

2005 CarswellOnt 1188  
Ontario Court of Appeal

Stelco Inc., Re

2005 CarswellOnt 1188, [2005] O.J. No. 1171, 138 A.C.W.S. (3d) 222, 196 O.A.C.  
142, 253 D.L.R. (4th) 109, 2 B.L.R. (4th) 238, 75 O.R. (3d) 5, 9 C.B.R. (5th) 135

**In the Matter of the Companies' Creditors  
Arrangement Act, R.S.C., c. C-36, as amended**

And In the Matter of a proposed plan of compromise or arrangement  
with respect to Stelco Inc. and the other Applicants listed in Schedule "A"

Application under the Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act, R.S.C. 1985, c. C-36, as amended

Goudge, Feldman, Blair J.J.A.

Heard: March 18, 2005  
Judgment: March 31, 2005  
Docket: CA M32289

Proceedings: reversed *Stelco Inc., Re* ((2005)), 2005 CarswellOnt 742, [2005] O.J. No. 729, 7 C.B.R. (5th) 307 ((Ont. S.C.J. [Commercial List])); reversed *Stelco Inc., Re* ((2005)), 2005 CarswellOnt 743, [2005] O.J. No. 730, 7 C.B.R. (5th) 310 ((Ont. S.C.J. [Commercial List])); additional reasons to *Stelco Inc., Re* ((2005)), 2005 CarswellOnt 742, [2005] O.J. No. 729, 7 C.B.R. (5th) 307 ((Ont. S.C.J. [Commercial List]))

Counsel: Jeffrey S. Leon, Richard B. Swan for Appellants, Michael Woollcombe, Roland Keiper  
Kenneth T. Rosenberg, Robert A. Centa for Respondent, United Steelworkers of America  
Murray Gold, Andrew J. Hatnay for Respondent, Retired Salaried Beneficiaries of Stelco Inc., CHT Steel Company  
Inc., Stelpipe Ltd., Stelwire Ltd., Welland Pipe Ltd.  
Michael C.P. McCreary, Carrie L. Clynick for USWA Locals 5328, 8782  
John R. Varley for Active Salaried Employee Representative  
Michael Barrack for Stelco Inc.  
Peter Griffin for Board of Directors of Stelco Inc.  
K. Mahar for Monitor  
David R. Byers (Agent) for CIT Business Credit, DIP Lender

Subject: Corporate and Commercial; Insolvency; Property; Civil Practice and Procedure

APPEAL by potential board members from judgments reported at *Stelco Inc., Re* (2005), 2005 CarswellOnt 742, 7 C.B.R. (5th) 307 (Ont. S.C.J. [Commercial List]) and at *Stelco Inc., Re* (2005), 2005 CarswellOnt 743, 7 C.B.R. (5th) 310 (Ont. S.C.J. [Commercial List]), granting motion by employees for removal of certain directors from board of corporation under protection of *Companies Creditors' Arrangement Act*.

*Blair J.A.:*

**Part I — Introduction**

1 Stelco Inc. and four of its wholly owned subsidiaries obtained protection from their creditors under the *Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act*<sup>1</sup> on January 29, 2004. Since that time, the Stelco Group has been engaged in a high profile,

and sometimes controversial, process of economic restructuring. Since October 2004, the restructuring has revolved around a court-approved capital raising process which, by February 2005, had generated a number of competitive bids for the Stelco Group.

2 Farley J., an experienced judge of the Superior Court Commercial List in Toronto, has been supervising the CCAA process from the outset.

3 The appellants, Michael Woolcombe and Roland Keiper, are associated with two companies — Clearwater Capital Management Inc., and Equilibrium Capital Management Inc. — which, respectively, hold approximately 20% of the outstanding publicly traded common shares of Stelco. Most of these shares have been acquired while the CCAA process has been ongoing, and Messrs. Woolcombe and Keiper have made it clear publicly that they believe there is good shareholder value in Stelco in spite of the restructuring. The reason they are able to take this position is that there has been a solid turn around in worldwide steel markets, as a result of which Stelco, although remaining in insolvency protection, is earning annual operating profits.

4 The Stelco board of directors ("the Board") has been depleted as a result of resignations, and in January of this year Messrs. Woolcombe and Keiper expressed an interest in being appointed to the Board. They were supported in this request by other shareholders who, together with Clearwater and Equilibrium, represent about 40% of the Stelco common shareholders. On February 18, 2005, the Board appointed the appellants directors. In announcing the appointments publicly, Stelco said in a press release:

After careful consideration, and given potential recoveries at the end of the company's restructuring process, the Board responded favourably to the requests by making the appointments announced today.

Richard Drouin, Chairman of Stelco's Board of Directors, said: "I'm pleased to welcome Roland Keiper and Michael Woolcombe to the Board. Their experience and their perspective will assist the Board as it strives to serve the best interests of all our stakeholders. We look forward to their positive contribution."

5 On the same day, the Board began its consideration of the various competing bids that had been received through the capital raising process.

6 The appointments of the appellants to the Board incensed the employee stakeholders of Stelco ("the Employees"), represented by the respondent Retired Salaried Beneficiaries of Stelco and the respondent United Steelworkers of America ("USWA"). Outstanding pension liabilities to current and retired employees are said to be Stelco's largest long-term liability — exceeding several billion dollars. The Employees perceive they do not have the same, or very much, economic leverage in what has sometimes been referred to as 'the bare knuckled arena' of the restructuring process. At the same time, they are amongst the most financially vulnerable stakeholders in the piece. They see the appointments of Messrs. Woolcombe and Keiper to the Board as a threat to their well being in the restructuring process, because the appointments provide the appellants, and the shareholders they represent, with direct access to sensitive information relating to the competing bids to which other stakeholders (including themselves) are not privy.

7 The Employees fear that the participation of the two major shareholder representatives will tilt the bid process in favour of maximizing shareholder value at the expense of bids that might be more favourable to the interests of the Employees. They sought and obtained an order from Farley J. removing Messrs. Woolcombe and Keiper from their short-lived position of directors, essentially on the basis of that apprehension.

8 The Employees argue that there is a reasonable apprehension the appellants would not be able to act in the best interests of the corporation — as opposed to their own best interests as shareholders — in considering the bids. They say this is so because of prior public statements by the appellants about enhancing shareholder value in Stelco, because of the appellants' linkage to such a large shareholder group, because of their earlier failed bid in the restructuring, and because of their opposition to a capital proposal made in the proceeding by Deutsche Bank (known as "the Stalking Horse Bid"). They submit further that the appointments have poisoned the atmosphere of the restructuring process, and

that the Board made the appointments under threat of facing a potential shareholders' meeting where the members of the Board would be replaced en masse.

9 On the other hand, Messrs. Woolcombe and Keiper seek to set aside the order of Farley J. on the grounds that (a) he did not have the jurisdiction to make the order under the provisions of the CCAA, (b) even if he did have jurisdiction, the reasonable apprehension of bias test applied by the motion judge has no application to the removal of directors, (c) the motion judge erred in interfering with the exercise by the Board of its business judgment in filling the vacancies on the Board, and (d) the facts do not meet any test that would justify the removal of directors by a court in any event.

10 For the reasons that follow, I would grant leave to appeal, allow the appeal, and order the reinstatement of the applicants to the Board.

## Part II — Additional Facts

11 Before the initial CCAA order on January 29, 2004, the shareholders of Stelco had last met at their annual general meeting on April 29, 2003. At that meeting they elected eleven directors to the Board. By the date of the initial order, three of those directors had resigned, and on November 30, 2004, a fourth did as well, leaving the company with only seven directors.

12 Stelco's articles provide for the Board to be made up of a minimum of ten and a maximum of twenty directors. Consequently, after the last resignation, the company's corporate governance committee began to take steps to search for new directors. They had not succeeded in finding any prior to the approach by the appellants in January 2005.

13 Messrs. Woolcombe and Keiper had been accumulating shares in Stelco and had been participating in the CCAA proceedings for some time before their request to be appointed to the Board, through their companies, Clearwater and Equilibrium. Clearwater and Equilibrium are privately held, Ontario-based, investment management firms. Mr. Keiper is the president of Equilibrium and associated with Clearwater. Mr. Woolcombe is a consultant to Clearwater. The motion judge found that they "come as a package".

14 In October 2004, Stelco sought court approval of its proposed method of raising capital. On October 19, 2004, Farley J. issued what has been referred to as the Initial Capital Process Order. This order set out a process by which Stelco, under the direction of the Board, would solicit bids, discuss the bids with stakeholders, evaluate the bids, and report on the bids to the court.

15 On November 9, 2004, Clearwater and Equilibrium announced they had formed an investor group and had made a capital proposal to Stelco. The proposal involved the raising of \$125 million through a rights offering. Mr. Keiper stated at the time that he believed "the value of Stelco's equity would have the opportunity to increase substantially if Stelco emerged from CCAA while minimizing dilution of its shareholders." The Clearwater proposal was not accepted.

16 A few days later, on November 14, 2004, Stelco approved the Stalking Horse Bid. Clearwater and Equilibrium opposed the Deutsche Bank proposal. Mr. Keiper criticized it for not providing sufficient value to existing shareholders. However, on November 29, 2004, Farley J. approved the Stalking Horse Bid and amended the Initial Capital Process Order accordingly. The order set out the various channels of communication between Stelco, the monitor, potential bidders and the stakeholders. It provided that members of the Board were to see the details of the different bids before the Board selected one or more of the offers.

17 Subsequently, over a period of two and a half months, the shareholding position of Clearwater and Equilibrium increased from approximately 5% as at November 19, to 14.9% as at January 25, 2005, and finally to approximately 20% on a fully diluted basis as at January 31, 2005. On January 25, Clearwater and Equilibrium announced that they had reached an understanding jointly to pursue efforts to maximize shareholder value at Stelco. A press release stated:

Such efforts will include seeking to ensure that the interests of Stelco's equity holders are appropriately protected by its board of directors and, ultimately, that Stelco's equity holders have an appropriate say, by vote or otherwise, in determining the future course of Stelco.

18 On February 1, 2005, Messrs. Keiper and Woolcombe and others representatives of Clearwater and Equilibrium, met with Mr. Drouin and other Board members to discuss their views of Stelco and a fair outcome for all stakeholders in the proceedings. Mr. Keiper made a detailed presentation, as Mr. Drouin testified, "encouraging the Board to examine how Stelco might improve its value through enhanced disclosure and other steps". Mr. Keiper expressed confidence that "there was value to the equity of Stelco", and added that he had backed this view up by investing millions of dollars of his own money in Stelco shares. At that meeting, Clearwater and Equilibrium requested that Messrs. Woolcombe and Keiper be added to the Board and to Stelco's restructuring committee. In this respect, they were supported by other shareholders holding about another 20% of the company's common shares.

19 At paragraphs 17 and 18 of his affidavit, Mr. Drouin, summarized his appraisal of the situation:

17. It was my assessment that each of Mr. Keiper and Mr. Woolcombe had personal qualities which would allow them to make a significant contribution to the Board in terms of their backgrounds and their knowledge of the steel industry generally and Stelco in particular. In addition I was aware that their appointment to the Board was supported by approximately 40% of the shareholders. In the event that these shareholders successfully requisitioned a shareholders meeting they were in a position to determine the composition of the entire Board.

18. I considered it essential that there be continuity of the Board through the CCAA process. I formed the view that the combination of existing Board members and these additional members would provide Stelco with the most appropriate board composition in the circumstances. The other members of the Board also shared my views.

20 In order to ensure that the appellants understood their duties as potential Board members and, particularly that "they would no longer be able to consider only the interests of shareholders alone but would have fiduciary responsibilities as a Board member to the corporation as a whole", Mr. Drouin and others held several further meetings with Mr. Woolcombe and Mr. Keiper. These discussions "included areas of independence, standards, fiduciary duties, the role of the Board Restructuring Committee and confidentiality matters". Mr. Woolcombe and Mr. Keiper gave their assurances that they fully understood the nature and extent of their prospective duties, and would abide by them. In addition, they agreed and confirmed that:

- a) Mr. Woolcombe would no longer be an advisor to Clearwater and Equilibrium with respect to Stelco;
- b) Clearwater and Equilibrium would no longer be represented by counsel in the CCAA proceedings; and
- c) Clearwater and Equilibrium then had no involvement in, and would have no future involvement, in any bid for Stelco.

21 On the basis of the foregoing — and satisfied "that Messrs. Keiper and Woolcombe would make a positive contribution to the various issues before the Board both in [the] restructuring and the ongoing operation of the business" — the Board made the appointments on February 18, 2005.

22 Seven days later, the motion judge found it "appropriate, just, necessary and reasonable to declare" those appointments "to be of no force and effect" and to remove Messrs. Woolcombe and Keiper from the Board. He did so not on the basis of any actual conduct on the part of the appellants as directors of Stelco but because there was some risk of anticipated conduct in the future. The gist of the motion judge's rationale is found in the following passage from his reasons (at para. 23):

In these particular circumstances and aside from the Board feeling coerced into the appointments for the sake of continuing stability, I am not of the view that it would be appropriate to wait and see if there was any explicit action

on behalf of K and W while conducting themselves as Board members which would demonstrate that they had not lived up to their obligations to be "neutral". They may well conduct themselves beyond reproach. But if they did not, the fallout would be very detrimental to Stelco and its ability to successfully emerge. What would happen to the bids in such a dogfight? I fear that it would be trying to put Humpty Dumpty back together again. The same situation would prevail even if K and W conducted themselves beyond reproach but with the Board continuing to be concerned that they not do anything seemingly offensive to the bloc. The risk to the process and to Stelco in its emergence is simply too great to risk the wait and see approach.

### Part III — Leave to Appeal

23 Because of the "real time" dynamic of this restructuring project, Laskin J.A. granted an order on March 4, 2005, expediting the appellants' motion for leave to appeal, directing that it be heard orally and, if leave be granted, directing that the appeal be heard at the same time. The leave motion and the appeal were argued together, by order of the panel, on March 18, 2005.

24 This court has said that it will only sparingly grant leave to appeal in the context of a CCAA proceeding and will only do so where there are "serious and arguable grounds that are of real and significant interest to the parties": *Country Style Food Services Inc., Re* (2002), 158 O.A.C. 30, [2002] O.J. No. 1377 (Ont. C.A. [In Chambers]), at para. 15. This criterion is determined in accordance with a four-pronged test, namely,

- a) whether the point on appeal is of significance to the practice;
- b) whether the point is of significance to the action;
- c) whether the appeal is *prima facie* meritorious or frivolous;
- d) whether the appeal will unduly hinder the progress of the action.

25 Counsel agree that (d) above is not relevant to this proceeding, given the expedited nature of the hearing. In my view, the tests set out in (a) - (c) are met in the circumstances, and as such, leave should be granted. The issue of the court's jurisdiction to intervene in corporate governance issues during a CCAA restructuring, and the scope of its discretion in doing so, are questions of considerable importance to the practice and on which there is little appellate jurisprudence. While Messrs. Woolcombe and Keiper are pursuing their remedies in their own right, and the company and its directors did not take an active role in the proceedings in this court, the Board and the company did stand by their decision to appoint the new directors at the hearing before the motion judge and in this court, and the question of who is to be involved in the Board's decision making process continues to be of importance to the CCAA proceedings. From the reasons that follow it will be evident that in my view the appeal has merit.

26 Leave to appeal is therefore granted.

### Part IV — The Appeal

#### *The Positions of the Parties*

27 The appellants submit that,

- a) in exercising its discretion under the CCAA, the court is not exercising its "inherent jurisdiction" as a superior court;
- b) there is no jurisdiction under the CCAA to remove duly elected or appointed directors, notwithstanding the broad discretion provided by s. 11 of that Act; and that,
- c) even if there is jurisdiction, the motion judge erred:

(i) by relying upon the administrative law test for reasonable apprehension of bias in determining that the directors should be removed;

(ii) by rejecting the application of the "business judgment" rule to the unanimous decision of the Board to appoint two new directors; and,

(iii) by concluding that Clearwater and Equilibrium, the shareholders with whom the appellants are associated, were focussed solely on a short-term investment horizon, without any evidence to that effect, and therefore concluding that there was a tangible risk that the appellants would not be neutral and act in the best interests of Stelco and all stakeholders in carrying out their duties as directors.

28 The respondents' arguments are rooted in fairness and process. They say, first, that the appointment of the appellants as directors has poisoned the atmosphere of the CCAA proceedings and, secondly, that it threatens to undermine the even-handedness and integrity of the capital raising process, thus jeopardizing the ability of the court at the end of the day to approve any compromise or arrangement emerging from that process. The respondents contend that Farley J. had jurisdiction to ensure the integrity of the CCAA process, including the capital raising process Stelco had asked him to approve, and that this court should not interfere with his decision that it was necessary to remove Messrs. Woolcombe and Keiper from the Board in order to ensure the integrity of that process. A judge exercising a supervisory function during a CCAA proceeding is owed considerable deference: *Algoma Steel Inc., Re* (2001), 25 C.B.R. (4th) 194 (Ont. C.A.), at para. 8.

29 The crux of the respondents' concern is well-articulated in the following excerpt from paragraph 72 of the factum of the Retired Salaried Beneficiaries:

The appointments of Keiper and Woolcombe violated every tenet of fairness in the restructuring process that is supposed to lead to a plan of arrangement. One stakeholder group — particular investment funds that have acquired Stelco shares during the CCAA itself — have been provided with privileged access to the capital raising process, and voting seats on the Corporation's Board of Directors and Restructuring Committee. No other stakeholder has been treated in remotely the same way. To the contrary, the salaried retirees have been completely excluded from the capital raising process and have no say whatsoever in the Corporation's decision-making process.

30 The respondents submit that fairness, and the perception of fairness, underpin the CCAA process, and depend upon effective judicial supervision: see *Olympia & York Developments Ltd. v. Royal Trust Co.* (1993), 12 O.R. (3d) 500 (Ont. Gen. Div.); *Ivaco Inc., Re* (2004), 3 C.B.R. (5th) 33 (Ont. S.C.J. [Commercial List]), at para.15-16. The motion judge reasonably decided to remove the appellants as directors in the circumstances, they say, and this court should not interfere.

### *Jurisdiction*

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

32 The CCAA is remedial legislation and is to be given a liberal interpretation to facilitate its objectives: *Babcock & Wilcox Canada Ltd., Re*, [2000] O.J. No. 786 (Ont. S.C.J. [Commercial List]), at para. 11. See also, *Hongkong Bank of Canada v. Chef Ready Foods Ltd.* (1990), 4 C.B.R. (3d) 311 (B.C. C.A.), at p. 320; *Lehndorff General Partner Ltd., Re* (1993), 17 C.B.R. (3d) 24 (Ont. Gen. Div. [Commercial List]). Courts have adopted this approach in the past to rely on inherent jurisdiction, or alternatively on the broad jurisdiction under s. 11 of the CCAA, as the source of judicial power in a CCAA proceeding to "fill in the gaps" or to "put flesh on the bones" of that Act: see *Dylex Ltd., Re* (1995), 31 C.B.R. (3d) 106 (Ont. Gen. Div. [Commercial List]), *Royal Oak Mines Inc., Re* (1999), 7 C.B.R. (4th) 293 (Ont. Gen. Div. [Commercial List]); and *Westar Mining Ltd., Re* (1992), 70 B.C.L.R. (2d) 6 (B.C. S.C.).

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

#### *Inherent Jurisdiction*

34 Inherent jurisdiction is a power derived "from the very nature of the court as a superior court of law", permitting the court "to maintain its authority and to prevent its process being obstructed and abused". It embodies the authority of the judiciary to control its own process and the lawyers and other officials connected with the court and its process, in order "to uphold, to protect and to fulfill the judicial function of administering justice according to law in a regular, orderly and effective manner". See I.H. Jacob, "The Inherent Jurisdiction of the Court" (1970) 23 Current Legal Problems 27-28. In Halsbury's Laws of England, 4<sup>th</sup> ed. (London: Lexis-Nexis UK, 1973 - ) vol. 37, at para. 14, the concept is described as follows:

In sum, it may be said that the inherent jurisdiction of the court is a virile and viable doctrine, and has been defined as being the reserve or fund of powers, a residual source of powers, which the court may draw upon as necessary whenever it is just or equitable to do so, in particularly to ensure the observation of the due process of law, to prevent improper vexation or oppression, to do justice between the parties and to secure a fair trial between them.

35 In spite of the expansive nature of this power, inherent jurisdiction does not operate where Parliament or the Legislature has acted. As Farley J. noted in *Royal Oak Mines Inc., supra*, inherent jurisdiction is "not limitless; if the legislative body has not left a functional gap or vacuum, then inherent jurisdiction should not be brought into-play" (para. 4). See also, *Baxter Student Housing Ltd. v. College Housing Co-operative Ltd.* (1975), [1976] 2 S.C.R. 475 (S.C.C.) at 480; *Richtree Inc., Re*, [2005] O.J. No. 251 (Ont. S.C.J. [Commercial List]).

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

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

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

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

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

#### *The Section 11 Discretion*

39 This appeal involves the scope of a supervisory judge's discretion under s. 11 of the CCAA, in the context of corporate governance decisions made during the course of the plan negotiating and approval process and, in particular, whether that discretion extends to the removal of directors in that environment. In my view, the s. 11 discretion — in spite of its considerable breadth and flexibility — does not permit the exercise of such a power in and of itself. There may be situations where a judge in a CCAA proceeding would be justified in ordering the removal of directors pursuant to the oppression remedy provisions found in s. 241 of the CBCA, and imported into the exercise of the s. 11 discretion through s. 20 of the CCAA. However, this was not argued in the present case, and the facts before the court would not justify the removal of Messrs. Woolcombe and Keiper on oppression remedy grounds.

40 The pertinent portions of s. 11 of the CCAA provide as follows:

#### **Powers of court**

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

#### **Initial application court orders**

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

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

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

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

#### **Other than initial application court orders**

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

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



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

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

#### Burden of proof on application

(6) The court shall not make an order under subsection (3) or (4) unless

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

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

41 The rule of statutory interpretation that has now been accepted by the Supreme Court of Canada, in such cases as *R. v. Sharpe*, [2001] 1 S.C.R. 45 (S.C.C.), at para. 33, and *Rizzo & Rizzo Shoes Ltd., Re*, [1998] 1 S.C.R. 27 (S.C.C.), at para. 21 is articulated in E.A. Driedger, *The Construction of Statutes*, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. (Toronto: Butterworths, 1983) as follows:

Today, there is only one principle or approach, namely, the words of an Act are to be read in their entire context and in their grammatical and ordinary sense harmoniously with the scheme of the Act, the object of the Act, and the intention of Parliament.

See also Ruth Sullivan, *Sullivan and Driedger on the Construction of Statutes*, 4<sup>th</sup> ed. (Toronto: Butterworths, 2002) at page 262.

42 The interpretation of s. 11 advanced above is true to these principles. It is consistent with the purpose and scheme of the CCAA, as articulated in para. 38 above, and with the fact that corporate governance matters are dealt with in other statutes. In addition, it honours the historical reluctance of courts to intervene in such matters, or to second-guess the business decisions made by directors and officers in the course of managing the business and affairs of the corporation.

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

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

45 With these principles in mind, I turn to an analysis of the various factors underlying the interpretation of the s. 11 discretion.

46 I start with the proposition that at common law directors could not be removed from office during the term for which they were elected or appointed: *London Finance Corp. v. Banking Service Corp.* (1922), 23 O.W.N. 138 (Ont. H.C.); *Stephenson v. Vokes* (1896), 27 O.R. 691 (Ont. H.C.). The authority to remove must therefore be found in statute law.

47 In Canada, the CBCA and its provincial equivalents govern the election, appointment and removal of directors, as well as providing for their duties and responsibilities. Shareholders elect directors, but the directors may fill vacancies that occur on the board of directors pending a further shareholders meeting: CBCA, ss. 106(3) and 111.<sup>4</sup> The specific power to remove directors is vested in the shareholders by s. 109(1) of the CBCA. However, s. 241 empowers the court — where it finds that oppression as therein defined exists — to "make any interim or final order it thinks fit", including (s. 241(3)(e)) "an order appointing directors in place of or in addition to all or any of the directors then in office". This power has been utilized to remove directors, but in very rare cases, and only in circumstances where there has been actual conduct rising to the level of misconduct required to trigger oppression remedy relief: see, for example, *Catalyst Fund General Partner I Inc. v. Hollinger Inc.*, [2004] O.J. No. 4722 (Ont. S.C.J.).

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

49 At paragraph 7 of his reasons, the motion judge said:

The board is charged with the standard duty of "manage[ing], [*sic*] or supervising the management, of the business and affairs of the corporation": s. 102(1) CBCA. *Ordinarily the Court will not interfere with the composition of the board of directors. However, if there is good and sufficient valid reason to do so, then the Court must not hesitate to do so to correct a problem.* The directors should not be required to constantly look over their shoulders for this would be the sure recipe for board paralysis which would be so detrimental to a restructuring process; thus interested parties should only initiate a motion where it is reasonably obvious that there is a problem, actual or poised to become actual.

[emphasis added]

50 Respectfully, I see no authority in s. 11 of the CCAA for the court to interfere with the composition of a board of directors on such a basis.

51 Court removal of directors is an exceptional remedy, and one that is rarely exercised in corporate law. This reluctance is rooted in the historical unwillingness of courts to interfere with the internal management of corporate affairs and in the court's well-established deference to decisions made by directors and officers in the exercise of their business judgment when managing the business and affairs of the corporation. These factors also bolster the view that where the CCAA is silent on the issue, the court should not read into the s. 11 discretion an extraordinary power — which the courts are disinclined to exercise in any event — except to the extent that that power may be introduced through the application of other legislation, and on the same principles that apply to the application of the provisions of the other legislation.

#### *The Oppression Remedy Gateway*

52 The fact that s. 11 does not itself provide the authority for a CCAA judge to order the removal of directors does not mean that the supervising judge is powerless to make such an order, however. Section 20 of the CCAA offers a gateway to the oppression remedy and other provisions of the CBCA and similar provincial statutes. Section 20 states:

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

53 The CBCA is legislation that "makes provision for the sanction of compromises or arrangements between a company and its shareholders or any class of them". Accordingly, the powers of a judge under s. 11 of the CCAA may be applied together with the provisions of the CBCA, including the oppression remedy provisions of that statute. I do not read s. 20 as limiting the application of outside legislation to the provisions of such legislation dealing specifically with the sanctioning of compromises and arrangements between the company and its shareholders. The grammatical structure of s. 20 mandates a broader interpretation and the oppression remedy is, therefore, available to a supervising judge in appropriate circumstances.

54 I do not accept the respondents' argument that the motion judge had the authority to order the removal of the appellants by virtue of the power contained in s. 145(2)(b) of the CBCA to make an order "declaring the result of the disputed election or appointment" of directors. In my view, s. 145 relates to the procedures underlying disputed elections or appointments, and not to disputes over the composition of the board of directors itself. Here, it is conceded that the appointment of Messrs. Woollcombe and Keiper as directors complied with all relevant statutory requirements. Farley J. quite properly did not seek to base his jurisdiction on any such authority.

#### *The Level of Conduct Required*

55 Colin Campbell J. recently invoked the oppression remedy to remove directors, without appointing anyone in their place, in *Catalyst Fund General Partner I Inc. v. Hollinger Inc.*, *supra*. The bar is high. In reviewing the applicable law, C. Campbell J. said (para. 68):

Director removal is an *extraordinary remedy* and certainly should be *imposed most sparingly*. As a starting point, I accept the basic proposition set out in Peterson, "Shareholder Remedies in Canada"<sup>5</sup>:

SS. 18.172 *Removing and appointing directors to the board is an extreme form of judicial intervention*. The board of directors is elected by the shareholders, vested with the power to manage the corporation, and appoints the officers of the company who undertake to conduct the day-to-day affairs of the corporation. [Footnote omitted.] It is clear that the board of directors has control over policymaking and management of the corporation. *By tampering with a board, a court directly affects the management of the corporation*. If a reasonable balance between protection of corporate stakeholders and the freedom of management to conduct the affairs of the business in an efficient manner is desired, altering the board of directors should be *a measure of last resort*. The order could be suitable where the continuing presence of the incumbent directors is harmful to both the company and the interests of corporate stakeholders, and where the appointment of a new director or directors would remedy the oppressive conduct without a receiver or receiver-manager.

[emphasis added]

56 C. Campbell J. found that the continued involvement of the Ravelston directors in the *Hollinger* situation would "significantly impede" the interests of the public shareholders and that those directors were "motivated by putting their interests first, not those of the company" (paras. 82-83). The evidence in this case is far from reaching any such benchmark, however, and the record would not support a finding of oppression, even if one had been sought.

57 Everyone accepts that there is no evidence the appellants have conducted themselves, as directors — in which capacity they participated over two days in the bid consideration exercise — in anything but a neutral fashion, having regard to the best interests of Stelco and all of the stakeholders. The motion judge acknowledged that the appellants "may well conduct themselves beyond reproach". However, he simply decided there was a risk — a reasonable apprehension — that Messrs. Woollcombe and Keiper would not live up to their obligations to be neutral in the future.

58 The risk or apprehension appears to have been founded essentially on three things: (1) the earlier public statements made by Mr. Keiper about "maximizing shareholder value"; (2) the conduct of Clearwater and Equilibrium in criticizing and opposing the Stalking Horse Bid; and (3) the motion judge's opinion that Clearwater and Equilibrium — the shareholders represented by the appellants on the Board — had a "vision" that "usually does not encompass any significant concern for the long-term competitiveness and viability of an emerging corporation", as a result of which the appellants would approach their directors' duties looking to liquidate their shares on the basis of a "short-term hold" rather than with the best interests of Stelco in mind. The motion judge transposed these concerns into anticipated predisposed conduct on the part of the appellants as directors, despite their apparent understanding of their duties as directors and their assurances that they would act in the best interests of Stelco. He therefore concluded that "the risk to the process and to Stelco in its emergence [was] simply too great to risk the wait and see approach".

59 Directors have obligations under s. 122(1) of the CBCA (a) to act honestly and in good faith with a view to the best interest of the corporation (the "statutory fiduciary duty" obligation), and (b) to exercise the care, diligence and skill that a reasonably prudent person would exercise in comparable circumstances (the "duty of care" obligation). They are also subject to control under the oppression remedy provisions of s. 241. The general nature of these duties does not change when the company approaches, or finds itself in, insolvency: *People's Department Stores Ltd. (1992) Inc., Re*, [2004] S.C.J. No. 64 (S.C.C.) at paras. 42-49.

60 In *Peoples* the Supreme Court noted that "the interests of the corporation are not to be confused with the interests of the creditors or those of any other stakeholders" (para. 43), but also accepted "as an accurate statement of the law that in determining whether [directors] are acting with a view to the best interests of the corporation it may be legitimate, given all the circumstances of a given case, for the board of directors to consider, *inter alia*, the interests of shareholders, employees, suppliers, creditors, consumers, governments and the environment" (para. 42). Importantly as well — in the context of "the shifting interest and incentives of shareholders and creditors" — the court stated (para. 47):

In resolving these competing interests, it is incumbent upon the directors to act honestly and in good faith with a view to the best interests of the corporation. In using their skills for the benefit of the corporation when it is in troubled waters financially, the directors must be careful to attempt to act in its best interests by creating a "better" corporation, and not to favour the interests of any one group of stakeholders.

61 In determining whether directors have fallen foul of those obligations, however, more than some risk of anticipated misconduct is required before the court can impose the extraordinary remedy of removing a director from his or her duly elected or appointed office. Although the motion judge concluded that there was a risk of harm to the Stelco process if Messrs Woolcombe and Keiper remained as directors, he did not assess the level of that risk. The record does not support a finding that there was a sufficient risk of sufficient misconduct to warrant a conclusion of oppression. The motion judge was not asked to make such a finding, and he did not do so.

62 The respondents argue that this court should not interfere with the decision of the motion judge on grounds of deference. They point out that the motion judge has been case-managing the restructuring of Stelco under the CCAA for over fourteen months and is intimately familiar with the circumstances of Stelco as it seeks to restructure itself and emerge from court protection.

63 There is no question that the decisions of judges acting in a supervisory role under the CCAA, and particularly those of experienced commercial list judges, are entitled to great deference: see *Algoma Steel Inc. v. Union Gas Ltd.* (2003), 63 O.R. (3d) 78 (Ont. C.A.) at para. 16. The discretion must be exercised judicially and in accordance with the principles governing its operation. Here, respectfully, the motion judge misconstrued his authority, and made an order that he was not empowered to make in the circumstances.

64 The appellants argued that the motion judge made a number of findings without any evidence to support them. Given my decision with respect to jurisdiction, it is not necessary for me to address that issue.

### *The Business Judgment Rule*

65 The appellants argue as well that the motion judge erred in failing to defer to the unanimous decision of the Stelco directors in deciding to appoint them to the Stelco Board. It is well-established that judges supervising restructuring proceedings — and courts in general — will be very hesitant to second-guess the business decisions of directors and management. As the Supreme Court of Canada said in *Peoples, supra*, at para. 67:

Courts are ill-suited and should be reluctant to second-guess the application of business expertise to the considerations that are involved in corporate decision making . . .

66 In *Brant Investments Ltd. v. KeepRite Inc.* (1991), 3 O.R. (3d) 289 (Ont. C.A.) at 320, this court adopted the following statement by the trial judge, Anderson J.:

Business decisions, honestly made, should not be subjected to microscopic examination. There should be no interference simply because a decision is unpopular with the minority.<sup>6</sup>

67 McKinlay J.A then went on to say:

There can be no doubt that on an application under s. 234<sup>7</sup> the trial judge is required to consider the nature of the impugned acts and the method in which they were carried out. That does not mean that the trial judge should substitute his own business judgment for that of managers, directors, or a committee such as the one involved in assessing this transaction. Indeed, it would generally be impossible for him to do so, regardless of the amount of evidence before him. He is dealing with the matter at a different time and place; it is unlikely that he will have the background knowledge and expertise of the individuals involved; he could have little or no knowledge of the background and skills of the persons who would be carrying out any proposed plan; and it is unlikely that he would have any knowledge of the specialized market in which the corporation operated. In short, he does not know enough to make the business decision required.

68 Although a judge supervising a CCAA proceeding develops a certain "feel" for the corporate dynamics and a certain sense of direction for the restructuring, this caution is worth keeping in mind. See also *Skeena Cellulose Inc., Re, supra*, *Sammi Atlas Inc., Re* (1998), 3 C.B.R. (4th) 171 (Ont. Gen. Div. [Commercial List]); *Olympia & York Developments Ltd. (Re), supra*; *Alberta-Pacific Terminals Ltd., Re* (1991), 8 C.B.R. (3d) 99 (B.C. S.C.). The court is not catapulted into the shoes of the board of directors, or into the seat of the chair of the board, when acting in its supervisory role in the restructuring.

69 Here, the motion judge was alive to the "business judgment" dimension in the situation he faced. He distinguished the application of the rule from the circumstances, however, stating at para. 18 of his reasons:

With respect I do not see the present situation as involving the "management of the business and affairs of the corporation", but rather as a quasi-constitutional aspect of the corporation entrusted albeit to the Board pursuant to s. 111(1) of the CBCA. I agree that where a board is actually engaged in the business of a judgment situation, the board should be given appropriate deference. However, to the contrary in this situation, I do not see it as a situation calling for (as asserted) more deference, but rather considerably less than that. With regard to this decision of the Board having impact upon the capital raising process, as I conclude it would, then similarly deference ought not to be given.

70 I do not see the distinction between the directors' role in "the management of the business and affairs of the corporation" (CBCA, s. 102) — which describes the directors' overall responsibilities — and their role with respect to a "quasi-constitutional aspect of the corporation" (i.e. in filling out the composition of the board of directors in the event of a vacancy). The "affairs" of the corporation are defined in s. 1 of the CBCA as meaning "the relationships among a corporation, its affiliates and the shareholders, directors and officers of such bodies corporate but does not include

the business carried on by such bodies corporate". Corporate governance decisions relate directly to such relationships and are at the heart of the Board's business decision-making role regarding the corporation's business *and* affairs. The dynamics of such decisions, and the intricate balancing of competing interests and other corporate-related factors that goes into making them, are no more within the purview of the court's knowledge and expertise than other business decisions, and they deserve the same deferential approach. Respectfully, the motion judge erred in declining to give effect to the business judgment rule in the circumstances of this case.

71 This is not to say that the conduct of the Board in appointing the appellants as directors may never come under review by the supervising judge. The court must ultimately approve and sanction the plan of compromise or arrangement as finally negotiated and accepted by the company and its creditors and stakeholders. The plan must be found to be fair and reasonable before it can be sanctioned. If the Board's decision to appoint the appellants has somehow so tainted the capital raising process that those criteria are not met, any eventual plan that is put forward will fail.

72 The respondents submit that it makes no sense for the court to have jurisdiction to declare the process flawed only after the process has run its course. Such an approach to the restructuring process would be inefficient and a waste of resources. While there is some merit in this argument, the court cannot grant itself jurisdiction where it does not exist. Moreover, there are a plethora of checks and balances in the negotiating process itself that moderate the risk of the process becoming irretrievably tainted in this fashion — not the least of which is the restraining effect of the prospect of such a consequence. I do not think that this argument can prevail. In addition, the court at all times retains its broad and flexible supervisory jurisdiction — a jurisdiction which feeds the creativity that makes the CCAA work so well — in order to address fairness and process concerns along the way. This case relates only to the court's exceptional power to order the removal of directors.

#### *The Reasonable Apprehension of Bias Analogy*

73 In exercising what he saw as his discretion to remove the appellants as directors, the motion judge thought it would be useful to "borrow the concept of reasonable apprehension of bias . . . with suitable adjustments for the nature of the decision making involved" (para. 8). He stressed that "there was absolutely no allegation against [Mr. Woolcombe and Mr. Keiper] of any actual 'bias' or its equivalent" (para. 8). He acknowledged that neither was alleged to have done anything wrong since their appointments as directors, and that at the time of their appointments the appellants had confirmed to the Board that they understood and would abide by their duties and responsibilities as directors, including the responsibility to act in the best interests of the corporation and not in their own interests as shareholders. In the end, however, he concluded that because of their prior public statements that they intended to "pursue efforts to maximize shareholder value at Stelco", and because of the nature of their business and the way in which they had been accumulating their shareholding position during the restructuring, and because of their linkage to 40% of the common shareholders, there was a risk that the appellants would not conduct themselves in a neutral fashion in the best interests of the corporation as directors.

74 In my view, the administrative law notion of apprehension of bias is foreign to the principles that govern the election, appointment and removal of directors, and to corporate governance considerations in general. Apprehension of bias is a concept that ordinarily applies to those who preside over judicial or quasi-judicial decision-making bodies, such as courts, administrative tribunals or arbitration boards. Its application is inapposite in the business decision-making context of corporate law. There is nothing in the CBCA or other corporate legislation that envisages the screening of directors in advance for their ability to act neutrally, in the best interests of the corporation, as a prerequisite for appointment.

75 Instead, the conduct of directors is governed by their common law and statutory obligations to act honestly and in good faith with a view to the best interests of the corporation, and to exercise the care, diligence and skill that a reasonably prudent person would exercise in comparable circumstances (CBCA, s. 122(1)(a) and (b)). The directors also have fiduciary obligations to the corporation, and they are liable to oppression remedy proceedings in appropriate circumstances. These remedies are available to aggrieved complainants — including the respondents in this case — but they depend for their applicability on the director having engaged in conduct justifying the imposition of a remedy.

76 If the respondents are correct, and reasonable apprehension that directors may not act neutrally because they are aligned with a particular group of shareholders or stakeholders is sufficient for removal, all nominee directors in Canadian corporations, and all management directors, would automatically be disqualified from serving. No one suggests this should be the case. Moreover, as Iacobucci J. noted in *Blair v. Consolidated Enfield Corp.*, [1995] 4 S.C.R. 5 (S.C.C.) at para. 35, "persons are assumed to act in good faith unless proven otherwise". With respect, the motion judge approached the circumstances before him from exactly the opposite direction. It is commonplace in corporate/commercial affairs that there are connections between directors and various stakeholders and that conflicts will exist from time to time. Even where there are conflicts of interest, however, directors are not removed from the board of directors; they are simply obliged to disclose the conflict and, in appropriate cases, to abstain from voting. The issue to be determined is not whether there is a connection between a director and other shareholders or stakeholders, but rather whether there has been some conduct on the part of the director that will justify the imposition of a corrective sanction. An apprehension of bias approach does not fit this sort of analysis.

#### Part V — Disposition

77 For the foregoing reasons, then, I am satisfied that the motion judge erred in declaring the appointment of Messrs. Woolcombe and Keiper as directors of Stelco of no force and effect.

78 I would grant leave to appeal, allow the appeal and set aside the order of Farley J. dated February 25, 2005.

79 Counsel have agreed that there shall be no costs of the appeal.

*Goudge J.A.:*

I agree.

*Feldman J.A.:*

I agree.

*Appeal allowed.*

#### Footnotes

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

2 The reference is to the decisions in *Dyle, Royal Oak Mines, and Westar*, cited above.

3 See paragraph 43, *infra*, where I elaborate on this distinction.

4 It is the latter authority that the directors of Stelco exercised when appointing the appellants to the Stelco Board.

5 Dennis H. Peterson, *Shareholder Remedies in Canada* (Markham: LexisNexis — Butterworths — Looseleaf Service, 1989) at 18-47.

6 Or, I would add, unpopular with other stakeholders.

7 Now s. 241.