

**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  
EXTREME FITNESS, INC.**

**APPLICATION UNDER THE *COMPANIES' CREDITORS ARRANGEMENT ACT*,  
R.S.C. 1985, c. C-36, AS AMENDED**

**BRIEF OF AUTHORITIES  
OF EXTREME FITNESS, INC.**

February 26, 2013

**AIRD & BERLIS LLP**  
Barristers and Solicitors  
Brookfield Place  
181 Bay Street, Suite 1800  
Toronto, Ontario M5J 2T9

**Steven L. Graff (LSUC # 31871V)**  
Tel: 416.865.7726  
Fax: 416.863.1515  
Email: [sgraff@airdberlis.com](mailto:sgraff@airdberlis.com)

**Ian Aversa (LSUC # 55449N)**  
Tel: 416.865.3082  
Fax: 416.863.1515  
Email: [iaversa@airdberlis.com](mailto:iaversa@airdberlis.com)

**James A. Desjardins (LSUC # 62493E)**  
Tel: 416.865.4641  
Fax: 416.863.1515  
Email: [jdesjardins@airdberlis.com](mailto:jdesjardins@airdberlis.com)

*Lawyers for Extreme Fitness, Inc.*

**SERVICE LIST**

TO: **AIRD & BERLIS LLP**  
Brookfield Place  
181 Bay Street, Suite 1800  
Toronto, ON M5J 2T9

**Steven L. Graff**  
Tel: 416-865-7726  
Fax: 416-863-1515  
Email: [sgraff@airdberlis.com](mailto:sgraff@airdberlis.com)

**Ian Aversa**  
Tel: 416-865-3082  
Fax: 416-863-1515  
Email: [iaversa@airdberlis.com](mailto:iaversa@airdberlis.com)

**James A. Desjardins**  
Tel: 416-865-4641  
Fax: 416-863-1515  
Email: [jdesjardins@airdberlis.com](mailto:jdesjardins@airdberlis.com)

*Lawyers for Extreme Fitness, Inc.*

AND TO: **FTI CONSULTING CANADA INC.**  
TD Waterhouse Tower  
79 Wellington Street West  
Toronto Dominion Centre, Suite 2010  
Toronto, ON M5K 1G8

**Steven Bissell**  
Tel: 416-649-8054  
Fax: 416-649-8101  
Email: [steven.bissell@fticonsulting.com](mailto:steven.bissell@fticonsulting.com)

**Brogan Taylor**  
Tel: 416-649-8074  
Fax: 416-649-8101  
Email: [brogan.taylor@fticonsulting.com](mailto:brogan.taylor@fticonsulting.com)

*Monitor*

AND TO: **GOODMANS LLP**  
Bay Adelaide Centre  
333 Bay Street, Suite 3400  
Toronto, ON M5H 2S7

**Melaney J. Wagner**  
Tel: 416-597-4258  
Fax: 416-979-1234  
Email: [mwagner@goodmans.ca](mailto:mwagner@goodmans.ca)

**Caroline Descours**  
Tel: 416-597-6275  
Fax: 416-979-1234  
Email: [cdescours@goodmans.ca](mailto:cdescours@goodmans.ca)

*Lawyers for the Monitor*

AND TO: **THORNTON GROUT FINNIGAN LLP**  
100 Wellington Street West, Suite 3200  
Toronto, ON M5K 1K7

**Grant B. Moffat**  
Tel: 416-304-0599  
Fax: 416-304-1313  
Email: [gmoffat@tgf.ca](mailto:gmoffat@tgf.ca)

**Alana Shepherd**  
Tel: 416-304-0597  
Fax: 416.304.1313  
Email: [ashepherd@tgf.ca](mailto:ashepherd@tgf.ca)

*Lawyers for National Bank of Canada*

AND TO: **BLAKE, CASSELS & GRAYDON LLP**  
Commerce Court West  
199 Bay Street, Suite 4000  
Toronto, ON M5L 1A9

**Steven J. Weisz**  
Tel: 416-863-2616  
Fax: 416-863-2653  
Email: [steven.weisz@blakes.com](mailto:steven.weisz@blakes.com)

**Ian Binnie**  
Tel: 416-863-3250  
Fax: 416-863-2653  
Email: [ian.binnie@blakes.com](mailto:ian.binnie@blakes.com)

**Marc Flynn**

Tel: 416-863-2685  
Fax: 416.863.2653  
Email: [marc.flynn@blakes.com](mailto:marc.flynn@blakes.com)

*Lawyers for Golub Capital Incorporated*

AND TO: **MILLER THOMSON LLP**

One London Place  
255 Queens Avenue, Suite 2010  
London, ON N6A 5R8

**Alissa Mitchell**

Tel: 519-931-3510  
Fax: 519-858-8511  
Email: [amitchell@millertomson.com](mailto:amitchell@millertomson.com)

*Lawyers for GoodLife Fitness Centres Inc.*

AND TO: **SISKINDS**

680 Waterloo Street  
London, ON N6A 3V8

**Henry Berg**

Tel: 519-660-7786  
Fax: 519-660-7787  
Email: [henry.berg@siskinds.com](mailto:henry.berg@siskinds.com)

*Lawyers for GoodLife Fitness Centres Inc.*

AND TO: **ALVAREZ & MARSAL CANADA INC.**

Royal Bank Plaza South Tower  
200 Bay Street, Suite 2900  
Toronto, ON M5J 2J1

**Alan J. Hutchens**

Tel: 416-847-5159  
Fax: 416-847-5201  
Email: [ahutchens@alvarezandmarsal.com](mailto:ahutchens@alvarezandmarsal.com)

**Greg A. Karpel**

Tel: 416-847-5170  
Fax: 416-847-5201  
Email: [gkarpel@alvarezandmarsal.com](mailto:gkarpel@alvarezandmarsal.com)

AND TO: **BORDEN LADNER GERVAIS LLP**

Scotia Plaza  
40 King Street West  
Toronto, ON M5H 3Y4

**Roger Jaipargas**

Tel: 416-367-6266  
Fax: 416-361-7067  
Email: [rjaipargas@blg.com](mailto:rjaipargas@blg.com)

*Lawyers for 2079843 Ontario Inc., 2044922 Ontario Ltd. and 2125879 Ontario Inc.*

AND TO: **BERKOW, COHEN LLP**

Barristers  
141 Adelaide Street West, Suite 400  
Toronto, ON M5H 3L5

**Alexandra Lev-Farrell**

Tel: 416-364-4900  
Fax: 416-364-3865  
Email: [alev-farrell@berkowcohen.com](mailto:alev-farrell@berkowcohen.com)

*Lawyers for Bentall Kennedy (Canada) LP*

AND TO: **EXTREME FITNESS, INC.**

8281 Yonge Street  
Thornhill, ON L3T 2C7

AND TO: **EXTREME FITNESS HOLDING CORP.**

c/o Falconhead Capital LLC  
450 Park Avenue #3  
New York, NY 10022

AND TO: **EXTREME FITNESS ULC**

c/o Golub Capital Incorporated  
551 Madison Avenue, Sixth Floor  
New York, NY 10022

AND TO: **ROYAL BANK OF CANADA**

180 Wellington Street West, 3rd Floor  
Toronto, ON M5J 1J1

AND TO: **LIFE FITNESS INTERNATIONAL SALES, INC.**

5100 North River Road  
Schiller Park, IL 60176

AND TO: **HEFFNER AUTO FINANCE CORP.**  
3121 King Street East  
Kitchener, ON N2A 1B1

AND TO: **HEFFNER AUTO SALES AND LEASING INC.**  
3121 King Street East  
Kitchener, ON N2A 1B1

AND TO: **HEFFNER LEASING LIMITED**  
3121 King Street East  
Kitchener, ON N2A 1B1

AND TO: **COINAMATIC COMMERCIAL LAUNDRY INC.**  
301 Matheson Boulevard West  
Mississauga, ON L5R 3G3

AND TO: **INDCOM LEASING INC.**  
5061 Ure Street  
Oldcastle, ON N0R 1L0

AND TO: **ESSEX CAPITAL LEASING CORP.**  
3280 Devon Drive  
Windsor, ON N8X 4L4

AND TO: **CLE LEASING ENTERPRISES LTD.**  
3390 South Service Road, 2nd Level  
Burlington, ON L7N 3J5

AND TO: **DSM LEASING LTD.**  
1300 Bay Street, Suite 400  
Toronto, ON M5R 3K8

AND TO: **ENERCARE SOLUTIONS LIMITED PARTNERSHIP**  
2 East Beaver Creek Road, Building 2  
Richmond Hill, ON L4B 2N3

AND TO: **DELL FINANCIAL SERVICES CANADA LIMITED**  
155 Gordon Baker Road, Suite 501  
North York, ON M2H 3N5

AND TO: **BMW CANADA INC.**  
50 Ultimate Drive  
Richmond Hill, ON L4S 0C8

AND TO: **DE LAGE LANDEN FINANCIAL SERVICES CANADA INC.**  
100-1235 North Service Road West  
Oakville, ON L6M 2W2

AND TO: **XEROX FINANCIAL SERVICES CANADA LTD.**  
c/o Xerox Canada Ltd.  
33 Bloor Street East  
Toronto, ON M4W 3H1

**Stephanie Grace**  
Tel: (416) 413-2805  
Fax: (416) 972-5530  
Email: [stephanie.grace@xerox.com](mailto:stephanie.grace@xerox.com)

AND TO: **DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE**  
The Exchange Tower  
130 King Street West, Suite 3400  
Toronto, ON M5X 1K6

**Diane Winters**  
Tel: (416) 973-3172  
Fax: (416) 973-0810  
Email: [diane.winters@justice.gc.ca](mailto:diane.winters@justice.gc.ca)

AND TO: **HER MAJESTY THE QUEEN IN RIGHT OF THE  
PROVINCE OF ONTARIO AS REPRESENTED BY  
THE MINISTER OF FINANCE**  
(Income Tax, PST)  
PO Box 620  
33 King Street West, 6<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Oshawa, ON L1H 8E9

**Kevin J. O'Hara**  
Email: [kevin.ohara@ontario.ca](mailto:kevin.ohara@ontario.ca)

**COURTESY COPIES**

**Morry Offman**  
Email: [morryoffman@msn.com](mailto:morryoffman@msn.com)

**Steve DaCosta**  
Email: [stevedacosta@rogers.blackberry.net](mailto:stevedacosta@rogers.blackberry.net)

# 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  
EXTREME FITNESS, INC.**

**APPLICATION UNDER THE *COMPANIES' CREDITORS ARRANGEMENT ACT*,  
R.S.C. 1985, c. C-36, AS AMENDED**

**BRIEF OF AUTHORITIES  
OF EXTREME FITNESS, INC.**

1. *Canwest Global Communications Corp. (Re)*, [2009] O.J. No. 4788 (Ont. S.C.J. [Comm. List])
2. *Grant Forest Products Inc. (Re)* (2009), 57 C.B.R. (5th) 128 (Ont. S.C.J. [Comm. List])
3. *Canwest Global Communications Corp. (Re)* (2009), 59 C.B.R. (5th) 72 (Ont. S.C.J. [Comm. List])
4. *Nortel Networks Corp. (Re)*, [2009] O.J. No. 1044 (S.C.J. [Comm. List])
5. *Sierra Club of Canada v. Canada (Minister of Finance)*, [2002] 2 S.C.R. 522

**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"**

[2009] O.J. No. 4788

Court File No. CV-09-8241-OOCL

Ontario Superior Court of Justice  
Commercial List

**S.E. Pepall J.**

November 12, 2009.

(43 paras.)

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

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

HELD: Application allowed. Court approval under s. 36 of the Act was required if a debtor company under the protection of the Act proposed to sell or dispose of assets outside the ordinary course of business. It did not apply to a

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

**Statutes, Regulations and Rules Cited:**

Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act,

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

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

**Counsel:**

*Lyndon Barnes and Jeremy Dacks* for the Applicants.

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

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

*Benjamin Zarnett* for the Ad Hoc Committee of Noteholders.

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

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

*Steve Weisz* for CIT Business Credit Canada Inc.

*Amanda Darroch* for Communication Workers of America.

*Alena Thouin* for Superintendent of Financial Services.

---

**REASONS FOR DECISION**

S.E. PEPALL J.:--

**Relief Requested**

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

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

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

Background Facts

(a) Parties

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

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

(b) History

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

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

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

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

9 The multitude of operations that were provided by the LP Entities for the benefit of the National Post Company

rendered the latter dependent on both the shared services arrangements and on the operational synergies that developed between the National Post Company and the newspaper and digital operations of the LP Entities.

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

(c) Restructuring

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

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

13 Schedule A to that agreement is the New Shared Services Agreement. It anticipates a cessation or renegotiation of the provision of certain services and the elimination of certain redundancies. It also addresses a realignment of certain employees who are misaligned and, subject to approval of the relevant regulator, a transfer of certain misaligned pension plan participants to pension plans that are sponsored by the appropriate party. The LP Entities, the CMI Chief Restructuring Advisor and the Monitor have consented to the entering into of the New Shared Services Agreement.

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

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

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

Irish Holdco Secured Note -- \$187.3 million

CIT Secured Facility -- \$10.7 million

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

## Irish Holdco Unsecured Note -- \$430.6 million

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

- it facilitates the reorganization and orderly transition and subsequent termination of the shared services arrangements between the CMI Entities and the LP Entities;
- it preserves approximately 277 jobs in an already highly distressed newspaper publishing industry;
- it will help maintain and promote competition in the national daily newspaper market for the benefit of Canadian consumers; and
- the Transferee will assume substantially all of the National Post Company's trade payables (including those owed to various suppliers) and various employment costs associated with the transferred employees.

#### Issues

24 The issues to consider are whether:

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

#### Discussion

- (a) Section 36 of the CCAA

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

26 Court approval is required under section 36 if:

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

27 Court approval under this section of the Act<sup>1</sup> is only required if those threshold requirements are met. If they are met, the court is provided with a list of non-exclusive factors to consider in determining whether to approve the sale or disposition. Additionally, certain mandatory criteria must be met for court approval of a sale or disposition of assets to a related party. Notice is to be given to secured creditors likely to be affected by the proposed sale or disposition. The court may only grant authorization if satisfied that the company can and will make certain pension and employee related payments.

28 Specifically, section 36 states:

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



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

(b) a person who has or has had, directly or indirectly, control in fact of the company; and

(c) a person who is related to a person described in paragraph (a) or (b).

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

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

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

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

32 The *CCAA* is remedial legislation designed to enable insolvent companies to restructure. As mentioned by me before in this case, the amendments do not detract from this objective. In discussing section 36, the Industry Canada Briefing Book<sup>3</sup> on the amendments states that "The reform is intended to provide the debtor company with greater flexibility in dealing with its property while limiting the possibility of abuse."<sup>4</sup>

33 The term "ordinary course of business" is not defined in the *CCAA* or in the *Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act*<sup>5</sup>. As noted by Cullity J. in *Millgate Financial Corp. v. BCED Holdings Ltd.*<sup>6</sup>, authorities that have considered the use of the term in various statutes have not provided an exhaustive definition. As one author observed in a different context,

namely the *Bulk Sales Act*<sup>7</sup>, courts have typically taken a common sense approach to the term "ordinary course of business" and have considered the normal business dealings of each particular seller<sup>8</sup>. In *Pacific Mobile Corp.*<sup>9</sup>, the Supreme Court of Canada stated:

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

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

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

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

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

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

36 In this case, the business of the National Post Company and the CP Entities are highly integrated and interdependent. The Canwest business structure predated the insolvency of the CMI Entities and reflects in part an anomaly that arose as a result of an income trust structure driven by tax considerations. The Transition and Reorganization Agreement is an internal reorganization transaction that is designed to realign shared services and assets within the Canwest corporate family so as to rationalize the business structure and to better reflect the appropriate business model. Furthermore, the realignment of the shared services and transfer of the assets and business of the National Post Company to the publishing side of the business are steps in the larger reorganization of the relationship between the CMI Entities and the LP Entities. There is no ability to proceed with either the Shared Services Agreement or the National Post Transition Agreement alone. The Transition and Reorganization Agreement provides a framework for the CMI Entities and the LP Entities to properly restructure their inter-entity arrangements for the benefit of their respective stakeholders. It would be commercially unreasonable to require the CMI Entities to engage in the sort of third party sales process contemplated by section 36(4) and offer the National Post for sale to third parties before permitting them to realign the shared services arrangements. In these circumstances, I am prepared to accept that section 36 is inapplicable.

(b) Transition and Reorganization Agreement

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

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

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

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

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

42 The remaining section 36 factor to consider is section 36(7) which provides that the court should be satisfied that the company can and will make certain pension and employee related payments that would have been required if the

court had sanctioned the compromise or arrangement. In oral submissions, counsel for the CMI Entities confirmed that they had met the requirements of section 36. It is agreed that the pension and employee liabilities will be assumed by the Transferee. Although present, the representative of the Superintendent of Financial Services was unopposed to the order requested. If and when a compromise and arrangement is proposed, the Monitor is asked to make the necessary inquiries and report to the court on the status of those payments.

Stay Extension

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

S.E. PEPALL J.

cp/e/qlrxg/qljxr/qlced/qlaxw

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

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

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

4 Ibid.

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

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

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

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

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

10 *Supra*, note 3.

11 *Supra*, note 9.

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

# TAB 2

Case Name:

**Grant Forest Products 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  
Grant Forest Products Inc., Grant Alberta Inc., Grant Forest  
Products Sales Inc. and Grant U.S. Holdings GP, Applicants**

[2009] O.J. No. 3344

57 C.B.R. (5th) 128

2009 CarswellOnt 4699

179 A.C.W.S. (3d) 517

Court File No. CV-09-8247-00CL

Ontario Superior Court of Justice  
Commercial List

**F.J.C. Newbould J.**

Heard: August 6, 2009.

Judgment: August 11, 2009.

(25 paras.)

*Bankruptcy and insolvency law -- Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act matters -- Compromises and arrangements -- With unsecured creditors -- Claims -- Priority -- Motion by GE Canada Leasing Services Co. for an order deleting the Key Employee Retention Plan provisions in the June 25, 2009 initial order in these Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act proceedings, dismissed -- It was clear on the record that the KERP agreement and charge contained in the order were appropriate and ought to be maintained -- The Monitor and other parties supported the agreement and charge in order to retain Lynch, a seasoned executive, as his continued presence was important for the stability of the business and to enhance the effectiveness of the marketing process -- Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act.*

Motion by GE Canada Leasing Services Company for an order deleting the Key Employee Retention Plan provisions in the initial order of June 25, 2009 in these Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act proceedings. A KERP agreement between Grant Forest Products Inc. and a Mr. Lynch was approved, and a KERP charge on all the property of the applicants as security for the amounts that could be owing to Lynch under the agreement was granted to Lynch, ranking

after the administration charge and the investment offering advisory charge. GE argued that these KERP provisions had the effect of preferring the interest of Lynch over the interest of the other creditors, including itself. Under the terms of the KERP agreement, if at any time before Lynch turned 65 a termination event occurred, he was to be paid three times his then base salary.

HELD: Motion dismissed. It was clear on the basis of the record that the KERP agreement and charge contained in the initial order were appropriate and ought to be maintained. The Monitor supported the agreement and charge. Lynch was a very seasoned executive, and the Monitor expected he would consider other employment options if the agreement were not secured by the charge, and that his doing so could only distract from the marketing process that was underway with respect to the applicants' assets. Lynch's continuing role as a senior executive was important for the stability the business and to enhance the effectiveness of the marketing process. The concern of the Monitor and of Stephen, the Chief Restructuring Advisor, that Lynch might consider other employment opportunities if the KERP provisions were not kept in place was not an idle concern. A three-year severance payment was not so large on the face of it to be unreasonable, or unfair to the other stakeholders. The first lien security holders owed approximately \$400 million also supported the KERP agreement and charge.

**Statutes, Regulations and Rules Cited:**

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

**Counsel:**

A. Duncan Grace for GE Canada Leasing Services Company.

Daniel R. Dowdall and Jane O. Dietrich, for Grant Forest Products Inc., Grant Alberta Inc., Grant Forest Products Sales Inc., and Grant U.S. Holdings GP.

Sean Dunphy and Katherine Mah for the Monitor Ernst & Young Inc.

Kevin McElcheran for The Toronto-Dominion Bank.

Stuart Brotman for the Independent Directors.

---

**ENDORSEMENT**

1 **F.J.C. NEWBOULD J.:**-- KERP is an acronym for key employee retention plan. In the Initial Order of June 25, 2009, a KERP agreement between Grant Forest Products Inc. and Mr. Peter Lynch was approved and a KERP charge on all of the property of the applicants as security for the amounts that could be owing to Mr. Lynch under the KERP agreement was granted to Mr. Lynch ranking after the Administration Charge and the Investment Offering Advisory Charge. The Initial Order was made without prejudice to the right of GE Canada Leasing Services Company ("GE Canada") to move to oppose the KERP provisions.

2 GE Canada has now moved for an order to delete the KERP provisions in the Initial Order. GE Canada takes the position that these KERP provisions have the effect of preferring the interest of Mr. Lynch over the interest of the other creditors, including GE Canada.

**KERP Agreement and Charge**

3 The applicant companies have been a leading manufacturer of oriented strand board and have interests in three



mills in Canada and two mills in the United States. The parent company is Grant Forest Products Inc. Grant Forest was founded by Peter Grant Sr. in 1980 and is privately owned by the Grant family. Peter Grant Sr. is the CEO, his son, Peter Grant Jr., is the president, having worked in the business for approximately fourteen years. Peter Lynch is 58 years old. He practised corporate commercial law from 1976 to 1993 during which time he acted on occasion for members of the Grant family. In 1993 he joined the business and became executive vice-president of Grant Forest. Mr. Lynch owns no shares in the business.

4 The only KERP agreement made was between Grant Forest and Mr. Lynch. It provides that if at any time before Mr. Lynch turns 65 years of age a termination event occurs, he shall be paid three times his then base salary. A termination event is defined as the termination of his employment for any reason other than just cause or resignation, constructive dismissal, the sale of the business or a material part of the assets, or a change of control of the company. The agreement provided that the obligation was to be secured by a letter of credit and that if the company made an application under the CCAA it would seek an order creating a charge on the assets of the company with priority satisfactory to Mr. Lynch. That provision led to the KERP charge in the Initial Order.

#### Creditors of the Applicants

5 Grant Forest has total funded debt obligations of approximately \$550 million in two levels of primary secured debt. The first lien lenders, for whom TD Bank is the agent, are owed approximately \$400 million. The second lien lenders are owed approximately \$150 million.

6 Grant Forest has unsecured trade creditors of over \$4 million as well as other unsecured debt obligations. GE Canada is an unsecured creditor of Grant Forest pursuant to a master aircraft leasing agreement with respect to three aircraft which have now been returned to GE Canada. GE Canada expects that after the aircraft have been sold, it will have a deficiency claim of approximately U.S. \$6.5 million.

7 The largest unsecured creditor is a numbered company owned by the Grant family interests which is owed approximately \$50 million for debt financing provided to the business.

#### Analysis

8 Whether KERP provisions such as the ones in this case should be ordered in a CCAA proceeding is a matter of discretion. While there are a small number of cases under the CCAA dealing with this issue, it certainly cannot be said that there is any established body of case law settling the principles to be considered. In *Houlden & Morawetz Bankruptcy and Insolvency Analysis, West Law, 2009*, it is stated:

In some instances, the court supervising the CCAA proceeding will authorize a key employee retention plan or key employee incentive plan. Such plans are aimed at retaining employees that are important to the management or operations of the debtor company in order to keep their skills within the company at a time when they are likely to look for other employment because of the company's financial distress. (Underlining added)

9 In *Canadian Insolvency in Canada* by Kevin P. McElcheran (LexisNexis -- Butterworths) at p. 231, it is stated:

KERPs and special director compensation arrangements are heavily negotiated and controversial arrangements. ... Because of the controversial nature of KERP arrangements, it is important that any proposed KERP be scrutinized carefully by the monitor with a view to insisting that only true key employees are covered by the plan and that the KERP will not do more harm than good by failing to include the truly key employees and failing to treat them fairly. (Underlining added)

10 I accept these statements as generally applicable. In my view it is quite clear on the basis of the record before me that the KERP agreement and charge contained in the Initial Order are appropriate and should be maintained. There are

a number of reasons for this.

11 The Monitor supports the KERP agreement and charge. Mr. Morrison has stated in the third report of the Monitor that as Mr. Lynch is a very seasoned executive, the Monitor would expect that he would consider other employment options if the KERP agreement were not secured by the KERP charge, and that his doing so could only distract from the marketing process that is underway with respect to the assets of the applicants. The Monitor has expressed the view that Mr. Lynch continuing role as a senior executive is important for the stability of the business and to enhance the effectiveness of the marketing process.

12 Mr. Hap Stephen, the Chairman and CEO of Stonecrest Capital Inc., appointed as the Chief Restructuring Advisor of the applicants in the Initial Order, pointed out in his affidavit that Mr. Lynch is the only senior officer of the applicants who is not a member of the Grant family and who works from Grant Forest's executive office in Toronto. He has sworn that the history, knowledge and stability that Mr. Lynch provides the applicants is crucial not only in dealing with potential investors during the restructuring to provide them with information regarding the applicants' operations, but also in making decisions regarding operations and management on a day-to-day basis during this period. He states that it would be extremely difficult at this stage of the restructuring to find a replacement to fulfill Mr. Lynch's current responsibilities and he has concern that if the KERP provisions in the Initial Order are removed, Mr. Lynch may begin to search for other professional opportunities given the uncertainty of his present position with the applicants. Mr. Stephen strongly supports the inclusion of the KERP provisions in the Initial Order.

13 It is contended on behalf of GE Canada that there is little evidence that Mr. Lynch has or will be foregoing other employment opportunities. Reliance is placed upon a statement of Leitch R.S.J. in *Textron Financial Canada Ltd. v. Beta Brands Ltd.* (2007), 36 C.B.R. (5th) 296. In that case Leitch J. refused to approve a KERP arrangement for a number of reasons, including the fact that there was no contract for the proposed payment and it had not been reviewed by the court appointed receiver who was applying to the court for directions. Leitch J. stated in distinguishing the case before her from *Re Warehouse Drug Store Ltd.*, [2006] O.J. No. 3416, that there was no suggestion that any of the key employees in the case before her had alternative employment opportunities that they chose to forego.

14 I do not read the decision of Leitch J. in *Textron* to state that there must be an alternative job that an employee chose to forego in order for a KERP arrangement to be approved. It was only a distinguishing fact in the case before her from the *Warehouse Drug Store* case. Moreover, I do not think that a court should be hamstrung by any such rule in a matter that is one of discretion depending upon the circumstances of each case. The statement in *Houlden Morawetz* to which I have earlier referred that a KERP plan is aimed at retaining important employees when they are likely to look for other employment indicates a much broader intent, i.e. for a key employee who is likely to look for other employment rather than a key employee who has been offered another job but turned it down. In *Re Nortel Networks Corp.* [2009] O.J. No. 1188, Morawetz J. approved a KERP agreement in circumstances in which there was a "potential" loss of management at the time who were sought after by competitors. To require a key employee to have already received an offer of employment from someone else before a KERP agreement could be justified would not in my view be something that is necessary or desirable.

15 In this case, the concern of the Monitor and of Mr. Stephen that Mr. Lynch may consider other employment opportunities if the KERP provisions are not kept in place is not an idle concern. On his cross-examination on July 28, 2009, Mr. Lynch disclosed that recently he was approached on an unsolicited basis to submit to an interview for a position of CEO of another company in a different sector. He declined to be interviewed for the position. He stated that the KERP provisions played a role in his decision which might well have been different if the KERP provisions did not exist. This evidence is not surprising and quite understandable for a person of Mr. Lynch's age in the uncertain circumstances that exist with the applicants' business.

16 It is also contended by GE Canada that Mr. Lynch shares responsibilities with Mr. Grant Jr., the implication being that Mr. Lynch is not indispensable. This contention is contrary to the views of the Monitor and Mr. Stephen and is not supported by any cogent evidence. It also does not take into account the different status of Mr. Lynch and Mr. Grant Jr.

Mr. Lynch is not a shareholder. One can readily understand that a prospective bidder in the marketing process that is now underway might want to hear from an experienced executive of the company who is not a shareholder and thus not conflicted. Mr. Dunphy on behalf of the Monitor submitted that Mr. Lynch is the only senior executive independent of the shareholders and that it is the Monitor's view that an unconflicted non-family executive is critical to the marketing process. The KERP agreement providing Mr. Lynch with a substantial termination payment in the event that the business is sold can be viewed as adding to his independence insofar as his dealing with respective bidders are concerned.

17 It is also contended on behalf of GE Canada that there is no material before the court to establish that the quantum of the termination payment, three times Mr. Lynch's salary at the time he is terminated, is reasonable. I do not accept that. The KERP agreement and charge were approved by the board of directors of Grant Forest, including approval by the independent directors. These independent directors included Mr. William Stinson, the former CEO of Canadian Pacific Limited and the lead director of Sun Life, Mr. Michael Harris, a former premier of Ontario, and Mr. Wallace, the president of a construction company and a director of Inco. The independent directors were advised by Mr. Levin, a very senior corporate counsel. One cannot assume without more that these people did not have experience in these matters or know what was reasonable.

18 A three year severance payment is not so large on the face of it to be unreasonable, or in this case, unfair to the other stakeholders. The business acumen of the board of directors of Grant Forest, including the independent directors, is one that a court should not ignore unless there is good reason on the record to ignore it. This is particularly so in light of the support of the Monitor and Mr. Stephens for the KERP provisions. Their business judgment cannot be ignored.

19 The Monitor is, of course, an officer of the court. The Chief Restructuring Advisor is not but has been appointed in the Initial Order. Their views deserve great weight and I would be reluctant to second guess them. The following statement of Gallagan J.A., in *Royal Bank v. Soundair Corp.* (1991), 4 O.R. (3d) 1, while made in the context of the approval by a court appointed receiver of the sale of a business, is instructive in my view in considering the views of a Monitor, including the Monitor in this case and the views of the Chief Restructuring Advisor:

When a court appoints a receiver to use its commercial expertise to sell an airline, it is inescapable that it intends to rely upon the receiver's expertise and not upon its own. Therefore, the court must place a great deal of confidence in the actions taken and in the opinions formed by the receiver. It should also assume that the receiver is acting properly unless the contrary is clearly shown. The second observation is that the court should be reluctant to second-guess, with the benefit of hindsight, the considered business decisions made by its receiver.

20 The first lien security holders owed approximately \$400 million also support the KERP agreement and charge for Mr. Lynch. They too take the position that it is important to have Mr. Lynch involved in the restructuring process. Not only did they support the KERP provisions in the Initial Order, they negotiated section 10(l) of the Initial Order that provides that the applicants could not without the prior written approval of their agent, TD Bank, and the Monitor, make any changes to the officers or senior management. That is, without the consent of the TD Bank as agent for the first lien creditors, Mr. Lynch could not be terminated unless the Initial Order were later amended by court order to permit that to occur.

21 With respect to the fairness of the KERP provisions for Mr. Lynch and whether they unduly interfere with the rights of the creditors of the applicants, it appears that the potential cost of the KERP agreement, if it in fact occurs, will be borne by the secured creditors who either consent to the provisions or do not oppose them. The first lien lenders owed approximately \$400 million are consenting and the second lien lenders owed approximately \$150 million have not taken any steps to oppose the KERP provisions. It appears from marketing information provided by the Monitor and Mr. Stephen to the Court on a confidential basis that the secured creditors will likely incur substantial shortfalls and that there likely will be no recovery for the unsecured creditors. Mr. Grace fairly acknowledged in argument that it is highly unlikely that there will be any recovery for the unsecured creditors. Even if that were not the case, and there was a

reasonable prospect for some recovery by the unsecured creditors, the largest unsecured creditor, being the numbered company owned by the Grant family that is owed approximately \$50 million, supports the KERP provisions for Mr. Lynch.

22 In his work, *Canadian Insolvency in Canada, supra*, Mr. McElcheran states that because a KERP arrangement is intended to keep key personnel for the duration of the restructuring process, the compensation covered by the agreement should be deferred until after the restructuring or sale of the business has been completed, although he acknowledges that there may be stated "staged bonuses". While I agree that the logic of a KERP agreement leads to it reflecting these principles, I would be reluctant to hold that they are necessarily a code limiting the discretion of a CCAA court in making an order that is just and fair in the circumstances of the particular case.

23 In this case, the KERP agreement does not expressly provide that the payments are to await the completion of the restructuring. It proves that they are to be made within five days of termination of Mr. Lynch. There would be nothing on the face of the agreement to prevent Mr. Lynch being terminated before the restructuring was completed. However, it is clear that the company wants Mr. Lynch to stay through the restructuring. The intent is not to dismiss him before then. Mr. Dunphy submitted, which I accept, that the provision to pay the termination pay upon termination is to protect Mr. Lynch. Thus while the agreement does not provide that the payment should not be made before the restructuring is complete, that is clearly its present intent, which in my view is sufficient.

24 I have been referred to the case of *Re MEI Computer Technology Group Inc.* (2005), 19 C.B.R. (5th) 257, a decision of Gascon J. in the Quebec Superior Court. In that case, Gascon J. refused to approve a charge for an employee retention plan in a CCAA proceeding. In doing so, Justice Gascon concluded there were guidelines to be followed, which included statements that the remedy was extraordinary that should be used sparingly, that the debtor should normally establish that there was an urgent need for the creation of the charge and that there must be a reasonable prospect of a successful restructuring. I do not agree that such guidelines are necessarily appropriate for a KERP agreement. Why, for example, refuse a KERP agreement if there was no reasonable prospect of a successful restructuring if the agreement provided for a payment on the restructuring? Justice Gascon accepted the submission of the debtor's counsel that the charge was the same as a charge for DIP financing, and took guidelines from DIP financing cases and commentary. I do not think that helpful. DIP financing and a KERP agreement are two different things. I decline to follow the case.

25 The motion by GE Canada to strike the KERP provisions from the Initial Order is denied. The applicants are entitled to their costs from GE Canada. If the quantum cannot be agreed, brief written submissions may be made.

F.J.C. NEWBOULD J.

cp/e/qlrxg/qlmxb/qlaxw/qlced/qlmlt

**TAB 3**

Case Name:

**Canwest Global Communications Corp. (Re)**

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

[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 noteholders 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 reorganize 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 Smurfit-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 Entities' 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 required 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 certain 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 serious 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 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 (the "Applicants")  
application under the Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act, R.S.C. 1985, c. C-36, as amended**

**[2009] O.J. No. 1044**

Court File Nos. 09-CL-7950 and 09-CL-7951

Ontario Superior Court of Justice  
Commercial List

**G.B. Morawetz J.**

Heard: March 6, 2009.

Judgment: March 12, 2009.

(20 paras.)

*Bankruptcy and insolvency law -- Motion by restructuring company for approval of plans designed to retain key employees during restructuring allowed -- Applicant obtained independent advice regarding the relevant industry standards -- Record established that the employees who were covered by the plans were key to the operations of the applicant and were sought after by competitors -- The Monitor reviewed the details of the applicant's proposed plans and believed that they provided reasonable compensation in the current situation.*

Motion by Nortel for approval of certain payment plans designed to retain key employees during its restructuring. In designing the plans, Nortel obtained independent advice regarding the relevant industry standards. The applicant argued that the commitment and retention of key employees was essential to the execution of a restructuring of Nortel and the completion of a plan of arrangement. The motion was not opposed by any party or the Monitor.

HELD: Motion allowed. It was appropriate to approve the plans in question. The record established that the employees who were covered by the plans were key to the operations of Nortel and were sought after by competitors. The Monitor reviewed the details of the applicant's proposed plans and believed that they provided reasonable compensation in the

current situation.

**Counsel:**

Derrick Tay and Jennifer Stam, for Nortel Networks Corporation, et al.

J. Pasquariello, for Ernst & Young Inc., Monitor.

Jonathan Bell, for Informal Group of Nortel Networks Noteholders.

R. Moncur and M. Barrack, for Flextronics.

M. Starnino, for Pension Benefits Guarantee Fund.

Harvey Chaiton, for IBM.

D. Ullman, for Verizon Communications Inc.

Harvey Garman, for U.K. Protection Fund and Nortel Networks UK Pension Trust Limited.

Demetrios Yiokaris, for Certain Former Salaried Employees of Nortel Networks.

Alex MacFarlane, for the U.S. Unsecured Creditors' Committee.

---

**ENDORSEMENT**

**1 G.B. MORAWETZ J.:**-- This motion was heard on March 6, 2009 and the requested relief was granted, with brief reasons to follow.

**2** At the outset of the Nortel proceedings on January 14, 2009, Mr. Tay, on behalf of Nortel Networks Corporation (the "Applicants or Nortel"), indicated that the Applicants would be seeking approval of a Key Employee Incentive Plan ("KEIP") and a Key Employee Retention Plan ("KERP"). Such approval was sought on this motion, together with a request to approve the Calgary Retention Plan (the "Calgary Retention Plan") providing for retention bonus payments promised to employees in connection with the closing of the Westwinds facility.

**3** This motion was not opposed.

**4** The record establishes that the commitment and retention of key employees will be essential to the execution of a restructuring of Nortel and the completion of a plan of arrangement.

**5** The KEIP applies to certain executives of the Senior Leadership Team ("SLTs") and the Executive Leadership Team ("ELTs") and the KERP applies to certain other key employees.

**6** The Monitor reports that these plans have been developed to incent those employees who are:

- (i) absolutely key to the success of the restructuring; and
- (ii) to remain with the Applicants and U.S. Debtors through to the completion of the Canadian and U.S. proceedings

**7** In designing the plans, Nortel obtained independent advice from Mercer (U.S.) Inc. ("Mercer") which included

benchmarking total direct compensation levels against industry standards in comparing other key employee incentive plans approved by the courts in recent comparable North American restructurings. In addition, the Monitor reports that Nortel's financial advisor, Lezard Frères & Co., as well as the Monitor were consulted by Nortel throughout the development process with respect to the plans and have provided Nortel with appropriate input.

8 A total of 972 employees are eligible for the plans. This represents approximately 5% of Nortel's global workforce (excluding employees of the EMEA Filed Entities and the joint venturers). The KEIP covers 92 participants, of which, 29 are employed by the Applicants. The potential dollar value to be paid out under the KEIP is approximately \$23 million, of which \$6.8 million is allocated to the Canadian Applicants. With respect to the KERP, this plan covers 880 participants, of which 294 are employed by the Canadian Applicants. The total potential dollar value to be paid out under the KERP is approximately \$22 million, of which \$6.2 million is allocated to the Canadian Applicants.

9 The awards under both the KEIP and the KERP will vest based on the achievement of three milestones, namely, achievement of North American objectives; achievement of certain parameters that will result in a leaner and more focussed organization; and court-approved confirmation of a plan of restructuring.

10 The Unsecured Creditors' Committee ("UCC") in the Chapter 11 proceedings has indicated that it supports the plans, although such support with respect to the KEIP for the SLTs is conditional upon the delivery to the UCC of Nortel's 2009 financial projections.

11 Counsel to the Applicants advised that the U.S. Bankruptcy Court has approved the KEIP (except as it relates to the SLTs) and the KERP.

12 In order to maintain consistency between Canada and the U.S., the Applicants' motion to approve the KEIP excludes the SLTs. The Monitor reports that the Applicants have advised that they intend to request approval of the KEIP for the SLTs at a future date.

13 With respect to the Calgary Retention Plan, a decision was made in July 2008 to close the Westwinds facility and transfer R & D and global operations to other facilities over a period of 12 months. In July 2008, Nortel developed the Calgary Retention Plan that provided for retention payments to be made to those Westwinds facility employees who Nortel determined were critical to the successful shutdown of the facility. The Applicants have indicated that the maximum cost of the Calgary Retention Plan is estimated to be approximately \$727,000 to be paid to 45 employees at the time the employees have completed their portion of the project.

14 I am satisfied that the record establishes that the employees who are covered by the KEIP, the KERP and the Calgary Retention Plan are key to the operations of Nortel and are sought after by competitors, even given current market conditions.

15 The Monitor has reviewed the details of the Applicants proposed plans and Mercer's analysis and believes that the proposed plans provide reasonable compensation in the current situation.

16 Full details with respect to the plans are contained in the Confidential Report. I have reviewed this Report and agree with the submissions of both the Applicants and the Monitor that the Report contains sensitive commercial information that would be harmful to the Applicants if it were disclosed in the marketplace. In addition, the Confidential Report contains sensitive personal information relating to Nortel's employees, the disclosure of which, in my view, would be harmful.

17 The Applicants and the Monitor request that the Confidential Report be sealed, pending further order of the court. I am satisfied that the test for sealing the Confidential Report, as set out in *Sierra Club of Canada v. Canada (Minister of Finance)*, [2002] 2 S.C.R. 522 has been satisfied and it is appropriate to grant the sealing order.

18 I have been satisfied that it is appropriate to approve the plans in question.

19 An order shall therefore issue approving:

- (i) the KEIP except as it relates to the Applicants' employees whose are designated members of the SLT;
- (ii) the KERP; and
- (iii) the Calgary Retention Plan

20 An order shall issue sealing the Confidential Report pending further order of this court.

G.B. MORAWETZ J.

cp/e/qlafr/qlmxb/qlaxw

**TAB 5**



*Indexed as:*

**Sierra Club of Canada v. Canada (Minister of Finance)**

**Atomic Energy of Canada Limited, appellant;**

**v.**

**Sierra Club of Canada, respondent, and  
The Minister of Finance of Canada, the Minister of  
Foreign Affairs of Canada, the Minister of International  
Trade of Canada and the Attorney General of Canada,  
respondents.**

[2002] 2 S.C.R. 522

[2002] S.C.J. No. 42

2002 SCC 41

File No.: 28020.

Supreme Court of Canada

2001: November 6 / 2002: April 26.

**Present: McLachlin C.J. and Gonthier, Iacobucci,  
Bastarache, Binnie, Arbour and LeBel JJ.**

ON APPEAL FROM THE FEDERAL COURT OF APPEAL (92 paras.)

*Practice -- Federal Court of Canada -- Filing of confidential material -- Environmental organization seeking judicial review of federal government's decision to provide financial assistance to Crown corporation for construction and sale of nuclear reactors -- Crown corporation requesting confidentiality order in respect of certain documents -- Proper analytical approach to be applied to exercise of judicial discretion where litigant seeks confidentiality order -- Whether confidentiality order should be granted -- Federal Court Rules, 1998, SOR/98-106, r. 151.*

Sierra Club is an environmental organization seeking judicial review of the federal government's decision to provide financial assistance to Atomic Energy of Canada Ltd. ("AECL"), a Crown corporation, for the construction and sale to China of two CANDU reactors. The reactors are currently under construction in China, where AECL is the main contractor and project manager. Sierra Club maintains that the authorization of financial assistance [page523] by the government triggered s. 5(1)(b) of the Canadian Environmental Assessment Act ("CEAA"), requiring an environmental assessment as a condition of the financial assistance, and that the failure to comply compels a cancellation of the financial arrangements. AECL filed an affidavit in the proceedings which summarized confidential documents

containing thousands of pages of technical information concerning the ongoing environmental assessment of the construction site by the Chinese authorities. AECL resisted Sierra Club's application for production of the confidential documents on the ground, inter alia, that the documents were the property of the Chinese authorities and that it did not have the authority to disclose them. The Chinese authorities authorized disclosure of the documents on the condition that they be protected by a confidentiality order, under which they would only be made available to the parties and the court, but with no restriction on public access to the judicial proceedings. AECL's application for a confidentiality order was rejected by the Federal Court, Trial Division. The Federal Court of Appeal upheld that decision.

Held: The appeal should be allowed and the confidentiality order granted on the terms requested by AECL.

In light of the established link between open courts and freedom of expression, the fundamental question for a court to consider in an application for a confidentiality order is whether the right to freedom of expression should be compromised in the circumstances. The court must ensure that the discretion to grant the order is exercised in accordance with Charter principles because a confidentiality order will have a negative effect on the s. 2(b) right to freedom of expression. A confidentiality order should only be granted when (1) such an order is necessary to prevent a serious risk to an important interest, including a commercial interest, in the context of litigation because reasonably alternative measures will not prevent the risk; and (2) the salutary effects of the confidentiality order, including the effects on the right of civil litigants to a fair trial, outweigh its deleterious effects, including the effects on the right to free expression, which in this context includes the public interest in open and accessible court proceedings. Three important elements are subsumed under the first branch of the test. First, the risk must be real and substantial, well grounded in evidence, posing a serious threat to the commercial interest in question. Second, the important commercial interest must be one which can be expressed in terms of a public interest in confidentiality, where there is a general principle at stake. Finally, the judge is required to consider not only whether reasonable alternatives are available to such an order but also to restrict the order as much as is reasonably possible while preserving the commercial interest in question.

[page524]

Applying the test to the present circumstances, the commercial interest at stake here relates to the objective of preserving contractual obligations of confidentiality, which is sufficiently important to pass the first branch of the test as long as certain criteria relating to the information are met. The information must have been treated as confidential at all relevant times; on a balance of probabilities, proprietary, commercial and scientific interests could reasonably be harmed by disclosure of the information; and the information must have been accumulated with a reasonable expectation of it being kept confidential. These requirements have been met in this case. Disclosure of the confidential documents would impose a serious risk on an important commercial interest of AECL, and there are no reasonably alternative measures to granting the order.

Under the second branch of the test, the confidentiality order would have significant salutary effects on AECL's right to a fair trial. Disclosure of the confidential documents would cause AECL to breach its contractual obligations and suffer a risk of harm to its competitive position. If a confidentiality order is denied, AECL will be forced to withhold the documents in order to protect its commercial interests, and since that information is relevant to defences available under the CEAA, the inability to present this information hinders AECL's capacity to make full answer and defence. Although in the context of a civil proceeding, this does not engage a Charter right, the right to a fair trial is a fundamental principle of justice. Further, the confidentiality order would allow all parties and the court access to the confidential documents, and permit cross-examination based on their contents, assisting in the search for truth, a core value underlying freedom of expression. Finally, given the technical nature of the information, there may be a substantial public security interest in maintaining the confidentiality of such information.

The deleterious effects of granting a confidentiality order include a negative effect on the open court principle, and therefore on the right to freedom of expression. The more detrimental the confidentiality order would be to the core

values of (1) seeking the truth and the common good, (2) promoting self-fulfilment of individuals by allowing them to develop thoughts and ideas as they see fit, and (3) ensuring that participation in the political process is open to all persons, the harder it will be to justify the confidentiality order. In the hands of the parties and their experts, the confidential documents may be of great assistance in probing the truth of the Chinese environmental assessment process, which would assist the court in reaching accurate factual conclusions. Given the highly technical nature of the documents, the important value of the search for the truth which underlies [page525] both freedom of expression and open justice would be promoted to a greater extent by submitting the confidential documents under the order sought than it would by denying the order.

Under the terms of the order sought, the only restrictions relate to the public distribution of the documents, which is a fairly minimal intrusion into the open court rule. Although the confidentiality order would restrict individual access to certain information which may be of interest to that individual, the second core value of promoting individual self-fulfilment would not be significantly affected by the confidentiality order. The third core value figures prominently in this appeal as open justice is a fundamental aspect of a democratic society. By their very nature, environmental matters carry significant public import, and openness in judicial proceedings involving environmental issues will generally attract a high degree of protection, so that the public interest is engaged here more than if this were an action between private parties involving private interests. However, the narrow scope of the order coupled with the highly technical nature of the confidential documents significantly temper the deleterious effects the confidentiality order would have on the public interest in open courts. The core freedom of expression values of seeking the truth and promoting an open political process are most closely linked to the principle of open courts, and most affected by an order restricting that openness. However, in the context of this case, the confidentiality order would only marginally impede, and in some respects would even promote, the pursuit of these values. The salutary effects of the order outweigh its deleterious effects and the order should be granted. A balancing of the various rights and obligations engaged indicates that the confidentiality order would have substantial salutary effects on AECL's right to a fair trial and freedom of expression, while the deleterious effects on the principle of open courts and freedom of expression would be minimal.

#### Cases Cited

Applied: *Edmonton Journal v. Alberta (Attorney General)*, [1989] 2 S.C.R. 1326; *Canadian Broadcasting Corp. v. New Brunswick (Attorney General)*, [1996] 3 S.C.R. 480; *Dagenais v. Canadian Broadcasting Corp.*, [1994] 3 S.C.R. 835; *R. v. Mentuck*, [2001] 3 S.C.R. 442, 2001 SCC 76; *M. (A.) v. Ryan*, [1997] 1 S.C.R. 157; *Irwin Toy Ltd. v. Quebec (Attorney General)*, [1989] 1 S.C.R. 927; *R. v. Keegstra*, [1990] 3 S.C.R. 697; referred to: *AB Hassle v. Canada (Minister of National Health and [page526] Welfare)*, [2000] 3 F.C. 360, affg (1998), 83 C.P.R. (3d) 428; *Ethyl Canada Inc. v. Canada (Attorney General)* (1998), 17 C.P.C. (4th) 278; *R. v. Oakes*, [1986] 1 S.C.R. 103; *R. v. O.N.E.*, [2001] 3 S.C.R. 478, 2001 SCC 77; *F.N. (Re)*, [2000] 1 S.C.R. 880, 2000 SCC 35; *Eli Lilly and Co. v. Novopharm Ltd.* (1994), 56 C.P.R. (3d) 437.

#### Statutes and Regulations Cited

Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms, ss. 1, 2(b).  
 Canadian Environmental Assessment Act, S.C. 1992, c. 37, ss. 5(1)(b), 8, 54, 54(2)(b).  
 Federal Court Rules, 1998, SOR/98-106, rr. 151, 312.

APPEAL from a judgment of the Federal Court of Appeal, [2000] 4 F.C. 426, 187 D.L.R. (4th) 231, 256 N.R. 1, 24 Admin. L.R. (3d) 1, [2000] F.C.J. No. 732 (QL), affirming a decision of the Trial Division, [2000] 2 F.C. 400, 178 F.T.R. 283, [1999] F.C.J. No. 1633 (QL). Appeal allowed.

J. Brett Ledger and Peter Chapin, for the appellant.  
 Timothy J. Howard and Franklin S. Gertler, for the respondent Sierra Club of Canada.

Graham Garton, Q.C., and J. Sanderson Graham, for the respondents the Minister of Finance of Canada, the Minister of Foreign Affairs of Canada, the Minister of International Trade of Canada and the Attorney General of Canada.

[Quicklaw note: Please see complete list of solicitors appended at the end of the judgment.]

---

The judgment of the Court was delivered by

**IACOBUCCI J.:**--

I. Introduction

1 In our country, courts are the institutions generally chosen to resolve legal disputes as best they can through the application of legal principles to the facts of the case involved. One of the underlying principles of the judicial process is public openness, both in the proceedings of the dispute, and in the material that is relevant to its resolution. However, some material can be made the subject of a confidentiality order. This appeal raises the important [page527] issues of when, and under what circumstances, a confidentiality order should be granted.

2 For the following reasons, I would issue the confidentiality order sought and accordingly would allow the appeal.

II. Facts

3 The appellant, Atomic Energy of Canada Limited ("AECL") is a Crown corporation that owns and markets CANDU nuclear technology, and is an intervener with the rights of a party in the application for judicial review by the respondent, the Sierra Club of Canada ("Sierra Club"). Sierra Club is an environmental organization seeking judicial review of the federal government's decision to provide financial assistance in the form of a \$1.5 billion guaranteed loan relating to the construction and sale of two CANDU nuclear reactors to China by the appellant. The reactors are currently under construction in China, where the appellant is the main contractor and project manager.

4 The respondent maintains that the authorization of financial assistance by the government triggered s. 5(1)(b) of the Canadian Environmental Assessment Act, S.C. 1992, c. 37 ("CEAA"), which requires that an environmental assessment be undertaken before a federal authority grants financial assistance to a project. Failure to undertake such an assessment compels cancellation of the financial arrangements.

5 The appellant and the respondent Ministers argue that the CEAA does not apply to the loan transaction, and that if it does, the statutory defences available under ss. 8 and 54 apply. Section 8 describes the circumstances where Crown corporations are required to conduct environmental assessments. Section 54(2)(b) recognizes the validity of an environmental assessment carried out by a foreign authority provided that it is consistent with the provisions of the CEAA.

6 In the course of the application by Sierra Club to set aside the funding arrangements, the appellant [page528] filed an affidavit of Dr. Simon Pang, a senior manager of the appellant. In the affidavit, Dr. Pang referred to and summarized certain documents (the "Confidential Documents"). The Confidential Documents are also referred to in an affidavit prepared by Mr. Feng, one of AECL's experts. Prior to cross-examining Dr. Pang on his affidavit, Sierra Club made an application for the production of the Confidential Documents, arguing that it could not test Dr. Pang's evidence without access to the underlying documents. The appellant resisted production on various grounds, including the fact that the documents were the property of the Chinese authorities and that it did not have authority to disclose them. After receiving authorization by the Chinese authorities to disclose the documents on the condition that they be protected by a confidentiality order, the appellant sought to introduce the Confidential Documents under Rule 312 of the Federal Court

Rules, 1998, SOR/98-106, and requested a confidentiality order in respect of the documents.

7 Under the terms of the order requested, the Confidential Documents would only be made available to the parties and the court; however, there would be no restriction on public access to the proceedings. In essence, what is being sought is an order preventing the dissemination of the Confidential Documents to the public.

8 The Confidential Documents comprise two Environmental Impact Reports on Siting and Construction Design (the "EIRs"), a Preliminary Safety Analysis Report (the "PSAR"), and the supplementary affidavit of Dr. Pang which summarizes the contents of the EIRs and the PSAR. If admitted, the EIRs and the PSAR would be attached as exhibits to the supplementary affidavit of Dr. Pang. The EIRs were prepared by the Chinese authorities in the Chinese language, and the PSAR was prepared by the appellant with assistance from the Chinese participants in the project. The documents contain a mass of technical information and comprise thousands of pages. They describe the ongoing environmental assessment of the construction site by the Chinese authorities under Chinese law.

[page529]

9 As noted, the appellant argues that it cannot introduce the Confidential Documents into evidence without a confidentiality order, otherwise it would be in breach of its obligations to the Chinese authorities. The respondent's position is that its right to cross-examine Dr. Pang and Mr. Feng on their affidavits would be effectively rendered nugatory in the absence of the supporting documents to which the affidavits referred. Sierra Club proposes to take the position that the affidavits should therefore be afforded very little weight by the judge hearing the application for judicial review.

10 The Federal Court of Canada, Trial Division refused to grant the confidentiality order and the majority of the Federal Court of Appeal dismissed the appeal. In his dissenting opinion, Robertson J.A. would have granted the confidentiality order.

### III. Relevant Statutory Provisions

11 Federal Court Rules, 1998, SOR/98-106

151. (1) On motion, the Court may order that material to be filed shall be treated as confidential.

(2) Before making an order under subsection (1), the Court must be satisfied that the material should be treated as confidential, notwithstanding the public interest in open and accessible court proceedings.

### IV. Judgments Below

A. Federal Court, Trial Division, [2000] 2 F.C. 400

12 Pelletier J. first considered whether leave should be granted pursuant to Rule 312 to introduce the supplementary affidavit of Dr. Pang to which the Confidential Documents were filed as exhibits. In his view, the underlying question was that of relevance, and he concluded that the documents were relevant to the issue of the appropriate remedy. Thus, in the absence of prejudice to the respondent, the affidavit should be permitted to be served and filed. He noted that the respondent would be prejudiced by delay, but since both parties had brought [page530] interlocutory motions which had contributed to the delay, the desirability of having the entire record before the court outweighed the prejudice arising from the delay associated with the introduction of the documents.

13 On the issue of confidentiality, Pelletier J. concluded that he must be satisfied that the need for confidentiality was greater than the public interest in open court proceedings, and observed that the argument for open proceedings in this case was significant given the public interest in Canada's role as a vendor of nuclear technology. As well, he noted that a confidentiality order was an exception to the rule of open access to the courts, and that such an order should be granted only where absolutely necessary.

14 Pelletier J. applied the same test as that used in patent litigation for the issue of a protective order, which is essentially a confidentiality order. The granting of such an order requires the appellant to show a subjective belief that the information is confidential and that its interests would be harmed by disclosure. In addition, if the order is challenged, then the person claiming the benefit of the order must demonstrate objectively that the order is required. This objective element requires the party to show that the information has been treated as confidential, and that it is reasonable to believe that its proprietary, commercial and scientific interests could be harmed by the disclosure of the information.

15 Concluding that both the subjective part and both elements of the objective part of the test had been satisfied, he nevertheless stated: "However, I am also of the view that in public law cases, the objective test has, or should have, a third component which is whether the public interest in disclosure exceeds the risk of harm to a party arising from disclosure" (para. 23).

16 A very significant factor, in his view, was the fact that mandatory production of documents was not in issue here. The fact that the application involved a voluntary tendering of documents to advance the [page531] appellant's own cause as opposed to mandatory production weighed against granting the confidentiality order.

17 In weighing the public interest in disclosure against the risk of harm to AECL arising from disclosure, Pelletier J. noted that the documents the appellant wished to put before the court were prepared by others for other purposes, and recognized that the appellant was bound to protect the confidentiality of the information. At this stage, he again considered the issue of materiality. If the documents were shown to be very material to a critical issue, "the requirements of justice militate in favour of a confidentiality order. If the documents are marginally relevant, then the voluntary nature of the production argues against a confidentiality order" (para. 29). He then decided that the documents were material to a question of the appropriate remedy, a significant issue in the event that the appellant failed on the main issue.

18 Pelletier J. also considered the context of the case and held that since the issue of Canada's role as a vendor of nuclear technology was one of significant public interest, the burden of justifying a confidentiality order was very onerous. He found that AECL could expunge the sensitive material from the documents, or put the evidence before the court in some other form, and thus maintain its full right of defence while preserving the open access to court proceedings.

19 Pelletier J. observed that his order was being made without having perused the Confidential Documents because they had not been put before him. Although he noted the line of cases which holds that a judge ought not to deal with the issue of a confidentiality order without reviewing the documents themselves, in his view, given their voluminous nature and technical content as well as his lack of information as to what information was already in the public domain, he found that an examination of these documents would not have been useful.

[page532]

20 Pelletier J. ordered that the appellant could file the documents in current form, or in an edited version if it chose to do so. He also granted leave to file material dealing with the Chinese regulatory process in general and as applied to this project, provided it did so within 60 days.

B. Federal Court of Appeal, [2000] 4 F.C. 426

(1) Evans J.A. (Sharlow J.A. concurring)

21 At the Federal Court of Appeal, AECL appealed the ruling under Rule 151 of the Federal Court Rules, 1998, and Sierra Club cross-appealed the ruling under Rule 312.

22 With respect to Rule 312, Evans J.A. held that the documents were clearly relevant to a defence under s. 54(2)(b) which the appellant proposed to raise if s. 5(1)(b) of the CEAA was held to apply, and were also potentially relevant to the exercise of the court's discretion to refuse a remedy even if the Ministers were in breach of the CEAA. Evans J.A. agreed with Pelletier J. that the benefit to the appellant and the court of being granted leave to file the documents outweighed any prejudice to the respondent owing to delay and thus concluded that the motions judge was correct in granting leave under Rule 312.

23 On the issue of the confidentiality order, Evans J.A. considered Rule 151, and all the factors that the motions judge had weighed, including the commercial sensitivity of the documents, the fact that the appellant had received them in confidence from the Chinese authorities, and the appellant's argument that without the documents it could not mount a full answer and defence to the application. These factors had to be weighed against the principle of open access to court documents. Evans J.A. agreed with Pelletier J. that the weight to be attached to the public interest in open proceedings varied with context and held that, where a case raises issues of public significance, the principle of openness of judicial process carries greater weight as a factor in [page533] the balancing process. Evans J.A. noted the public interest in the subject matter of the litigation, as well as the considerable media attention it had attracted.

24 In support of his conclusion that the weight assigned to the principle of openness may vary with context, Evans J.A. relied upon the decisions in *AB Hassle v. Canada (Minister of National Health and Welfare)*, [2000] 3 F.C. 360 (C.A.), where the court took into consideration the relatively small public interest at stake, and *Ethyl Canada Inc. v. Canada (Attorney General)* (1998), 17 C.P.C. (4th) 278 (Ont. Ct. (Gen. Div.)), at p. 283, where the court ordered disclosure after determining that the case was a significant constitutional case where it was important for the public to understand the issues at stake. Evans J.A. observed that openness and public participation in the assessment process are fundamental to the CEAA, and concluded that the motions judge could not be said to have given the principle of openness undue weight even though confidentiality was claimed for a relatively small number of highly technical documents.

25 Evans J.A. held that the motions judge had placed undue emphasis on the fact that the introduction of the documents was voluntary; however, it did not follow that his decision on the confidentiality order must therefore be set aside. Evans J.A. was of the view that this error did not affect the ultimate conclusion for three reasons. First, like the motions judge, he attached great weight to the principle of openness. Secondly, he held that the inclusion in the affidavits of a summary of the reports could go a long way to compensate for the absence of the originals, should the appellant choose not to put them in without a confidentiality order. Finally, if AECL submitted the documents in an expunged fashion, the claim for confidentiality would rest upon a relatively unimportant factor, i.e., the appellant's claim that it would suffer a loss of business if it breached its undertaking with the Chinese authorities.

26 Evans J.A. rejected the argument that the motions judge had erred in deciding the motion without [page534] reference to the actual documents, stating that it was not necessary for him to inspect them, given that summaries were available and that the documents were highly technical and incompletely translated. Thus the appeal and cross-appeal were both dismissed.

(2) Robertson J.A. (dissenting)

27 Robertson J.A. disagreed with the majority for three reasons. First, in his view, the level of public interest in the case, the degree of media coverage, and the identities of the parties should not be taken into consideration in assessing

an application for a confidentiality order. Instead, he held that it was the nature of the evidence for which the order is sought that must be examined.

28 In addition, he found that without a confidentiality order, the appellant had to choose between two unacceptable options: either suffering irreparable financial harm if the confidential information was introduced into evidence, or being denied the right to a fair trial because it could not mount a full defence if the evidence was not introduced.

29 Finally, he stated that the analytical framework employed by the majority in reaching its decision was fundamentally flawed as it was based largely on the subjective views of the motions judge. He rejected the contextual approach to the question of whether a confidentiality order should issue, emphasizing the need for an objective framework to combat the perception that justice is a relative concept, and to promote consistency and certainty in the law.

30 To establish this more objective framework for regulating the issuance of confidentiality orders pertaining to commercial and scientific information, he turned to the legal rationale underlying the commitment to the principle of open justice, referring to *Edmonton Journal v. Alberta (Attorney General)*, [1989] 2 S.C.R. 1326. There, the Supreme Court of Canada held that open proceedings foster the search for the truth, and reflect the importance of public scrutiny of the courts.

[page535]

31 Robertson J.A. stated that although the principle of open justice is a reflection of the basic democratic value of accountability in the exercise of judicial power, in his view, the principle that justice itself must be secured is paramount. He concluded that justice as an overarching principle means that exceptions occasionally must be made to rules or principles.

32 He observed that, in the area of commercial law, when the information sought to be protected concerns "trade secrets", this information will not be disclosed during a trial if to do so would destroy the owner's proprietary rights and expose him or her to irreparable harm in the form of financial loss. Although the case before him did not involve a trade secret, he nevertheless held that the same treatment could be extended to commercial or scientific information which was acquired on a confidential basis and attached the following criteria as conditions precedent to the issuance of a confidentiality order (at para. 13):

- (1) the information is of a confidential nature as opposed to facts which one would like to keep confidential; (2) the information for which confidentiality is sought is not already in the public domain; (3) on a balance of probabilities the party seeking the confidentiality order would suffer irreparable harm if the information were made public; (4) the information is relevant to the legal issues raised in the case; (5) correlatively, the information is "necessary" to the resolution of those issues; (6) the granting of a confidentiality order does not unduly prejudice the opposing party; and (7) the public interest in open court proceedings does not override the private interests of the party seeking the confidentiality order. The onus in establishing that criteria one to six are met is on the party seeking the confidentiality order. Under the seventh criterion, it is for the opposing party to show that a prima facie right to a protective order has been overtaken by the need to preserve the openness of the court proceedings. In addressing these criteria one must bear in mind two of the threads woven into the fabric of the principle of open justice: the search for truth and the preservation of the rule of law. As stated at the outset, I do not believe that the perceived degree of public importance of a case is a relevant consideration.



[page536]

33 In applying these criteria to the circumstances of the case, Robertson J.A. concluded that the confidentiality order should be granted. In his view, the public interest in open court proceedings did not override the interests of AECL in maintaining the confidentiality of these highly technical documents.

34 Robertson J.A. also considered the public interest in the need to ensure that site plans for nuclear installations were not, for example, posted on a Web site. He concluded that a confidentiality order would not undermine the two primary objectives underlying the principle of open justice: truth and the rule of law. As such, he would have allowed the appeal and dismissed the cross-appeal.

#### V. Issues

35 A. What is the proper analytical approach to be applied to the exercise of judicial discretion where a litigant seeks a confidentiality order under Rule 151 of the Federal Court Rules, 1998?

B. Should the confidentiality order be granted in this case?

#### VI. Analysis

##### A. The Analytical Approach to the Granting of a Confidentiality Order

###### (1) The General Framework: Herein the Dagenais Principles

36 The link between openness in judicial proceedings and freedom of expression has been firmly established by this Court. In *Canadian Broadcasting Corp. v. New Brunswick (Attorney General)*, [1996] 3 S.C.R. 480, at para. 23, La Forest J. expressed the relationship as follows:

The principle of open courts is inextricably tied to the rights guaranteed by s. 2(b). Openness permits public access to information about the courts, which in turn permits the public to discuss and put forward opinions and criticisms of court practices and proceedings. While the freedom to express ideas and opinions about the operation of the courts is clearly within the ambit of the [page537] freedom guaranteed by s. 2(b), so too is the right of members of the public to obtain information about the courts in the first place.

Under the order sought, public access and public scrutiny of the Confidential Documents would be restricted; this would clearly infringe the public's freedom of expression guarantee.

37 A discussion of the general approach to be taken in the exercise of judicial discretion to grant a confidentiality order should begin with the principles set out by this Court in *Dagenais v. Canadian Broadcasting Corp.*, [1994] 3 S.C.R. 835. Although that case dealt with the common law jurisdiction of the court to order a publication ban in the criminal law context, there are strong similarities between publication bans and confidentiality orders in the context of judicial proceedings. In both cases a restriction on freedom of expression is sought in order to preserve or promote an interest engaged by those proceedings. As such, the fundamental question for a court to consider in an application for a publication ban or a confidentiality order is whether, in the circumstances, the right to freedom of expression should be compromised.

38 Although in each case freedom of expression will be engaged in a different context, the Dagenais framework utilizes overarching Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms principles in order to balance freedom of expression with other rights and interests, and thus can be adapted and applied to various circumstances. As a result, the analytical

approach to the exercise of discretion under Rule 151 should echo the underlying principles laid out in *Dagenais*, although it must be tailored to the specific rights and interests engaged in this case.

39 *Dagenais* dealt with an application by four accused persons under the court's common law jurisdiction requesting an order prohibiting the broadcast of a television programme dealing with the physical and sexual abuse of young boys at [page538] religious institutions. The applicants argued that because the factual circumstances of the programme were very similar to the facts at issue in their trials, the ban was necessary to preserve the accused's right to a fair trial.

40 Lamer C.J. found that the common law discretion to order a publication ban must be exercised within the boundaries set by the principles of the Charter. Since publication bans necessarily curtail the freedom of expression of third parties, he adapted the pre-Charter common law rule such that it balanced the right to freedom of expression with the right to a fair trial of the accused in a way which reflected the substance of the test from *R. v. Oakes*, [1986] 1 S.C.R. 103. At p. 878 of *Dagenais*, Lamer C.J. set out his reformulated test:

A publication ban should only be ordered when:

- (a) Such a ban is necessary in order to prevent a real and substantial risk to the fairness of the trial, because reasonably available alternative measures will not prevent the risk; and
- (b) The salutary effects of the publication ban outweigh the deleterious effects to the free expression of those affected by the ban. [Emphasis in original.]

41 In New Brunswick, *supra*, this Court modified the *Dagenais* test in the context of the related issue of how the discretionary power under s. 486(1) of the Criminal Code, R.S.C. 1985, c. C-46, to exclude the public from a trial should be exercised. That case dealt with an appeal from the trial judge's order excluding the public from the portion of a sentencing proceeding for sexual assault and sexual interference dealing with the specific acts committed by the accused on the basis that it would avoid "undue hardship" to both the victims and the accused.

42 La Forest J. found that s. 486(1) was a restriction on the s. 2(b) right to freedom of expression in that it provided a "discretionary bar on public and media access to the courts": New Brunswick, at para. 33; [page539] however he found this infringement to be justified under s. 1 provided that the discretion was exercised in accordance with the Charter. Thus, the approach taken by La Forest J. at para. 69 to the exercise of discretion under s. 486(1) of the Criminal Code, closely mirrors the *Dagenais* common law test:

- (a) the judge must consider the available options and consider whether there are any other reasonable and effective alternatives available;
- (b) the judge must consider whether the order is limited as much as possible; and
- (c) the judge must weigh the importance of the objectives of the particular order and its probable effects against the importance of openness and the particular expression that will be limited in order to ensure that the positive and negative effects of the order are proportionate.

In applying this test to the facts of the case, La Forest J. found that the evidence of the potential undue hardship consisted mainly in the Crown's submission that the evidence was of a "delicate nature" and that this was insufficient to override the infringement on freedom of expression.

43 This Court has recently revisited the granting of a publication ban under the court's common law jurisdiction in *R. v. Mentuck*, [2001] 3 S.C.R. 442, 2001 SCC 76, and its companion case *R. v. O.N.E.*, [2001] 3 S.C.R. 478, 2001 SCC 77. In *Mentuck*, the Crown moved for a publication ban to protect the identity of undercover police officers and operational methods employed by the officers in their investigation of the accused. The accused opposed the motion as an infringement of his right to a fair and public hearing under s. 11(d) of the Charter. The order was also opposed by two intervening newspapers as an infringement of their right to freedom of expression.

44 The Court noted that, while Dagenais dealt with the balancing of freedom of expression on the one hand, and the right to a fair trial of the accused on the other, in the case before it, both the right of the [page540] accused to a fair and public hearing, and freedom of expression weighed in favour of denying the publication ban. These rights were balanced against interests relating to the proper administration of justice, in particular, protecting the safety of police officers and preserving the efficacy of undercover police operations.

45 In spite of this distinction, the Court noted that underlying the approach taken in both Dagenais and New Brunswick was the goal of ensuring that the judicial discretion to order publication bans is subject to no lower a standard of compliance with the Charter than legislative enactment. This goal is furthered by incorporating the essence of s. 1 of the Charter and the Oakes test into the publication ban test. Since this same goal applied in the case before it, the Court adopted a similar approach to that taken in Dagenais, but broadened the Dagenais test (which dealt specifically with the right of an accused to a fair trial) such that it could guide the exercise of judicial discretion where a publication ban is requested in order to preserve any important aspect of the proper administration of justice. At para. 32, the Court reformulated the test as follows:

A publication ban should only be ordered when:

- (a) such an order is necessary in order to prevent a serious risk to the proper administration of justice because reasonably alternative measures will not prevent the risk; and
- (b) the salutary effects of the publication ban outweigh the deleterious effects on the rights and interests of the parties and the public, including the effects on the right to free expression, the right of the accused to a fair and public trial, and the efficacy of the administration of justice.

46 The Court emphasized that under the first branch of the test, three important elements were subsumed under the "necessity" branch. First, the risk in question must be a serious risk well grounded in the evidence. Second, the phrase "proper administration of justice" must be carefully interpreted so as not to [page541] allow the concealment of an excessive amount of information. Third, the test requires the judge ordering the ban to consider not only whether reasonable alternatives are available, but also to restrict the ban as far as possible without sacrificing the prevention of the risk.

47 At para. 31, the Court also made the important observation that the proper administration of justice will not necessarily involve Charter rights, and that the ability to invoke the Charter is not a necessary condition for a publication ban to be granted:

The [common law publication ban] rule can accommodate orders that must occasionally be made in the interests of the administration of justice, which encompass more than fair trial rights. As the test is intended to "reflec[t] the substance of the Oakes test", we cannot require that Charter rights be the only legitimate objective of such orders any more than we require that government action or legislation in violation of the Charter be justified exclusively by the pursuit of another Charter right. [Emphasis added.]

The Court also anticipated that, in appropriate circumstances, the Dagenais framework could be expanded even further in order to address requests for publication bans where interests other than the administration of justice were involved.

48 Mentuck is illustrative of the flexibility of the Dagenais approach. Since its basic purpose is to ensure that the judicial discretion to deny public access to the courts is exercised in accordance with Charter principles, in my view, the Dagenais model can and should be adapted to the situation in the case at bar where the central issue is whether judicial discretion should be exercised so as to exclude confidential information from a public proceeding. As in Dagenais, New Brunswick and Mentuck, granting the confidentiality order will have a negative effect on the Charter right to freedom of expression, as well as the principle of open and accessible court proceedings, and, as in those cases, courts must ensure

that the discretion to grant the order is exercised in accordance with Charter principles. [page542] However, in order to adapt the test to the context of this case, it is first necessary to determine the particular rights and interests engaged by this application.

(2) The Rights and Interests of the Parties

49 The immediate purpose for AECL's confidentiality request relates to its commercial interests. The information in question is the property of the Chinese authorities. If the appellant were to disclose the Confidential Documents, it would be in breach of its contractual obligations and suffer a risk of harm to its competitive position. This is clear from the findings of fact of the motions judge that AECL was bound by its commercial interests and its customer's property rights not to disclose the information (para. 27), and that such disclosure could harm the appellant's commercial interests (para. 23).

50 Aside from this direct commercial interest, if the confidentiality order is denied, then in order to protect its commercial interests, the appellant will have to withhold the documents. This raises the important matter of the litigation context in which the order is sought. As both the motions judge and the Federal Court of Appeal found that the information contained in the Confidential Documents was relevant to defences available under the CEEA, the inability to present this information hinders the appellant's capacity to make full answer and defence, or, expressed more generally, the appellant's right, as a civil litigant, to present its case. In that sense, preventing the appellant from disclosing these documents on a confidential basis infringes its right to a fair trial. Although in the context of a civil proceeding this does not engage a Charter right, the right to a fair trial generally can be viewed as a fundamental principle of justice: *M. (A.) v. Ryan*, [1997] 1 S.C.R. 157, at para. 84, per L'Heureux-Dubé J. (dissenting, but not on that point). Although this fair trial right is directly relevant to the appellant, there is also a general public interest in protecting the right to a fair trial. Indeed, as a general proposition, all disputes in the courts should be decided under a fair trial standard. The legitimacy of the judicial process alone [page543] demands as much. Similarly, courts have an interest in having all relevant evidence before them in order to ensure that justice is done.

51 Thus, the interests which would be promoted by a confidentiality order are the preservation of commercial and contractual relations, as well as the right of civil litigants to a fair trial. Related to the latter are the public and judicial interests in seeking the truth and achieving a just result in civil proceedings.

52 In opposition to the confidentiality order lies the fundamental principle of open and accessible court proceedings. This principle is inextricably tied to freedom of expression enshrined in s. 2(b) of the Charter: *New Brunswick*, supra, at para. 23. The importance of public and media access to the courts cannot be understated, as this access is the method by which the judicial process is scrutinized and criticized. Because it is essential to the administration of justice that justice is done and is seen to be done, such public scrutiny is fundamental. The open court principle has been described as "the very soul of justice", guaranteeing that justice is administered in a non-arbitrary manner: *New Brunswick*, at para. 22.

(3) Adapting the Dagenais Test to the Rights and Interests of the Parties

53 Applying the rights and interests engaged in this case to the analytical framework of Dagenais and subsequent cases discussed above, the test for whether a confidentiality order ought to be granted in a case such as this one should be framed as follows:

A confidentiality order under Rule 151 should only be granted when:

- (a) such an order is necessary in order to prevent a serious risk to an important interest, including a commercial interest, in the context of litigation because reasonably alternative measures will not prevent the risk; and

- (b) the salutary effects of the confidentiality order, including the effects on the right of civil litigants to a fair trial, outweigh its deleterious effects, including the effects on the right to free expression, which in this context includes the public interest in open and accessible court proceedings.

54 As in *Mentuck*, I would add that three important elements are subsumed under the first branch of this test. First, the risk in question must be real and substantial, in that the risk is well grounded in the evidence, and poses a serious threat to the commercial interest in question.

55 In addition, the phrase "important commercial interest" is in need of some clarification. In order to qualify as an "important commercial interest", the interest in question cannot merely be specific to the party requesting the order; the interest must be one which can be expressed in terms of a public interest in confidentiality. For example, a private company could not argue simply that the existence of a particular contract should not be made public because to do so would cause the company to lose business, thus harming its commercial interests. However, if, as in this case, exposure of information would cause a breach of a confidentiality agreement, then the commercial interest affected can be characterized more broadly as the general commercial interest of preserving confidential information. Simply put, if there is no general principle at stake, there can be no "important commercial interest" for the purposes of this test. Or, in the words of Binnie J. in *F.N. (Re)*, [2000] 1 S.C.R. 880, 2000 SCC 35, at para. 10, the open court rule only yields "where the public interest in confidentiality outweighs the public interest in openness" (emphasis added).

56 In addition to the above requirement, courts must be cautious in determining what constitutes an "important commercial interest". It must be remembered that a confidentiality order involves an infringement on freedom of expression. Although the balancing of the commercial interest with freedom of expression takes place under the second [page 545] branch of the test, courts must be alive to the fundamental importance of the open court rule. See generally *Muldoon J. in Eli Lilly and Co. v. Novopharm Ltd.* (1994), 56 C.P.R. (3d) 437 (F.C.T.D.), at p. 439.

57 Finally, the phrase "reasonably alternative measures" requires the judge to consider not only whether reasonable alternatives to a confidentiality order are available, but also to restrict the order as much as is reasonably possible while preserving the commercial interest in question.

## B. Application of the Test to this Appeal

### (1) Necessity

58 At this stage, it must be determined whether disclosure of the Confidential Documents would impose a serious risk on an important commercial interest of the appellant, and whether there are reasonable alternatives, either to the order itself, or to its terms.

59 The commercial interest at stake here relates to the objective of preserving contractual obligations of confidentiality. The appellant argues that it will suffer irreparable harm to its commercial interests if the Confidential Documents are disclosed. In my view, the preservation of confidential information constitutes a sufficiently important commercial interest to pass the first branch of the test as long as certain criteria relating to the information are met.

60 Pelletier J. noted that the order sought in this case was similar in nature to an application for a protective order which arises in the context of patent litigation. Such an order requires the applicant to demonstrate that the information in question has been treated at all relevant times as confidential and that on a balance of probabilities its proprietary, commercial and scientific interests could reasonably be harmed by the disclosure of the information: *AB Hassle v. Canada (Minister of National Health and Welfare)* (1998), 83 C.P.R. (3d) 428 (F.C.T.D.), at p. 434. To this I would add

the requirement proposed [page546] by Robertson J.A. that the information in question must be of a "confidential nature" in that it has been "accumulated with a reasonable expectation of it being kept confidential" as opposed to "facts which a litigant would like to keep confidential by having the courtroom doors closed" (para. 14).

61 Pelletier J. found as a fact that the AB Hassle test had been satisfied in that the information had clearly been treated as confidential both by the appellant and by the Chinese authorities, and that, on a balance of probabilities, disclosure of the information could harm the appellant's commercial interests (para. 23). As well, Robertson J.A. found that the information in question was clearly of a confidential nature as it was commercial information, consistently treated and regarded as confidential, that would be of interest to AECL's competitors (para. 16). Thus, the order is sought to prevent a serious risk to an important commercial interest.

62 The first branch of the test also requires the consideration of alternative measures to the confidentiality order, as well as an examination of the scope of the order to ensure that it is not overly broad. Both courts below found that the information contained in the Confidential Documents was relevant to potential defences available to the appellant under the CEEA and this finding was not appealed at this Court. Further, I agree with the Court of Appeal's assertion (at para. 99) that, given the importance of the documents to the right to make full answer and defence, the appellant is, practically speaking, compelled to produce the documents. Given that the information is necessary to the appellant's case, it remains only to determine whether there are reasonably alternative means by which the necessary information can be adduced without disclosing the confidential information.

63 Two alternatives to the confidentiality order were put forward by the courts below. The motions judge suggested that the Confidential Documents could be expunged of their commercially sensitive contents, and edited versions of the documents could be [page547] filed. As well, the majority of the Court of Appeal, in addition to accepting the possibility of expungement, was of the opinion that the summaries of the Confidential Documents included in the affidavits could go a long way to compensate for the absence of the originals. If either of these options is a reasonable alternative to submitting the Confidential Documents under a confidentiality order, then the order is not necessary, and the application does not pass the first branch of the test.

64 There are two possible options with respect to expungement, and in my view, there are problems with both of these. The first option would be for AECL to expunge the confidential information without disclosing the expunged material to the parties and the court. However, in this situation the filed material would still differ from the material used by the affiants. It must not be forgotten that this motion arose as a result of Sierra Club's position that the summaries contained in the affidavits should be accorded little or no weight without the presence of the underlying documents. Even if the relevant information and the confidential information were mutually exclusive, which would allow for the disclosure of all the information relied on in the affidavits, this relevancy determination could not be tested on cross-examination because the expunged material would not be available. Thus, even in the best case scenario, where only irrelevant information needed to be expunged, the parties would be put in essentially the same position as that which initially generated this appeal, in the sense that, at least some of the material relied on to prepare the affidavits in question would not be available to Sierra Club.

65 Further, I agree with Robertson J.A. that this best case scenario, where the relevant and the confidential information do not overlap, is an untested assumption (para. 28). Although the documents themselves were not put before the courts on this motion, given that they comprise thousands of pages of detailed information, this assumption is at best optimistic. The expungement alternative would be further complicated by the fact that the Chinese [page548] authorities require prior approval for any request by AECL to disclose information.

66 The second option is that the expunged material be made available to the court and the parties under a more narrowly drawn confidentiality order. Although this option would allow for slightly broader public access than the current confidentiality request, in my view, this minor restriction to the current confidentiality request is not a viable alternative given the difficulties associated with expungement in these circumstances. The test asks whether there are reasonably alternative measures; it does not require the adoption of the absolutely least restrictive option. With respect,

in my view, expungement of the Confidential Documents would be a virtually unworkable and ineffective solution that is not reasonable in the circumstances.

67 A second alternative to a confidentiality order was Evans J.A.'s suggestion that the summaries of the Confidential Documents included in the affidavits "may well go a long way to compensate for the absence of the originals" (para. 103). However, he appeared to take this fact into account merely as a factor to be considered when balancing the various interests at stake. I would agree that at this threshold stage to rely on the summaries alone, in light of the intention of Sierra Club to argue that they should be accorded little or no weight, does not appear to be a "reasonably alternative measure" to having the underlying documents available to the parties.

68 With the above considerations in mind, I find the confidentiality order necessary in that disclosure of the Confidential Documents would impose a serious risk on an important commercial interest of the appellant, and that there are no reasonably alternative measures to granting the order.

(2) The Proportionality Stage

69 As stated above, at this stage, the salutary effects of the confidentiality order, including the effects on the appellant's right to a fair trial, must be weighed against the deleterious effects of the confidentiality order, including the effects on the right to free [page549] expression, which in turn is connected to the principle of open and accessible court proceedings. This balancing will ultimately determine whether the confidentiality order ought to be granted.

(a) Salutary Effects of the Confidentiality Order

70 As discussed above, the primary interest that would be promoted by the confidentiality order is the public interest in the right of a civil litigant to present its case, or, more generally, the fair trial right. Because the fair trial right is being invoked in this case in order to protect commercial, not liberty, interests of the appellant, the right to a fair trial in this context is not a Charter right; however, a fair trial for all litigants has been recognized as a fundamental principle of justice: Ryan, supra, at para. 84. It bears repeating that there are circumstances where, in the absence of an affected Charter right, the proper administration of justice calls for a confidentiality order: Mentuck, supra, at para. 31. In this case, the salutary effects that such an order would have on the administration of justice relate to the ability of the appellant to present its case, as encompassed by the broader fair trial right.

71 The Confidential Documents have been found to be relevant to defences that will be available to the appellant in the event that the CEAA is found to apply to the impugned transaction and, as discussed above, the appellant cannot disclose the documents without putting its commercial interests at serious risk of harm. As such, there is a very real risk that, without the confidentiality order, the ability of the appellant to mount a successful defence will be seriously curtailed. I conclude, therefore, that the confidentiality order would have significant salutary effects on the appellant's right to a fair trial.

72 Aside from the salutary effects on the fair trial interest, the confidentiality order would also have a beneficial impact on other important rights and interests. First, as I discuss in more detail below, the confidentiality order would allow all parties and the court access to the Confidential Documents, and [page550] permit cross-examination based on their contents. By facilitating access to relevant documents in a judicial proceeding, the order sought would assist in the search for truth, a core value underlying freedom of expression.

73 Second, I agree with the observation of Robertson J.A. that, as the Confidential Documents contain detailed technical information pertaining to the construction and design of a nuclear installation, it may be in keeping with the public interest to prevent this information from entering the public domain (para. 44). Although the exact contents of the documents remain a mystery, it is apparent that they contain technical details of a nuclear installation, and there may well be a substantial public security interest in maintaining the confidentiality of such information.

(b) Deleterious Effects of the Confidentiality Order

74 Granting the confidentiality order would have a negative effect on the open court principle, as the public would be denied access to the contents of the Confidential Documents. As stated above, the principle of open courts is inextricably tied to the s. 2(b) Charter right to freedom of expression, and public scrutiny of the courts is a fundamental aspect of the administration of justice: *New Brunswick*, supra, at paras. 22-23. Although as a general principle, the importance of open courts cannot be overstated, it is necessary to examine, in the context of this case, the particular deleterious effects on freedom of expression that the confidentiality order would have.

75 Underlying freedom of expression are the core values of (1) seeking the truth and the common good; (2) promoting self-fulfilment of individuals by allowing them to develop thoughts and ideas as they see fit; and (3) ensuring that participation in the political process is open to all persons: *Irwin Toy Ltd. v. Quebec (Attorney General)*, [1989] 1 S.C.R. 927, [page551] at p. 976; *R. v. Keegstra*, [1990] 3 S.C.R. 697, at pp. 762-64, per Dickson C.J. Charter jurisprudence has established that the closer the speech in question lies to these core values, the harder it will be to justify a s. 2(b) infringement of that speech under s. 1 of the Charter: *Keegstra*, at pp. 760-61. Since the main goal in this case is to exercise judicial discretion in a way which conforms to Charter principles, a discussion of the deleterious effects of the confidentiality order on freedom of expression should include an assessment of the effects such an order would have on the three core values. The more detrimental the order would be to these values, the more difficult it will be to justify the confidentiality order. Similarly, minor effects of the order on the core values will make the confidentiality order easier to justify.

76 Seeking the truth is not only at the core of freedom of expression, but it has also been recognized as a fundamental purpose behind the open court rule, as the open examination of witnesses promotes an effective evidentiary process: *Edmonton Journal*, supra, at pp. 1357-58, per Wilson J. Clearly the confidentiality order, by denying public and media access to documents relied on in the proceedings, would impede the search for truth to some extent. Although the order would not exclude the public from the courtroom, the public and the media would be denied access to documents relevant to the evidentiary process.

77 However, as mentioned above, to some extent the search for truth may actually be promoted by the confidentiality order. This motion arises as a result of Sierra Club's argument that it must have access to the Confidential Documents in order to test the accuracy of Dr. Pang's evidence. If the order is denied, then the most likely scenario is that the appellant will not submit the documents with the unfortunate result that evidence which may be relevant to the proceedings will not be available to Sierra Club or the court. As a result, Sierra Club will not be able to fully test the accuracy of Dr. Pang's evidence on cross-examination. In addition, the court will not have the benefit of this cross-examination or [page552] documentary evidence, and will be required to draw conclusions based on an incomplete evidentiary record. This would clearly impede the search for truth in this case.

78 As well, it is important to remember that the confidentiality order would restrict access to a relatively small number of highly technical documents. The nature of these documents is such that the general public would be unlikely to understand their contents, and thus they would contribute little to the public interest in the search for truth in this case. However, in the hands of the parties and their respective experts, the documents may be of great assistance in probing the truth of the Chinese environmental assessment process, which would in turn assist the court in reaching accurate factual conclusions. Given the nature of the documents, in my view, the important value of the search for truth which underlies both freedom of expression and open justice would be promoted to a greater extent by submitting the Confidential Documents under the order sought than it would by denying the order, and thereby preventing the parties and the court from relying on the documents in the course of the litigation.

79 In addition, under the terms of the order sought, the only restrictions on these documents relate to their public distribution. The Confidential Documents would be available to the court and the parties, and public access to the proceedings would not be impeded. As such, the order represents a fairly minimal intrusion into the open court rule, and thus would not have significant deleterious effects on this principle.

80 The second core value underlying freedom of speech, namely, the promotion of individual self-fulfilment by



allowing open development of thoughts and ideas, focusses on individual expression, and thus does not closely relate to the open court principle which involves institutional expression. Although the confidentiality order would [page553] restrict individual access to certain information which may be of interest to that individual, I find that this value would not be significantly affected by the confidentiality order.

**81** The third core value, open participation in the political process, figures prominently in this appeal, as open justice is a fundamental aspect of a democratic society. This connection was pointed out by Cory J. in *Edmonton Journal*, supra, at p. 1339:

It can be seen that freedom of expression is of fundamental importance to a democratic society. It is also essential to a democracy and crucial to the rule of law that the courts are seen to function openly. The press must be free to comment upon court proceedings to ensure that the courts are, in fact, seen by all to operate openly in the penetrating light of public scrutiny.

Although there is no doubt as to the importance of open judicial proceedings to a democratic society, there was disagreement in the courts below as to whether the weight to be assigned to the open court principle should vary depending on the nature of the proceeding.

**82** On this issue, Robertson J.A. was of the view that the nature of the case and the level of media interest were irrelevant considerations. On the other hand, Evans J.A. held that the motions judge was correct in taking into account that this judicial review application was one of significant public and media interest. In my view, although the public nature of the case may be a factor which strengthens the importance of open justice in a particular case, the level of media interest should not be taken into account as an independent consideration.

**83** Since cases involving public institutions will generally relate more closely to the core value of public participation in the political process, the public nature of a proceeding should be taken into consideration when assessing the merits of a confidentiality order. It is important to note that this core value will always be engaged where the open court [page554] principle is engaged owing to the importance of open justice to a democratic society. However, where the political process is also engaged by the substance of the proceedings, the connection between open proceedings and public participation in the political process will increase. As such, I agree with Evans J.A. in the court below where he stated, at para. 87:

While all litigation is important to the parties, and there is a public interest in ensuring the fair and appropriate adjudication of all litigation that comes before the courts, some cases raise issues that transcend the immediate interests of the parties and the general public interest in the due administration of justice, and have a much wider public interest significance.

**84** This motion relates to an application for judicial review of a decision by the government to fund a nuclear energy project. Such an application is clearly of a public nature, as it relates to the distribution of public funds in relation to an issue of demonstrated public interest. Moreover, as pointed out by Evans J.A., openness and public participation are of fundamental importance under the CEAA. Indeed, by their very nature, environmental matters carry significant public import, and openness in judicial proceedings involving environmental issues will generally attract a high degree of protection. In this regard, I agree with Evans J.A. that the public interest is engaged here more than it would be if this were an action between private parties relating to purely private interests.

**85** However, with respect, to the extent that Evans J.A. relied on media interest as an indicium of public interest, this was an error. In my view, it is important to distinguish public interest, from media interest, and I agree with Robertson J.A. that media exposure cannot be viewed as an impartial measure of public interest. It is the public nature of the proceedings which increases the need for openness, and this public nature is not necessarily reflected by the media desire to probe the facts of the case. [page555] I reiterate the caution given by Dickson C.J. in *Keegstra*, supra, at p. 760, where he stated that, while the speech in question must be examined in light of its relation to the core values, "we must

guard carefully against judging expression according to its popularity".

86 Although the public interest in open access to the judicial review application as a whole is substantial, in my view, it is also important to bear in mind the nature and scope of the information for which the order is sought in assigning weight to the public interest. With respect, the motions judge erred in failing to consider the narrow scope of the order when he considered the public interest in disclosure, and consequently attached excessive weight to this factor. In this connection, I respectfully disagree with the following conclusion of Evans J.A., at para. 97:

Thus, having considered the nature of this litigation, and having assessed the extent of public interest in the openness of the proceedings in the case before him, the Motions Judge cannot be said in all the circumstances to have given this factor undue weight, even though confidentiality is claimed for only three documents among the small mountain of paper filed in this case, and their content is likely to be beyond the comprehension of all but those equipped with the necessary technical expertise.

Open justice is a fundamentally important principle, particularly when the substance of the proceedings is public in nature. However, this does not detract from the duty to attach weight to this principle in accordance with the specific limitations on openness that the confidentiality order would have. As Wilson J. observed in *Edmonton Journal*, supra, at pp. 1353-54:

One thing seems clear and that is that one should not balance one value at large and the conflicting value in its context. To do so could well be to pre-judge the issue by placing more weight on the value developed at large than is appropriate in the context of the case.

[page556]

87 In my view, it is important that, although there is significant public interest in these proceedings, open access to the judicial review application would be only slightly impeded by the order sought. The narrow scope of the order coupled with the highly technical nature of the Confidential Documents significantly temper the deleterious effects the confidentiality order would have on the public interest in open courts.

88 In addressing the effects that the confidentiality order would have on freedom of expression, it should also be borne in mind that the appellant may not have to raise defences under the CEAA, in which case the Confidential Documents would be irrelevant to the proceedings, with the result that freedom of expression would be unaffected by the order. However, since the necessity of the Confidential Documents will not be determined for some time, in the absence of a confidentiality order, the appellant would be left with the choice of either submitting the documents in breach of its obligations, or withholding the documents in the hopes that either it will not have to present a defence under the CEAA, or that it will be able to mount a successful defence in the absence of these relevant documents. If it chooses the former option, and the defences under the CEAA are later found not to apply, then the appellant will have suffered the prejudice of having its confidential and sensitive information released into the public domain, with no corresponding benefit to the public. Although this scenario is far from certain, the possibility of such an occurrence also weighs in favour of granting the order sought.

89 In coming to this conclusion, I note that if the appellant is not required to invoke the relevant defences under the CEAA, it is also true that the appellant's fair trial right will not be impeded, even if the confidentiality order is not granted. However, I do not take this into account as a factor which weighs in favour of denying the order because, if the order is granted and the Confidential Documents are not required, there will be no deleterious effects on either the public interest in freedom of expression or the appellant's commercial interests or fair trial right. This neutral result is in contrast with the [page557] scenario discussed above where the order is denied and the possibility arises that the

appellant's commercial interests will be prejudiced with no corresponding public benefit. As a result, the fact that the Confidential Documents may not be required is a factor which weighs in favour of granting the confidentiality order.

90 In summary, the core freedom of expression values of seeking the truth and promoting an open political process are most closely linked to the principle of open courts, and most affected by an order restricting that openness. However, in the context of this case, the confidentiality order would only marginally impede, and in some respects would even promote, the pursuit of these values. As such, the order would not have significant deleterious effects on freedom of expression.

## VII. Conclusion

91 In balancing the various rights and interests engaged, I note that the confidentiality order would have substantial salutary effects on the appellant's right to a fair trial, and freedom of expression. On the other hand, the deleterious effects of the confidentiality order on the principle of open courts and freedom of expression would be minimal. In addition, if the order is not granted and in the course of the judicial review application the appellant is not required to mount a defence under the CEEA, there is a possibility that the appellant will have suffered the harm of having disclosed confidential information in breach of its obligations with no corresponding benefit to the right of the public to freedom of expression. As a result, I find that the salutary effects of the order outweigh its deleterious effects, and the order should be granted.

92 Consequently, I would allow the appeal with costs throughout, set aside the judgment of the Federal Court of Appeal, and grant the confidentiality order on the terms requested by the appellant under Rule 151 of the Federal Court Rules, 1998.

[page558]

Solicitors for the appellant: Osler, Hoskin & Harcourt, Toronto.

Solicitors for the respondent Sierra Club of Canada: Timothy J. Howard, Vancouver; Franklin S. Gertler, Montréal.

Solicitor for the respondents the Minister of Finance of Canada, the Minister of Foreign Affairs of Canada, the Minister of International Trade of Canada and the Attorney General of Canada: The Deputy Attorney General of Canada, Ottawa.

cp/e/qllls

**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 EXTREME FITNESS, INC.**

Court File No CV-13-10000-00CL

**ONTARIO  
SUPERIOR COURT OF JUSTICE  
COMMERCIAL LIST**

Proceeding commenced at Toronto

**BRIEF OF AUTHORITIES**

**AIRD & BERLIS LLP**  
Barristers and Solicitors  
Brookfield Place  
181 Bay Street, Suite 1800  
Toronto, Ontario M5J 2T9

**Steven L. Graff (LSUC # 31871V)**

Tel: 416.865.7726

Fax: 416.863.1515

Email: [sgraff@airdberlis.com](mailto:sgraff@airdberlis.com)

**Ian Aversa (LSUC # 55449N)**

Tel: 416.865.3082

Fax: 416.863.1515

Email: [iaversa@airdberlis.com](mailto:iaversa@airdberlis.com)

**James A. Desjardins (LSUC # 62493E)**

Tel: 416.865.4641

Fax: 416.863.1515

Email: [jdesjardins@airdberlis.com](mailto:jdesjardins@airdberlis.com)

*Lawyers for Extreme Fitness, Inc.*