

**EXHIBIT 3**

**CITATION:** Canwest Global Communications Corp., 2011 ONSC 2215  
**COURT FILE NO.:** CV-09-8396-00CL  
**DATE:** 20110407

**ONTARIO**

**SUPERIOR COURT OF JUSTICE  
(COMMERCIAL LIST)**

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

AND IN THE MATTER OF A PLAN OF COMPROMISE OR ARRANGEMENT OF  
CANWEST GLOBAL COMMUNICATIONS CORP. AND OTHER APPLICANTS

COUNSEL: *Douglas J. Wray and Jesse B. Kugler*, counsel for the Applicant,  
Communications, Energy and Paperworkers Union of Canada ("CEP")  
*David Byers and Maria Konyukhova*, counsel for the Monitor

**PEPALL J.**

**REASONS FOR DECISION**

**Introduction**

[1] The Communications, Energy and Paperworkers Union of Canada ("CEP") requests an order lifting the stay of proceedings in respect of certain grievances and directing that they be adjudicated in accordance with the provisions of the applicable collective agreement. In the alternative, CEP requests an order amending the claims procedure order so as to permit the subject claim to be adjudicated in accordance with the provisions of the collective agreement.

**Background Facts**

[2] On October 6, 2009, the CMI Entities obtained an initial order pursuant to the *CCAA* staying all proceedings and claims against them. Specifically, paragraphs 15 and 16 of that order stated:

**NO PROCEEDINGS AGAINST THE CMI ENTITIES  
OR THE CMI PROPERTY**

15. **THIS COURT ORDERS** that until and including November 5, 2009, or such later date as this Court may order (the "Stay Period"), no proceeding or enforcement process in any court or tribunal (each, a "Proceeding") shall be commenced or continued against or in respect of the CMI Entities, the Monitor or the CMI CRA or affecting the CMI Business or the CMI Property, except with the written consent of the applicable CMI Entity, the Monitor and the CMI CRA (in respect of Proceedings affecting the CMI Entities, the CMI Property or the CMI Business), the CMI CRA (in respect of Proceedings affecting the CMI CRA), or with leave of this Court, and any and all Proceedings currently under way against or in respect of the CMI Entities or the CMI CRA or affecting the CMI Business or the CMI Property are hereby stayed and suspended pending further Order of this Court. In the case of the CMI CRA, no Proceeding shall be commenced against the CMI CRA or its directors and officers without prior leave of this Court on seven (7) days notice to Stonecrest Capital Inc.

**NO EXERCISE OF RIGHTS OR REMEDIES**

16. **THIS COURT ORDERS** that during the Stay Period, all rights and remedies of any individual, firm, corporation, governmental body or agency, or any other entities (all of the foregoing, collectively being "Persons" and each being a "Person") against or in respect of the CMI Entities, the Monitor and/or the CMI CRA, or affecting the CMI Business or the CMI Property, are hereby stayed and suspended except with the written consent of the applicable CMI Entity, the Monitor and the CMI CRA (in respect of rights and remedies affecting the CMI Entities, the CMI Property or the CMI Business), the CMI CRA (in respect of rights or remedies affecting the CMI CRA), or leave of this Court, provided that nothing in this Order shall (i) empower the CMI Entities to carry on any business which the CMI entities are not lawfully entitled to carry on, (ii) exempt the CMI Entities from compliance with statutory or regulatory provisions relating to health, safety or the environment, (iii) prevent the filing of any registration to preserve or perfect a security interest, or (iv) prevent the registration of claim for lien.

[3] On October 14, 2009, as part of the CCAA proceedings, I granted a claims procedure order which established a claims procedure for the identification and quantification of claims against the CMI Entities. In that order, "Claim" is defined as any right or claim of any Person against one or more of the CMI Entities in existence on the Filing Date<sup>1</sup> (a "Prefiling Claim") and any right or claim of any Person against one or more of the CMI Entities arising out of the restructuring on or after the Filing Date (a "Restructuring Claim"). Claims arising prior to certain dates had to be asserted within the claims procedure failing which they were forever extinguished and barred. Pursuant to the claims procedure order, subject to the discretion of the Court, claims of any person against one or more of the CMI Entities were to be determined by a claims officer who would determine the validity and amount of the disputed claim in accordance with the claims procedure order. The Honourable Ed Saunders, The Honourable Jack Ground and The Honourable Coulter Osborne were appointed as claims officers. Other persons could also be appointed by court order or on consent of the CMI Entities and the Monitor. This order was unopposed. It was amended on November 30, 2009 and again the motion was unopposed. As at October 29, 2010, over 1,800 claims asserted against the CMI Entities had been finally resolved in accordance with and pursuant to the claims procedure order.

[4] On October 27, 2010, CEP was authorized to represent its current and former union members including pensioners employed or formerly employed by the CMI Entities to the extent, if any, that it was necessary to do so.

[5] On the date of the initial order, CEP had a number of outstanding grievances. CEP filed claims pursuant to the claims procedure order in respect of those grievances. The claim that is the subject matter of this motion is the only claim filed by CEP that has not been resolved and therefore is the only claim filed by CEP that requires adjudication. There is at least one other claim in Western Canada that may require adjudication.

---

<sup>1</sup> The Filing Date was October 6, 2009, the date of the initial order.

[6] John Bradley had been employed for 20 years by Global Television, a division of Canwest Television Limited Partnership (“CTLP”), one of the CMI Entities. Mr. Bradley is a member of CEP. On February 24, 2010, CTLP suspended Mr. Bradley for alleged misconduct. On March 8, 2010, CEP filed a grievance relating to his suspension under the applicable collective agreement. On March 25, 2010, CTLP terminated his employment. On March 26, 2010, CEP filed a grievance requesting full redress for Mr. Bradley’s termination. This would include reinstatement to his employment. On June 23, 2010 a restructuring period claim was filed with respect to the Bradley grievances on the following basis:

The Union has filed this claim in order to preserve its rights. Filing this claim is without prejudice to the Union’s ability to pursue all other remedies at its disposal to enforce its rights, including any other statutory remedies available. Notwithstanding that the Union has filed the present claim, the Union does not agree that this claim is subject to compromise pursuant [to the CCAA]<sup>2</sup>. The Union reserves its right to make further submissions in this regard.

[7] In spite of the parties’ good faith attempts to resolve the Bradley grievances and the Bradley claim, no resolution was achieved.

[8] The Plan was sanctioned on July 28, 2010 and implemented on October 27, 2010. At that time, all of the operating assets of the CMI Entities were transferred to the Plan Sponsor and the CMI Entities ceased operations. The CTLP stay was also terminated. The stay with respect to the Remaining CMI Entities (as that term is defined in the Plan) was extended until May 5, 2011. Pursuant to an order dated September 27, 2010, following the Plan implementation date the Monitor shall be:

(a) empowered and authorized to exercise all of the rights and powers of the CMI Entities under the Claims Procedure Order, including, without limitation, revise, reject, accept,

---

<sup>2</sup> The words in brackets were omitted but presumably this was the intention.

settle and/or refer for adjudication Claims (as defined in the Claims Procedure Order) all without (i) seeking or obtaining the consent of the CMI Entities, the Chief Restructuring Advisor or any other person, and (ii) consulting with the Chief Restructuring Advisor in the CMI Entities; and

(b) take such further steps and seek such amendments to the Claims Procedure Order or additional orders as the Monitor considers necessary or appropriate in order to fully determine, resolve or deal with any Claims.

[9] The Monitor has taken the position that if the Bradley matter is not resolved, the claim should be referred to a claims officer for determination. It is conceded that a claims officer would have no jurisdiction to reinstate Mr. Bradley to his employment.

[10] CEP now requests an order lifting the stay of proceedings in respect of the Bradley grievances and directing that they be adjudicated in accordance with the provisions of the collective agreement. In the alternative, CEP requests an order amending the claims procedure order so as to permit the Bradley claim to be adjudicated in accordance with the provisions of the collective agreement.

[11] For the purposes of this motion and as is obvious from the motion seeking to lift the stay, both CEP and the Monitor agree that the stay did catch the Bradley claim and that it is encompassed by the definition of claim found in the claims procedure order.

[12] Since the commencement of the *CCAA* proceedings, CEP has only sought to lift the stay in respect of one other claim, that being a claim relating to a grievance filed by CEP on behalf of Vicky Anderson. The CMI Entities consented to lifting the stay in respect of Ms. Anderson's claim because at the date of the initial order, there had already been eight days of hearing before an arbitrator, all evidence had already been called, and only one further date was scheduled for final argument. Ultimately, the arbitrator ordered that Ms. Anderson be reinstated but made no order for compensation.

[13] Pursuant to Article 12.3 of the applicable collective agreement, discharge grievances are to be heard by a single arbitrator. All other grievances are to be heard by a three person Board of

Arbitration unless the parties consent to submit the grievance to a single arbitrator. The single arbitrator is to be selected within 10 days of the notice of referral to arbitration from a list of 5 people drawn by lot. An award is to be given within 30 days of the conclusion of the hearing. The list of arbitrators was negotiated and included in the collective agreement. The arbitrator has the power to reinstate with or without compensation.

[14] The evidence before me suggests that adjudications of grievances under collective agreements are typically much more costly and time consuming than adjudications before a claims officer as the latter may determine claims in a summary manner and there is more control over scheduling. The Monitor takes the position that additional cost and delay would arise if the claims were adjudicated pursuant to the terms of the collective agreement rather than pursuant to the terms of the claims procedure order.

#### Issues

[15] Both parties agree that the following two issues are to be considered:

- (a) Should this court lift the stay of proceedings in respect of the Bradley grievances and direct that the Bradley grievances be adjudicated in accordance with the provisions of the collective agreement?
- (b) Should this court amend the claims procedure order so as to permit the Bradley claim to be adjudicated in accordance with the provisions of the collective agreement?

#### Positions of the Parties

[16] In brief, dealing firstly with the stay, CEP submits that the balance of convenience favours pursuit of the grievances through arbitration. CEP is seeking to compel the employer to comply with fundamental obligations that flow from the collective agreement. This includes the appointment of an arbitrator on consent who has jurisdiction to award reinstatement if he or she determines that there was no just cause to terminate Mr. Bradley's employment. Requiring that the claim and the grievances be adjudicated in a manner that is inconsistent with the collective

agreement would have the effect of depriving the grievor of some of the most fundamental rights under a collective agreement. Furthermore, permitting the grievances to proceed to arbitration would prejudice no one.

[17] Alternatively, CEP submits that the claims procedure order ought to be amended. It is in conflict with the terms of the collective agreement. Pursuant to section 33 of the *CCAA*, the collective agreement remains in force during the *CCAA* proceedings. The claims procedure order must comply with the express requirements of the *CCAA*. Lastly, orders issued under the *CCAA* should not infringe upon the right to engage in associational activities which are protected by the *Charter of Rights and Freedoms*.

[18] The Monitor opposes the relief requested. On the issue of the lifting of the stay, it submits that the *CCAA* is intended to provide a structured environment for the negotiation of compromises between a debtor company and its creditors for the benefit of both. The stay of proceedings permits the *CCAA* to accomplish its legislative purpose and in particular enables continuance of the company seeking *CCAA* protection.

[19] The lifting of a stay is discretionary. Mr. Bradley is no more prejudiced than any other creditor and the claims procedure established under the order has been uniformly applied. The claims officer has the power to recognize Mr. Bradley's right to reinstatement and monetize that right. The efficacy of *CCAA* proceedings would be undermined if a debtor company was forced to participate in an arbitration outside the *CCAA* proceedings. This would place the resources of an insolvent *CCAA* debtor under strain. The Monitor submits that CEP has not satisfied the onus to demonstrate that the lifting of the stay is appropriate in this case.

[20] As for the second issue, the Monitor submits that the claims procedure order should not be amended. Courts regularly affect employee rights arising from collective agreements during *CCAA* proceedings and recent amendments to the *CCAA* do not change the existing case law in this regard. Furthermore, amending the claims procedure order would undermine the purpose of the *CCAA*. Lastly, relying on the Supreme Court of Canada's statements in *Health Services and*



*Support – Facilities Subsector Bargaining Assn. v. British Columbia*<sup>3</sup>, the claims procedure order does not interfere with freedom of association.

[21] Following argument, I requested additional brief written submissions on certain issues and in particular, to what employment Mr. Bradley would be reinstated if so ordered. I have now received those submissions from both parties.

### Discussion

#### 1. Stay of Proceedings

[22] The purpose of the *CCAA* has frequently been described but bears repetition. In *Lehndorff General Partner Limited*<sup>4</sup>, Farley J. stated:

The *CCAA* is intended to provide a structured environment for the negotiation of compromises between a debtor company and its creditors for the benefit of both.

[23] The stay provisions in the *CCAA* are discretionary and very broad. Section 11.02 provides that:

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

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

---

<sup>3</sup> [2007] S.C.J. No. 27.

<sup>4</sup> (1993), 17 C.B.R. (3rd) 24 (Ont. Gen. Div.) at para. 6.

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

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

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

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

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

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

[24] As the Court of Appeal noted in *Nortel Networks Corp.*<sup>5</sup>, the discretion provided in section 11 is the engine that drives this broad and flexible statutory scheme. The stay of proceedings in section 11 should be broadly construed to accomplish the legislative purpose of the *CCAA* and in particular to enable continuance of the company seeking *CCAA* protection: *Lehndorff General Partner Limited*<sup>6</sup>.

[25] Section 11 provides an insolvent company with breathing room and by doing so, preserves the status quo to assist the company in its restructuring or arrangement and prevents any particular stakeholder from obtaining an advantage over other stakeholders during the

---

<sup>5</sup> [2009] O.J. No. 4967 at para. 33.

<sup>6</sup> *Supra*, note 4 at para. 10.

restructuring process. It is anticipated that one or more creditors may be prejudiced in favour of the collective whole. As stated in *Lendorff General Partner Limited*<sup>7</sup>:

The possibility that one or more creditors may be prejudiced should not affect the court's exercise of its authority to grant a stay of proceedings under the *CCAA* because this effect is offset by the benefit to all creditors and to the company of facilitating a reorganization. The court's primary concerns under the *CCAA* must be for the debtor and all of the creditors.

[26] In *Canwest Global Communications Corp.*<sup>8</sup>, I had occasion to address the issue of lifting a stay in a *CCAA* proceeding. I referred to situations in which a court had lifted a stay as described by Paperny J. (as she then was) in *Re Canadian Airlines Corp.*<sup>9</sup> and by Professor McLaren in his book, "*Canadian Commercial Reorganization: Preventing Bankruptcy*"<sup>10</sup>. They included where:

- a) a plan is likely to fail;
- b) the applicant shows hardship (the hardship must be caused by the stay itself and be independent of any pre-existing condition of the applicant creditor);
- c) the applicant shows necessity for payment;
- d) the applicant would be significantly prejudiced by refusal to lift the stay and there would be no resulting prejudice to the debtor company or the positions of creditors;

---

<sup>7</sup> *Ibid.* at para. 6.

<sup>8</sup> (2009) O.J. 5379.

<sup>9</sup> (2000) 19 C.B.R. (4<sup>th</sup>) 1.

<sup>10</sup> (Aurora: Canada Law Book, looseleaf) at para. 3.3400.

- e) it is necessary to permit the applicant to take steps to protect a right that could be lost by the passage of time;
- f) after the lapse of a significant period, the insolvent debtor is no closer to a proposal than at the commencement of the stay period;
- g) there is a real risk that a creditor's loan will become unsecured during the stay period;
- h) it is necessary to allow the applicant to perfect a right that existed prior to the commencement of the stay period;
- i) it is in the interests of justice to do so.

[27] The lifting of a stay is discretionary. As I wrote in *Camvest Global Communications Corp.*<sup>11</sup>:

There are no statutory guidelines contained in the Act. According to Professor R.H. McLaren in his book "Canadian Commercial Reorganization: Preventing Bankruptcy", an opposing party faces a very heavy onus if it wishes to apply to the court for an order lifting the stay. In determining whether to lift the stay, the court should consider whether there are sound reasons for doing so consistent with the objectives of the CCAA, including a consideration of the balance of convenience, the relative prejudice to parties, and where relevant, the merits of the proposed action: *ICR Commercial Real Estate (Regina) Ltd. v. Bricore Land Group Ltd.* (2007), 33 C.B.R. (5<sup>th</sup>) 50 (Sask. C.A.) at para. 68. That decision also indicated that the judge should consider the good faith and due diligence of the debtor company.

[28] There appears to be no real issue that the grievances are caught by the stay of proceedings. In *Luscar Ltd. v. Smoky River Coal Limited*<sup>12</sup>, the issue was whether a judge had

---

<sup>11</sup> *Supra*, note 8 at para. 32.

<sup>12</sup> [1999] A.J. No. 676.

the discretion under the *CCAA* to establish a procedure for resolving a dispute between parties who had previously agreed by contract to arbitrate their disputes. The question before the court was whether the dispute should be resolved as part of the supervised reorganization of the company under the *CCAA* or whether the court should stay the proceedings while the dispute was resolved by an arbitrator. The presiding judge was of the view that the dispute should be resolved as expeditiously as possible under the *CCAA* proceedings. The Alberta Court of Appeal upheld the decision stating:

The above jurisprudence persuades me that “proceedings” in section 11 includes the proposed arbitration under the B.C. *Arbitration Act*. The Appellants assert that arbitration is expeditious. That is often, but not always, the case. Arbitration awards can be appealed. Indeed, this is contemplated by section 15(5) of the *Rules*. Arbitration awards, moreover, can be subject to judicial review, further lengthening and complicating the decision making process. Thus, the efficacy of *CCAA* proceedings (many of which are time sensitive) could be seriously undermined if a debtor company was forced to participate in an extra-*CCAA* arbitration. For these reasons, having taken into account the nature and purpose of the *CCAA*, I conclude that, in appropriate cases, arbitration is a “proceeding” that can be stayed under section 11 of the *CCAA*.<sup>13</sup>

[29] I do recognize that the *Luscar* decision did not involve a collective agreement but an agreement to arbitrate. That said, the principles described also apply to an arbitration pursuant to the terms of a collective agreement.

[30] In considering balance of convenience, CEP’s primary concerns are that the claims procedure order does not accord with the rights and obligations contained in the collective agreement. Firstly, a claims officer is the adjudicator rather than an arbitrator chosen pursuant to the terms of the collective agreement and secondly, reinstatement is not an available remedy

---

<sup>13</sup> *Ibid*, at para. 33.

before a claims officer. Thirdly, an arbitration imports rules of natural justice and procedural fairness whereas the claims procedure is summary in nature.

[31] The claims officers who were identified in the claims procedure order are all former respected and experienced judges who are well suited and capable of addressing the issues arising from the Bradley claim. Furthermore, had this been a real issue, CEP could have raised it earlier and identified another claims officer for inclusion in the claims procedure order. Indeed, an additional claims officer still could be appointed but no such request was ever advanced by CEP.

[32] Should the claims officer find that CTLP did not have just cause to terminate Mr. Bradley's employment, he can recognize Mr. Bradley's right to reinstatement by monetizing that right. This was done for a multitude of other claims in the *CCAA* proceedings including claims filed by CEP on behalf of other members. I note that Mr. Bradley would not be receiving treatment different from that of any other creditor participating in the claims process.

[33] The claims process is summary in nature for a reason. It reduces delay, streamlines the process, and reduces expense and in so doing promotes the objectives of *CCAA*. Indeed, if grievances were to customarily proceed to arbitration, potential exists to significantly undermine the *CCAA* proceedings. Arbitration of all claims arising from collective agreements would place the already stretched resources of insolvent *CCAA* debtors under significant additional strain and could divert resources away from the restructuring. It is my view that generally speaking, grievances should be adjudicated along with other claims pursuant to the provisions of a claims procedure order within the context of the *CCAA* proceedings.

[34] That said, it seems to me that this case is unique. While the claims procedure order and the meeting order of June 23, 2010 provide that all claims against CTLP and others arising prior to certain dates must be asserted within the claims procedure failing which they are forever extinguished and barred, the stay relating to CTPL was terminated on October 27, 2010. CTLP has emerged from *CCAA* protection and is currently operating in the normal course having changed its name to Shaw Television Limited Partnership ("STLP"). If the grievance relating to

Mr. Bradley's termination is successful, he could be reinstated to his employment at STLP. The position of CEP, Mr. Bradley and the Monitor is that reinstatement, if ordered, would be to STLP. Counsel for CEP advised the court that notice of the motion was given to STLP and that a representative was present in court for the argument of the motion although did not appear on the record. The Monitor has also confirmed that Shaw Communications Inc., the parent of STLP, was aware of the motion and its counsel has confirmed its understanding that any reinstatement of Mr. Bradley, if ordered, would be to STLP.

[35] As mentioned, Mr. Bradley was a 20 year employee. While I do not consider the identity of the arbitrator and the natural justice arguments of CEP to be persuasive, given the stage of the CCAA proceedings, the fact that the stay relating to CTLP has been lifted, and Mr. Bradley's employment tenure, I am persuaded that he ought to be given the opportunity to pursue his claim for reinstatement rather than being compelled to have that entitlement monetized by a claims officer if so ordered. Counsel for the Monitor has confirmed that the timing of the distributions would not appear to be affected by the outcome of this motion. No meaningful prejudice would ensue to any stakeholder. It seems to me that the balance of convenience and the interests of justice favour lifting the stay to permit the grievances to proceed through arbitration rather than before the claims procedure officer. Therefore, CEP's motion to lift the stay is granted and the Bradley grievances may be adjudicated in accordance with the terms of the collective agreement.

## 2. Amendment of the Claims Procedure Order

[36] In light of my decision on the stay, it is not strictly necessary to consider whether the claims procedure order should be amended as requested by CEP as alternative relief. As this issue was argued, however, I will address it.

[37] Section 33 of *CCAA* was added to the statute in September, 2009. The relevant subsections now provide:

33(1) If proceedings under this Act have been commenced in respect of a debtor company, any collective agreement that the company has entered into as the employer remains in

force, and may not be altered except as provided in this section or under the laws of the jurisdiction governing collective bargaining between the company and the bargaining agent.

33(8) For greater certainty, any collective agreement that the company and the bargaining agent have not agreed to revise remains in force, and the court shall not alter its terms.

[38] Justice Mongeon of the Québec Superior Court had occasion to address the effect of section 33 of the *CCAA* in *White Birch Paper Holding Company*<sup>14</sup>. He stated that the fact that a collective agreement remains in force under a *CCAA* proceeding does not have the effect of “excluding the entire collective labour relations process from the application of the *CCAA*.”<sup>15</sup>

He went on to write that:

It would be tantamount to paralyzing the employer with respect to reducing its costs by any means at all, and to providing the union with a veto with regard to the restructuring process.<sup>16</sup>

[39] In *Canwest Global Communications Corp.*<sup>17</sup>, I wrote that section 33 of the *CCAA* “maintains the terms and obligations contained in the collective agreement but does not alter priorities or status.”<sup>18</sup> In that case when dealing with the issue of immediate payment of severance payments, I wrote:

There are certain provisions in the amendments that expressly mandate certain employee related payments. In those

---

<sup>14</sup> 2010, Q.C.C.S. 2590.

<sup>15</sup> *Ibid.*, at para. 31.

<sup>16</sup> *Ibid.*, at para. 35.

<sup>17</sup> [2010] O.J. No. 2544.

<sup>18</sup> *Ibid.*, at para. 32.



instances, section 6(5) dealing with a sanction of a plan and section 36 dealing with a sale outside the ordinary course of business being two such examples, Parliament specifically dealt with certain employee claims. If Parliament had intended to make such a significant amendment whereby severance and termination payments (and all other payments under a collective agreement) would take priority over secured creditors, it would have done so expressly.<sup>19</sup>

[40] I agree with the Monitor's position that if Parliament had intended to carve grievances out of the claims process, it would have done so expressly. To do so, however, would have undermined the purpose of the *CCAA* and in particular, the claims process which is designed to streamline the resolution of the multitude of claims against an insolvent debtor in the most time sensitive and cost efficient manner. It is hard to imagine that it was Parliament's intention that grievances under collective agreements be excluded from the reach of the stay provisions of section 11 of the *CCAA* or the ancillary claims process. In my view, such a result would seriously undermine the objectives of the *Act*.

[41] Furthermore, I note that over 1,800 claims have been processed and dealt with by way of the claims procedure order, many of them involving claims filed by CEP on behalf of its members. CEP was provided with notice of the motion wherein the claims procedure order and the claims officers were approved. CEP did not raise any objection to the claims procedure order, the claims officers or the inclusion of grievances in the claims procedure at the time that the order was granted. The claims procedure order was not an order made without notice and none of the prerequisites to variation of an order has been met. Had I not lifted the stay, I would not have amended the claims procedure order as requested by CEP.

[42] CEP's last argument is that the claims procedure order interferes with Mr. Bradley's freedoms under the Canadian *Charter of Rights and Freedoms*. In this regard I make the

---

<sup>19</sup> *Ibid*, at para. 33.

following observations. Firstly, this argument was not advanced when the claims procedure order was granted. Secondly, CEP is not challenging the validity of any section of the *CCAA*. Thirdly, nothing in the statute or the claims procedure inhibits the ability to collectively bargain. In *Health Services and Support – Facilities Subsector Bargaining Assn. v. British Columbia*<sup>20</sup>, the Supreme Court of Canada stated:

We conclude that section 2(d) of the *Charter* protects the capacity of members of labour unions to engage, in association, in collective bargaining on fundamental workplace issues. This protection does not cover all aspects of “collective bargaining”, as that term is understood in the statutory labour relations regimes that are in place across the country. Nor does it ensure a particular outcome in a labour dispute or guarantee access to any particularly statutory regime. ...

In our view, it is entirely possible to protect the “procedure” known as collective bargaining without mandating constitutional protection for the fruits of that bargaining process.<sup>21</sup>

[43] In my view, nothing in the claims procedure or the *CCAA* impacts the procedure known as collective bargaining.

#### Conclusion

[44] Under the circumstances, the request to lift the stay as requested by CEP is granted. Had it been necessary to do so, I would have dismissed the alternative relief requested.

---

<sup>20</sup> *Supra*, note 3.

<sup>21</sup> *Ibid*, at at paras. 19 and 29.

**Released:** April 7, 2011

---

**Pepall J.**

20110407 09:10:10 AM

**CITATION:** Canwest Global Communications Corp., 2011 ONSC 2215  
**COURT FILE NO.:** CV-09-8396-00CL  
**DATE:** 20110407

**ONTARIO**

**SUPERIOR COURT OF JUSTICE  
(COMMERCIAL LIST)**

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

AND IN THE MATTER OF A PLAN OF  
COMPROMISE OR ARRANGEMENT OF  
CANWEST GLOBAL COMMUNICATIONS CORP.  
AND OTHER APPLICANTS

---

**REASONS FOR DECISION**

---

Pepall J.

**Released:** April 7, 2011