from the Plan's releases. The carve-out did not encompass all possible claims of fraud, however. It was limited in three key respects. First, it applied only to claims against ABCP Dealers. Secondly, it applied only to cases involving an express fraudulent misrepresentation made with the intention to induce purchase and in circumstances where the person making the representation knew it to be false. Thirdly, the carve-out limited available damages to the value of the notes, minus any funds distributed as part of the Plan. The appellants argue vigorously that such a limited release respecting fraud claims is unacceptable and should not have been sanctioned by the application judge.

**37** A second sanction hearing -- this time involving the amended Plan (with the fraud carve-out) -- was held on June 3, 2008. Two days later, Campbell J. released his reasons for decision, approving and sanctioning the Plan on the basis both that he had jurisdiction to sanction a Plan calling for third-party releases and that the Plan including the third-party releases in question here was fair and reasonable.

**38** The appellants attack both of these determinations.

### **C. LAW AND ANALYSIS**

**39** There are two principal questions for determination on this appeal:

- 1) As a matter of law, may a CCAA plan contain a release of claims against anyone other than the debtor company or its directors?
- 2) If the answer to that question is yes, did the application judge err in the exercise of his discretion to sanction the Plan as fair and reasonable given the nature of the releases called for under it?

#### **(1) Legal Authority for the Releases**

**40** The standard of review on this first issue -- whether, as a matter of law, a CCAA plan may contain third-party releases -- is correctness.

**41** The appellants submit that a court has no jurisdiction or legal authority under the CCAA to sanction a plan that imposes an obligation on creditors to give releases to third parties other than the directors of the debtor company.<sup>1</sup> The requirement that objecting creditors release claims against third parties is illegal, they contend, because:

- a) on a proper interpretation, the CCAA does not permit such releases;
- b) the court is not entitled to "fill in the gaps" in the CCAA or rely upon its inherent jurisdiction to create such authority because to do so would be contrary to the principle that Parliament did not intend to interfere with private property rights or rights of action in the absence of clear statutory language to that effect;
- c) the releases constitute an unconstitutional confiscation of private property that is within the exclusive domain of the provinces under s. 92 of the *Constitution Act, 1867*;
- d) the releases are invalid under Quebec rules of public order; and because
- e) the prevailing jurisprudence supports these conclusions.

42 I would not give effect to any of these submissions.

Interpretation, "Gap Filling" and Inherent Jurisdiction

43 On a proper interpretation, in my view, the CCAA permits the inclusion of third party releases in a plan of compromise or arrangement to be sanctioned by the court where those releases are reasonably connected to the proposed restructuring. I am led to this conclusion by a combination of (a) the open-ended, flexible character of the CCAA itself, (b) the broad nature of the term "compromise or arrangement" as used in the Act, and (c) the express statutory effect of the "double-majority" vote and court sanction which render the plan binding on all creditors, including those unwilling to accept certain portions of it. The first of these signals a flexible approach to the application of the Act in new and evolving situations, an active judicial role in its application and interpretation, and a liberal approach to that interpretation. The second provides the entrée to negotiations between the parties affected in the restructuring and furnishes them with the ability to apply the broad scope of their ingenuity in fashioning the proposal. The latter afford necessary protection to unwilling creditors who may be deprived of certain of their civil and property rights as a result of the process.

44 The CCAA is skeletal in nature. It does not contain a comprehensive code that lays out all that is permitted or barred. Judges must therefore play a role in fleshing out the details of the statutory scheme. The scope of the Act and the powers of the court under it are not limitless. It is beyond controversy, however, that the CCAA is remedial legislation to be liberally construed in accordance with the modern purposive approach to statutory interpretation. It is designed to be a flexible instrument and it is that very flexibility which gives the Act its efficacy: *Canadian Red Cross Society (Re)* (1998), 5 C.B.R. (4th) 299 (Ont. Gen. Div.). As Farley J. noted in *Re Dylex Ltd.* (1995), 31 C.B.R. (3d) 106 at 111 (Ont. Gen. Div.), "[t]he history of CCAA law has been an evolution of judicial interpretation."

45 Much has been said, however, about the "evolution of judicial interpretation" and there is some controversy over both the source and scope of that authority. Is the source of the court's authority statutory, discerned solely through application of the principles of statutory interpretation, for example? Or does it rest in the court's ability to "fill in the gaps" in legislation? Or in the court's inherent jurisdiction?

46 These issues have recently been canvassed by the Honourable Georgina R. Jackson and Dr. Janis Sarra in their publication "Selecting the Judicial Tool to get the Job Done: An Examination of Statutory Interpretation, Discretionary Power and Inherent Jurisdiction in Insolvency Matters,"<sup>2</sup> and there was considerable argument on these issues before the application judge and before us. While I generally agree with the authors' suggestion that the courts should adopt a hierarchical approach in their resort to these interpretive tools -- statutory interpretation, gap-filling, discretion and inherent jurisdiction -- it is not necessary in my view to go beyond the general principles of statutory interpretation to resolve the issues on this appeal. Because I am satisfied that it is implicit in the language of the CCAA itself that the court has authority to sanction plans incorporating third-party releases that are reasonably related to the proposed restructuring, there is no "gap-filling" to be done and no need to fall back on inherent jurisdiction. In this respect, I take a somewhat different approach than the application judge did.

47 The Supreme Court of Canada has affirmed generally -- and in the insolvency context particularly -- that remedial statutes are to be interpreted liberally and in accordance with Professor

Driedger's modern principle of statutory interpretation. Driedger advocated that "the words of an Act are to be read in their entire context and in their grammatical and ordinary sense harmoniously with the scheme of the Act, the object of the Act, and the intention of Parliament": *Re Rizzo & Rizzo Shoes Ltd.*, [1998] 1 S.C.R. 27 at para. 21, quoting E.A. Driedger, *Construction of Statutes*, 2nd ed. (Toronto: Butterworths, 1983); *Bell ExpressvU Ltd. Partnership v. R.*, [2002] 2 S.C.R. 559 at para. 26.

**48** More broadly, I believe that the proper approach to the judicial interpretation and application of statutes -- particularly those like the CCAA that are skeletal in nature -- is succinctly and accurately summarized by Jackson and Sarra in their recent article, *supra*, at p. 56:

The exercise of a statutory authority requires the statute to be construed. The plain meaning or textualist approach has given way to a search for the object and goals of the statute and the intentionalist approach. This latter approach makes use of the purposive approach and the mischief rule, including its codification under interpretation statutes that every enactment is deemed remedial, and is to be given such fair, large and liberal construction and interpretation as best ensures the attainment of its objects. This latter approach advocates reading the statute as a whole and being mindful of Driedger's "one principle", that the words of the Act are to be read in their entire context, in their grammatical and ordinary sense harmoniously with the scheme of the Act, the object of the Act, and the intention of Parliament. It is important that courts first interpret the statute before them and exercise their authority pursuant to the statute, before reaching for other tools in the judicial toolbox. Statutory interpretation using the principles articulated above leaves room for gap-filling in the common law provinces and a consideration of purpose in *Québec* as a manifestation of the judge's overall task of statutory interpretation. Finally, the jurisprudence in relation to statutory interpretation demonstrates the fluidity inherent in the judge's task in seeking the objects of the statute and the intention of the legislature.

**49** I adopt these principles.

**50** The remedial purpose of the CCAA -- as its title affirms -- is to facilitate compromises or arrangements between an insolvent debtor company and its creditors. In *Chef Ready Foods Ltd. v. Hongkong Bank of Canada* (1990), 4 C.B.R. (3d) 311 at 318 (B.C.C.A.), Gibbs J.A. summarized very concisely the purpose, object and scheme of the Act:

Almost inevitably, liquidation destroyed the shareholders' investment, yielded little by way of recovery to the creditors, and exacerbated the social evil of devastating levels of unemployment. The government of the day sought, through the C.C.A.A., to create a regime whereby the principals of the company and the creditors could be brought together under the supervision of the court to attempt a reorganization or compromise or arrangement under which the company could continue in business.

**51** The CCAA was enacted in 1933 and was necessary -- as the then Secretary of State noted in introducing the Bill on First Reading -- "because of the prevailing commercial and industrial depression" and the need to alleviate the effects of business bankruptcies in that context: see the

statement of the Hon. C.H. Cahan, Secretary of State, *House of Commons Debates (Hansard)* (April 20, 1933) at 4091. One of the greatest effects of that Depression was what Gibbs J.A. described as "the social evil of devastating levels of unemployment". Since then, courts have recognized that the Act has a broader dimension than simply the direct relations between the debtor company and its creditors and that this broader public dimension must be weighed in the balance together with the interests of those most directly affected: see, for example, *Elan Corp. v. Comiskey (Trustee of)* (1990), 1 O.R. (3d) 289 (C.A.), *per* Doherty J.A. in dissent; *Re Skydome Corp.* (1998), 16 C.B.R. (4th) 125 (Ont. Gen. Div.); *Re Anvil Range Mining Corp.* (1998), 3 C.B.R. (4th) 93 (Ont. Gen. Div.).

**52** In this respect, I agree with the following statement of Doherty J.A. in *Elan, supra*, at pp. 306-307:

... [T]he Act was designed to serve a "broad constituency of investors, creditors and employees".<sup>3</sup> Because of that "broad constituency" the court must, when considering applications brought under the Act, *have regard not only to the individuals and organizations directly affected by the application, but also to the wider public interest.* [Emphasis added.]

#### Application of the Principles of Interpretation

**53** An interpretation of the CCAA that recognizes its broader socio-economic purposes and objects is apt in this case. As the application judge pointed out, the restructuring underpins the financial viability of the Canadian ABCP market itself.

**54** The appellants argue that the application judge erred in taking this approach and in treating the Plan and the proceedings as an attempt to restructure a financial market (the ABCP market) rather than simply the affairs between the debtor corporations who caused the ABCP Notes to be issued and their creditors. The Act is designed, they say, only to effect reorganizations between a corporate debtor and its creditors and not to attempt to restructure entire marketplaces.

**55** This perspective is flawed in at least two respects, however, in my opinion. First, it reflects a view of the purpose and objects of the CCAA that is too narrow. Secondly, it overlooks the reality of the ABCP marketplace and the context of the restructuring in question here. It may be true that, in their capacity as ABCP *Dealers*, the releasee financial institutions are "third-parties" to the restructuring in the sense that they are not creditors of the debtor corporations. However, in their capacities as *Asset Providers* and *Liquidity Providers*, they are not only creditors but they are prior secured creditors to the Noteholders. Furthermore -- as the application judge found -- in these latter capacities they are making significant contributions to the restructuring by "foregoing immediate rights to assets and ... providing real and tangible input for the preservation and enhancement of the Notes" (para. 76). In this context, therefore, the application judge's remark at para. 50 that the restructuring "involves the commitment and participation of all parties" in the ABCP market makes sense, as do his earlier comments at paras. 48-49:

Given the nature of the ABCP market and all of its participants, it is more appropriate to consider all Noteholders as claimants and the object of the Plan to restore liquidity to the assets being the Notes themselves. The restoration of the li-

quidity of the market necessitates the participation (including more tangible contribution by many) of all Noteholders.

In these circumstances, *it is unduly technical to classify the Issuer Trustees as debtors and the claims of the Noteholders as between themselves and others as being those of third party creditors*, although I recognize that the restructuring structure of the CCAA requires the corporations as the vehicles for restructuring. [Emphasis added.]

**56** The application judge did observe that "[t]he insolvency is of the ABCP market itself, the restructuring is that of the market for such paper ..." (para. 50). He did so, however, to point out the uniqueness of the Plan before him and its industry-wide significance and not to suggest that he need have no regard to the provisions of the CCAA permitting a restructuring as between debtor and creditors. His focus was on *the effect* of the restructuring, a perfectly permissible perspective, given the broad purpose and objects of the Act. This is apparent from his later references. For example, in balancing the arguments against approving releases that might include aspects of fraud, he responded that "what is at issue is a liquidity crisis that affects the ABCP market in Canada" (para. 125). In addition, in his reasoning on the fair-and-reasonable issue, he stated at para. 142: "Apart from the Plan itself, there is a need to restore confidence in the financial system in Canada and this Plan is a legitimate use of the CCAA to accomplish that goal."

**57** I agree. I see no error on the part of the application judge in approaching the fairness assessment or the interpretation issue with these considerations in mind. They provide the context in which the purpose, objects and scheme of the CCAA are to be considered.

#### *The Statutory Wording*

**58** Keeping in mind the interpretive principles outlined above, I turn now to a consideration of the provisions of the CCAA. Where in the words of the statute is the court clothed with authority to approve a plan incorporating a requirement for third-party releases? As summarized earlier, the answer to that question, in my view, is to be found in:

- a) the skeletal nature of the CCAA;
- b) Parliament's reliance upon the broad notions of "compromise" and "arrangement" to establish the framework within which the parties may work to put forward a restructuring plan; and in
- c) the creation of the statutory mechanism binding all creditors in classes to the compromise or arrangement once it has surpassed the high "double majority" voting threshold and obtained court sanction as "fair and reasonable".

Therein lies the expression of Parliament's intention to permit the parties to negotiate and vote on, and the court to sanction, third-party releases relating to a restructuring.

**59** Sections 4 and 6 of the CCAA state:

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

of creditors, and, if the court so determines, of the shareholders of the company, to be summoned in such manner as the court directs.

6. Where a majority in number representing two-thirds in value of the creditors, or class of creditors, as the case may be, present and voting either in person or by proxy at the meeting or meetings thereof respectively held pursuant to sections 4 and 5, or either of those sections, agree to any compromise or arrangement either as proposed or as altered or modified at the meeting or meetings, the compromise or arrangement may be sanctioned by the court, and if so sanctioned is binding

(a) on all the creditors or the class of creditors, as the case may be, and on any trustee for any such class of creditors, whether secured or unsecured, as the case may be, and on the company; and

(b) in the case of a company that has made an authorized assignment or against which a bankruptcy order has been made under the *Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act* or is in the course of being wound up under the *Winding-up and Restructuring Act*, on the trustee in bankruptcy or liquidator and contributories of the company.

#### *Compromise or Arrangement*

**60** While there may be little practical distinction between "compromise" and "arrangement" in many respects, the two are not necessarily the same. "Arrangement" is broader than "compromise" and would appear to include any scheme for reorganizing the affairs of the debtor: Houlden and Morawetz, *Bankruptcy and Insolvency Law of Canada*, loose-leaf, 3rd ed., vol. 4 (Toronto: Thomson Carswell) at 10A-12.2, N para. 10. It has been said to be "a very wide and indefinite [word]": *Re Refund of Dues under Timber Regulations*, [1935] A.C. 184 at 197 (P.C.), affirming S.C.C. [1933] S.C.R. 616. See also, *Re Guardian Assur. Co.*, [1917] 1 Ch. 431 at 448, 450; *Re T&N Ltd. and Others (No. 3)*, [2007] 1 All E.R. 851 (Ch.).

**61** The CCAA is a sketch, an outline, a supporting framework for the resolution of corporate insolvencies in the public interest. Parliament wisely avoided attempting to anticipate the myriad of business deals that could evolve from the fertile and creative minds of negotiators restructuring their financial affairs. It left the shape and details of those deals to be worked out within the framework of the comprehensive and flexible concepts of a "compromise" and "arrangement." I see no reason why a release in favour of a third party, negotiated as part of a package between a debtor and creditor and reasonably relating to the proposed restructuring cannot fall within that framework.

**62** A proposal under the *Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act*, R.S., 1985, c. B-3 (the "BIA") is a contract: *Employers' Liability Assurance Corp. Ltd. v. Ideal Petroleum (1959) Ltd.* [1978] 1 S.C.R. 230 at 239; *Society of Composers, Authors & Music Publishers of Canada v. Armitage* (2000), 50 O.R. (3d) 688 at para. 11 (C.A.). In my view, a compromise or arrangement under the CCAA is directly analogous to a proposal for these purposes, and therefore is to be treated as a contract between the debtor and its creditors. Consequently, parties are entitled to put anything into such a plan that could lawfully be incorporated into any contract. See *Re Air Canada* (2004), 2 C.B.R. (5th) 4 at para. 6 (Ont. S.C.J.); *Olympia & York Developments Ltd. v. Royal Trust Co.* (1993), 12 O.R. (3d) 500 at 518 (Gen. Div.).

**63** There is nothing to prevent a debtor and a creditor from including in a contract between them a term providing that the creditor release a third party. The term is binding as between the debtor and creditor. In the CCAA context, therefore, a plan of compromise or arrangement may propose that creditors agree to compromise claims against the debtor and to release third parties, just as any debtor and creditor might agree to such a term in a contract between them. Once the statutory mechanism regarding voter approval and court sanctioning has been complied with, the plan -- including the provision for releases -- becomes binding on all creditors (including the dissenting minority).

**64** *Re T&N Ltd. and Others, supra*, is instructive in this regard. It is a rare example of a court focussing on and examining the meaning and breadth of the term "arrangement". T&N and its associated companies were engaged in the manufacture, distribution and sale of asbestos-containing products. They became the subject of many claims by former employees, who had been exposed to asbestos dust in the course of their employment, and their dependents. The T&N companies applied for protection under s. 425 of the U.K. *Companies Act 1985*, a provision virtually identical to the scheme of the CCAA -- including the concepts of compromise or arrangement.<sup>4</sup>

**65** T&N carried employers' liability insurance. However, the employers' liability insurers (the "EL insurers") denied coverage. This issue was litigated and ultimately resolved through the establishment of a multi-million pound fund against which the employees and their dependants (the "EL claimants") would assert their claims. In return, T&N's former employees and dependants (the "EL claimants") agreed to forego any further claims against the EL insurers. This settlement was incorporated into the plan of compromise and arrangement between the T&N companies and the EL claimants that was voted on and put forward for court sanction.

**66** Certain creditors argued that the court could not sanction the plan because it did not constitute a "compromise or arrangement" between T&N and the EL claimants since it did not purport to affect rights as between them but only the EL claimants' rights against the EL insurers. The Court rejected this argument. Richards J. adopted previous jurisprudence -- cited earlier in these reasons -- to the effect that the word "arrangement" has a very broad meaning and that, while both a compromise and an arrangement involve some "give and take", an arrangement need not involve a compromise or be confined to a case of dispute or difficulty (paras. 46-51). He referred to what would be the equivalent of a solvent arrangement under Canadian corporate legislation as an example.<sup>5</sup> Finally, he pointed out that the compromised rights of the EL claimants against the EL insurers were not unconnected with the EL claimants' rights against the T&N companies; the scheme of arrangement involving the EL insurers was "an integral part of a single proposal affecting all the parties" (para. 52). He concluded his reasoning with these observations (para. 53):

In my judgment it is not a necessary element of an arrangement for the purposes of s. 425 of the 1985 Act that it should alter the rights existing between the company and the creditors or members with whom it is made. No doubt in most cases it will alter those rights. But, provided that the context and content of the scheme are such as properly to constitute an arrangement between the company and the members or creditors concerned, it will fall within s. 425. It is ... neither necessary nor desirable to attempt a definition of arrangement. The legislature has not done so. To insist on an alteration of rights, or a termination of rights as in the case of schemes to effect takeovers or mergers, is to impose a restriction which is neither warranted by the statutory language nor justified by the courts' approach

over many years to give the term its widest meaning. *Nor is an arrangement necessarily outside the section, because its effect is to alter the rights of creditors against another party or because such alteration could be achieved by a scheme of arrangement with that party.* [Emphasis added.]

67 I find Richard J.'s analysis helpful and persuasive. In effect, the claimants in *T&N* were being asked to release their claims against the EL insurers in exchange for a call on the fund. Here, the appellants are being required to release their claims against certain financial third parties in exchange for what is anticipated to be an improved position for all ABCP Noteholders, stemming from the contributions the financial third parties are making to the ABCP restructuring. The situations are quite comparable.

#### *The Binding Mechanism*

68 Parliament's reliance on the expansive terms "compromise" or "arrangement" does not stand alone, however. Effective insolvency restructurings would not be possible without a statutory mechanism to bind an unwilling minority of creditors. Unanimity is frequently impossible in such situations. But the minority must be protected too. Parliament's solution to this quandary was to permit a wide range of proposals to be negotiated and put forward (the compromise or arrangement) and to bind all creditors by class to the terms of the plan, but to do so only where the proposal can gain the support of the requisite "double majority" of votes<sup>6</sup> and obtain the sanction of the court on the basis that it is fair and reasonable. In this way, the scheme of the CCAA supports the intention of Parliament to encourage a wide variety of solutions to corporate insolvencies without unjustifiably overriding the rights of dissenting creditors.

#### *The Required Nexus*

69 In keeping with this scheme and purpose, I do not suggest that any and all releases between creditors of the debtor company seeking to restructure and third parties may be made the subject of a compromise or arrangement between the debtor and its creditors. Nor do I think the fact that the releases may be "necessary" in the sense that the third parties or the debtor may refuse to proceed without them, of itself, advances the argument in favour of finding jurisdiction (although it may well be relevant in terms of the fairness and reasonableness analysis).

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

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

- a) The parties to be released are necessary and essential to the restructuring of the debtor;
- b) *The claims to be released are rationally related to the purpose of the Plan and necessary for it;*
- c) The Plan cannot succeed without the releases;
- d) *The parties who are to have claims against them released are contributing in a tangible and realistic way to the Plan; and*

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

72 Here, then -- as was the case in *T&N* -- there is a close connection between the claims being released and the restructuring proposal. The tort claims arise out of the sale and distribution of the ABCP Notes and their collapse in value, just as do the contractual claims of the creditors against the debtor companies. The purpose of the restructuring is to stabilize and shore up the value of those notes in the long run. The third parties being released are making separate contributions to enable those results to materialize. Those contributions are identified earlier, at para. 31 of these reasons. The application judge found that the claims being released are not independent of or unrelated to the claims that the Noteholders have against the debtor companies; they are closely connected to the value of the ABCP Notes and are required for the Plan to succeed. At paras. 76-77 he said:

[76] I do not consider that the Plan in this case involves a change in relationship among creditors "that does not directly involve the Company." Those who support the Plan and are to be released are "directly involved in the Company" in the sense that many are foregoing immediate rights to assets and are providing real and tangible input for the preservation and enhancement of the Notes. It would be unduly restrictive to suggest that the moving parties' claims against released parties do not involve the Company, since the claims are directly related to the value of the Notes. The value of the Notes is in this case the value of the Company.

[77] This Plan, as it deals with releases, doesn't change the relationship of the creditors apart from involving the Company and its Notes.

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

#### The Jurisprudence

74 Third party releases have become a frequent feature in Canadian restructurings since the decision of the Alberta Court of Queen's Bench in *Re Canadian Airlines Corp.* (2000), 265 A.R. 201, leave to appeal refused by *Resurgence Asset Management LLC v. Canadian Airlines Corp.* (2000), 266 A.R. 131 (C.A.), and [2001] S.C.C.A. No. 60, (2001) 293 A.R. 351 (S.C.C.). In *Re Muscle Tech Research and Development Inc.* (2006), 25 C.B.R. (5th) 231 (Ont. S.C.J.) Justice Ground remarked (para. 8):

[It] is not uncommon in CCAA proceedings, in the context of a plan of compromise and arrangement, to compromise claims against the Applicants and other parties against whom such claims or related claims are made.

75 We were referred to at least a dozen court-approved CCAA plans from across the country that included broad third-party releases. With the exception of *Re Canadian Airlines*, however, the releases in those restructurings -- including *Muscle Tech* -- were not opposed. The appellants argue that those cases are wrongly decided, because the court simply does not have the authority to approve such releases.

76 In *Re Canadian Airlines* the releases in question were opposed, however. Paperny J. (as she then was) concluded the court had jurisdiction to approve them and her decision is said to be the well-spring of the trend towards third-party releases referred to above. Based on the foregoing analysis, I agree with her conclusion although for reasons that differ from those cited by her.

77 Justice Paperny began her analysis of the release issue with the observation at para. 87 that "[p]rior to 1997, the CCAA did not provide for compromises of claims against anyone other than the petitioning company." It will be apparent from the analysis in these reasons that I do not accept that premise, notwithstanding the decision of the Quebec Court of Appeal in *Michaud v. Steinberg*,<sup>7</sup> of which her comment may have been reflective. Paperny J.'s reference to 1997 was a reference to the amendments of that year adding s. 5.1 to the CCAA, which provides for limited releases in favour of directors. Given the limited scope of s. 5.1, Justice Paperny was thus faced with the argument -- dealt with later in these reasons -- that Parliament must not have intended to extend the authority to approve third-party releases beyond the scope of this section. She chose to address this contention by concluding that, although the amendments "[did] not authorize a release of claims against third parties other than directors, [they did] not prohibit such releases either" (para. 92).

78 Respectfully, I would not adopt the interpretive principle that the CCAA permits releases because it does not expressly prohibit them. Rather, as I explain in these reasons, I believe the open-ended CCAA permits third-party releases that are reasonably related to the restructuring at issue because they are encompassed in the comprehensive terms "compromise" and "arrangement" and because of the double-voting majority and court sanctioning statutory mechanism that makes them binding on unwilling creditors.

79 The appellants rely on a number of authorities, which they submit support the proposition that the CCAA may not be used to compromise claims as between anyone other than the debtor company and its creditors. Principal amongst these are *Michaud v. Steinberg, supra*; *NBD Bank, Canada v. Dofasco Inc.*, (1999), 46 O.R. (3d) 514 (C.A.); *Pacific Coastal Airlines Ltd. v. Air Canada* (2001), 19 B.L.R. (3d) 286 (B.C.S.C.); and *Re Stelco Inc.* (2005), 78 O.R. (3d) 241 (C.A.) ("*Stelco I*"). I do not think these cases assist the appellants, however. With the exception of *Steinberg*, they do not involve third party claims that were reasonably connected to the restructuring. As I shall explain, it is my opinion that *Steinberg* does not express a correct view of the law, and I decline to follow it.

80 In *Pacific Coastal Airlines*, Tysoe J. made the following comment at para. 24:

[The purpose of the CCAA proceeding] is not to deal with disputes between a creditor of a company and a third party, even if the company was also involved in the subject matter of the dispute. While issues between the debtor company and non-creditors are sometimes dealt with in CCAA proceedings, it is not a proper use of a CCAA proceeding to determine disputes between parties other than the debtor company.

81 This statement must be understood in its context, however. Pacific Coastal Airlines had been a regional carrier for Canadian Airlines prior to the CCAA reorganization of the latter in 2000. In the action in question it was seeking to assert separate tort claims against Air Canada for contractual interference and inducing breach of contract in relation to certain rights it had to the use of Canadian's flight designator code prior to the CCAA proceeding. Air Canada sought to have the action

dismissed on grounds of *res judicata* or issue estoppel because of the CCAA proceeding. Tysoe J. rejected the argument.

**82** The facts in *Pacific Coastal* are not analogous to the circumstances of this case, however. There is no suggestion that a resolution of Pacific Coastal's separate tort claim against Air Canada was in any way connected to the Canadian Airlines restructuring, even though Canadian -- at a contractual level -- may have had some involvement with the particular dispute. Here, however, the disputes that are the subject-matter of the impugned releases are not simply "disputes between parties other than the debtor company". They are closely connected to the disputes being resolved between the debtor companies and their creditors and to the restructuring itself.

**83** Nor is the decision of this Court in the *NBD Bank* case dispositive. It arose out of the financial collapse of Algoma Steel, a wholly-owned subsidiary of Dofasco. The Bank had advanced funds to Algoma allegedly on the strength of misrepresentations by Algoma's Vice-President, James Melville. The plan of compromise and arrangement that was sanctioned by Farley J. in the Algoma CCAA restructuring contained a clause releasing Algoma from all claims creditors "may have had against Algoma or its directors, officers, employees and advisors." Mr. Melville was found liable for negligent misrepresentation in a subsequent action by the Bank. On appeal, he argued that since the Bank was barred from suing Algoma for misrepresentation by its officers, permitting it to pursue the same cause of action against him personally would subvert the CCAA process -- in short, he was personally protected by the CCAA release.

**84** Rosenberg J.A., writing for this Court, rejected this argument. The appellants here rely particularly upon his following observations at paras. 53-54:

53 In my view, the appellant has not demonstrated that allowing the respondent to pursue its claim against him would undermine or subvert the purposes of the Act. As this court noted in *Elan Corp. v. Comiskey* (1990), 1 O.R. (3d) 289 at 297, the CCAA is remedial legislation "intended to provide a structured environment for the negotiation of compromises between a debtor company and its creditors for the benefit of both". It is a means of avoiding a liquidation that may yield little for the creditors, especially unsecured creditors like the respondent, and the debtor company shareholders. However, the appellant has not shown that allowing a creditor to continue an action against an officer for negligent misrepresentation would erode the effectiveness of the Act.

54 In fact, to refuse on policy grounds to impose liability on an officer of the corporation for negligent misrepresentation would contradict the policy of Parliament as demonstrated in recent amendments to the CCAA and the *Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act*, R.S.C. 1985, c. B-3. Those Acts now contemplate that an arrangement or proposal may include a term for compromise of certain types of claims against directors of the company except claims that "are based on allegations of misrepresentations made by directors". L.W. Houlden and C.H. Morawetz, the editors of *The 2000 Annotated Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act* (Toronto: Carswell, 1999) at p. 192 are of the view that the policy behind the provision is to encourage directors of an insolvent corporation to remain in office so that the affairs of the corporation can be reorganized. I can see no similar policy interest in barring an action against an officer of the company who, prior to

the insolvency, has misrepresented the financial affairs of the corporation to its creditors. It may be necessary to permit the compromise of claims against the debtor corporation, otherwise it may not be possible to successfully reorganize the corporation. The same considerations do not apply to individual officers. Rather, it would seem to me that it would be contrary to good policy to immunize officers from the consequences of their negligent statements which might otherwise be made in anticipation of being forgiven under a subsequent corporate proposal or arrangement. [Footnote omitted.]

**85** Once again, this statement must be assessed in context. Whether Justice Farley had the authority in the earlier Algoma CCAA proceedings to sanction a plan that included third party releases was not under consideration at all. What the Court was determining in *NBD Bank* was whether the release extended by its terms to protect a third party. In fact, on its face, it does not appear to do so. Justice Rosenberg concluded only that not allowing Mr. Melville to rely upon the release did not subvert the purpose of the CCAA. As the application judge here observed, "there is little factual similarity in *NBD* to the facts now before the Court" (para. 71). Contrary to the facts of this case, in *NBD Bank* the creditors had not agreed to grant a release to officers; they had not voted on such a release and the court had not assessed the fairness and reasonableness of such a release as a term of a complex arrangement involving significant contributions by the beneficiaries of the release -- as is the situation here. Thus, *NBD Bank* is of little assistance in determining whether the court has authority to sanction a plan that calls for third party releases.

**86** The appellants also rely upon the decision of this Court in *Stelco I*. There, the Court was dealing with the scope of the CCAA in connection with a dispute over what were called the "Turn-over Payments". Under an inter-creditor agreement one group of creditors had subordinated their rights to another group and agreed to hold in trust and "turn over" any proceeds received from Stelco until the senior group was paid in full. On a disputed classification motion, the Subordinated Debt Holders argued that they should be in a separate class from the Senior Debt Holders. Farley J. refused to make such an order in the court below, stating:

[Sections] 4, 5 and 6 [of the CCAA] talk of compromises or arrangements between a company and its creditors. There is no mention of this extending by statute to encompass a change of relationship among the creditors vis-à-vis the creditors themselves *and not directly involving the company*. [Citations omitted; emphasis added.]

See *Re Stelco Inc.* (2005), 15 C.B.R. (5th) 297 (Ont. S.C.J.) at para. 7.

**87** This Court upheld that decision. The legal relationship between each group of creditors and Stelco was the same, albeit there were inter-creditor differences, and creditors were to be classified in accordance with their legal rights. In addition, the need for timely classification and voting decisions in the CCAA process militated against enmeshing the classification process in the vagaries of inter-corporate disputes. In short, the issues before the Court were quite different from those raised on this appeal.

**88** Indeed, the Stelco plan, as sanctioned, included third party releases (albeit uncontested ones). This Court subsequently dealt with the same inter-creditor agreement on an appeal where the Subordinated Debt Holders argued that the inter-creditor subordination provisions were beyond the

reach of the CCAA and therefore that they were entitled to a separate civil action to determine their rights under the agreement: *Re Stelco Inc.*, (2006), 21 C.B.R. (5th) 157 (Ont. C.A.) ("*Stelco II*"). The Court rejected that argument and held that where the creditors' rights amongst themselves were sufficiently related to the debtor and its plan, they were properly brought within the scope of the CCAA plan. The Court said (para. 11):

In [*Stelco I*] -- the classification case -- the court observed that it is not a proper use of a CCAA proceeding to determine disputes between parties other than the debtor company ... [*H*]owever, the present case is not simply an inter-creditor dispute that does not involve the debtor company; it is a dispute that is inextricably connected to the restructuring process. [Emphasis added.]

**89** The approach I would take to the disposition of this appeal is consistent with that view. As I have noted, the third party releases here are very closely connected to the ABCP restructuring process.

**90** Some of the appellants -- particularly those represented by Mr. Woods -- rely heavily upon the decision of the Quebec Court of Appeal in *Michaud v. Steinberg, supra*. They say that it is determinative of the release issue. In *Steinberg*, the Court held that the CCAA, as worded at the time, did not permit the release of directors of the debtor corporation and that third-party releases were not within the purview of the Act. Deschamps J.A. (as she then was) said (paras. 42, 54 and 58 -- English translation):

[42] Even if one can understand the extreme pressure weighing on the creditors and the respondent at the time of the sanctioning, a plan of arrangement is not the appropriate forum to settle disputes other than the claims that are the subject of the arrangement. In other words, one cannot, under the pretext of an absence of formal directives in the Act, transform an arrangement into a potpourri.

...

[54] The Act offers the respondent a way to arrive at a compromise with its creditors. It does not go so far as to offer an umbrella to all the persons within its orbit by permitting them to shelter themselves from any recourse.

...

[58] The [CCAA] and the case law clearly do not permit extending the application of an arrangement to persons other than the respondent and its creditors and, consequently, the plan should not have been sanctioned as is [that is, including the releases of the directors].

**91** Justices Vallerand and Delisle, in separate judgments, agreed. Justice Vallerand summarized his view of the consequences of extending the scope of the CCAA to third party releases in this fashion (para. 7):

In short, the Act will have become the Companies' and Their Officers and Employees Creditors Arrangement Act -- an awful mess -- and likely not attain its purpose, which is to enable the company to survive in the face of *its* creditors and

through their will, and not in the face of the creditors of its officers. This is why I feel, just like my colleague, that such a clause is contrary to the Act's mode of operation, contrary to its purposes and, for this reason, is to be banned.

**92** Justice Delisle, on the other hand, appears to have rejected the releases because of their broad nature -- they released directors from all claims, including those that were altogether unrelated to their corporate duties with the debtor company -- rather than because of a lack of authority to sanction under the Act. Indeed, he seems to have recognized the wide range of circumstances that could be included within the term "compromise or arrangement". He is the only one who addressed that term. At para. 90 he said:

The CCAA is drafted in general terms. It does not specify, among other things, what must be understood by "compromise or arrangement". However, it may be inferred from the purpose of this [A]ct that these terms *encompass all that should enable the person who has recourse to it to fully dispose of his debts*, both those that exist on the date when he has recourse to the statute and *those contingent on the insolvency in which he finds himself ...* [Emphasis added.]

**93** The decision of the Court did not reflect a view that the terms of a compromise or arrangement should "encompass all that should enable the person who has recourse to [the Act] to dispose of his debts ... and those contingent on the insolvency in which he finds himself," however. On occasion such an outlook might embrace third parties other than the debtor and its creditors in order to make the arrangement work. Nor would it be surprising that, in such circumstances, the third parties might seek the protection of releases, or that the debtor might do so on their behalf. Thus, the perspective adopted by the majority in *Steinberg*, in my view, is too narrow, having regard to the language, purpose and objects of the CCAA and the intention of Parliament. They made no attempt to consider and explain why a compromise or arrangement could not include third-party releases. In addition, the decision appears to have been based, at least partly, on a rejection of the use of contract-law concepts in analysing the Act -- an approach inconsistent with the jurisprudence referred to above.

**94** Finally, the majority in *Steinberg* seems to have proceeded on the basis that the CCAA cannot interfere with civil or property rights under Quebec law. Mr. Woods advanced this argument before this Court in his factum, but did not press it in oral argument. Indeed, he conceded that if the Act encompasses the authority to sanction a plan containing third-party releases -- as I have concluded it does -- the provisions of the CCAA, as valid federal insolvency legislation, are paramount over provincial legislation. I shall return to the constitutional issues raised by the appellants later in these reasons.

**95** Accordingly, to the extent *Steinberg* stands for the proposition that the court does not have authority under the CCAA to sanction a plan that incorporates third-party releases, I do not believe it to be a correct statement of the law and I respectfully decline to follow it. The modern approach to interpretation of the Act in accordance with its nature and purpose militates against a narrow interpretation and towards one that facilitates and encourages compromises and arrangements. Had the majority in *Steinberg* considered the broad nature of the terms "compromise" and "arrangement" and the jurisprudence I have referred to above, they might well have come to a different conclusion.

**96** *Steinberg* led to amendments to the CCAA, however. In 1997, s. 5.1 was added, dealing specifically with releases pertaining to directors of the debtor company. It states:

5.1 (1) A compromise or arrangement made in respect of a debtor company may include in its terms provision for the compromise of claims against directors of the company that arose before the commencement of proceedings under this Act and that relate to the obligations of the company where the directors are by law liable in their capacity as directors for the payment of such obligations.

Exception

- (2) A provision for the compromise of claims against directors may not include claims that
- (a) relate to contractual rights of one or more creditors; or
- (b) are based on allegations of misrepresentations made by directors to creditors or of wrongful or oppressive conduct by directors.

Powers of court

- (3) The court may declare that a claim against directors shall not be compromised if it is satisfied that the compromise would not be fair and reasonable in the circumstances.

Resignation or removal of directors

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

1997, c. 12, s. 122.

**97** Perhaps the appellants' strongest argument is that these amendments confirm a prior lack of authority in the court to sanction a plan including third party releases. If the power existed, why would Parliament feel it necessary to add an amendment specifically permitting such releases (subject to the exceptions indicated) in favour of directors? *Expressio unius est exclusio alterius*, is the Latin maxim sometimes relied on to articulate the principle of interpretation implied in that question: to express or include one thing implies the exclusion of the other.

**98** The maxim is not helpful in these circumstances, however. The reality is that there *may* be another explanation why Parliament acted as it did. As one commentator has noted:<sup>8</sup>

Far from being a rule, [the maxim *expressio unius*] is not even lexicographically accurate, because it is simply not true, generally, that the mere express conferral of a right or privilege in one kind of situation implies the denial of the equivalent right or privilege in other kinds. Sometimes it does and sometimes it does not,

and whether it does or does not depends on the particular circumstances of context. Without contextual support, therefore there is not even a mild presumption here. Accordingly, the maxim is at best a description, after the fact, of what the court has discovered from context.

**99** As I have said, the 1997 amendments to the CCAA providing for releases in favour of directors of debtor companies in limited circumstances were a response to the decision of the Quebec Court of Appeal in *Steinberg*. A similar amendment was made with respect to proposals in the BIA at the same time. The rationale behind these amendments was to encourage directors of an insolvent company to remain in office during a restructuring, rather than resign. The assumption was that by remaining in office the directors would provide some stability while the affairs of the company were being reorganized: see Houlden and Morawetz, vol. 1, *supra*, at 2-144, Es.11A; *Le Royal Penfield Inc. (Syndic de)*, [2003] R.J.Q. 2157 at paras. 44-46 (C.S.).

**100** Parliament thus had a particular focus and a particular purpose in enacting the 1997 amendments to the CCAA and the BIA. While there is some merit in the appellants' argument on this point, at the end of the day I do not accept that Parliament intended to signal by its enactment of s. 5.1 that it was depriving the court of authority to sanction plans of compromise or arrangement in all circumstances where they incorporate third party releases in favour of anyone other than the debtor's directors. For the reasons articulated above, I am satisfied that the court does have the authority to do so. Whether it sanctions the plan is a matter for the fairness hearing.

#### The Deprivation of Proprietary Rights

**101** Mr. Shapray very effectively led the appellants' argument that legislation must not be construed so as to interfere with or prejudice established contractual or proprietary rights -- including the right to bring an action -- in the absence of a clear indication of legislative intention to that effect: *Halsbury's Laws of England*, 4th ed. reissue, vol. 44 (1) (London: Butterworths, 1995) at paras. 1438, 1464 and 1467; Driedger, 2nd ed., *supra*, at 183; Ruth Sullivan, *Sullivan and Driedger on the Construction of Statutes*, 4th ed., (Markham: Butterworths, 2002) at 399. I accept the importance of this principle. For the reasons I have explained, however, I am satisfied that Parliament's intention to clothe the court with authority to consider and sanction a plan that contains third party releases is expressed with sufficient clarity in the "compromise or arrangement" language of the CCAA coupled with the statutory voting and sanctioning mechanism making the provisions of the plan binding on all creditors. This is not a situation of impermissible "gap-filling" in the case of legislation severely affecting property rights; it is a question of finding meaning in the language of the Act itself. I would therefore not give effect to the appellants' submissions in this regard.

#### The Division of Powers and Paramountcy

**102** Mr. Woods and Mr. Sternberg submit that extending the reach of the CCAA process to the compromise of claims as between solvent creditors of the debtor company and solvent third parties to the proceeding is constitutionally impermissible. They say that under the guise of the federal insolvency power pursuant to s. 91(21) of the *Constitution Act, 1867*, this approach would improperly affect the rights of civil claimants to assert their causes of action, a provincial matter falling within s. 92(13), and contravene the rules of public order pursuant to the *Civil Code of Quebec*.

**103** I do not accept these submissions. It has long been established that the CCAA is valid federal legislation under the federal insolvency power: *Reference re: Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act (Canada)*, [1934] S.C.R. 659. As the Supreme Court confirmed in that case (p. 661), citing

Viscount Cave L.C. in *Royal Bank of Canada v. Larue* [1928] A.C. 187, "the exclusive legislative authority to deal with all matters within the domain of bankruptcy and insolvency is vested in Parliament." Chief Justice Duff elaborated:

Matters normally constituting part of a bankruptcy scheme but not in their essence matters of bankruptcy and insolvency may, of course, from another point of view and in another aspect be dealt with by a provincial legislature; but, when treated as matters pertaining to bankruptcy and insolvency, they clearly fall within the legislative authority of the Dominion.

**104** That is exactly the case here. The power to sanction a plan of compromise or arrangement that contains third-party releases of the type opposed by the appellants is embedded in the wording of the CCAA. The fact that this may interfere with a claimant's right to pursue a civil action -- normally a matter of provincial concern -- or trump Quebec rules of public order is constitutionally immaterial. The CCAA is a valid exercise of federal power. Provided the matter in question falls within the legislation directly or as necessarily incidental to the exercise of that power, the CCAA governs. To the extent that its provisions are inconsistent with provincial legislation, the federal legislation is paramount. Mr. Woods properly conceded this during argument.

#### Conclusion With Respect to Legal Authority

**105** For all of the foregoing reasons, then, I conclude that the application judge had the jurisdiction and legal authority to sanction the Plan as put forward.

#### **(2) The Plan is "Fair and Reasonable"**

**106** The second major attack on the application judge's decision is that he erred in finding that the Plan is "fair and reasonable" and in sanctioning it on that basis. This attack is centred on the nature of the third-party releases contemplated and, in particular, on the fact that they will permit the release of some claims based in fraud.

**107** Whether a plan of compromise or arrangement is fair and reasonable is a matter of mixed fact and law, and one on which the application judge exercises a large measure of discretion. The standard of review on this issue is therefore one of deference. In the absence of a demonstrable error an appellate court will not interfere: see *Re Ravelston Corp. Ltd.* (2007), 31 C.B.R. (5th) 233 (Ont. C.A.).

**108** I would not interfere with the application judge's decision in this regard. While the notion of releases in favour of third parties -- including leading Canadian financial institutions -- that extend to claims of fraud is distasteful, there is no legal impediment to the inclusion of a release for claims based in fraud in a plan of compromise or arrangement. The application judge had been living with and supervising the ABCP restructuring from its outset. He was intimately attuned to its dynamics. In the end he concluded that the benefits of the Plan to the creditors as a whole, and to the debtor companies, outweighed the negative aspects of compelling the unwilling appellants to execute the releases as finally put forward.

**109** The application judge was concerned about the inclusion of fraud in the contemplated releases and at the May hearing adjourned the final disposition of the sanctioning hearing in an effort to encourage the parties to negotiate a resolution. The result was the "fraud carve-out" referred to earlier in these reasons.

**110** The appellants argue that the fraud carve-out is inadequate because of its narrow scope. It (i) applies only to ABCP Dealers, (ii) limits the type of damages that may be claimed (no punitive damages, for example), (iii) defines "fraud" narrowly, excluding many rights that would be protected by common law, equity and the Quebec concept of public order, and (iv) limits claims to representations made directly to Noteholders. The appellants submit it is contrary to public policy to sanction a plan containing such a limited restriction on the type of fraud claims that may be pursued against the third parties.

**111** The law does not condone fraud. It is the most serious kind of civil claim. There is therefore some force to the appellants' submission. On the other hand, as noted, there is no legal impediment to granting the release of an antecedent claim in fraud, provided the claim is in the contemplation of the parties to the release at the time it is given: *Fotinis Restaurant Corp. v. White Spot Ltd.* (1998), 38 B.L.R. (2d) 251 at paras. 9 and 18 (B.C.S.C.). There may be disputes about the scope or extent of what is released, but parties are entitled to settle allegations of fraud in civil proceedings -- the claims here all being untested allegations of fraud -- and to include releases of such claims as part of that settlement.

**112** The application judge was alive to the merits of the appellants' submissions. He was satisfied in the end, however, that the need "to avoid the potential cascade of litigation that ... would result if a broader 'carve out' were to be allowed" (para. 113) outweighed the negative aspects of approving releases with the narrower carve-out provision. Implementation of the Plan, in his view, would work to the overall greater benefit of the Noteholders as a whole. I can find no error in principle in the exercise of his discretion in arriving at this decision. It was his call to make.

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

- a) The parties to be released are necessary and essential to the restructuring of the debtor;
- b) The claims to be released are rationally related to the purpose of the Plan and necessary for it;
- c) The Plan cannot succeed without the releases;
- d) The parties who are to have claims against them released are contributing in a tangible and realistic way to the Plan;
- e) The Plan will benefit not only the debtor companies but creditor Noteholders generally;
- f) The voting creditors who have approved the Plan did so with knowledge of the nature and effect of the releases; and that,
- g) The releases are fair and reasonable and not overly broad or offensive to public policy.

**114** These findings are all supported on the record. Contrary to the submission of some of the appellants, they do not constitute a new and hitherto untried "test" for the sanctioning of a plan under the CCAA. They simply represent findings of fact and inferences on the part of the application judge that underpin his conclusions on jurisdiction and fairness.

**115** The appellants all contend that the obligation to release the third parties from claims in fraud, tort, breach of fiduciary duty, etc. is confiscatory and amounts to a requirement that they -- as individual creditors -- make the equivalent of a greater financial contribution to the Plan. In his usual lively fashion, Mr. Sternberg asked us the same rhetorical question he posed to the application judge. As he put it, how could the court countenance the compromise of what in the future might turn out to be fraud perpetrated at the highest levels of Canadian and foreign banks? Several appellants complain that the proposed Plan is unfair to them because they will make very little additional recovery if the Plan goes forward, but will be required to forfeit a cause of action against third-party financial institutions that may yield them significant recovery. Others protest that they are being treated unequally because they are ineligible for relief programs that Liquidity Providers such as Canaccord have made available to other smaller investors.

**116** All of these arguments are persuasive to varying degrees when considered in isolation. The application judge did not have that luxury, however. He was required to consider the circumstances of the restructuring as a whole, including the reality that many of the financial institutions were not only acting as Dealers or brokers of the ABCP Notes (with the impugned releases relating to the financial institutions in these capacities, for the most part) but also as Asset and Liquidity Providers (with the financial institutions making significant contributions to the restructuring in these capacities).

**117** In insolvency restructuring proceedings almost everyone loses something. To the extent that creditors are required to compromise their claims, it can always be proclaimed that their rights are being unfairly confiscated and that they are being called upon to make the equivalent of a further financial contribution to the compromise or arrangement. Judges have observed on a number of occasions that CCAA proceedings involve "a balancing of prejudices," inasmuch as everyone is adversely affected in some fashion.

**118** Here, the debtor corporations being restructured represent the issuers of the more than \$32 billion in non-bank sponsored ABCP Notes. The proposed compromise and arrangement affects that entire segment of the ABCP market and the financial markets as a whole. In that respect, the application judge was correct in adverting to the importance of the restructuring to the resolution of the ABCP liquidity crisis and to the need to restore confidence in the financial system in Canada. He was required to consider and balance the interests of all Noteholders, not just the interests of the appellants, whose notes represent only about 3% of that total. That is what he did.

**119** The application judge noted at para. 126 that the Plan represented "a reasonable balance between benefit to all Noteholders and enhanced recovery for those who can make out specific claims in fraud" within the fraud carve-out provisions of the releases. He also recognized at para. 134 that:

No Plan of this size and complexity could be expected to satisfy all affected by it. The size of the majority who have approved it is testament to its overall fairness. No plan to address a crisis of this magnitude can work perfect equity among all stakeholders.

**120** In my view we ought not to interfere with his decision that the Plan is fair and reasonable in all the circumstances.

#### **D. DISPOSITION**

**121** For the foregoing reasons, I would grant leave to appeal from the decision of Justice Campbell, but dismiss the appeal.

R.A. BLAIR J.A.

J.I. LASKIN J.A.:-- I agree.

E.A. CRONK J.A.:-- I agree.

\* \* \* \* \*

**SCHEDULE "A" - CONDUITS**

Apollo Trust

Apsley Trust

Aria Trust

Aurora Trust

Comet Trust

Encore Trust

Gemini Trust

Ironstone Trust

MMAI-I Trust

Newshore Canadian Trust

Opus Trust

Planet Trust

Rocket Trust

Selkirk Funding Trust

Silverstone Trust

Slate Trust

Structured Asset Trust

Structured Investment Trust III

Symphony Trust

Whitehall Trust

\* \* \* \* \*

**SCHEDULE "B" - APPLICANTS**

ATB Financial

Caisse de Dépôt et Placement du Québec

Canaccord Capital Corporation

Canada Post Corporation

Credit Union Central of Alberta Limited  
Credit Union Central of British Columbia  
Credit Union Central of Canada  
Credit Union Central of Ontario  
Credit Union Central of Saskatchewan  
Desjardins Group  
Magna International Inc.  
National Bank Financial Inc./National Bank of Canada  
NAV Canada  
Northwater Capital Management Inc.  
Public Sector Pension Investment Board  
The Governors of the University of Alberta

\* \* \* \* \*

**SCHEDULE "A" - COUNSEL**

- 1) Benjamin Zarnett and Frederick L. Myers for the Pan-Canadian Investors Committee.
- 2) Aubrey E. Kauffman and Stuart Brotman for 4446372 Canada Inc. and 6932819 Canada Inc.
- 3) Peter F.C. Howard and Samaneh Hosseini for Bank of America N.A.; Citibank N.A.; Citibank Canada, in its capacity as Credit Derivative Swap Counterparty and not in any other capacity; Deutsche Bank AG; HSBC Bank Canada; HSBC Bank USA, National Association; Merrill Lynch International; Merrill Lynch Capital Services, Inc.; Swiss Re Financial Products Corporation; and UBS AG.
- 4) Kenneth T. Rosenberg, Lily Harmer and Max Starnino for Jura Energy Corporation and Redcorp Ventures Ltd.
- 5) Craig J. Hill and Sam P. Rappos for the Monitors (ABCP Appeals).
- 6) Jeffrey C. Carhart and Joseph Marin for Ad Hoc Committee and Pricewaterhouse Coopers Inc., in its capacity as Financial Advisor.
- 7) Mario J. Forte for Caisse de Dépôt et Placement du Québec.
- 8) John B. Laskin for National Bank Financial Inc. and National Bank of Canada.
- 9) Thomas McRae and Arthur O. Jacques for Ad Hoc Retail Creditors Committee (Brian Hunter, et al).
- 10) Howard Shapray, Q.C. and Stephen Fitterman for Ivanhoe Mines Ltd.
- 11) Kevin P. McElcheran and Heather L. Meredith for Canadian Banks, BMO, CIBC RBC, Bank of Nova Scotia and T.D. Bank.

- 12) Jeffrey S. Leon for CIBC Mellon Trust Company, Computershare Trust Company of Canada and BNY Trust Company of Canada, as Indenture Trustees.
- 13) Usman Sheikh for Coventree Capital Inc.
- 14) Allan Sternberg and Sam R. Sasso for Brookfield Asset Management and Partners Ltd. and Hy Bloom Inc. and Cardacian Mortgage Services Inc.
- 15) Neil C. Saxe for Dominion Bond Rating Service.
- 16) James A. Woods, Sebastien Richemont and Marie-Anne Paquette for Air Transat A.T. Inc., Transat Tours Canada Inc., The Jean Coutu Group (PJC) Inc., Aéroports de Montréal, Aéroports de Montréal Capital Inc., Pomerleau Ontario Inc., Pomerleau Inc., Labopharm Inc., Agence Métropolitaine de Transport (AMT), Giro Inc., Vêtements de sports RGR Inc., 131519 Canada Inc., Tecsys Inc., New Gold Inc. and Jazz Air LP.
- 17) Scott A. Turner for Webtech Wireless Inc., Wynn Capital Corporation Inc., West Energy Ltd., Sabre Energy Ltd., Petrolifera Petroleum Ltd., Vaquero Resources Ltd., and Standard Energy Ltd.
- 18) R. Graham Phoenix for Metcalfe & Mansfield Alternative Investments II Corp., Metcalfe & Mansfield Alternative Investments III Corp., Metcalfe & Mansfield Alternative Investments V Corp., Metcalfe & Mansfield Alternative Investments XI Corp., Metcalfe & Mansfield Alternative Investments XII Corp., Quanto Financial Corporation and Metcalfe & Mansfield Capital Corp.

cp/e/ln/qlkxl/qlkbb/qltl/qlrxg/qlhcs/qlcas/qlhcs/qlhcs

1 Section 5.1 of the CCAA specifically authorizes the granting of releases to directors in certain circumstances.

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

3 Citing Gibbs J.A. in *Chef Ready Foods*, *supra*, at pp. 319-320.

4 The Legislative Debates at the time the CCAA was introduced in Parliament in April 1933 make it clear that the CCAA is patterned after the predecessor provisions of s. 425 of the *Companies Act 1985* (U.K.): see *House of Commons Debates (Hansard)*, *supra*.

5 See *Canada Business Corporations Act*, R.S.C. 1985, c. C-44, s. 192; *Ontario Business Corporations Act*, R.S.O. 1990, c. B.16, s. 182.

6 A majority in number representing two-thirds in value of the creditors (s. 6).

7 *Steinberg* was originally reported in French: [1993] R.J.Q. 1684 (C.A.). All paragraph references to *Steinberg* in this judgment are from the unofficial English translation available at 1993 CarswellQue 2055.

8 Reed Dickerson, *The Interpretation and Application of Statutes* (1975) at pp. 234-235, cited in Bryan A. Garner, ed., *Black's Law Dictionary*, 8th ed. (West Group, St. Paul, Minn., 2004) at 621.

# TAB 4

*Case Name:*  
**Nortel Networks Corp. (Re)**

**IN THE MATTER OF the Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act,  
R.S.C. 1985, c. C-36, as amended  
AND IN THE MATTER OF a Plan of Compromise or Arrangement of  
Nortel Networks Corporation, Nortel Networks Limited, Nortel  
Networks Global Corporation, Nortel Networks International  
Corporation and Nortel Networks Technology Corporation  
Between  
Donald Sproule, David D. Archibald and Michael Campbell on  
their own behalf and on behalf of Former Employees of Nortel  
Networks Corporation, Nortel Networks Limited, Nortel Networks  
Global Corporation, Nortel Networks International Corporation  
and Nortel Networks Technology Corporation, Appellants, and  
Nortel Networks Corporation, Nortel Networks Limited, Nortel  
Networks Global Corporation, Nortel Networks International  
Corporation and Nortel Networks Technology Corporation, the  
Board of Directors of Nortel Networks Corporation and Nortel  
Networks Limited, the Informal Nortel Noteholder Group, the  
Official Committee of Unsecured Creditors and Ernst & Young  
Inc. in its capacity as Monitor, Respondents  
And between  
National Automobile, Aerospace, Transportation and General  
Workers Union of Canada (CAW-Canada) and its Locals 27, 1525,  
1530, 1535, 1837, 1839, 1905 and/or 1915, George Borosh and  
other retirees of Nortel Networks Corporation, Nortel Networks  
Limited, Nortel Networks Global Corporation, Nortel Networks  
International Corporation and Nortel Networks Technology  
Corporation, Appellants, and  
Nortel Networks Corporation, Nortel Networks Limited, Nortel  
Networks Global Corporation, Nortel Networks International  
Corporation and Nortel Networks Technology Corporation, the  
Board of Directors of Nortel Networks Corporation and Nortel  
Networks Limited, the Informal Nortel Noteholder Group, the  
Official Committee of Unsecured Creditors and Ernst & Young  
Inc. in its capacity as Monitor, Respondents**

[2009] O.J. No. 4967

2009 ONCA 833

59 C.B.R. (5th) 23

77 C.C.P.B. 161

99 O.R. (3d) 708

[2010] CLLC para. 210-005

256 O.A.C. 131

2009 CarswellOnt 7383

Dockets: C50986, C50988

Ontario Court of Appeal  
Toronto, Ontario

**S.T. Goudge, K.N. Feldman and R.A. Blair JJ.A.**

Heard: October 1, 2009.

Judgment: November 26, 2009.

(49 paras.)

*Bankruptcy and insolvency law -- Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act (CCAA) matters -- Application of Act -- Appeal by union and former employees of company under protection from dismissal of motion for directions dismissed -- Appellants sought direction requiring company to make periodic retirement and severance payments to former employees as required by collective agreement and provincial employment standards legislation -- Appellate court upheld finding that payments were not exempted from stay provisions of protection order -- Payments sought by union were deferred compensation for past services rather than compensation for current services exempted from the stay -- Payments sought by former employees under provincial standards legislation were not exempted under application of doctrine of paramountcy -- Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act, ss. 11, 11.3(a) -- Employment Standards Act, s. 11(5).*

*Constitutional law -- Constitutional validity of legislation -- Interpretive and constructive doctrines -- Paramountcy doctrine -- Appeal by former employees of company under protection from dismissal of motion for directions dismissed -- Former employees sought direction requiring company to make retirement and severance payments to former employees as required by provincial employment standards legislation -- Appellate court upheld finding that payments were not exempted from stay provisions of protection order under application of doctrine of paramountcy -- To find otherwise would defeat intent of stay provisions providing for restructuring for benefit of all stakeholders -- Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act, ss. 11 -- Employment Standards Act, s. 11(5).*

*Employment law -- Employment standards legislation -- Constitutional issues -- Appeal by former employees of company under protection from dismissal of motion for directions dismissed -- Former employees sought direction requiring company to make retirement and severance payments to former employees as required by provincial employment standards legislation -- Appellate court upheld finding that payments were not exempted from stay provisions of protection order under application of doctrine of paramountcy -- To find otherwise would defeat intent of stay provisions providing for restructuring for benefit of all stakeholders -- Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act, ss. 11 -- Employment Standards Act, s. 11(5).*

Two appeals by the former employees of Nortel, and the union, CAW-Canada, from dismissal of their motions for directions. The Nortel companies were granted protection under the Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act (CCAA). The order provided for a stay of all proceedings against Nortel and a suspension of all rights and remedies against Nortel. The collective agreement between Nortel and the union obliged Nortel to make periodic payments to former employees that had retired or been terminated. Nortel ceased making the periodic payments following the protection order. The payments at issue for the union were monthly payments under the Retirement Allowance Plan, payments under the Voluntary Retirement Option and termination and severance payments. The payments at issue for former employees included payments immediately payable pursuant to the Employment Standards Act (ESA) in respect of termination, severance and vacation pay, payments for continuation of benefit plans, certain pension benefit payments and a transitional retirement allowance. The appellants brought a motion for directions requesting an order directing Nortel to resume the periodic payments. The union submitted that the collective agreement was not divisible into separate obligations to current and former employees, and thus the periodic payments fell within the scope of compensation for services exempted from the protection order under s. 11.3(a) of the CCAA. The former employees submitted that the effect of the protection order could not override payments owed under the ESA. In dismissing both motions, the judge distinguished crystallization of the periodic payment obligations under the collective agreement from the provision of a service within the meaning of s. 11.3, as the services of former employees were provided pre-filing of the protection order. The union and the former employees appealed.

HELD: Appeals dismissed. The periodic payments sought by the union were not excluded from the stay provisions of the protection order under s. 11.3(a) of the CCAA. The payments required for current services provided by Nortel's continuing employees did not encompass the periodic retirement or severance payments owed to former employees. Such payments were best characterized as deferred compensation under predecessor collective agreements rather than compensation for services currently being performed for Nortel. In addition, the vested interest of former employees in such payments was inconsistent with current services being the source of the obligation to pay. The statutory payments sought by former employees were not excluded from the stay provisions of the protection order. The stay provisions of the CCAA were intended to freeze Nortel's debt obligations in order to permit restructuring for the benefit of all stakeholders. Upon consideration of the doctrine of paramountcy, such intent would be frustrated if the order did not apply to termination and severance payments owed under the provincial ESA to terminated employees in respect of past services. The effect of the stay related to the timing of the statutory payments rather than the interrelationship between ESA and the CCAA in respect of ultimate payment of Nortel's statutory obligations.

**Statutes, Regulations and Rules Cited:**

Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act, R.S.C. 1985, c. B-3,

Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act, R.S.C. 1985 c. C-36, s. 11, s. 11(3), s. 11(4), s. 11.3(a)

Employment Standards Act, 2000, S.O. 2000, c. 41, s. 11(5)

**Appeal From:**

On appeal from the order of Justice Geoffrey B. Morawetz of the Superior Court of Justice, dated June 18, 2009, with reasons reported at (2009), 55 C.B.R. (5th) 68, [2009] O.J. No. 2558.

**Counsel:**

Mark Zigler, Andrew Hatnay and Andrea McKinnon, for the appellants, Nortel Networks Former Employees.

Barry E. Wadsworth, for the appellant, CAW-Canada.

Suzanne Wood and Alan Mersky, for the respondents, Nortel Networks Limited, Nortel Networks Corporation, Nortel Networks Global Corporation, Nortel Networks International Corporation and Nortel Networks Technology Corporation.

Lyndon A.J. Barnes and Adam Hirsh, for the respondents, Board of Directors of Nortel Networks Corporation and Nortel Networks Limited.

Benjamin Zarnett, for the monitor Ernst & Young Inc.

Gavin H. Finlayson, for the Informal Nortel Noteholder Group.

Thomas McRae, for the Nortel Canadian Continuing Employees.

Massimo Starnino, for the Superintendent of Financial Services.

Alex MacFarlane and Jane Dietrich, for the Official Committee of Unsecured Creditors

The judgment of the Court was delivered by

**1 S.T. GOUDGE and K.N. FELDMAN JJ.A.:**-- On January 14, 2009, the Nortel group of companies (referred to in these reasons as "Nortel") applied for and was granted protection under the *Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act*, R.S.C. 1985 c. C-36, ("*CCAA*").

**2** In order to provide Nortel with breathing space to permit it to file a plan of compromise or arrangement with the court, that order provided, *inter alia*, a stay of all proceedings against Nortel, a suspension of all rights and remedies against Nortel, and an order that during the stay period, no person shall discontinue, repudiate, or cease to perform any contract or agreement with Nortel.

**3** The CAW-Canada ("Union") represents employees of Nortel at two sites in Ontario. The Union and Nortel are parties to a collective agreement covering both sites. On April 21, 2009, the Union and a group of former employees of Nortel ("Former Employees") each brought a motion for

directions seeking certain relief from the order granted to Nortel on January 14, 2009. On June 18, 2009, Morawetz J. denied both motions.

4 The Union and the Former Employees both appealed from that decision. Their appeals were heard one after the other on October 1, 2009. The appeal of the Former Employees was supported by a group of Canadian non-unionized employees, whose employment with Nortel continues. Nortel was supported in opposing the appeals by the board of directors of two of the Nortel companies, an informal Nortel noteholders group, and the Official Committee of Unsecured Creditors of Nortel.

5 We will address each of the two appeals in turn.

## **THE UNION APPEAL**

### **Background**

6 The collective agreement between the Union and Nortel sets out the terms and conditions of employment of the 45 employees that have continued to work for Nortel since January 14, 2009. The collective agreement also obliges Nortel to make certain periodic payments to unionized former employees who have retired or been terminated from Nortel. The three kinds of periodic payments at issue in this proceeding are monthly payments under the Retirement Allowance Plan ("RAP"), payments under the Voluntary Retirement Option ("VRO"), and termination and severance payments to unionized employees who have been terminated or who have severed their employment at Nortel.

7 Since the January 14, 2009 order, Nortel has continued to pay the continuing employees their compensation and benefits as required by the collective agreement. However, as of that date, it ceased to make the periodic payments at issue in this case.

8 The Union's motion requested an order directing Nortel to resume those periodic payments as required by the collective agreement. The Union's argument hinges on s. 11.3(a) of the *CCAA*. At the time this appeal was argued, it read as follows:<sup>1</sup>

11.3 No order made under section 11 shall have the effect of

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

9 The Union's argument before the motion judge was that the collective agreement is a bargain between it and Nortel that ought not to be divided into separate obligations and therefore the "compensation" for services performed under it must include all of Nortel's monetary obligations, not just those owed specifically to those who remain actively employed. The Union argued that the contested periodic payments to Former Employees must be considered part of the compensation for services provided after January 14, 2009, and therefore exempted from the order of that date by s. 11.3(a) of the *CCAA*.

10 The motion judge dismissed this argument. The essence of his reasons is as follows at para. 67:

The flaw in the argument of the Union is that it equates the crystallization of a payment obligation under the Collective Agreement to a provision of a service

within the meaning of s. 11.3. The triggering of the payment obligation may have arisen after the Initial Order but it does not follow that a service has been provided after the Initial Order. Section 11.3 contemplates, in my view, some current activity by a service provider post-filing that gives rise to a payment obligation post-filing. The distinction being that the claims of the Union for termination and severance pay are based, for the most part, on services that were provided pre-filing. Likewise, obligations for benefits arising from RAP and VRO are again based, for the most part, on services provided pre-filing. The exact time of when the payment obligation crystallized is not, in my view, the determining factor under section 11.3. Rather, the key factor is whether the employee performed services after the date of the Initial Order. If so, he or she is entitled to compensation benefits for such current service.

**11** The Union challenges this conclusion.

**12** In this court, neither the Union nor any other party argues that Nortel's obligation to make the contested periodic payments should be decided by arbitration under the collective agreement rather than by the court.

**13** Nor does the Union argue that any of the unionized former employees, who would receive these periodic payments, have themselves provided services to Nortel since the January 14, 2009 order.

**14** Rather, the Union reiterates the argument it made at first instance, namely that these periodic payments are protected by s. 11.3(a) of the *CCAA* as payment for service provided after the January 14, 2009 order was made by the Union members who have continued as employees of Nortel.

**15** In our opinion, this argument must fail.

### **Analysis**

**16** Two preliminary points should be made. First, as the motion judge wrote at para. 47 of his reasons, the acknowledged purpose of the *CCAA* is to facilitate the making of a compromise or arrangement between an insolvent debtor company and its creditors, to the end that the company is able to continue in business. The primary instrument provided by the *CCAA* to achieve its purpose is the power of the court to issue a broad stay of proceedings under s. 11. That power includes the power to stay the debt obligations of the company. The order of January 14, 2009 is an exercise of that power, and must be read in the context of the purpose of the legislation. Nonetheless, it is important to underline that, while that order stays those obligations, it does not eliminate them.

**17** Second, we also agree with the motion judge when he stated at para. 66:

In my view, section 11.3 is an exception to the general stay provision authorized by section 11 provided for in the Initial Order. As such, it seems to me that section 11.3 should be narrowly construed.

**18** Because of s. 11.3(a) of the *CCAA*, the January 14, 2009 order cannot stay Nortel's obligation to make immediate payment for the services provided to it after the date of the order.

**19** What then does the collective agreement require of Nortel as payment for the work done by its continuing employees? The straightforward answer is that the collective agreement sets out in detail the compensation that Nortel must pay and the benefits it must provide to its employees in

return for their services. That bargain is at the heart of the collective agreement. Indeed, as counsel for the Union candidly acknowledged, the typical grievance, if services of employees went unremunerated, would be to seek as a remedy not what might be owed to former employees but only the payment of compensation and benefits owed under the collective agreement to those employees who provided the services. Indeed, that package of compensation and benefits represents the commercially reasonable contractual obligation resting on Nortel for the supply of services by those continuing employees. It is that which is protected by s. 11.3(a) from the reach of the January 14, 2009 order: see *Re: Mirant Canada Energy Marketing Ltd.* (2004), 36 Alta. L.R. (4th) 87 (Q.B.).

**20** Can it be said that the payment required for the services provided by the continuing employees of Nortel also extends to encompass the periodic payments to the former employees in question in this case? In our opinion, for the following reasons the answer is clearly no.

**21** The periodic payments to former employees are payments under various retirement programs, and termination and severance payments. All are products of the ongoing collective bargaining process and the collective agreements it has produced over time. As Krever J.A. wrote regarding analogous benefits in *Metropolitan Police Service Board v. Ontario Municipal Employees Retirement Board et al.* (1999), 45 O.R. (3d) 622 (C.A.) at 629, it can be assumed that the cost of these benefits was considered in the overall compensation package negotiated when they were created by predecessor collective agreements. These benefits may therefore reasonably be thought of as deferred compensation under those predecessor agreements. In other words, they are compensation deferred from past agreements but provided currently as periodic payments owing to former employees for prior services. The services for which these payments constitute "payment" under the *CCAA* were those provided under predecessor agreements, not the services currently being performed for Nortel.

**22** Moreover, the rights of former employees to these periodic payments remain currently enforceable even though those rights were created under predecessor collective agreements. They become a form of "vested" right, although they may only be enforceable by the Union on behalf of the former employees: see *Dayco (Canada) Ltd. v. CAW-Canada*, [1993] 2 S.C.R. 230 at 274. That is entirely inconsistent with the periodic payments constituting payment for current services. If current service was the source of the obligation to make these periodic payments then, if there were no current services being performed, the obligation would evaporate and the right of the former employees to receive the periodic payments would disappear. It would in no sense be a "vested" right.

**23** In summary, we can find no basis upon which the Union's position can be sustained. The periodic payments in issue cannot be characterized as part of the payment required of Nortel for the services provided to it by its continuing employees after January 14, 2009. Section 11.3(a) of the *CCAA* does not exclude these payments from the effect of the order of that date.

**24** The Union's appeal must be dismissed.

## **THE FORMER EMPLOYEES' APPEAL**

### **Background**

**25** The Former Employees' motion was brought by three men as representatives of former employees including pensioners and their survivors. On the motion their claim was for an order varying the Initial Order to require Nortel to pay termination pay, severance pay, vacation pay, an amount for continuation of the Nortel benefit plans during the notice period in accordance with the

*Employment Standards Act, 2000*, S.O. 2000, c. 41 ("*ESA*") and any other provincial employment legislation. The representatives also sought an order varying the Initial Order to require Nortel to pay the Transitional Retirement Allowance ("*TRA*") and certain pension benefit payments to affected former employees. The motion judge described the motion by the former employees as "not dissimilar to the CAW motion, such that the motion of the former employees can almost be described as a "Me too motion."

26 After he dismissed the union motion, the motion judge turned to the "me too" motion of the former employees. The former employees wanted to achieve the same result as the unionized employees. The motion judge described their argument as based on the position that Nortel could not contract out of the *ESA* of Ontario or another province. However, as he noted, rather than trying to contract out, it was acknowledged that the *ESA* applied, except that immediate payment of amounts owing as required by the *ESA* were stayed during the stay period under the Initial Order, so that the former employees could not enforce the acknowledged payment obligation during that time. The motion judge concluded that on the same basis as the union motion, the former employees' motion was also dismissed.

27 For the purposes of the appeal, the former employees narrowed their claim only to statutory termination and severance claims under the *ESA* that were not being paid by Nortel pursuant to the Initial Order, and served a Notice of Constitutional Question. The appellant asks this court to find that judges cannot use their discretion to order a stay under the *CCAA* that has the effect of overriding valid provincial minimum standards legislation where there is no conflict between the statutes and the doctrine of paramountcy has not been triggered.

28 Neither the provincial nor the federal governments responded to the notice on this appeal.

29 Paragraphs 6 and 11 of the Initial Order (as amended) provide as follows:

6. THIS COURT ORDERS that each of the Applicants, either on its own or on behalf of another Applicant, *shall be entitled but not required to pay* the following expenses whether incurred prior to, on or after the date of this Order:
  - (a) all outstanding and future wages, salaries and employee benefits (including but not limited to, employee medical and similar benefit plans, relocation and tax equalization programs, the Incentive Plan (as defined in the Doolittle affidavit) and employee assistance programs), current service, special and similar pension benefit payments, vacation pay, commissions and employee and director expenses, in each case incurred in the ordinary course of business and consistent with existing compensation policies and arrangements;
11. THIS COURT ORDERS that each of the Applicants shall have the right to:
 

...

  - (b) terminate the employment of such of its employees or temporarily lay off such employees as it deems appropriate *and to deal with the consequences thereof in the Plan or on further order of the Court.*

...

all of the foregoing to permit the Applicants to proceed with an orderly restructuring of the Business. [Emphasis added.]

**30** Pursuant to these paragraphs, from the date of the Initial Order, Nortel stopped making payments to former employees as well as employees terminated following the Initial Order for certain retirement and pension allowances as well as for statutory severance and termination payments. The *ESA* sets out obligations to provide notice of termination of employment or payment in lieu of notice and severance pay in defined circumstances. By virtue of s. 11(5), those payments must be made on the later of seven days after the date employment ends or the employee's next pay date.

**31** As the motion judge stated, it is acknowledged by all parties on this motion that the *ESA* continues to apply while a company is subject to a *CCAA* restructuring. The issue is whether the company's provincial statutory obligations for virtually immediate payment of termination and severance can be stayed by an order made under the *CCAA*.

**32** Sections 11(3), dealing with the initial application, and (4), dealing with subsequent applications under the *CCAA* are the stay provisions of the Act. Section 11(3) provides:

11. (3) A court may, on an initial application in respect of a company, make an order on such terms as it may impose, effective for such period as the court deems necessary not exceeding thirty days,
  - (a) staying, until otherwise ordered by the court, all proceedings taken or that might be taken in respect of the company under an Act referred to in subsection 1; [the Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act and the Winding Up Act]
  - (b) restraining, until otherwise ordered by the court, further proceedings in any action, suit or proceeding against the company;
  - (c) prohibiting, until otherwise ordered by the court, the commencement of or proceeding with any other action, suit or proceeding against the company.

### Analysis

**33** As earlier noted, the stay provisions of the *CCAA* are well recognized as the key to the successful operation of the *CCAA* restructuring process. As this court stated in *Stelco Inc. (Re)* (2005), 75 O.R. (3d) 5 at para. 36:

In the *CCAA* context, Parliament has provided a statutory framework to extend protection to a company while it holds its creditors at bay and attempts to negotiate a compromised plan of arrangement that will enable it to emerge and continue as a viable economic entity, thus benefiting society and the company in the long run, along with the company's creditors, shareholders, employees and other stakeholders. The s. 11 discretion is the engine that drives this broad and flexible statutory scheme...

**34** Parliament has carved out defined exceptions to the court's ability to impose a stay. For example, s. 11.3(a) prohibits a stay of payments for goods and services provided after the initial order, so that while the company is given the opportunity and privilege to carry on during the *CCAA* restructuring process without paying its existing creditors, it is on a pay-as-you-go basis only. In contrast, there is no exception for statutory termination and severance pay.<sup>2</sup> Furthermore, as the respondent Boards of Directors point out, the recent amendments to the *CCAA* that came into force on

September 18, 2009 do not address this issue, although they do deal in other respects with employee-related matters.

**35** As there is no specific protection from the general stay provision for *ESA* termination and severance payments, the question to be determined is whether the court is entitled to extend the effect of its stay order to such payments based on the constitutional doctrine of paramountcy: *Crystal-line Investments Ltd. v. Domgroup Ltd.*, [2004] 1 S.C.R. 60 at para. 43.

**36** The scope, intent and effect of the operation of the doctrine of paramountcy was recently reviewed and summarized by Binnie and Lebel JJ. in *Canadian Western Bank v. Alberta*, [2007] 2 S.C.R. 3 at paras. 69-75. They reaffirmed the "conflict" test stated by Dickson J. in *Multiple Access Ltd. v. McCutcheon*, [1982] 2 S.C.R. 161:

In principle, there would seem to be no good reasons to speak of paramountcy and preclusion except where there is actual conflict in operation as where one enactment says "yes" and the other says "no"; "the same citizens are being told to do inconsistent things"; compliance with one is defiance of the other. [p. 191]

**37** However, they also explained an important proviso or gloss on the strict conflict rule that has developed in the case law since *Multiple Access*:

Nevertheless, there will be cases in which imposing an obligation to comply with provincial legislation would in effect frustrate the purpose of a federal law even though it did not entail a direct violation of the federal law's provisions. The Court recognized this in *Bank of Montreal v. Hall*, [1990] 1 S.C.R. 121, in noting that Parliament's "intent" must also be taken into account in the analysis of incompatibility. The Court thus acknowledged that the impossibility of complying with two enactments is not the sole sign of incompatibility. The fact that a provincial law is incompatible with the purpose of a federal law will also be sufficient to trigger the application of the doctrine of federal paramountcy. This point was recently reaffirmed in *Mangat* and in *Rothmans, Benson & Hedges Inc. v. Saskatchewan*, [2005] 1 S.C.R. 188, 2005 SCC 13. (para. 73)

**38** Therefore, the doctrine of paramountcy will apply either where a provincial and a federal statutory provision are in conflict and cannot both be complied with, or where complying with the provincial law will have the effect of frustrating the purpose of the federal law and therefore the intent of Parliament. Binnie and Lebel JJ. concluded by summarizing the operation of the doctrine in the following way:

To sum up, the onus is on the party relying on the doctrine of federal paramountcy to demonstrate that the federal and provincial laws are in fact incompatible by establishing either that it is impossible to comply with both laws or that to apply the provincial law would frustrate the purpose of the federal law. (para. 75)

**39** The *CCAA* stay provision is a clear example of a case where the intent of Parliament, to allow the court to freeze the debt obligations owing to all creditors for past services (and goods) in order to permit a company to restructure for the benefit of all stakeholders, would be frustrated if

the court's stay order could not apply to statutory termination and severance payments owed to terminated employees in respect of past services.

**40** The record before the court indicates that the motion judge made the initial order and the amended order in the context of the insolvency of a complex, multinational conglomerate as part of co-ordinated proceedings in a number of countries including the U.S. In June 2009, an Interim Funding and Settlement Agreement was negotiated which, together with the proceeds of certain ongoing asset sales, is providing funds necessary in the view of the court appointed Monitor, for the ongoing operations of Nortel during the next few months of the *CCAA* oversight operation. This funding was achieved on the basis that the stay applied to the severance and termination payments. The Monitor advises that if these payments were not subject to the stay and had to be funded, further financing would have to be found to do that and also maintain operations.

**41** In that context, the motion judge exercised his discretion to impose a stay that could extend to the severance and termination payments. He considered the financial position of Nortel, that it was not carrying "business as usual" and that it was under financial pressure. He also considered that the *CCAA* proceeding is at an early stage, before the claims of creditor groups, including former employees and others have been considered or classified for ultimate treatment under a plan of arrangement. He noted that employees have no statutory priority and their claims are not secured claims.

**42** While reference was made to the paramountcy doctrine by the motion judge, it was not the main focus of the argument before him. Nevertheless, he effectively concluded that it would thwart the intent of Parliament for the successful conduct of the *CCAA* restructuring if the initial order and the amended order could not include a stay provision that allowed Nortel to suspend the payment of statutory obligations for termination and severance under the *ESA*.

**43** The respondents also argued that if the stay did not apply to statutory termination and severance obligations, then the employees who received these payments would in effect be receiving a "super-priority" over other unsecured or possibly even secured creditors on the assumption that in the end there will not be enough money to pay everyone in full. We agree that this may be the effect if the stay does not apply to these payments. However, that could also be the effect if Nortel chose to make such payments, as it is entitled to do under paragraph 6 (a) of the amended initial order. Of course, in that case, any such payments would be made in consultation with appropriate parties including the Monitor, resulting in the effective grant of a consensual rather than a mandatory priority. Even in this case, the motion judge provided a "hardship" alleviation program funded up to \$750,000, to allow payments to former employees in clear need. This will have the effect of granting the "super-priority" to some. This is an acceptable result in appropriate circumstances.

**44** However, this result does not in any way undermine the paramountcy analysis. That analysis is driven by the need to preserve the ability of the *CCAA* court to ensure, through the scope of the stay order, that Parliament's intent for the operation of the *CCAA* regime is not thwarted by the operation of provincial legislation. The court issuing the stay order considers all of the circumstances and can impose an order that has the effect of overriding a provincial enactment where it is necessary to do so.

**45** Morawetz J. was satisfied that such a stay was necessary in the circumstances of this case. We see no error in that conclusion on the record before him and before this court.

46 Another issue was raised based on the facts of this restructuring as it has developed. It appears that the company will not be restructured, but instead its assets will be sold. It is necessary to continue operations in order to maintain maximum value for this process to achieve the highest prices and therefore the best outcome for all stakeholders. It is true that the basis for the very broad stay power has traditionally been expressed as a necessary aspect of the restructuring process, leading to a plan of arrangement for the newly restructured entity. However, we see no reason in the present circumstances why the same analysis cannot apply during a sale process that requires the business to be carried on as a going concern. No party has taken the position that the *CCAA* process is no longer available because it is not proceeding as a restructuring, nor has any party taken steps to turn the proceeding into one under the *Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act*, R.S.C. 1985, c. B-3.

47 The former employee appellants have raised the constitutional question whether the doctrine of paramountcy applies to give to the *CCAA* judge the authority, under s. 11 of the Act, to order a stay of proceedings that has the effect of overriding s. 11(5) of the *ESA*, which requires almost immediate payment of termination and severance obligations. The answer to this question is yes.

48 We note again that the question before this court was limited to the effect of the stay on the timing of required statutory payments under the *ESA* and does not deal with the inter-relation of the *ESA* and the *CCAA* for the purposes of the plan of arrangement and the ultimate payment of these statutory obligations.

49 The appeal by the former employees is also dismissed.

S.T. GOUDGE J.A.

K.N. FELDMAN J.A.

R.A. BLAIR J.A.:-- I agree.

cp/e/ln/qlaim/qlaxw/qlsxs/qlced/qlhcs/qlcas/qljyw/qlhcs

1 The analogous section to the former s. 11.3(a) is now found in s. 11.01(a) of the recently amended *CCAA*.

2 The issue of post-initial order employee terminations, and specifically whether any portion of the termination or severance that may be owed is attributable to post-initial order services, was not at issue in this motion. In *Windsor Machine & Stamping Ltd. (Re)* [2009] O.J. No. 3195, decided one month after this motion, the issue was discussed more fully and Morawetz J. determined that it could be decided as part of a post-filing claim. Leave to appeal has been filed.

# TAB 5