

2008 CarswellOnt 2652
Ontario Superior Court of Justice [Commercial List]

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

2008 CarswellOnt 2652, [2008] O.J. No. 1818, 168 A.C.W.S. (3d) 245, 42 C.B.R. (5th) 90, 45 B.L.R. (4th) 201

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

AND IN THE MATTER OF A PLAN OF COMPROMISE AND ARRANGEMENT Involving Metcalfe & Mansfield Alternative Investments II Corp., Metcalfe & Mansfield Alternative Investments III Corp., Metcalfe & Mansfield Alternative Investments V Corp., Metcalfe & Mansfield Alternative Investments XI Corp., Metcalfe & Mansfield Alternative Investments XII Corp., 6932819 Canada Inc. and 4446372 Canada Inc., Trustees of the Conduits Listed In Schedule "A" Hereto

THE INVESTORS REPRESENTED ON THE PAN-CANADIAN INVESTORS COMMITTEE FOR THIRD-PARTY STRUCTURED ASSET-BACKED COMMERCIAL PAPER LISTED IN SCHEDULE "B" HERETO (Applicants) and METCALFE & MANSFIELD ALTERNATIVE INVESTMENTS II CORP., METCALFE & MANSFIELD ALTERNATIVE INVESTMENTS III CORP., METCALFE & MANSFIELD ALTERNATIVE INVESTMENTS V CORP., METCALFE & MANSFIELD ALTERNATIVE INVESTMENTS XI CORP., METCALFE & MANSFIELD ALTERNATIVE INVESTMENTS XII CORP., 6932819 CANADA INC. AND 4446372 CANADA INC., TRUSTEES OF THE CONDUITS LISTED IN SCHEDULE "A" HERETO (Respondents)

C. Campbell J.

Heard: March 17, 2008

Judgment: April 8, 2008

Docket: 08-CL-7440

Counsel: B. Zarnett, F. Myers, B. Empey for Applicants
R.S. Harrison for Metcalfe & Mansfield Alternative Investments II Corps.
Scott Bomhof, John Laskin for National Bank of Canada
Peter Howard, William Scott for Asset Providers/Liquidity Providers
Jeff Carhart, Joe Marin, Jay Hoffman for Ad Hoc Committee of ABCP Holders
T. Sutton for Securitus
Jay Swartz, Nastasha MacParland for New Shore Conduits
Aubrey Kaufmann for 4446372 Canada Inc.
Stuart Brotman for 6932819 Canada Inc.
Robin B. Schwill, James Rumball for Coventree Captial Inc., Coventree Administration Corp., Nereus Financial Inc.
Ian D. Collins for Desjardins Group
Harvey Chaiton for CIBC
Kevin McEicheran, Geoff R. Hall for Bank of Montreal, Bank of Nova Scotia, CIBC, Royal Bank of Canada, Toronto Dominion Bank
Marc S. Wasserman for Blackrock Financial
S. Richard Orzy for CIBC Mellon, Computershare, Bank of New York as Indenture Trustee
Dan Macdonald, Andrew Kent for Bank of Nova Scotia
Virginie Gauthier, Mario Forte for Caisse de Dépôt
Junior Sirivar for Navean

Subject: Insolvency; Corporate and Commercial

APPLICATION by creditors for initial order under *Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act*.

C. Campbell J.:

1 These are the reasons for this Court having granted on March 17, 2008 an Initial Order under the *Companies Creditors Arrangement Act* ("CCAA") in respect of various corporate trustees in respect of what is known as Asset Backed Commercial Paper ("ABCP.")

2 This highly unusual and hopefully not to be repeated procedure (given its magnitude and implications) represents the culmination of a great deal of work and effort on the part of the Applicants known informally as the Investors' Committee under the leadership of a leading Canadian lawyer and businessman, Purdy Crawford.

3 Assuming approval of the proposed Plan under the CCAA, the process will result in the successful restructuring of the ABCP market in Canada and avoid a liquidity crisis that would result in certain loss to many of the various participants in the ABCP market.

4 It is neither necessary nor appropriate in these Reasons to describe in detail just what is involved in the products and operation of the ABCP market.

5 The Information Circular that is part of the Application and will be sent to each of the affected Noteholders (and is also found on the website of the Monitor, Ernst & Young), contains a complete description of the nature of the products, the various market participants, the problem giving rise to the liquidity crisis and the proposed Plan that, if approved, will allow for recovery by most Noteholders of at least their capital over time in return for releases of other market participant parties.

6 An equally informative but less detailed description of the market for ABCP and its problems can be found in the affidavit of Mr. Crawford in the sites referred to above.

7 The Applicants include Crown corporations, business corporations, pension funds and financial institutions. Together, they hold more than \$21 billion of the approximately \$32 billion of ABCP at issue in this proceeding. Each Applicant holds ABCP for which at least one of the Respondents is the debtor. Each Applicant has a significant ABCP claim.

8 Each series of ABCP was issued pursuant to a trust indenture or supplemental trust indenture. Each trust indenture appointed an "Indenture Trustee" to serve as trustee for the investors, and gave that trustee certain rights, on behalf of investors, to enforce obligations under ABCP. However, the Indenture Trustee has no economic interest in the underlying debt and, under the circumstances, it is neither practical nor realistic to expect the Indenture Trustees to put forward a restructuring plan.

9 In this proceeding, the Applicants seek to put forward and obtain approval of the restructuring plan they have developed in their own right as holders of ABCP and as the real creditors of the Respondents.

10 Each Respondent is a corporation which is the trustee of one or more Conduits. Each Respondent is the legal owner of the assets held for each series in the Conduit of which it is the trustee, and is the debtor with respect to the ABCP issued by the trustee of that Conduit. The ABCP debt for which each Respondent is liable exceeds \$5 million.

11 Each ABCP note provides that recourse under it is limited to the assets of the trust. The trust indentures pursuant to which each series of notes were issued provide that each note is to be repaid from the assets held for that series.

12 Since mid-August, 2007, the trustees of each of the Conduits have, in respect of each series of ABCP, had insufficient liquidity to make payments that were due and payable on their maturing ABCP. Each remains unable to meet its liabilities to the Applicants and to the other holders of each series of ABCP as those obligations become due, from assets held for that series. Accordingly, each of the Respondents is insolvent.

13 Most of the Conduits originally had trustees that were trust companies. The original trustees that were trust companies were replaced by certain of the Respondents, in accordance with applicable law and the terms of the applicable declarations of trust, in order to facilitate the making of this Application. The Respondents that replaced the trust companies assumed legal ownership of the assets of each Conduit for which they serve as trustees and assumed all of the obligations of the original trustees whom they replaced.

14 The Applicants chose court proceedings under the CCAA because the issuer trustees of the Conduits, as currently structured, are insolvent because they cannot satisfy their liabilities as they become due. The CCAA process allows meaningful efficiencies by restructuring all of the affected ABCP simultaneously while also providing stakeholders, including Noteholders, with more certainty that the Plan will be implemented. In addition, the CCAA provides a process to obtain comprehensive releases, which releases bind Noteholders and other parties who are not directly affected by the Plan. The granting of these comprehensive releases is a condition of participation by certain key parties.

15 The CCAA expresses a public policy favouring compromise and consensual restructuring over piecemeal liquidation and the attendant loss of value. It is designed to encourage and facilitate consensual compromises and arrangements among businesspeople; indeed the essence of a CCAA proceeding is the determination of whether a sufficient consensus exists among them to justify the imposition of a statutory compromise. It is only after this determination is made that the Court will examine whether a plan is otherwise fair and reasonable.

16 On the first day of a CCAA proceeding, the Court should strive to maintain the *status quo* while the plan is developed. The Court will exercise its power under the statute and at common law in order to maintain a level playing field while allowing the debtor the breathing space it needs to develop the required consensus. At this stage, the goal is to seek consensus — to allow the business people and individual investors to make their judgments and to express those judgments by voting. The Court's primary concern on a first day application is to ensure that the business people have a chance to exercise their judgment and vote on the Plan.

17 The Applicants submitted that the Initial Order sought should be granted and the creditors given an opportunity to vote on the Plan, because (a) this application complies with all requirements of the CCAA and is properly brought as a single proceeding; (b) the relief sought is available under the CCAA. It is also consistent with the purpose and policy of the CCAA and essential to the resolution of the ABCP crisis; and (c) the classification of creditors set out in the Plan for voting and distribution purposes is appropriate.

18 ABCP programs have been used to fund the acquisition of long-term assets, such as mortgages and auto loans. Even when funding short-term assets such as trade receivables, ABCP issuers still face the inherent timing mismatch between cash generated by the underlying assets and the cash needed to repay maturing ABCP. Maturing ABCP is typically repaid with the proceeds of newly issued ABCP, a process commonly referred to as "rolling." Because ABCP is a highly rated commercial obligation with a long history of market acceptance, market participants in Canada formed the view that, absent a "general market disruption," ABCP would readily be saleable without the need for extraordinary funding measures.

19 There are three questions that need to be answered before the Court makes an Order accepting an Initial Plan under the CCAA.

20 The first question is, does the Application comply with the requirements of the CCAA? The second question involves determining that the relief sought in the circumstances is available under the CCAA and is consistent with the

purpose and policy of the statute. The third question asks whether the classification of creditors set out in the Plan for voting and distribution purposes is appropriate.

21 I am satisfied that all three questions can be answered in the affirmative.

22 The CCAA, despite its relative brevity and lack of specifics, has been accepted by the Courts across Canada as a vehicle to encourage and facilitate consensual compromise and arrangements among various creditor interests in circumstances of insolvent corporations.

23 At the stage of accepting a Plan for filing, the Court seeks to maintain a status quo and provide a "structured environment for the negotiation of compromises between a company and its creditors." The ultimate decision on the acceptance of a Plan will be made by those directly affected and vote in favour of it.¹

24 Section 3(1) of the CCAA applies in respect of a "debtor company" or "affiliate debtor companies" with claims against them of \$5 million.

25 The problem faced by the applicants in this proceeding is that the terms "company" and "debtor company" as defined in s. 2 of the CCAA do not include trust entities.

26 For the purpose of this Application and proposed Plan, those entities that did not qualify as "companies" for the purposes of the CCAA were replaced by Companies (the Respondents) that do meet the definition.

27 I am satisfied in the circumstances that these steps are an appropriate exercise of legally available rights to satisfy the threshold requirements of the CCAA. I am satisfied that the change in trustees was undertaken in good faith to facilitate the making of this application.

28 The use of what have been called "instant" trust deeds has been judicially accepted as legitimate devices that can satisfy the requirement of s. 3 of the CCAA as long as they reflect legitimate transactions that actually occurred and are not shams.²

29 I am satisfied that the Respondents are "debtor companies" within the meaning of the CCAA because they are companies that meet the s. 2 definition and they are insolvent. The Conduits (referred to above) are trusts and the Respondents are trustees of those trusts. The trustee is the obligor under the trusts covenant to pay. I am satisfied that the trustee corporations are "insolvent" within the judicially accepted meaning under the CCAA.

30 The decision in *Stelco Inc., Re*³ sets out three disjunctive tests. A company will be an insolvent "debtor company" under the CCAA if: (a) it is for any reason unable to meet its obligations as they generally become due; or (b) it has ceased paying its current obligations in the ordinary course of business as they generally become due; or (c) the aggregate of its property is not, at a fair valuation, sufficient or, if disposed of at a fairly conducted sale under legal process, would not be sufficient to enable payment of all its obligations, due and accruing due.

31 I am satisfied that on the material filed as of August 13, 2007 and the stoppage of payment by trustees of the Conduits (which continues), the Conduits and now the Respondents remain unable to meet their liabilities at the present time.

32 The Conduits and now trustees in my view meet the test accepted by the Court in *Stelco Inc., Re* of being "reasonably expected to run out of liquidity within a reasonable proximity of time as compared with the time reasonably required to implement a restructuring."⁴ Indeed, it was that very circumstance that brought about the standstill agreement and the ensuing discussions and negotiations to formulate a Plan.

33 Finally on this point I am satisfied that the insolvency of the Respondents is not affected or negated by contractual provisions in the applicable notes and trust indentures that limit Noteholders' recourse to the trust assets held in the Conduits. This statement should not be taken as a determination of the rights or remedies of any creditor.

34 It was urged and I accept that the applicants are creditors under ss. 4 and 5 of the CCAA and as such are entitled to standing to propose a Plan for restructuring the ABCP.

35 On the return of the motion for the Initial Order, while the proceeding was technically "ex parte," a significant number of interested parties were represented. None of those parties opposed the making of the Initial Order and since then no one has come forward to challenge the entitlement of the Applicants to the Initial Order.

36 S. 8 of the CCAA renders ineffective any provisions in the trust indentures that otherwise purport to restrict, directly or indirectly, the rights of the Applicants to bring this application:

8. This Act extends and does not limit the provisions of any instrument now or hereafter existing that governs the rights of creditors or any class of them and has full force and effect notwithstanding anything to the contrary contained in that instrument.

37 See also the following for the proposition that a trust indenture cannot by its terms restrict recourse to the CCAA.⁵

38 Another feature of this Application is the joining within a single proceeding of claims by many parties against each of the Respondents. Rules 5.01 and 5.02 of the *Rules of Civil Procedure* allow for the joinder of claims by multiple applicants against multiple respondents. It is not necessary that all relief claimed by each applicant be claimed against each respondent. Here the Applicants assert claims for relief against the Respondents involving common questions of law and fact. Joining of the claims in one proceeding promotes the convenient administration of justice.

39 I am satisfied that in the unique circumstances that prevail here, the practical restructuring of the ABCP claims can only be implemented on a global basis; accordingly, if there were separate proceedings, each individual plan would of necessity have been conditional upon approval of all the other plans.

40 One further somewhat unusual aspect of this Application has been the filing of the proposed Plan along with the request for the Initial Order. This is not unusual in what have come to be known as "liquidating" CCAA applications where the creditors are in agreement when the matter first comes to Court. It is more unusual where there are a large number of creditors who are agreed but a significant number of investors who have yet to be consulted.

41 In general terms, besides complying with the technical requirements of the CCAA, this Application is consistent with the purpose and policy underlying the Act. It is well established that the CCAA is remedial legislation, intended to facilitate compromises and arrangements. The Court should give the statute a broad and liberal interpretation so as to encourage and facilitate successful restructurings whenever possible.

42 The CCAA is to be broadly interpreted as giving the Court a good deal of power and flexibility. The very brevity of the CCAA and the fact that it is silent on details permits a wide and liberal construction to enable it to serve its remedial purpose.

43 A restructuring under the CCAA may take any number of forms, limited only by the creativity of those proposing the restructuring. The courts have developed new and creative remedies to ensure that the objectives of the CCAA are met.

[45] The CCAA is designed to be a flexible instrument, and it is that very flexibility which gives it its efficacy. ... It is not infrequently that judges are told, by those opposing a particular initiative at a particular time, that if they make a particular order that is requested it will be the first time in Canadian jurisprudence (sometimes in global jurisprudence, depending upon the level of the rhetoric) that such an order has been made! *Nonetheless, the orders are made, if the circumstances are appropriate and the orders can be made within the framework and in the spirit of the CCAA legislation.* [Emphasis added.]⁶

44 Similarly, the courts have acknowledged the need to maintain flexibility in CCAA matters, discouraging importation of any statutory provisions, restrictions or requirements that might impede creative use of the CCAA without a demonstrated need or statutory direction.

45 I am satisfied that a failure of the Plan would cause far-reaching negative consequences to investors, including pension funds, governments, business corporations and individuals.

46 All those involved, particularly the individuals, may not yet appreciate the consequences involved with a Plan failure.

47 In order that those who are affected have an opportunity to consider all the consequences and decide whether or not they are prepared to vote in favour of the proposed or any other Plan, the stay of proceedings sought in favour of those parties integrally involved in the financial management of the Conduits or whose support is essential to the Plan is appropriate.

48 S. 11 of the CCAA provides for stays of proceedings against the debtor companies. It is silent as to the availability of stays in favour of non-parties. The granting of stays in favour of non-parties has been held to be an appropriate exercise of the Court's jurisdiction. A number of authorities have supported the concept of a stay to enable a "global resolution."⁷

49 More recently in *Calpine Canada Energy Ltd., Re*⁸, Romaine J. of the Alberta Court of Queens Bench permitted not only an initial order, but also one that extended after exit from CCAA without a plan so that the process of the CCAA would not be undermined against orders made during an unsuccessful plan.

50 Finally, I am satisfied at this stage of the approval of filing of the Initial Plan that all creditors be placed in a single class. The CCAA provides no statutory guidance to assist the Court in determining the proper classification of creditors. The tests for proper classification of creditors for the purpose of voting on a CCAA plan of arrangement have been developed in the case law.⁹

51 The Plan is, in essence, an offer to all investors that must be accepted by or made binding on all investors. In light of this reality, the Applicants propose that there be a single class of creditors consisting of all ABCP holders. It is urged that all holders of ABCP invested in the Canadian marketplace with its lack of transparency and other common problems. The Plan treats all ABCP holders equitably. While the risks differ as among traditional assets, ineligible assets and synthetic assets, I am advised that the calculation of the differing risks and corresponding interests has been taken into account consistently across all of the ABCP in the Plan.

52 I am satisfied that, at least at this stage, fragmentation of classes would render it excessively difficult to obtain approval of a CCAA plan and is therefore contrary to the purpose of the CCAA.

Not every difference in the nature of a debt due to a creditor or a group of creditors warrants the creation of a separate class. What is required is some community of interest and rights which are not so dissimilar as to make it impossible for the creditors in the class to consult with a view toward a common interest.¹⁰

53 The Court of Appeal for Ontario in *Stelco, Re* noted that a "commonality of interest" applied. Likely fact-driven circumstances were at the heart of classification.

It is clear that classification is a fact-driven exercise, dependent upon the circumstances of each particular case. Moreover, given the nature of the CCAA process and the underlying flexibility of that process — a flexibility which is its genius — there can be no fixed rules that must apply in all cases.¹¹

54 For the above reasons the Initial Order and Meeting Ordered will issue in the form filed and signed.

55 I note that the process includes sending to each investor a detailed and comprehensive description of the problems that developed in the ABCP market as well as its proposed solution. In a recognition that the understanding of the problem and its proposed solution might be difficult to understand, the Investor Committee is to be commended for arranging to hold information meetings across Canada.

56 I am of the view that resolution of this difficult and complex problem will be best achieved by those directly affected reaching agreement in a timely fashion for a lasting resolution.

Schedule A

Conduits

Apollo Trust

Apsley Trust

Aria Trust

Aurora Trust

Comet Trust

Encore Trust

Gemini Trust

Ironstone Trust

MMAI-I Trust

Newshore Canadian Trust

Opus Trust

Planet Trust

Rocket Trust

Selkirk Funding Trust

Silverstone Trust

Slate Trust

Structured Asset Trust

Structured Investment Trust III

Symphony Trust

Whitehall Trust

Schedule B

Applicants

ATB Financier
Caisse de Dépôt et Placement du Québec
Canaccord Capital Corporation
Canada Post Corporation
Credit Union Central of Alberta Limited
Credit Union Central of British Columbia
Credit Union Central of Canada
Credit Union Central of Ontario
Credit Union Central of Saskatchewan
Desjardins Group
Magna International Inc.
National Bank Financial Inc./National Bank of Canada
NAV Canada
Northwater Capital Management Inc.
Public Sector Pension Investment Board
The Governors of the University of Alberta

Application granted.

Footnotes

- 1 See *Lehndorff General Partner Ltd., Re* (1993), 17 C.B.R. (3d) 24 (Ont. Gen. Div. [Commercial List]) at 31 contrasted with *Royal Oak Mines Inc., Re* (1999), 6 C.B.R. (4th) 314 (Ont. Gen. Div. [Commercial List]) at 316.
- 2 *Nova Metal Products Inc. v. Comiskey (Trustee of)* (1990), 1 O.R. (3d) 289 (Ont. C.A.) per Doherty J.A. (in dissent on result but not on this point); also cases referred to in *Cadillac Fairview Inc., Re* (1995), 30 C.B.R. (3d) 29 (Ont. Gen. Div. [Commercial List])
- 3 *Stelco Inc., Re* (2004), 48 C.B.R. (4th) 299 (Ont. S.C.J. [Commercial List]) at paras 21-22; leave to appeal to C.A. refused, (Ont. C.A.); leave to appeal to S.C.C. refused (S.C.C.)
- 4 *Supra* at (2004) paragraphs 26 and 28.
- 5 Instruments such as trust deeds may give specified rights to creditors or any class of them in certain circumstances. Some instruments may purport to provide that a creditor may not circumvent any limitation in the rights contained in the instrument by proposing an arrangement under the CCAA and thereby obtaining wider or extended rights. ... Relief under the CCAA is available notwithstanding the terms of any instrument. [Footnote omitted.] (John D. Honsberger, *Debt Restructuring: Principles and Practice*, vol. 1 (Aurora: Canada Law Book, 1997+) at 9-18). See also *Citibank Canada v. Chase Manhattan Bank of Canada* [1991 CarswellOnt 182 (Ont. Gen. Div.)], *supra*, at paras. 25-26; *United Used Auto & Truck Parts Ltd., Re* (1999), 12 C.B.R. (4th) 144 (B.C. S.C. [In Chambers]) at para. 11

- 6 *Canadian Red Cross Society / Société Canadienne de la Croix-Rouge, Re* (1998), 5 C.B.R. (4th) 299 (Ont. Gen. Div. [Commercial List]) at para. 45
- 7 *Campeau v. Olympia & York Developments Ltd.* (1992), 14 C.B.R. (3d) 303 (Ont. Gen. Div.) at paras. 23-25; *Muscletech Research & Development Inc., Re* (2006), 19 C.B.R. (5th) 54 (Ont. S.C.J. [Commercial List]) at para. 3
- 8 *Calpine Canada Energy Ltd., Re* (2006), 19 C.B.R. (5th) 187 (Alta. Q.B.) at paras. 33-34; *Calpine Canada Energy Ltd., Re* [2007 CarswellAlta 156 (Alta. Q.B.)] (8 February 2007), Calgary 0501-17864 at 5
- 9 *Campeau Corp., Re* (1991), 10 C.B.R. (3d) 100 (Ont. Gen. Div.) at para. 18
- 10 *Sklar-Peppler Furniture Corp. v. Bank of Nova Scotia* (1991), 8 C.B.R. (3d) 312 (Ont. Gen. Div.) at paras. 13-14
- 11 *Stelco Inc., Re* (2005), 15 C.B.R. (5th) 307 (Ont. C.A.), at para. 22

End of Document

Copyright © Thomson Reuters Canada Limited or its licensors (excluding individual court documents). All rights reserved.