Court File No. CV-09-8396-00CL

ONTARIO
SUPERIOR COURT OF JUSTICE
(COMMERCIAL LIST)

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

AND IN THE MATTER OF A PLAN OF COMPROMISE OR ARRANGEMENT OF CANWEST GLOBAL COMMUNICATIONS CORP. and THE OTHER APPLICANTS LISTED ON SCHEDULE "A"

BOOK OF AUTHORITIES OF THE MONITOR
(Motion Returnable February 11, 2011)

February 9, 2011

STIKEMAN ELLIOTT LLP
Barristers & Solicitors
5300 Commerce Court West
199 Bay Street
Toronto, Canada M5L 1B9

David Byers LSUC#: 22992W
Tel: (416) 869-5697
Fax: (416) 947-0866

Maria Konyukhova LSUC#: 52880V
Tel: (416) 869-5230
Fax: (416) 947-0866

Lawyers for the Monitor, FTI Consulting Canada Inc.

TO: ATTACHED SERVICE LIST

Court File No. CV-09-8396-00CL

ONTARIO
SUPERIOR COURT OF JUSTICE
(COMMERCIAL LIST)

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

AND IN THE MATTER OF A PLAN OF COMPROMISE OR ARRANGEMENT OF CANWEST GLOBAL COMMUNICATIONS CORP. and THE OTHER APPLICANTS LISTED ON SCHEDULE "A"

BOOK OF AUTHORITIES OF THE MONITOR
(Motion Returnable February 11, 2011)

INDEX

9.	*Collins & Aikman Automotive Canada Inc.*, [2007] O.J. No. 4186
10.	*Syndicat national de l'amiante d'Asbestos inc. v. Jeffrey Mines Inc.*, [2003] J.Q. no. 264 (Q.C.A).
11.	*Re AbitibiBowater Inc.*, [2009] J.Q. no 4473
12.	*White Birch Paper Holding Company*, 2010 Q.C.C.S. 2590 (Q.C.S.C.).
13.	*Windsor Machine and Stamping Ltd.*, [2009] O.J. No. 3195 (Ont. S.C.J.).
14.	*Health Services & Support-Facilities Subsector Bargaining Assn. v. British Columbia*, 1997 2 S.C.R. 391 (S.C.C.)

TAB 1

1993 CarswellOnt 183, 17 C.B.R. (3d) 24, 9 B.L.R. (2d) 275

1993 CarswellOnt 183

Lehndorff General Partner Ltd., Re

Re Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act, R.S.C. 1985, c. C-36; Re Courts of Justice Act, R.S.O. 1990, c. C-43; Re plan of compromise in respect of LEHNDORFF GENERAL PARTNER LTD. (in its own capacity and in its capacity as general partner of LEHNDORFF UNITED PROPERTIES (CANADA), LEHNDORFF PROPERTIES (CANADA) and LEHNDORFF PROPERTIES (CANADA) II) and in respect of certain of their nominees LEHNDORFF UNITED PROPERTIES (CANADA) LTD., LEHNDORFF CANADIAN HOLDINGS LTD., LEHNDORFF CANADIAN HOLDINGS II LTD., BAYTEMP PROPERTIES LIMITED and 102 BLOOR STREET WEST LIMITED and in respect of THG LEHNDORFF VERMÖGENSVERWALTUNG GmbH (in its capacity as limited partner of LEHNDORFF UNITED PROPERTIES (CANADA))

Ontario Court of Justice (General Division — Commercial List)

Farley J.

Heard: December 24, 1992
Judgment: January 6, 1993
Docket: Doc. B366/92

Counsel: *Alfred Apps, Robert Harrison* and *Melissa J. Kennedy* , for applicants.

L. Crozier , for Royal Bank of Canada.

R.C. Heintzman , for Bank of Montreal.

J. Hodgson, Susan Lundy and *James Hilton* , for Canada Trustco Mortgage Corporation.

Jay Schwartz , for Citibank Canada.

Stephen Golick , for Peat Marwick Thorne[FN*] Inc., proposed monitor.

John Teolis , for Fuji Bank Canada.

Robert Thorton , for certain of the advisory boards.

Subject: Corporate and Commercial; Insolvency

Corporations --- Arrangements and compromises — Under Companies' Creditors Arrangements Act — Arrangements — Effect of arrangement — Stay of proceedings.

Corporations — Arrangements and compromises — Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act — Stay of proceedings — Stay being granted even where it would affect non-applicants that were not companies within meaning of Act — Business operations of applicants and non-applicants being so intertwined as to make stay appropriate.

The applicant companies were involved in property development and management and sought the protection of the *Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act* ("CCAA") in order that they could present a plan of compromise. They also sought a stay of all proceedings against the individual company applicants either in their own capacities or because of their interest in a larger group of companies. Each of the applicant companies was insolvent and had outstanding debentures issued under trust deeds. They proposed a plan of compromise among themselves and the holders of the debentures as well as those others of their secured and unsecured creditors deemed appropriate in the circumstances.

A question arose as to whether the court had the power to grant a stay of proceedings against non-applicants that were not companies and, therefore, not within the express provisions of the CCAA.

Held:

The application was allowed.

It was appropriate, given the significant financial intertwining of the applicant companies, that a consolidated plan be approved. Further, each of the applicant companies had a realistic possibility of being able to continue operating even though each was currently unable to meet all of its expenses. This was precisely the sort of situation in which all of the creditors would likely benefit from the application of the CCAA and in which it was appropriate to grant an order staying proceedings.

The inherent power of the court to grant stays can be used to supplement s. 11 of the CCAA when it is just and reasonable to do so. Clearly, the court had the jurisdiction to grant a stay in respect of any of the applicants that were companies fitting the criteria in the CCAA. However, the stay requested also involved limited partnerships where (1) the applicant companies acted on behalf of the limited partnerships, or (2) the stay would be effective against any proceedings taken by any party against the property assets and undertakings of the limited partnerships in which they held a direct interest. The business operations of the applicant companies were so intertwined with the limited partnerships that it would be impossible for a stay to be granted to the applicant companies that would affect their business without affecting the undivided interest of the limited partnerships in the business. As a result, it was just and reasonable to supplement s. 11 and grant the stay.

While the provisions of the CCAA allow for a cramdown of a creditor's claim, as well as the interest of any other person, anyone wishing to start or continue proceedings against the applicant companies could use the comeback clause in the order to persuade the court that it would not be just and reasonable to maintain the stay. In such a motion, the onus would be on the applicant companies to show that it was appropriate in the circumstances to continue the stay.

Cases considered:

Amirault Fish Co., Re, 32 C.B.R. 186, [1951] 4 D.L.R. 203 (N.S. T.D.) — *referred to*

Associated Investors of Canada Ltd., Re, 67 C.B.R. (N.S.) 237 , Alta. L.R. (2d) 259, [1988] 2 W.W.R. 211, 38 B.L.R. 148, (sub nom. *Re First Investors Corp.)* 46 D.L.R. (4th) 669 (Q.B.) , reversed (1988), 71 C.B.R. 71, 60 Alta. L.R. (2d) 242, 89 A.R. 344 (C.A.) — *referred to*

Campeau v. Olympia & York Developments Ltd. (1992), 14 C.B.R. (3d) 303 (Ont. Gen. Div.) — *referred to*

Canada Systems Group (EST) v. Allen-Dale Mutual Insurance Co. (1982), 29 C.P.C. 60, 137 D.L.R. (3d) 287 (Ont. H.C.) [affirmed (1983), 41 O.R. (2d) 135, 33 C.P.C. 210, 145 D.L.R. (3d) 266 (C.A.)] — *referred to*

Empire-Universal Films Ltd. v. Rank, [1947] O.R. 775 [H.C.] — *referred to*

Feifer v. Frame Manufacturing Corp., Re, 28 C.B.R. 124, [1947] Que. K.B. 348 (C.A.) — *referred to*

Fine's Flowers Ltd. v. Fine's Flowers (Creditors of) (1992), 10 C.B.R. (3d) 87, 4 B.L.R. (2d) 293, 87 D.L.R. (4th) 391, 7 O.R. (3d) 193 (Gen. Div.) — *referred to*

Gaz Métropolitain v. Wynden Canada Inc. (1982), 44 C.B.R. (N.S.) 285 (Que. S.C.) [affirmed (1982), 45 C.B.R. (N.S.) 11 (Que. C.A.)] — *referred to*

Hongkong Bank of Canada v. Chef Ready Foods Ltd. (1990), 4 C.B.R. (3d) 311, 51 B.C.L.R. (2d) 84, [1991] 2 W.W.R. 136 (C.A.) — *referred to*

Inducon Development Corp. Re (1992), 8 C.B.R. (3d) 306 (Ont. Gen. Div.) — *referred to*

International Donut Corp. v. 050863 N.B. Ltd. (1992), 127 N.B.R. (2d) 290, 319 A.P.R. 290 (Q.B.) — *considered*

Keppoch Development Ltd., Re (1991), 8 C.B.R. (3d) 95 (N.S. T.D.) — *referred to*

Langley's Ltd., Re, [1938] O.R. 123, [1938] 3 D.L.R. 230 (C.A.) — *referred to*

McCordic v. Bosanquet (1974), 5 O.R. (2d) 53 (H.C.) — *referred to*

Meridian Developments Inc. v. Toronto Dominion Bank, 52 C.B.R. (N.S.) 109, [1984] 5 W.W.R. 215, 32 Alta. L.R. (2d) 150, 53 A.R. 39, 11 D.L.R. (4th) 576 (Q.B.) — *referred to*

Norcen Energy Resources Ltd. v. Oakwood Petroleums Ltd. (1988), 72 C.B.R. (N.S.) 1, 63 Alta. L.R. (2d) 361, 92 A.R. 1 (Q.B.) — *referred to*

Northland Properties Ltd., Re (1988), 73 C.B.R. (N.S.) 141 (B.C. S.C.) — *referred to*

Nova Metal Products Inc. v. Comiskey (Trustee of) (1990), 1 C.B.R. (3d) 101, *(*sub nom. *Elan Corp. v. Comiskey)* 41 O.A.C. 282, 1 O.R. (3d) 289 (C.A.) — *referred to*

Quintette Coal Ltd. v. Nippon Steel Corp. (1990), 2 C.B.R. (3d) 303, 51 B.C.L.R. (2d) 105 (C.A.) , affirming (1990), 2 C.B.R. (3d) 291, 47 B.C.L.R. (2d) 193 (S.C.) , leave to appeal to S.C.C. refused (1991), 7 C.B.R. (3d) 164 (note), 55 B.C.L.R. (2d) xxxiii (note), 135 N.R. 317 (note) — *referred to*

Reference re Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act (Canada), [1934] S.C.R. 659, 16 C.B.R. 1, [1934] 4 D.L.R. 75 — *referred to*

Seven Mile Dam Contractors v. R. (1979), 13 B.C.L.R. 137, 104 D.L.R. (3d) 274 (S.C.) , affirmed (1980), 25 B.C.L.R. 183 (C.A.) — *referred to*

Sklar-Peppler Furniture Corp. v. Bank of Nova Scotia (1991), 8 C.B.R. (3d) 312, 86 D.L.R. (4th) 621 (Ont. Gen. Div.) — *referred to*

Slavik, Re (1992), 12 C.B.R. (3d) 157 (B.C. S.C.) — *considered*

Stephanie's Fashions Ltd., Re (1990), 1 C.B.R. (3d) 248 (B.C. S.C.) — *referred to*

Ultracare Management Inc. v. Zevenberger (Trustee of) (1990), 3 C.B.R. (3d) 151, (sub nom. *Ultracare Management Inc. v. Gammon)* 1 O.R. (3d) 321 (Gen. Div.) — *referred to*

United Maritime Fishermen Co-operative, Re (1988), 67 C.B.R. (N.S.) 44, 84 N.B.R. (2d) 415, 214 A.P.R. 415 (Q.B.) , varied on reconsideration (1988), 68 C.B.R. (N.S.) 170, 87 N.B.R. (2d) 333, 221 A.P.R. 333 (Q.B.) , reversed (1988), 69 C.B.R. (N.S.) 161, 88 N.B.R. (2d) 253, 224 A.P.R. 253, (sub nom. *Cdn. Co-op. Leasing Services v. United Maritime Fishermen Co-op.)* 51 D.L.R. (4th) 618 (C.A.) — *referred to*

Statutes considered:

Bankruptcy Act, R.S.C. 1985, c. B-3 —

s. 85

s. 142

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

s. 2

s. 3

s. 4

s. 5

s. 6

s. 7

s. 8

s. 11

Courts of Justice Act, R.S.O. 1990, c. C.43.

Judicature Act, The, R.S.O. 1937, c. 100.

Limited Partnerships Act, R.S.O. 1990, c. L.16 —

s. 2(2)

s. 3(1)

s. 8

s. 9

s. 11

s. 12(1)

s. 13

s. 15(2)

s. 24

Partnership Act, R.S.A. 1980, c.P-2 — Pt. 2

s. 75

Rules considered:

Ontario, Rules of Civil Procedure —

r. 8.01

r. 8.02

Application under Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act to file consolidated plan of compromise and for stay of proceedings.

***Farley J.*:**

1 These are my written reasons relating to the relief granted the applicants on December 24, 1992 pursuant to their application under the *Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act* , R.S.C. 1985, c. C-36 ("CCAA") and the *Courts of Justice Act* , R.S.O. 1990, c. C.43 ("CJA"). The relief sought was as follows:

(a) short service of the notice of application;

(b) a declaration that the applicants were companies to which the CCAA applies;

(c) authorization for the applicants to file a consolidated plan of compromise;

(d) authorization for the applicants to call meetings of their secured and unsecured creditors to approve the consolidated plan of compromise;

(e) a stay of all proceedings taken or that might be taken either in respect of the applicants in their own capacity or on account of their interest in Lehndorff United Properties (Canada) ("LUPC"), Lehndorff Properties (Can-

ada) ("LPC") and Lehndorff Properties (Canada) II ("LPC II") and collectively (the "Limited Partnerships") whether as limited partner, as general partner or as registered titleholder to certain of their assets as bare trustee and nominee; and

(f) certain other ancillary relief.

2 The applicants are a number of companies within the larger Lehndorff group ("Group") which operates in Canada and elsewhere. The group appears to have suffered in the same way that a number of other property developers and managers which have also sought protection under the CCAA in recent years. The applicants are insolvent; they each have outstanding debentures issues under trust deeds; and they propose a plan of compromise among themselves and the holders of these debentures as well as those others of their secured and unsecured creditors as they deemed appropriate in the circumstances. Each applicant except THG Lehndorff Vermögensverwaltung GmbH ("GmbH") is an Ontario corporation. GmbH is a company incorporated under the laws of Germany. Each of the applicants has assets or does business in Canada. Therefore each is a "company" within the definition of s. 2 of the CCAA. The applicant Lehndorff General Partner Ltd. ("General Partner Company") is the sole general partner of the Limited Partnerships. The General Partner Company has sole control over the property and businesses of the Limited Partnerships. All major decisions concerning the applicants (and the Limited Partnerships) are made by management operating out of the Lehndorff Toronto Office. The applicants aside from the General Partner Company have as their sole purpose the holding of title to properties as bare trustee or nominee on behalf of the Limited Partnerships. LUPC is a limited partnership registered under the *Limited Partnership Act* , R.S.O. 1990, c. L.16 ("Ontario LPA"). LPC and LPC II are limited partnerships registered under Part 2 of the *Partnership Act* , R.S.A. 1980, c. P-2 ("Alberta PA") and each is registered in Ontario as an extra provincial limited partnership. LUPC has over 2,000 beneficial limited partners, LPC over 500 and LPC II over 250, most of whom are residents of Germany. As at March 31, 1992 LUPC had outstanding indebtedness of approximately $370 million, LPC $45 million and LPC II $7 million. Not all of the members of the Group are making an application under the CCAA. Taken together the Group's indebtedness as to Canadian matters (including that of the applicants) was approximately $543 million. In the summer of 1992 various creditors (Canada Trustco Mortgage Company, Bank of Montreal, Royal Bank of Canada, Canadian Imperial Bank of Commerce and the Bank of Tokyo Canada) made demands for repayment of their loans. On November 6, 1992 Funtanua Investments Limited, a minor secured lendor also made a demand. An interim standstill agreement was worked out following a meeting of July 7, 1992. In conjunction with Peat Marwick Thorne Inc. which has been acting as an informal monitor to date and Fasken Campbell Godfrey the applicants have held multiple meetings with their senior secured creditors over the past half year and worked on a restructuring plan. The business affairs of the applicants (and the Limited Partnerships) are significantly intertwined as there are multiple instances of intercorporate debt, cross-default provisions and guarantees and they operated a centralized cash management system.

3 This process has now evolved to a point where management has developed a consolidated restructuring plan which plan addresses the following issues:

(a) The compromise of existing conventional, term and operating indebtedness, both secured and unsecured.

(b) The restructuring of existing project financing commitments.

(c) New financing, by way of equity or subordinated debt.

(d) Elimination or reduction of certain overhead.

(e) Viability of existing businesses of entities in the Lehndorff Group.

(f) Restructuring of income flows from the limited partnerships.

(g) Disposition of further real property assets aside from those disposed of earlier in the process.

(h) Consolidation of entities in the Group; and

(i) Rationalization of the existing debt and security structure in the continuing entities in the Group.

Formal meetings of the beneficial limited partners of the Limited Partnerships are scheduled for January 20 and 21, 1993 in Germany and an information circular has been prepared and at the time of hearing was being translated into German. This application was brought on for hearing at this time for two general reasons: (a) it had now ripened to the stage of proceeding with what had been distilled out of the strategic and consultative meetings; and (b) there were creditors other than senior secured lenders who were in a position to enforce their rights against assets of some of the applicants (and Limited Partnerships) which if such enforcement did take place would result in an undermining of the overall plan. Notice of this hearing was given to various creditors: Barclays Bank of Canada, Barclays Bank PLC, Bank of Montreal, Citibank Canada, Canada Trustco Mortgage Corporation, Royal Trust Corporation of Canada, Royal Bank of Canada, the Bank of Tokyo Canada, Funtauna Investments Limited, Canadian Imperial Bank of Commerce, Fuji Bank Canada and First City Trust Company. In this respect the applicants have recognized that although the initial application under the CCAA may be made on an ex parte basis (s. 11 of the CCAA; *Re Langley's Ltd.*, [1938] O.R. 123, [1938] 3 D.L.R. 230 (C.A.) ; *Re Keppoch Development Ltd.* (1991), 8 C.B.R. (3d) 95 (N.S. T.D.) . The court will be concerned when major creditors have not been alerted even in the most minimal fashion (*Re Inducon Development Corp.* (1992), 8 C.B.R. (3d) 306 (Ont. Gen. Div.) at p. 310). The application was either supported or not opposed.

4 "Instant" debentures are now well recognized and respected by the courts: see *Re United Maritime Fishermen Co-operative* (1988), 67 C.B.R. (N.S.) 44 (N.B. Q.B.) , at pp. 55-56, varied on reconsideration (1988), 68 C.B.R. (N.S.) 170 (N.B. Q.B.) , reversed on different grounds (1988), 69 C.B.R. (N.S.) 161 (N.B. C.A.) , at pp. 165-166; *Re Stephanie's Fashions Ltd.* (1990), 1 C.B.R. (3d) 248 (B.C. S.C.) at pp. 250-251; *Nova Metal Products Inc. v. Comiskey (Trustee of)* (sub nom. *Elan Corp. v. Comiskey*) (1990), 1 O.R. (3d) 289, 1 C.B.R. (3d) 101 (C.A.) per Doherty J.A., dissenting on another point, at pp. 306-310 (O.R.); *Ultracare Management Inc. v. Zevenberger (Trustee of)* (sub nom. *Ultracare Management Inc. v. Gammon*) (1990), 1 O.R. (3d) 321 (Gen. Div.) at p. 327. The applicants would appear to me to have met the technical hurdle of s. 3 and as defined s. 2) of the CCAA in that they are debtor companies since they are insolvent, they have outstanding an issue of debentures under a trust deed and the compromise or arrangement that is proposed includes that compromise between the applicants and the holders of those trust deed debentures. I am also satisfied that because of the significant intertwining of the applicants it would be appropriate to have a consolidated plan. I would also understand that this court (Ontario Court of Justice (General Division)) is the appropriate court to hear this application since all the applicants except GmbH have their head office or their chief place of business in Ontario and GmbH, although it does not have a place of business within Canada, does have assets located within Ontario.

5 The CCAA is intended to facilitate compromises and arrangements between companies and their creditors as an alternative to bankruptcy and, as such, is remedial legislation entitled to a liberal interpretation. It seems to me that the purpose of the statute is to enable insolvent companies to carry on business in the ordinary course or otherwise deal with their assets so as to enable plan of compromise or arrangement to be prepared, filed and considered by their creditors and the court. In the interim, a judge has great discretion under the CCAA to make order 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. See the preamble to and sections 4, 5, 6, 7, 8 and 11 of the CCAA; *Reference re Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act*, [1934] S.C.R. 659 at p. 661, 16 C.B.R. 1, [1934] 4 D.L.R. 75 ; *Meridian Developments Inc. v. Toronto Dominion Bank*, [1984] 5 W.W.R. 215 (Alta. Q.B.) at pp. 219-220; *Norcen Energy Resources Ltd. v. Oakwood Petroleums Ltd.* (1988), 72 C.B.R. (N.S.) 1, 63 Alta. L.R. (2d) 361 (Q.B.) , at pp. 12-13 (C.B.R.); *Quintette Coal Ltd. v. Nippon Steel Corp.* (1990), 2 C.B.R. (3d) 303 (B.C. C.A.) , at pp. 310-311, affirming (1990), 2 C.B.R.

(3d) 291, 47 B.C.L.R. (2d) 193 (S.C.) , leave to appeal to S.C.C. dismissed (1991), 7 C.B.R. (3d) 164 (S.C.C.) .; *Nova Metal Products Inc. v. Comiskey (Trustee of)* , supra, at p. 307 (O.R.); *Fine's Flowers v. Fine's Flowers (Creditors of)* (1992), 7 O.R. (3d) 193 (Gen. Div.) , at p. 199 and "Reorganizations Under The Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act", Stanley E. Edwards (1947) 25 Can. Bar Rev. 587 at p. 592.

6 The CCAA is intended to provide a structured environment for the negotiation of compromises between a debtor company and its creditors for the benefit of both. Where a debtor company realistically plans to continue operating or to otherwise deal with its assets but it requires the protection of the court in order to do so and it is otherwise too early for the court to determine whether the debtor company will succeed, relief should be granted under the CCAA. see *Nova Metal Products Inc. v. Comiskey (Trustee of)* , supra at pp. 297 and 316; *Re Stephanie's Fashions Ltd.* , supra, at pp. 251-252 and *Ultracare Management Inc. v. Zevenberger (Trustee of)* , supra, at p. 328 and p. 330. It has been held that the intention of the CCAA is to prevent any manoeuvres for positioning among the creditors during the period required to develop a plan and obtain approval of creditors. Such manoeuvres could give an aggressive creditor an advantage to the prejudice of others who are less aggressive and would undermine the company's financial position making it even less likely that the plan will succeed: see *Meridian Developments Inc. v. Toronto Dominion Bank* , supra, at p. 220 (W.W.R.). 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 affect 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: see *Quintette Coal Ltd. v. Nippon Steel Corp.* , supra, at pp. 108-110; *Hongkong Bank of Canada v. Chef Ready Foods Ltd.* (1990), 4 C.B.R. (3d) 311, 51 B.C.L.R. (2d) 84 (C.A.) , at pp. 315-318 (C.B.R.) and *Re Stephanie's Fashions Ltd.* , supra, at pp. 251-252.

7 One of the purposes of the CCAA is to facilitate ongoing operations of a business where its assets have a greater value as part of an integrated system than individually. The CCAA facilitates reorganization of a company where the alternative, sale of the property piecemeal, is likely to yield far less satisfaction to the creditors. Unlike the *Bankruptcy Act* , R.S.C. 1985, c. B-3, before the amendments effective November 30, 1992 to transform it into the *Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act* ("BIA"), it is possible under the CCAA to bind secured creditors it has been generally speculated that the CCAA will be resorted to by companies that are generally larger and have a more complicated capital structure and that those companies which make an application under the BIA will be generally smaller and have a less complicated structure. Reorganization may include partial liquidation where it is intended as part of the process of a return to long term viability and profitability. See *Hongkong Bank of Canada v. Chef Ready Foods Ltd.* , supra, at p. 318 and *Re Associated Investors of Canada Ltd.* (1987), 67 C.B.R. (N.S.) 237 (Alta. Q.B.) at pp. 245, reversed on other grounds at (1988), 71 C.B.R. (N.S.) 71 (Alta. C.A.) . It appears to me that the purpose of the CCAA is also to protect the interests of creditors and to enable an orderly distribution of the debtor company's affairs. This may involve a winding-up or liquidation of a company or simply a substantial downsizing of its business operations, provided the same is proposed in the best interests of the creditors generally. See *Re Associated Investors of Canada Ltd.* , supra, at p. 318; *Re Amirault Fish Co.*, 32 C.B.R. 186, [1951] 4 D.L.R. 203 (N.S. T.D.) at pp. 187-188 (C.B.R.).

8 It strikes me that each of the applicants in this case has a realistic possibility of being able to continue operating, although each is currently unable to meet all of its expenses albeit on a reduced scale. This is precisely the sort of circumstance in which all of the creditors are likely to benefit from the application of the CCAA and in which it is appropriate to grant an order staying proceedings so as to allow the applicant to finalize preparation of and file a plan of compromise and arrangement.

9 Let me now review the aspect of the stay of proceedings. Section 11 of the CCAA provides as follows:

> 11. Notwithstanding anything in the *Bankruptcy Act* or the *Winding-up Act* , whenever an application has been made under this Act in respect of any company, the court, on the application of any person interested in the matter, may, on notice to any other person or without notice as it may see fit,

(*a*) make an order staying, until such time as the court may prescribe or until any further order, all proceedings taken or that might be taken in respect of the company under the *Bankruptcy Act* and the *Winding-up Act* or either of them;

(*b*) restrain further proceedings in any action, suit or proceeding against the company on such terms as the court sees fit; and

(*c*) make an order that no suit, action or other proceeding shall be proceeded with or commenced against the company except with the leave of the court and subject to such terms as the court imposes.

10 The power to grant a stay of proceeding should be construed broadly in order to permit the CCAA to accomplish its legislative purpose and in particular to enable continuance of the company seeking CCAA protection. The power to grant a stay therefore extends to a stay which affected the position not only of the company's secured and unsecured creditors, but also all non-creditors and other parties who could potentially jeopardize the success of the plan and thereby the continuance of the company. See *Norcen Energy Resources Ltd. v. Oakwood Petroleums Ltd.* , supra, at pp. 12-17 (C.B.R.) and *Quintette Coal Ltd. v. Nippon Steel Corp.* , supra, at pp. 296-298 (B.C. S.C.) and pp. 312-314 (B.C. C.A.) and *Meridian Developments Inc. v. Toronto Dominion Bank* , supra, at pp. 219 ff. Further the court has the power to order a stay that is effective in respect of the rights arising in favour of secured creditors under all forms of commercial security: see *Hongkong Bank of Canada v. Chef Ready Foods Ltd.* , supra, at p. 320 where Gibbs J.A. for the court stated:

> The trend which emerges from this sampling will be given effect here by holding that where the word "security" occurs in the C.C.A.A., it includes s. 178 security and, where the word creditor occurs, it includes a bank holding s. 178 security. To the extent that there may be conflict between the two statutes, therefore, the broad scope of the C.C.A.A. prevails.

11 The power to grant a stay may also extend to preventing persons seeking to terminate or cancel executory contracts, including, without limitation agreements with the applying companies for the supply of goods or services, from doing so: see *Gaz Métropolitain v. Wynden Canada Inc.* (1982), 44 C.B.R. (N.S.) 285 (Que. S.C.) at pp. 290-291 and *Quintette Coal Ltd. v. Nippon Steel Corp.* , supra, at pp. 311-312 (B.C. C.A.). The stay may also extend to prevent a mortgagee from proceeding with foreclosure proceedings (see *Re Northland Properties Ltd.* (1988), 73 C.B.R. (N.S.) 141 (B.C. S.C.) or to prevent landlords from terminating leases, or otherwise enforcing their rights thereunder (see *Feifer v. Frame Manufacturing Corp.* (1947), 28 C.B.R. 124 (Que. C.A.)). Amounts owing to landlords in respect of arrears of rent or unpaid rent for the unexpired portion of lease terms are properly dealt with in a plan of compromise or arrangement: see *Sklar-Peppler Furniture Corp. v. Bank of Nova Scotia* (1991), 8 C.B.R. (3d) 312 (Ont. Gen. Div.) especially at p. 318. The jurisdiction of the court to make orders under the CCAA in the interest of protecting the debtor company so as to enable it to prepare and file a plan is effective notwithstanding the terms of any contract or instrument to which the debtor company is a party. Section 8 of the CCAA provides:

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

The power to grant a stay may also extend to prevent persons from exercising any right of set off in respect of the amounts owed by such a person to the debtor company, irrespective of whether the debtor company has commenced any action in respect of which the defense of set off might be formally asserted: see *Quintette Coal Ltd. v. Nippon Steel Corp.* , supra, at pp. 312-314 (B.C.C.A.).

12 It was submitted by the applicants that the power to grant a stay of proceedings may also extend to a stay of proceedings against non-applicants who are not companies and accordingly do not come within the express provi-

sions of the CCAA. In support thereof they cited a CCAA order which was granted staying proceedings against individuals who guaranteed the obligations of a debtor-applicant which was a qualifying company under the terms of the CCAA: see *Re Slavik* , unreported, [1992] B.C.J. No. 341 [now reported at 12 C.B.R. (3d) 157 (B.C. S.C.)]. However in the *Slavik* situation the individual guarantors were officers and shareholders of two companies which had sought and obtained CCAA protection. Vickers J. in that case indicated that the facts of that case included the following unexplained and unamplified fact [at p. 159]:

> 5. The order provided further that all creditors of Norvik Timber Inc. be enjoined from making demand for payment upon that firm or upon any guarantor of an obligation of the firm until further order of the court.

The CCAA reorganization plan involved an assignment of the claims of the creditors to "Newco" in exchange for cash and shares. However the basis of the stay order originally granted was not set forth in this decision.

13 It appears to me that Dickson J. in *International Donut Corp. v. 050863 N.D. Ltd.* , unreported, [1992] N.B.J. No. 339 (N.B. Q.B.) [now reported at 127 N.B.R. (2d) 290, 319 A.P.R. 290] was focusing only on the stay arrangements of the CCAA when concerning a limited partnership situation he indicated [at p. 295 N.B.R.]:

> In August 1991 the limited partnership, through its general partner the plaintiff, applied to the Court under the *Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act* , R.S.C., c. C-36 for an order delaying the assertion of claims by creditors until an opportunity could be gained to work out with the numerous and sizable creditors a compromise of their claims. An order was obtained but it in due course expired without success having been achieved in arranging with creditors a compromise. *That effort may have been wasted, because it seems questionable that the federal Act could have any application to a limited partnership in circumstances such as these* . (Emphasis added.)

14 I am not persuaded that the words of s. 11 which are quite specific as relating as to a *company* can be enlarged to encompass something other than that. However it appears to me that Blair J. was clearly in the right channel in his analysis in *Campeau v. Olympia & York Developments Ltd.* unreported, [1992] O.J. No. 1946 [now reported at 14 C.B.R. (3d) 303 (Ont. Gen. Div.)] at pp. 4-7 [at pp. 308-310 C.B.R.].

The Power to Stay

The court has always had an inherent jurisdiction to grant a stay of proceedings whenever it is just and convenient to do so, in order to control its process or prevent an abuse of that process: see *Canada Systems Group (EST) Ltd. v. Allendale Mutual Insurance Co.* (1982), 29 C.P.C. 60, 137 D.L.R. (3d) 287 (Ont. H.C.) , and cases referred to therein. In the civil context, this general power is also embodied in the very broad terms of s. 106 of the *Courts of Justice Act* , R.S.O. 1990, c. C.43, which provides as follows:

> 106. A court, on its own initiative or on motion by any person, whether or not a party, may stay any proceeding in the court on such terms as are considered just.

Recently, Mr. Justice O'Connell has observed that this discre tionary power is "highly dependent on the facts of each particular case": *Arab Monetary Fund v. Hashim* (unreported) [(June 25, 1992), Doc. 24127/88 (Ont. Gen. Div.)], [1992] O.J. No. 1330.

Apart from this inherent and general jurisdiction to stay proceedings, there are many instances where the court is specifically granted the power to stay in a particular context, by virtue of statute or under the *Rules of Civil Procedure* . The authority to prevent multiplicity of proceedings in the same court, under r. 6.01(1), is an example of the latter. The power to stay judicial and extra-judicial proceedings under s. 11 of the C.C.A.A., is an example of the former. Section 11 of the C.C.A.A. provides as follows.

1993 CarswellOnt 183, 17 C.B.R. (3d) 24, 9 B.L.R. (2d) 275

The Power to Stay in the Context of C.C.A.A. Proceedings

By its formal title the C.C.A.A. is known as "An Act to facilitate compromises and arrangements between companies and their creditors". To ensure the effective nature of such a "facilitative" process it is essential that the debtor company be afforded a respite from the litigious and other rights being exercised by creditors, while it attempts to carry on as a going concern and to negotiate an acceptable corporate restructuring arrangement with such creditors.

In this respect it has been observed that the C.C.A.A. is "to be used as a practical and effective way of restructuring corporate indebtedness.": see the case comment following the report of *Norcen Energy Resources Ltd. v. Oakwood Petroleums Ltd.* (1988), 72 C.B.R. (N.S.) 1, 63 Alta. L.R. (2d) 361, 92 A.R. 81 (Q.B.) , and the approval of that remark as "a perceptive observation about the attitude of the courts" by Gibbs J.A. in *Quintette Coal Ltd. v. Nippon Steel Corp.* (1990), 51 B.C.L.R. (2d) 105 (C.A.) at p. 113 [B.C.L.R.].

Gibbs J.A. continued with this comment:

> To the extent that a general principle can be extracted from the few cases directly on point, and the others in which there is persuasive obiter, it would appear to be that the courts have concluded that under s. 11 there is *a discretionary power to restrain judicial or extra-judicial conduct* against the debtor company *the effect of which is, or would be, seriously to impair the ability of the debtor company to continue in business during the compromise or arrangement negotiating period* .
>
> (emphasis added)
>
> I agree with those sentiments and would simply add that, in my view, the restraining power extends as well to conduct which could seriously impair the debtor's ability to focus and concentrate its efforts on the business purpose of negotiating the compromise or arrangement. [In this respect, see also *Sairex GmbH v. Prudential Steel Ltd.* (1991), 8 C.B.R. (3d) 62 (Ont. Gen. Div.) at p. 77.]
>
> I must have regard to these foregoing factors while I consider, as well, the general principles which have historically governed the court's exercise of its power to stay proceedings. These principles were reviewed by Mr. Justice Montgomery in *Canada Systems Group (EST) Ltd. v. Allendale Mutual Insurance* , supra (a "Mississauga Derailment" case), at pp. 65-66 [C.P.C.]. The balance of convenience must weigh significantly in favour of granting the stay, as a party's right to have access to the courts must not be lightly interfered with. The court must be satisfied that a continuance of the proceeding would serve as an injustice to the party seeking the stay, in the sense that it would be oppressive or vexatious or an abuse of the process of the court in some other way. The stay must not cause an injustice to the plaintiff.

It is quite clear from *Empire-Universal Films Limited v. Rank*, [1947] O.R. 775 (H.C.) that McRuer C.J.H.C. considered that *The Judicature Act* [R.S.O. 1937, c. 100] then [and now the CJA] merely confirmed a statutory right that previously had been considered inherent in the jurisdiction of the court with respect to its authority to grant a stay of proceedings. See also *McCordic v. Bosanquet* (1974), 5 O.R. (2d) 53 (H.C.) and *Canada Systems Group (EST) Ltd. v. Allen-Dale Mutual Insurance Co.* (1982), 29 C.P.C. 60 (H.C.) at pp. 65-66.

15 Montgomery J. in *Canada Systems* , supra, at pp. 65-66 indicated:

Goodman J. (as he then was) in *McCordic v. Bosanquet* (1974), 5 O.R. (2d) 53 in granting a stay reviewed the authorities and concluded that the inherent jurisdiction of the Court to grant a stay of proceedings may be made whenever it is just and reasonable to do so. "This court has ample jurisdiction to grant a stay whenever it is just and reasonable to do so." (Per Lord Denning M.R. in *Edmeades v. Thames Board Mills Ltd.*, [1969] 2 Q.B. 67 at 71, [1969]

2 All E.R. 127 (C.A.)). Lord Denning's decision in *Edmeades* was approved by Lord Justice Davies in *Lane v. Willis; Lane v. Beach (Executor of Estate of George William Willis)*, [1972] 1 All E.R. 430, *(sub nom. Lane v. Willis; Lane v. Beach)* [1972] 1 W.L.R. 326 (C.A.) .

. . . . .

In *Weight Watchers Int. Inc. v. Weight Watchers of Ont. Ltd.* (1972), 25 D.L.R. (3d) 419, 5 C.P.R. (2d) 122 , appeal allowed by consent without costs *(sub nom. Weight Watchers of Ont. Ltd. v. Weight Watchers Inc. Inc.)* 42 D.L.R. (3d) 320n, 10 C.P.R. (2d) 96n (Fed. C.A.) , Mr. Justice Heald on an application for stay said at p. 426 [25 D.L.R.]:

The principles which must govern in these matters are clearly stated in the case of *Empire Universal Films Ltd. et al. v. Rank et al.*, [1947] O.R. 775 at p. 779, as follows [quoting *St. Pierre et al. v. South American Stores (Gath & Chaves), Ltd. et al.*, [1936] 1 K.B. 382 at p. 398]:

> (1.) A mere balance of convenience is not a sufficient ground for depriving a plaintiff of the advantages of prosecuting his action in an English Court if it is otherwise properly brought. The right of access to the King's Court must not be lightly refused. (2.) In order to justify a stay two conditions must be satisfied, one positive and the other negative: (a) the defendant must satisfy the Court that the continuance of the action would work an injustice because it would be oppressive or vexatious to him or would be an abuse of the process of the Court in some other way; and (b) the stay must not cause an injustice to the plaintiff. On both the burden of proof is on the defendant.

16 Thus it appears to me that the inherent power of this court to grant stays can be used to supplement s. 11 of the CCAA when it is just and reasonable to do so. Is it appropriate to do so in the circumstances? Clearly there is jurisdiction under s. 11 of the CCAA to grant a stay in respect of any of the applicants which are all companies which fit the criteria of the CCAA. However the stay requested also involved the limited partnerships to some degree either (i) with respect to the applicants acting on behalf of the Limited Partnerships or (ii) the stays being effective vis-à-vis any proceedings taken by any party against the property assets and undertaking of the Limited Partnerships in respect of which they hold a direct interest (collectively the "Property") as set out in the terms of the stay provisions of the order paragraphs 4 through 18 inclusive attached as an appendix to these reasons. [Appendix omitted.] I believe that an analysis of the operations of a limited partnership in this context would be beneficial to an understanding of how there is a close inter-relationship to the applicants involved in this CCAA proceedings and how the Limited Partnerships and their Property are an integral part of the operations previously conducted and the proposed restructuring.

17 A limited partnership is a creation of statute, consisting of one or more general partners and one or more limited partners. The limited partnership is an investment vehicle for passive investment by limited partners. It in essence combines the flow through concept of tax depreciation or credits available to "ordinary" partners under general partnership law with limited liability available to shareholders under corporate law. See Ontario LPA sections 2(2) and 3(1) and Lyle R. Hepburn, *Limited Partnerships* , (Toronto: De Boo, 1991), at p. 1-2 and p. 1-12. I would note here that the limited partnership provisions of the Alberta PA are roughly equivalent to those found in the Ontario LPA with the interesting side aspect that the Alberta legislation in s. 75 does allow for judgment against a limited partner to be charged against the limited partner's interest in the limited partnership. A general partner has all the rights and powers and is subject to all the restrictions and liabilities of a partner in a partnership. In particular a general partner is fully liable to each creditor of the business of the limited partnership. The general partner has sole control over the property and business of the limited partnership: see Ontario LPA ss. 8 and 13. Limited partners have no liability to the creditors of the limited partnership's business; the limited partners' financial exposure is limited to their contribution. The limited partners do not have any "independent" ownership rights in the property of the limited partnership. The entitlement of the limited partners is limited to their contribution plus any profits thereon, after satisfaction of claims of the creditors. See Ontario LPA sections 9, 11, 12(1), 13, 15(2) and 24. The process of debtor and creditor relationships associated with the limited partnership's business are between the general partner and the creditors of

the business. In the event of the creditors collecting on debt and enforcing security, the creditors can only look to the assets of the limited partnership together with the assets of the general partner including the general partner's interest in the limited partnership. This relationship is recognized under the *Bankruptcy Act* (now the BIA) sections 85 and 142.

18 A general partner is responsible to defend proceedings against the limited partnership in the firm name, so in procedural law and in practical effect, a proceeding against a limited partnership is a proceeding against the general partner. See Ontario *Rules of Civil Procedure* , O. Reg. 560/84, Rules 8.01 and 8.02.

19 It appears that the preponderance of case law supports the contention that contention that a partnership including a limited partnership is not a separate legal entity. See *Lindley on Partnership* , 15th ed. (London: Sweet & Maxwell, 1984), at pp. 33-35; *Seven Mile Dam Contractors v. R.* (1979), 13 B.C.L.R. 137 (S.C.) , affirmed (1980), 25 B.C.L.R. 183 (C.A.) and "Extra-Provincial Liability of the Limited Partner", Brad A. Milne, (1985) 23 Alta. L. Rev. 345, at pp. 350-351. Milne in that article made the following observations:

> The preponderance of case law therefore supports the contention that a limited partnership is not a separate legal entity. It appears, nevertheless, that the distinction made in *Re Thorne* between partnerships and trade unions could not be applied to limited partnerships which, like trade unions, must rely on statute for their validity. The mere fact that limited partnerships owe their existence to the statutory provision is probably not sufficient to endow the limited partnership with the attribute of legal personality as suggested in *Ruzicks* unless it appeared that the Legislature clearly intended that the limited partnership should have a separate legal existence. A review of the various provincial statutes does not reveal any procedural advantages, rights or powers that are fundamentally different from those advantages enjoyed by ordinary partnerships. The legislation does not contain any provision resembling section 15 of the *Canada Business Corporation Act* [S.C. 1974-75, c. 33, as am.] which expressly states that a corporation has the capacity, both in and outside of Canada, of a natural person. It is therefore difficult to imagine that the Legislature intended to create a new category of legal entity.

20 It appears to me that the operations of a limited partnership in the ordinary course are that the limited partners take a completely passive role (they must or they will otherwise lose their limited liability protection which would have been their sole reason for choosing a limited partnership vehicle as opposed to an "ordinary" partnership vehicle). For a lively discussion of the question of "control" in a limited partnership as contrasted with shareholders in a corporation, see R. Flannigan, "The Control Test of Investor Liability in Limited Partnerships" (1983) 21 Alta. L. Rev. 303; E. Apps, "Limited Partnerships and the 'Control' Prohibition: Assessing the Liability of Limited Partners" (1991) 70 Can. Bar Rev. 611; R. Flannigan, "Limited Partner Liability: A Response" (1992) 71 Can. Bar Rev. 552. The limited partners leave the running of the business to the general partner and in that respect the care, custody and the maintenance of the property, assets and undertaking of the limited partnership in which the limited partners and the general partner hold an interest. The ownership of this limited partnership property, assets and undertaking is an undivided interest which cannot be segregated for the purpose of legal process. It seems to me that there must be afforded a protection of the whole since the applicants' individual interest therein cannot be segregated without in effect dissolving the partnership arrangement. The limited partners have two courses of action to take if they are dissatisfied with the general partner or the operation of the limited partnership as carried on by the general partner — the limited partners can vote to (a) remove the general partner and replace it with another or (b) dissolve the limited partnership. However Flannigan strongly argues that an unfettered right to remove the general partner would attach general liability for the limited partners (and especially as to the question of continued enjoyment of favourable tax deductions) so that it is prudent to provide this as a conditional right: *Control Test* , (1992), supra, at pp. 524-525. Since the applicants are being afforded the protection of a stay of proceedings in respect to allowing them time to advance a reorganization plan and complete it if the plan finds favour, there should be a stay of proceedings (vis-à-vis any action which the limited partners may wish to take as to replacement or dissolution) through the period of allowing the limited partners to vote on the reorganization plan itself.

21 It seems to me that using the inherent jurisdiction of this court to supplement the statutory stay provisions of s.

11 of the CCAA would be appropriate in the circumstances; it would be just and reasonable to do so. The business operations of the applicants are so intertwined with the limited partnerships that it would be impossible for relief as to a stay to be granted to the applicants which would affect their business without at the same time extending that stay to the undivided interests of the limited partners in such. It also appears that the applicants are well on their way to presenting a reorganization plan for consideration and a vote; this is scheduled to happen within the month so there would not appear to be any significant time inconvenience to any person interested in pursuing proceedings. While it is true that the provisions of the CCAA allow for a cramdown of a creditor's claim (as well as an interest of any other person), those who wish to be able to initiate or continue proceedings against the applicants may utilize the comeback clause in the order to persuade the court that it would not be just and reasonable to maintain that particular stay. It seems to me that in such a comeback motion the onus would be upon the applicants to show that in the circumstances it was appropriate to continue the stay.

22 The order is therefore granted as to the relief requested including the proposed stay provisions.

Application allowed.

FN* As amended by the court.

END OF DOCUMENT

TAB 2

Case Name:

Nortel Networks Corp. (Re)

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

[2009] O.J. No. 4967

2009 ONCA 833

Dockets: C50986, C50988

Ontario Court of Appeal
Toronto, Ontario

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

Heard: October 1, 2009.
Judgment: November 26, 2009.

(49 paras.)

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

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

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

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

meaning of s. 11.3, as the services of former employees were provided pre-filing of the protection order. The union and the former employees appealed.

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

Statutes, Regulations and Rules Cited:

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

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

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

Appeal From:

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

Counsel:

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

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

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

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

Benjamin Zarnett, for the monitor Ernst & Young Inc.

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

Thomas McRae, for the Nortel Canadian Continuing Employees.

Massimo Starnino, for the Superintendent of Financial Services.

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

---

The judgment of the Court was delivered by

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

2 In order to provide Nortel with breathing space to permit it to file a plan of compromise or arrangement with the court, that order provided, *inter alia*, a stay of all proceedings against Nortel, a suspension of all rights and remedies

against Nortel, and an order that during the stay period, no person shall discontinue, repudiate, or cease to perform any contract or agreement with Nortel.

3 The CAW-Canada ("Union") represents employees of Nortel at two sites in Ontario. The Union and Nortel are parties to a collective agreement covering both sites. On April 21, 2009, the Union and a group of former employees of Nortel ("Former Employees") each brought a motion for directions seeking certain relief from the order granted to Nortel on January 14, 2009. On June 18, 2009, Morawetz J. denied both motions.

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

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

THE UNION APPEAL

Background

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

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

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

> 11.3 No order made under section 11 shall have the effect of
>
> (a) prohibiting a person from requiring immediate payment for goods, services, use of leased or licensed property or other valuable consideration provided after the order is made.

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

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

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

> vices after the date of the Initial Order. If so, he or she is entitled to compensation benefits for such current service.

11 The Union challenges this conclusion.

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

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

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

15 In our opinion, this argument must fail.

Analysis

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

24 The Union's appeal must be dismissed.

THE FORMER EMPLOYEES' APPEAL

Background

25 The Former Employees' motion was brought by three men as representatives of former employees including pensioners and their survivors. On the motion their claim was for an order varying the Initial Order to require Nortel to pay termination pay, severance pay, vacation pay, an amount for continuation of the Nortel benefit plans during the notice period in accordance with the *Employment Standards Act, 2000*, S.O. 2000, c. 41 ("*ESA*") and any other provincial employment legislation. The representatives also sought an order varying the Initial Order to require Nortel to pay the Transitional Retirement Allowance ("TRA") and certain pension benefit payments to affected former employees. The motion judge described the motion by the former employees as "not dissimilar to the CAW motion, such that the motion of the former employees can almost be described as a "Me too motion."

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

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

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

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

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

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

...

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Analysis

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

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

34 Parliament has carved out defined exceptions to the court's ability to impose a stay. For example, s. 11.3(a) prohibits a stay of payments for goods and services provided after the initial order, so that while the company is given the opportunity and privilege to carry on during the *CCAA* restructuring process without paying its existing creditors, it is on a pay-as-you-go basis only. In contrast, there is no exception for statutory termination and severance pay.[2] Furthermore, as the respondent Boards of Directors point out, the recent amendments to the *CCAA* that came into force on September 18, 2009 do not address this issue, although they do deal in other respects with employee-related matters.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

39 The *CCAA* stay provision is a clear example of a case where the intent of Parliament, to allow the court to freeze the debt obligations owing to all creditors for past services (and goods) in order to permit a company to restructure for the benefit of all stakeholders, would be frustrated if the court's stay order could not apply to statutory termination and severance payments owed to terminated employees in respect of past services.

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

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

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

43 The respondents also argued that if the stay did not apply to statutory termination and severance obligations, then the employees who received these payments would in effect be receiving a "super-priority" over other unsecured or pos-

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

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

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

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

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

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

49 The appeal by the former employees is also dismissed.

S.T. GOUDGE J.A.
K.N. FELDMAN J.A.
R.A. BLAIR J.A.:-- I agree.

cp/e/ln/qlaim/qlaxw/qlsxs

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

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

TAB 3

Case Name:

Canwest Global Communications Corp. (Re)

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

[2010] O.J. No. 2544
2010 ONSC 1746
82 C.C.E.L. (3d) 180
321 D.L.R. (4th) 561
2010 CarswellOnt 3948

Court File No. CV-09-8396-00CL

Ontario Superior Court of Justice
Commercial List

S.E. Pepall J.

June 14, 2010.
(38 paras.)

Bankruptcy and insolvency law -- Creditors and claims -- Claims -- Priorities -- Unsecured claims -- Motion by the Union for an order directing the CMI Entities to satisfy obligations regarding severance and notice of termination payments in accordance with collective agreements dismissed -- The CMI Entities were granted protection under the Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act in October 2006 -- In September and November 2009, CMI Entity employers announced employee layoffs -- The employees were not paid any severance -- However, termination and severance payments were unsecured claims and there was no statutory justification for giving the employees priority over secured creditors -- Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act, s. 11, s. 33.

Creditors and debtors law -- Payment and discharge of debt -- Payment -- Time for payment -- Motion by the Union for an order directing the CMI Entities to satisfy obligations regarding severance and notice of termination payments in accordance with collective agreements dismissed -- The CMI Entities were granted protection under the Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act in October 2006 -- In September and November 2009, CMI Entity employers announced employee layoffs -- The employees were not paid any severance -- However, termination and severance payments were unsecured claims and there was no statutory justification for giving the employees priority over secured creditors -- Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act, s. 11, s. 33.

Labour law -- Collective agreements -- Motion by the Union for an order directing the CMI Entities to satisfy obligations regarding severance and notice of termination payments in accordance with collective agreements dismissed -- The CMI Entities were granted protection under the Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act in October 2006 -- In September and November 2009, CMI Entity employers announced employee layoffs -- The employees were not paid any severance -- However, termination and severance payments were unsecured claims and there was no statutory justification for giving the employees priority over secured creditors -- Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act, s. 11, s. 33.

Motion by the Communications, Energy and Paperworkers' Union (CEP) for an order directing the CMI Entities to satisfy obligations regarding severance and notice of termination payments in accordance with the collective agreements.

In October 2006, an initial order granted the CMI Entities protection under the Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act (CCAA). In September and November 2009, CMI Entity employers announced employee layoffs in Kelowna and Saskatoon. The employees were not paid any severance after they were laid off and some employees were also owed money in lieu of notice of termination. The CEP took the position that the employees provided post-filing services and were entitled to severance and termination payments in accordance with the collective agreements. The CMI Entities took the position that the employees' severance entitlements were not converted into post-filing obligations simply because they had provided services following the date of the initial order.

HELD: Motion dismissed. Termination and severance payments were unsecured claims and section 33 of the CCAA did not alter priorities or status. While terminated employees were entitled to such payments, the obligation to make those payments was not immediate. Rather, the obligation was stayed and subject to a compromise. Finally, there was no statutory justification for giving the employees priority over secured creditors.

Statutes, Regulations and Rules Cited:

Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act, R.S.C. 1985, c. C.36, s. 6(5), s. 11, s. 11.01, s. 11.01(a), s. 33, s. 33(1), s. 33.1, s. 36

Employment Standards Act, 2000, S.O. c. 41,

Counsel:

Lyndon Barnes and Alex Cobb, for the CMI Entities.

Maria Konyukhova, for the Monitor, FTI Consulting Canada Inc.

Robert Chadwick and Logan Willis, for the Ad Hoc Committee of Noteholders.

Steve Weisz, for CIT Business Credit Canada Inc.

D. Wray, for the Communications, Energy and Paperworkers' Union.

REASONS FOR DECISION

S.E. PEPALL J.:--

Introduction

1 On October 6, 2009, I granted the CMI Entities an Initial Order which provided protection under the Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act' (the "CCAA") and stayed all proceedings against them. The Communications, Energy and Paperworkers' Union ("CEP") is the certified bargaining agent for certain employees of the CMI Entities. The CEP and the CMI Entities are parties to certain collective agreements. The CEP requests an order directing the CMI Entities to satisfy all obligations in respect of severance payments and notice of termination and/or notice of layoff payments in accordance with the terms of collective agreements. These payments are alleged to be due to union members who rendered services to the CMI Entities after October 6, 2009, the date of the Initial Order. Payments to two groups of employees are in issue. CEP did not proceed with that part of the motion relating to a third group whose effective layoff date predated the Initial Order. In addition, the parties adjourned on consent CEP's request for the establishment of a financial hardship process.

Factual Background

2 On September 3, 2009, the applicable CMI Entity employer announced nine layoffs of employees at the CHBC Kelowna television station. The effective layoff dates were in mid October or December of 2009. The applicable collective agreement provided for severance payments. Specifically, it stated:

> In the event that an employee who has completed their probationary period is laid off, he/she shall receive severance of two (2) weeks pay for each completed year of continuous service up to seven (7) years, and three (3) weeks severance pay for each year of continuous service beyond seven (7) years, to a maximum of fifty-two (52) weeks severance pay. Up to two (2) weeks of the

> total may be actual notice with the balance paid in a single lump sum or in payments agreeable between the employee and the Company. In the event of a temporary layoff not longer than eight (8) weeks, where the (sic) is guaranteed to be recalled, there shall be no requirement to pay severance pay.

3 In lieu of lump sum severance payments, the CMI Entities proposed to make severance payments by way of "salary continuance". As such, post layoff, the CMI Entities would continue to pay the employees their regular salary until their severance obligations were exhausted. But for the CCAA proceedings and the insolvency of the debtor companies, this salary continuance would have commenced in mid October or December, 2009. All of the employees worked beyond October 6, 2009 and remained employed until their effective layoff dates. They were paid their ordinary wages and benefits until their effective layoff dates and thereafter nothing was paid.

4 On November 12, 2009, the applicable CMI Entity employer announced nine terminations of employment at Global Saskatoon[2]. The effective termination date was November 30, 2009. The CMI Entities did not pay these employees any severance after they were laid off. Some of these employees are also owed money in respect of pay in lieu of notice of termination. These payments were also not made. While the applicable collective agreement was not filed on this motion, it is acknowledged that it provides for termination and severance payments to employees whose employment has been terminated or severed. Even though they were told that they would not be paid any severance, all of the affected employees continued to work until their effective termination date of November 30, 2009. The employer paid the employees their wages plus a retention bonus if they continued to work until November 30, 2009. For example, one employee was paid a retention bonus of $5400. Two layoffs were subsequently rescinded.

5 CEP filed an affidavit of Robert Lumgair, a national representative of the Union. He emphasized the significance of severance payments to employees. He stated that employees consider the promise of severance pay to be part of their total compensation package. He also noted that anticipated severance often serves as an incentive for employees to remain in the employment of the employer.

6 The Initial Order was largely based on the Commercial List Users' Committee Model Order. Paragraph 7(a) of the Initial Order entitles but does not require the CMI Entities: (a) to pay all outstanding and future wages, salaries, and employee benefits (including, but not limited to, employee medical, dental, disability, life insurance and similar benefit plans or arrangements, incentive plans, share compensation plans and employee assistance programs and employee or employer contributions in respect of pension and other benefits), current service, special and similar pension and/or retirement benefit payments, vacation pay, commissions, bonuses and other incentive payments, payments under collective bargaining agreements, and employee and director expenses and reimbursements, in each case incurred in the ordinary course of business and consistent with existing compensation policies and arrangements.

7 Subject to certain conditions including such requirements as are imposed by the CCAA, paragraph 12 of the Initial Order authorizes the CMI Entities to terminate the employment of such of their employees or lay off or temporarily or indefinitely lay off such of their employees as the relevant CMI Entity deems appropriate on such terms as may be agreed upon between the relevant CMI Entity and such employee, or failing such agreement, to deal with the consequences thereof in the CMI Plan.

8 The CMI Entities sent letters to the affected employees outlining the anticipated payments due to them.

9 Severance payments to sixteen employees totaling approximately $425,000 are in issue on this motion. Of the sixteen, eleven termination claims amounting to approximately $6000 are also in issue.[3]

Issue

10 The parties agree that: (i) the collective agreements provide for severance and termination pay; (ii) the collective agreements remain in force during the CCAA proceeding; and (iii) section 11.01 of the CCAA provides that employees are entitled to immediate payment for services provided to the CMI Entities after the date of the Initial Order. The issue for me to consider is whether as a result of working for some period of time after the granting of the Initial Order, these sixteen employees are entitled to immediate payment of all severance and termination payments owed to them.

Positions of the Parties

11 CEP submits that these groups of employees provided post-filing service to the CMI Entities and are entitled to severance and termination payments in accordance with the terms of the collective agreements. Section 11.01 of the CCAA provides that employees are entitled to payment for post-filing services. The collective agreements provide for

severance and termination payments. Pursuant to section 33(1) of the CCAA, collective agreements remain in force during CCAA proceedings. Severance and termination payments are in respect of post-filing service and therefore should be paid. In the alternative, at a minimum, the termination payments are properly characterized as payments in respect of post-filing service. CEP relies on *Jeffrey Mines Inc.*[4], *Nortel Networks Corp. (Re)*[5], *West Bay SonShip Yachts Ltd. (Re)*[6], and *Fraser Papers Inc.*[7] CEP submits that *Windsor Machine & Stamping Ltd.*[8] was wrongly decided.

12 The CMI Entities submit that they paid the ordinary wages and benefits of the two groups of employees until the effective date of their layoff, based on the fact that they remained at work until that date and that payment of their salary for such service was required by section 11.01 of the CCAA. The fact that these employees provided services following the date of the Initial Order did not convert their severance entitlements---which take effect upon the termination of their services and are calculated based on tenure of past service---into post-filing obligations. Such a holding would be contrary to the jurisprudence and would have wide spread and unprecedented implications generally for the application of a stay to pre-filing obligations owed to post-filing suppliers. There is a distinction between the conclusion that a collective agreement subsists during the CCAA stay period and the conclusion that any and all amounts owing under the collective agreement can be enforced during that period. The CMI Entities rely on the same cases relied upon by CEP plus *Communications, Energy, Paperworkers, Local 721G v. Printwest Communications Ltd.*[9], *Re ICM/Krebsoge Canada Ltd. and International Association of Machinists & Aerospace Workers, Local 1975*[10], *Re Lehndorff General Partner Ltd.*[11], *Re Mirant Canada Energy Marketing Ltd.*[12], *Providence Continuing Care Centre St. Mary's of the Lake v. Ontario Public Service Employees' Union-Local 483*[13], *Re Stelco Inc.*[14], and *Re Wright Lithographing Co. and Graphic Communications International Union Local 517*[15].

13 The Ad Hoc Committee of Noteholders and CIT Business Credit Canada Inc. both supported the position advanced by the CMI Entities. Counsel for the Ad Hoc Committee also observed that under the proposed Plan, unsecured creditors owed $5000 or less would be paid in full. As such, approximately one half of the 16 employees would be paid in full provided the Plan is approved, sanctioned and remains unchanged in that regard. The Monitor took no position on the motion.

Discussion

14 To properly assess these issues, it is necessary to examine the relevant provisions of the CCAA, the treatment of termination and severance obligations, and recent case law.

15 The CCAA was amended on September 18, 2009. The relevant provisions of the CCAA are sections 11 and 33. Subject to the restrictions set out in the Act, section 11 provides the court with the power to make any order that it considers appropriate in the circumstances and the power to grant a stay of proceedings. Additionally, section 11.01 states:

> No order made under section 11 or 11.02 has the effect of
>
> (a) prohibiting a person from requiring immediate payment for goods, services, use of leased or licensed property or other valuable consideration provided after the order is made; or
> (b) requiring the further advance of money or credit.

Case law on this provision has focused on the provision of services after the Initial Order has been made.

16 Section 33 for the most part incorporates law that has been established and applied for some time[16]. It is, however, a new provision in the statute itself. Section 33.1 states:

> 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.

17 Both termination and severance pay are designed to "cushion the economic dislocation that an employee suffers upon termination of employment and provide support to allow terminated employees to secure new employment: M. Starnino, J-C Killey and C.P. Prophet in "*The Inter Section of Labour and Restructuring Law in Ontario: A Survey of the Current Law*"[17] In discussing the treatment of termination and severance in CCAA proceedings, the same authors note,

> "... amounts owing to employees whose employment has been terminated in the course of or at the end of the restructuring proceeding are typically treated as unsecured creditors in the restructuring proceeding and subject to compromise in accordance with the plan of compromise or arrangement....
>
> There are remarkably few cases expressly considering whether post-employment benefits, termination pay and severance pay are subject to compromise. What little authority there is tends to support the treatment of these claims as unsecured claims subject to compromise in the plan of arrangement. The apparent rationale behind this approach is that in bankruptcy these claims would be treated as unsecured claims subject to compensation in accordance with the scheme of distribution set forth in the BIA."[18]

18 Turning to the relevant case law, in *Re: Nortel Networks Corp.*[19], two motions were involved. In the first motion, the Union requested a declaration that certain former employees were entitled to post-employment retirement benefits and termination and severance amounts. None of the former employees had provided services to Nortel after the Initial Order. The Union argued that the collective agreement was a bargain that should not be divided into separate obligations and therefore the compensation for services should include all monetary obligations and not just those owed to active employees.

19 The Court of Appeal rejected the Union's appeal. The Court acknowledged the purpose of the CCAA, namely the facilitation of a compromise or an arrangement between a company and its creditors and stated that the Initial Order stays obligations; it does not eliminate them. The Court reiterated that section 11.3 (now section 11.01(a)) of the CCAA is an exception to the general stay provision and should be narrowly construed. Payment for services provided by the continuing employees did not extend to encompass payments to former employees. The latter were in the nature of deferred compensation for prior, not current services. Furthermore, these were independent vested rights.

20 The ratio of *Re: Nortel Networks Corp* did not address post-filing employees and their rights, if any, to severance and termination payments nor did it address any of the amendments to the CCAA[20]. The Court of Appeal did state:

> "What then does the collective agreement require of Nortel as payment for the work done by its continuing employees? The straightforward answer is that the collective agreement sets out in detail the compensation that Nortel must pay and the benefits it must provide to its employees in return for their services. That bargain is at the heart of the collective agreement. Indeed, as counsel for the Union candidly acknowledged, the typical grievance, if services of employees went unremunerated, would be to seek as a remedy not what might be owed to former employees but only the payment of compensation and benefits owed under the collective agreement to those employees who provided the services. Indeed, that package of compensation and benefits represents the commercially reasonable contractual obligation resting on Nortel for the supply of services by those continuing employees. It is that which is protected by s. 11.3(a) from the reach of the [Initial Order]: see *Re: Mirant Canada Energy Marketing Ltd.* (2004), 36 Alta. L.R. (4th) 87 (Q.B.)."[21]

21 The second motion in the *Re Nortel Networks* case was brought by former non-unionized employees who sought payment of statutory termination and severance claims under the *Employment Standards Act, 2000*[22]. In addressing their appeal, in a footnote, the Court of Appeal observed that:

> "The issue of post-initial order employee terminations, and specifically whether any portion of the termination or severance that may be owed is attributable to post-initial order services, was not in issue on the motion. In *Windsor Machine & Stamping Ltd (Re)* [2009] O.J. 3195, decided one month after this motion, the issue was discussed more fully and Morawetz J. determined that it could be decided as part of a post-filing claim. Leave to appeal has been filed."

22 The leave to appeal proceedings in *Windsor Machine* have been delayed. Although it was a pre-amendment case, the issue was similar to that before me. While it would have been helpful to have the benefit of the Court of Appeal's decision in that case, unfortunately, given timing requirements, I am rendering this decision beforehand.

23 In *Windsor Machine and Stamping Ltd.*[23], the Union sought an order that the CCAA applicants pay termination and severance pay arising from terminations that occurred some time after the CCAA Initial Order. Morawetz J. reiter-

ated and applied certain of his conclusions from *Re: Nortel Networks Corp.* including that the claims for termination and severance pay were unsecured claims and based for the most part on services that were provided pre-filing. A failure to pay did not amount to a contracting out of a payment obligation; rather, during the stay period, there was a stay of the enforcement of the payment obligation.

24 There, as in the case before me, the claims for termination and severance were for the most part based on services that were provided pre-filing. Morawetz J. stated that the court has jurisdiction to order a stay of outstanding termination and severance pay obligations and concluded that the effect of paying termination and severance would be to accord to those claims special status over the claims of other unsecured and secured creditors. He noted that the priority of secured creditors had to be recognized. He also observed that in a receivership or bankruptcy, termination and severance pay claims would rank as unsecured claims.

25 Morawetz J. did order that any incremental increases in termination and severance pay attributable to the post-filing time period were not stayed.

26 The case relied upon by the Court of Appeal in *Re: Nortel Networks Corp.* was *Mirant Canada Energy Marketing.*[24] In that case, a letter agreement provided for severance pay in the event that an employee's employment was terminated without cause. Kent J. held that an obligation to pay severance was an obligation that arose on termination of services, not an obligation that was essential for the continued supply of services. She wrote:

> Thus, for me to find the decision of the Court of Appeal in *Smokey River Coal*, [2001] A.J. No. 1006, analogous to Schaefer's situation, I would need to find that the obligation to pay severance pay to Schaefer was a clear contractual obligation that was necessary for Schaefer to continue his employment and not an obligation that arose from the cessation or termination of services. In my view, to find it to be the former would be to stretch the meaning of the obligation in the Letter Agreement to pay severance pay. It is an obligation that arises on the termination of services. It does not fall within a commercially reasonable contractual obligation essential for the continued supply of services. Only his salary which he has been paid falls within that definition.[25]

27 Similarly, in *Communications, Energy, Paperworkers, Local 721G v. Printwest Communications Ltd.* [26], the court held that severance pay did not fall within the category of essential services provided during the reorganization period in order to enable the debtor company to function.

28 Other cases of note include *Jeffrey Mines Inc.*[27] and *TQS Inc.*[28] both of which accepted that an employer is bound by its collective agreement notwithstanding CCAA proceedings, however, both courts concluded that obligations governed by collective agreements may be compromised.

29 Having conducted this review, I have concluded that CEP's request for immediate payment should be dismissed. I do so for the following reasons.

30 As noted by numerous courts including the Court of Appeal in *Re: Nortel Networks Corp.*, the purpose of the CCAA is to facilitate a compromise between a company and its creditors. The Act is rehabilitative in nature. A key feature of this purpose is found in the court's power to stay the payment of obligations including termination and severance payments. Section 11.01(a) permits payment for services provided after the date of the Initial Order. Consistent with the purpose of the statute, that subsection is to be narrowly construed.

31 Termination and severance payments have traditionally been treated as unsecured claims. There is no express statutory priority given to these obligations. The nub of the issue is whether section 33 of the CCAA dealing with collective agreements alters the treatment of these obligations. In my view, it does not.

32 Consistent with established law, section 33 of the CCAA does provide that a collective agreement remains in force and may not be altered except as provided by section 33 or under the laws of the jurisdiction governing collective bargaining. It does not provide for any priority of treatment though. The section maintains the terms and obligations contained in the collective agreement but does not alter priorities or status. The essential nature of severance pay is rooted in tenure of service most of which will have occurred in the pre-filing period. As established in the *Re Nortel Networks Corp., Windsor Machine,* and *Mirant* decisions, severance pay relates to prior service regardless of whether the source of the severance obligation is a collective agreement, an employment standards statute or an individual employment contract. As such, terminated employees are entitled to termination and severance but payment of that obligation is not immediate; rather it is stayed and is subject to compromise in a Plan. This conclusion is consistent with the case law and

with the statute. As noted by the CMI Entities in their factum, the case law affirms that severance pay is the antithesis of a payment for current service.

33 Furthermore, there is no statutory justification for giving these employees priority of payment over secured creditors. As stated by Morawetz J. in *Windsor Machine*, the priority of secured creditors must be recognized. There are certain provisions in the amendments that expressly mandate certain employee-related payments. In those instances, section 6(5) dealing with the 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.

34 The same is true with respect to other unsecured creditors including other non-unionized employees. Quite apart from the priority to which secured creditors are entitled, quere the merits of a priority regime that treated unionized and non-unionized employees differently. Under such a regime, unionized employees would get immediate payment of termination and severance obligations based on section 33 of the CCAA whereas non-unionized employees would not.

35 Additionally, based on CEP's submissions, someone who worked a day after the Initial Order would be entitled to full and immediate payment of termination and severance obligations ahead of all others whereas someone who was terminated the day before the Initial Order would not. This cannot be the scheme contemplated by the statutory amendments.

36 I should say in all frankness that it would be appealing to find in favour of the employees in this case. They are a small group and the quantum in issue is not large relative to the amounts involved in this CCAA proceeding. That said, I have a very serious concern that while such a decision would result in immediate payment for these sixteen employees, the precedent such a decision would establish would have long term and negative consequences for employees generally. Although case law on a superficial read might cause one to conclude otherwise, in CCAA proceedings, a judge is extraordinarily conscious of the fate of employees. Indeed, one of the primary benefits of a restructuring that sees the continuance of the debtor company as a going concern is the maintenance of jobs for the employees. Acceptance of CEP's submissions could well result in behavior modification that would be an anathema to the interests of employees as a whole. As stated by Morawetz J. in *Windsor Machine and Stamping Ltd.*, the giving of priority to termination and severance payments would result in:

> "a situation where secured creditors would be prejudiced by participating in CCAA proceedings as opposed to receivership/bankruptcy proceedings. This could very well result in a situation where secured creditors would prefer the receivership/bankruptcy option as opposed to the CCAA option as it would recognize their priority position. Such an outcome would undermine certain key objectives of the CCAA, namely, (i) maintain the status quo during the proceedings; and (ii) to facilitate the ability of a debtor to restructure its affairs."[29]

Other alternatives such as mass pre-filing terminations are even less palatable.

37 As to CEP's alternative submission that termination payments are properly characterized as payments in respect of post-filing service, I am not persuaded that the distinction between severance and termination payments is a meaningful one within the context of this case. The *West Bay* decision supported the conclusion that a claim for damages for wrongful dismissal carried out in the post-filing period gave rise to a monetary claim that was subject to compromise under a plan. The clear inference to be drawn from the case is that the claim had been stayed and there was no immediate requirement to pay. The same is true in the case before me.

38 As in *Windsor Machine*, any incremental amount of termination and severance pay attributable to the period of time after the date of the Initial Order in which services were actually provided is not stayed. Otherwise, for the reasons outlined, I am dismissing CEP's motion.

S.E. PEPALL J.

cp/e/qlafr/qlmxj/qljxr/qlced/qljyw/qlcas

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

2 Two of these were later rescinded.

3 Of the eleven, four claim 3 months pay in lieu but these claims were not quantified.

4 [2003] J.Q. No. 264.

5 (2009), 55 C.B.R. (5th) 68 (ont. S.C.J.), aff'd 2009 ONCA 833.

6 [2009] B.C.J. No. 120 [B.C. C.A.].

7 [2009] O.J. No. 3188.

8 [2009] O.J. No. 3195.

9 2005 SKQB 331.

10 38 L.A.C. (4th) 426.

11 (1993), 9 B.L.R. (2d) 275.

12 2004 ABQB 218.

13 85 C.L.A.S. 149, 2006 C.L.B. 12961.

14 (2005), 75 O.R. (3d) 5 (C.A.).

15 91 L.A.C. (4th) 129.

16 See for example *Jeffrey Mines*, supra note 3.

17 Ontario Bar Association Continuing Legal Education, April 24, 2009.

18 Ibid, at p.27-29. Although logical, the authors state that there is a lack of clarity as to whether the analysis should end there.

19 2009 ONCA 833.

20 The *Nortel* filing predated the CCAA amendments in September, 2009.

21 *Supra* note 19 at paragraph 19.

22 2000, S.O. c. 41.

23 [2009] O.J. No. 3195.

24 2004 ABQB 218.

25 Supra, note 11 at para. 28.

26 Supra, note 8.

27 2003 CarswellQue 90 (C.A.).

28 [2008] J.Q. no 7151, 2008 CarswellQue 7132 (C.A.).

29 *Ibid* paragraph 43.

TAB 4

Case Name:

Canwest Global Communications Corp. (Re)

IN THE MATTER OF the Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act, R.S.C. 1985, C-36, as amended AND IN THE MATTER OF a proposed plan of compromise or arrangement of Canwest Global Communications Corp. and the other applicants listed on Schedule "A"

**[Editor's note:
Schedule A was not attached to the copy received from the Court and therefore is not included in the judgment.]**

[2009] O.J. No. 5379

61 C.B.R. (5th) 200

2009 CarswellOnt 7882

Court File No. CV-09-8241-OOCL

Ontario Superior Court of Justice
Commercial List

S.E. Pepall J.

Heard: December 8, 2009.
Judgment: December 15, 2009.

(52 paras.)

Bankruptcy and insolvency law -- Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act (CCAA) matters -- Compromises and arrangements -- Claims -- Application in this Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act matter for an order declaring that the relief sought by the "GS Parties" was subject to an Oct. 6, 2009 stay of proceedings granted -- Cross-motion by the GS Parties for an order lifting the stay so that they could pursue their motion challenging pre-filing conduct of the CMI entities, etc., dismissed -- The substance and subject matter of the motion were certainly encompassed by the stay -- The balance of convenience, the assessment of relative prejudice and the relevant merits favoured the position of the CMI Entities on the lift stay motion.

Bankruptcy and insolvency law -- Proceedings -- Practice and procedure -- Stays -- Application in this Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act matter for an order declaring that the relief sought by the "GS Parties" was subject to an Oct. 6, 2009 stay of proceedings granted -- Cross-motion by the GS Parties for an order lifting the stay so that they could pursue their motion challenging pre-filing conduct of the CMI entities, etc., dismissed -- The substance and subject matter of the motion were certainly encompassed by the stay -- The balance of convenience, the assessment of relative prejudice and the relevant merits favoured the position of the CMI Entities on the lift stay motion.

Application by the CCAA applicants and the "CMI entities" for an order declaring that the relief sought by the "GS parties" was subject to the stay of proceedings granted on Oct. 6, 2009. Cross-motion by GS Parties for an order lifting the stay so they could pursue their motion challenging pre-filing conduct of the CMI entities, etc. The Ad Hoc Committee of Noteholders and the Special Committee of the Board of Directors supported the position of the CMI Entities. In es-

sence, the GS Parties' motion sought to undo the transfer of the CW Investments Co. shares from 441 to CMI or to require CMI to perform and not disclaim the shareholders agreement as though the shares had not been transferred.

HELD: GS Parties' motions dismissed, save for a portion dealing with para. 59 of the initial order on consent; CMI Entities' motion granted with the exception of a strike portion, which was moot. The first issue was caught by the stay of proceedings and the second was properly addressed if and when CMI sought to disclaim the shareholders agreement. The substance of the GS Parties' motion was a "proceeding" subject to the stay under para. 15 of the initial order prohibiting the commencement of all proceedings against or in respect of the CMI Entitites, or affecting the CMI business or property. The relief sought would also involve "the exercise of any right or remedy affecting the CMI business or the CMI property" which was stayed under para. 16 of the initial order. The substance and subject matter of the motion were certainly encompassed by the stay. The real question was whether the stay ought to be lifted in this case. If the stay were lifted, the prejudice to CMI would be great and the proceedings contemp lated by the GS Parties would be extraordinarily disruptive. The GS Parties were in no worse position than any other stakeholder who was precluded from relying on rights that arise upon an insolvency default. The balance of convenience, the assessment of relative prejudice and the relevant merits favoured the position of the CMI Entities on the lift stay motion. The onus to lift the stay was on the moving party. The stay was performing the essential function of keeping stakeholders at bay in order to give CMI Entities a reasonable opportunity to develop a restructuring plan.

Statutes, Regulations and Rules Cited:

Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act, R.S.C. 1985, c. C-36, s. 32, s. 11.02

Counsel:

Lyndon Barnes, Alex Cobb and Shawn Irving for the CMI Entities.

Alan Mark and Alan Merskey for the Special Committee of the Board of Directors of Canwest.

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

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

K. McElcheran and G. Gray for GS Parties.

Hugh O'Reilly and Amanda Darrach for Canwest Retirees and the Canadian Media Guild.

Hilary Clarke for Senior Secured Lenders to LP Entities.

Steve Weisz for CIT Business Credit Canada Inc.

REASONS FOR DECISION

S.E. PEPALL J.:--

Relief Requested

1 The CCAA applicants and partnerships (the "CMI Entities") request an order declaring that the relief sought by GS Capital Partners VI Fund L.P., GSCP VI AA One Holding S.ar.1 and GS VI AA One Parallel Holding S.ar.1 (the "GS Parties") is subject to the stay of proceedings granted in my Initial Order dated October 6, 2009. The GS Parties bring a cross-motion for an order that the stay be lifted so that they may pursue their motion which, among other things, challenges pre-filing conduct of the CMI Entities. The Ad Hoc Committee of Noteholders and the Special Committee of the Board of Directors support the position of the CMI Entities. All of these stakeholders are highly sophisticated. Put differently, no one is a commercial novice. Such is the context of this dispute.

Background Facts

2 Canwest's television broadcast business consists of the CTLP TV business which is comprised of 12 free-to-air television stations and a portfolio of subscription based specialty television channels on the one hand and the Specialty TV Business on the other. The latter consists of 13 specialty television channels that are operated by CMI for the ac-

count of CW Investments Co. and its subsidiaries and 4 other specialty television channels in which the CW Investments Co. ownership interest is less than 50%.

3 The Specialty TV Business was acquired jointly with Goldman Sachs from Alliance Atlantis in August, 2007. In January of that year, CMI and Goldman Sachs agreed to acquire the business of Alliance Atlantis through a jointly owned acquisition company which later became CW Investments Co. It is a Nova Scotia Unlimited Liability Corporation ("NSULC").

4 CMI held its shares in CW Investments Co. through its wholly owned subsidiary, 4414616 Canada Inc. ("441"). According to the CMI Entities, the sole purpose of 441 was to insulate CMI from any liabilities of CW Investments Co. As a NSULC, its shareholders may face exposure if the NSULC is liquidated or becomes bankrupt. As such, 441 served as a "blocker" to potential liability. The CMI Entities state that similarly the GS parties served as "blockers" for Goldman Sachs' part of the transaction.

5 According to the GS Parties, the essential elements of the deal were as follows:

(i) GS would acquire at its own expense and at its own risk, the slower growth businesses;
(ii) CW Investments Co. would acquire the Specialty TV Business and that company would be owned by 441 and the GS Parties under the terms of a Shareholders Agreement;
(iii) GS would assist CW Investments Co. in obtaining separate financing for the Specialty TV Business;
(iv) Eventually Canwest would contribute its conventional TV business on a debt free basis to CW Investments Co. in return for an increased ownership stake in CW Investments Co.

6 The GS Parties also state that but for this arrangement, Canwest had no chance of acquiring control of the Specialty TV Business. That business is subject to regulation by the CRTC. Consistent with policy objectives, the CRTC had to satisfy itself that CW Investments Co. was not controlled either at law or in fact by a non-Canadian.

7 A Shareholders Agreement was entered into by the GS parties, CMI, 441, and CW Investments Co. The GS Parties state that 441 was a critical party to this Agreement. The Agreement reflects the share ownership of each of the parties to it: 64.67% held by the GS Parties and 35.33% held by 441. It also provides for control of CW Investments Co. by distribution of voting shares: 33.33% held by the GS Parties and 66.67% held by 441. The Agreement limits certain activities of CW Investments Co. without the affirmative vote of a director nominated to its Board by the GS Parties. The Agreement provides for call and put options that are designed to allow the GS parties to exit from the investment in CW Investments Co. in 2011, 2012, and 2013. Furthermore, in the event of an insolvency of CMI, the GS parties have the ability to effect a sale of their interest in CW Investments Co. and require as well a sale of CMI's interest. This is referred to as the drag-along provision. Specifically, Article 6.10(a) of the Shareholders Agreement states:

> Notwithstanding the other provisions of this Article 6, if an Insolvency Event occurs in respect of CanWest and is continuing, the GS Parties shall be entitled to sell all of their Shares to any *bona fide* Arm's Length third party or parties at a price and on other terms and conditions negotiated by GSCP in its discretion provided that such third party or parties acquires all of the Shares held by the CanWest Parties at the same price and on the same terms and conditions, and in such event, the CanWest Parties shall sell their Shares to such third party or parties at such price and on such terms and conditions. The Corporation and the CanWest Parties each agree to cooperate with and assist GSCP with the sale process (including by providing protected purchasers designated by GSCP with confidential information regarding the Corporation (subject to a customary confidentiality agreement) and with access to management).

8 The Agreement also provided that 441 as shareholder could transfer its CW Investments Co. shares to its parent, CMI, at any time, by gift, assignment or otherwise, whether or not for value. While another specified entity could not be dissolved, no prohibition was placed on the dissolution of 441. 441 had certain voting obligations that were to be carried out at the direction of CMI. Furthermore, CMI was responsible for ensuring the performance by 441 of its obligations under the Shareholders Agreement.

9 On October 5, 2009, pursuant to a Dissolution Agreement between 441 and CMI and as part of the winding-up and distribution of its property, 441 transferred all of its property, namely its 352,986 Class A shares and 666 Class B preferred shares of CW Investments Co., to CMI. CMI undertook to pay and discharge all of 441's liabilities and obliga-

tions. The material obligations were those contained in the Shareholders Agreement. At the time, 441 and CW Investments Co. were both solvent and CMI was insolvent. 441 was subsequently dissolved.

10 For the purposes of these two motions only, the parties have agreed that the court should assume that the transfer and dissolution of 441 was intended by CMI to provide it with the benefit of all the provisions of the CCAA proceedings in relation to contractual obligations pertaining to those shares. This would presumably include both the stay provisions found in section 11 of the CCAA and the disclaimer provisions in section 32 .

11 The CMI Entities state that CMI's interest in the Specialty TV Business is critical to the restructuring and recapitalization prospects of the CMI Entities and that if the GS parties were able to effect a sale of CW Investments Co. at this time, and on terms that suit them, it would be disastrous to the CMI Entities and their stakeholders. Even the overhanging threat of such a sale is adversely affecting the negotiation of a successful restructuring or recapitalization of the CMI Entities.

12 On October 6, 2009, I granted an Initial Order in these proceedings. CW Investments Co. was not an applicant. The CMI Entities requested a stay of proceedings to allow them to proceed to develop a plan of arrangement or compromise to implement a consensual "pre-packaged" recapitalization transaction. The CMI Entities and the Ad Hoc Committee of 8% Noteholders had agreed on terms of such a transaction that were reflected in a support agreement and term sheet. Those noteholders who support the term sheet have agreed to vote in favour of the plan subject to certain conditions one of which is a requirement that the Shareholders Agreement be amended.

13 The Initial Order included the typical stay of proceedings provisions that are found in the standard form order promulgated by the Commercial List Users Committee. Specifically, the order stated:

> 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 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.
>
> 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 a claim for lien.

14 The GS parties were not given notice of the CCAA application. On November 2, 2009, they brought a motion that, among other things, seeks to set aside the transfer of the shares from 441 to CMI or, in the alternative, require CMI to perform and not disclaim the Shareholders Agreement as if the shares had not been transferred. On November 10, 2009 the GS parties purported to revive 441 by filing Articles of Revival with the Director of the CBCA. The CMI Entities were not notified nor was any leave of the court sought in this regard. In an amended notice of motion dated November 19, 2009 (the "main motion"), the GS Parties request an order:

> (a) Setting aside and declaring void the transfer of the shares from 441 to CMI;

(b) declaring that the rights and remedies of the GS Parties in respect of the obligations of 441 under the Shareholders Agreement are not affected by these CCAA proceedings in any way whatsoever;
(c) in the alternative to (a) and (b), an order directing CMI to perform all of the obligations that bound 441 immediately prior to the transfer;
(d) in the alternative to (a) and (b), an order declaring that the obligations that bound 441 immediately prior to the transfer, may not be disclaimed by CMI pursuant to section 32 of the CCAA or otherwise; and
(e) if necessary, a trial of the issues arising from the foregoing.

15 They also requested an order amending paragraph 59 of the Initial Order but that issue has now been resolved and I am satisfied with the amendment proposed.

16 The CMI Entities then brought a motion on November 24, 2009 for an order that the GS motion is stayed. As in a game of chess, on December 3, 2009, the GS Parties served a cross-motion in which, if required, they seek leave to proceed with their motion.

17 In furtherance of their main motion, the GS Parties have expressed a desire to examine 4 of the 5 members of the Special Committee of the Board of Directors of Canwest. That Committee was constituted, among other things, to oversee the restructuring. The GS Parties have also demanded an extensive list of documentary production. They also seek to impose significant discovery demands upon the senior management of CanWest.

Issues

18 The issues to be determined on these motions are whether the relief requested by the GS Parties in their main motion is stayed based on the Initial Order and if so, whether the stay should be lifted. In addition, should the relief sought in paragraph 1(e) of the main motion be struck.

Positions of Parties

19 In brief, the parties' positions are as follows. The CMI Entities submit that the GS Parties' motion is a "proceeding" that is subject to the stay under paragraph 15 of the Initial Order. In addition, the relief sought by them involves "the exercise of any right or remedy affecting the CMI Business or the CMI Property" which is stayed under paragraph 16 of the Initial Order. The stay is consistent with the purpose of the CCAA. They submit that the subject matter of the motion should be caught so as to prevent the GS parties from gaining an unfair advantage over other stakeholders of the CMI Entities and to ensure that the resources of the CMI Entities are devoted to developing a viable restructuring plan for the benefit of all stakeholders. They also state that CMI's interest in CW Investments Co. is a significant portion of its enterprise value. They state further that their actions were not in breach of the Shareholders Agreement and in any event, debtor companies are able to organize their affairs in order to benefit from the CCAA stay. Furthermore, any loss suffered by the GS Parties can be quantified.

20 In paragraph 1(e) of the main motion, the GS parties seek to prevent CMI from disclaiming the obligations of 441 that existed immediately prior to the transfer of the shares to CMI. If this relief is not stayed, the CMI Entities submit that it should be struck out pursuant to Rule 25.11(b) and (c) as premature and improper. They also argue that section 32 of the CCAA provides a procedure for disclaimer of agreements which the GS Parties improperly seek to circumvent.

21 Lastly, the CMI Entities state that the bases on which a CCAA stay should be lifted are very limited. Most of the grounds set forth in *Re Canadian Airlines Corp.*[1] which support the lifting of a stay are manifestly inapplicable. As to prejudice, the GS parties are in no worse position than any other stakeholder who is precluded from relying on rights that arise on an insolvency default. In contrast, the prejudice to the CMI Entities would be debilitating and their resources need to be devoted to their restructuring. The GS Parties' rights would not be lost by the passage of time. The GS Parties' motion is all about leverage and a desire to improve the GS Parties' negotiating position submits counsel for the CMI Entities.

22 The Ad Hoc Committee of Noteholders, as mentioned, supports the CMI Entities' position. In examining the context of the dispute, they submit that the Shareholders Agreement permitted and did not prohibit the transfer of 441's shares. Furthermore, the operative obligations in that agreement are obligations of CMI, not 441. It is the substance of the GS Parties' claims and not the form that should govern their ability to pursue them and it is clearly encompassed by the stay. The Committee relies on *Chef Ready Foods Ltd. v. Hongkong Bank of Canada*[2] in support of their position on timing.

23 The Special Committee also supports the CMI Entities. It submits that the primary relief sought by the GS parties is a declaration that their contracts to and with CW Investments cannot or should not be disclaimed. The debate as to whether 441 could properly be assimilated into CMI is no more than an alternate argument as to why such disclaimer can or cannot occur. They state that the subject matter of the GS Parties' motion is premature.

24 The GS Parties submit that the stay does not prevent parties affected by the CCAA proceedings from bringing motions within the CCAA proceedings themselves. The use of CCAA powers and the scope of the stay provided in the Initial Order and whether it applies to the GS Parties' motion are proper questions for the court charged with supervising the CCAA process. They also argue that the motion would facilitate negotiation between key parties, raises the important preliminary issue of the proper scope and application of section 32 of the CCAA, and avoids putting the Monitor in the impossible position of having to draw legal conclusions as to the scope of CMI's power to disclaim. The court should be concerned with pre-filing conduct including the reason for the share transfer, the timing, and CMI's intentions.

25 Even if the stay is applicable, the GS parties submit that it should be lifted. In this regard, the court should consider the balance of convenience, the relative prejudice to parties, and where relevant, the merits of the proposed action. The court should also consider whether the debtor company has acted and is acting in good faith. The GS Parties were the medium by which the Specialty TV Business became part of Canwest. Here, all that is being sought is a reversal of the false and highly prejudicial start to these restructuring proceedings. It is necessary to take steps now to protect a right that could be lost by the passage of time. The transfer of the shares exhibited bad faith on the part of Canwest. 441 insulated CW Investments Co. and the Specialty TV Business from the insolvency of CMI and thereby protected the contractual rights of the GS Parties. The manifest harm to the GS Parties that invited the motion should be given weight in the court's balancing of prejudices. Concerns as to disruption of the restructuring process could be met by imposing conditions on the lifting of a stay as, for example, the establishment of a timetable.

Discussion

(a) Legal Principles

26 First I will address the legal principles applicable to the granting and lifting of a CCAA stay.

27 The stay provisions in the CCAA are discretionary and are extraordinarily broad. Section 11.02 (1) and (2) states:

> 11.02 (1) A court may, on an initial application in respect of a 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;
> (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.

28 The underlying purpose of the court's power to stay proceedings has frequently been described in the case law. It is the engine that drives the broad and flexible statutory scheme of the CCAA: *Re Stelco Inc*[3] and the key element of the CCAA process: *Re Canadian Airlines Corp.*[4] The power to grant the stay is to be interpreted broadly in order to permit the CCAA to accomplish its legislative purpose. As noted in *Re Lehndorff General Partner Ltd.*[5], the power to grant a

stay extends to effect the position of a company's secured and unsecured creditors as well as other parties who could potentially jeopardize the success of the restructuring plan and the continuance of the company. As stated by Farley J. in that case,

> "It has been held that the intention of the CCAA is to prevent any manoeuvres for positioning among the creditors during the period required to develop a plan and obtain approval of creditors. Such manoeuvres could give an aggressive creditor an advantage to the prejudice of others who are less aggressive and would undermine the company's financial position making it even less likely that the plan will succeed. ... 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 affect 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."[6] (Citations omitted)

29 The all encompassing scope of the CCAA is underscored by section 8 of the Act which precludes parties from contracting out of the statute. See *Chef Ready Foods Ltd. v. Hongkong Bank of Canada*[7] in this regard.

30 Two cases dealing with stays merit specific attention. *Campeau v. Olympia & York Developments Ltd.*[8] was a decision granted in the early stages of the evolution of the CCAA. In that case, the plaintiffs brought an action for damages including the loss of share value and loss of opportunity both against a company under CCAA protection and a bank. The statement of claim had been served before the company's CCAA filing. The plaintiff sought to lift the stay to proceed with its action. The bank sought an order staying the action against it pending the disposition of the CCAA proceedings. Blair J. examined the stay power described in the CCAA, section 106 of the Courts of Justice Act[9] and the court's inherent jurisdiction. He refused to lift the stay and granted the stay in favour of the bank until the expiration of the CCAA stay period. Blair J. stated that the plaintiff's claims may be addressed more expeditiously in the CCAA proceeding itself.[10] Presumably this meant through a claims process and a compromise of claims. The CCAA stay precludes the litigating of claims comparable to the plaintiff's in *Campeau*. If it were otherwise, the stay would have no meaningful impact.

31 The decision of *Chef Ready Foods Ltd. v. Hongkong Bank of Canada* is also germane to the case before me. There, the Bank demanded payment from the debtor company and thereafter the debtor company issued instant trust deeds to qualify for protection under the CCAA. The bank commenced proceedings on debenture security and the next day the company sought relief under the CCAA. The court stayed the bank's enforcement proceedings. The bank appealed the order and asked the appellate court to set aside the stay order insofar as it restrained the bank from exercising its rights under its security. The B.C. Court of Appeal refused to do so having regard to the broad public policy objectives of the CCAA.

32 As with the imposition of a stay, the lifting of a stay is discretionary. There are no statutory guidelines contained in the Act. According to Professor R.H. McLaren in his book "Canadian Commercial Reorganization: Preventing Bankruptcy"[11], 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.*[12]. That decision also indicated that the judge should consider the good faith and due diligence of the debtor company.[13]

33 Professor McLaren enumerates situations in which courts will lift a stay order. The first six were cited by Paperny J. in 2000 in *Re Canadian Airlines Corp.*[14] and Professor McLaren has added three more since then. They are:

1. When the plan is likely to fail.
2. 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).
3. The applicant shows necessity for payment (where the creditors' financial problems are created by the order or where the failure to pay the creditor would cause it to close and thus jeopardize the debtor's company's existence).
4. 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.

5. It is necessary to permit the applicant to take steps to protect a right which could be lost by the passing of time.
6. After the lapse of a significant time period, the insolvent is no closer to a proposal than at the commencement of the stay period.
7. There is a real risk that a creditor's loan will become unsecured during the stay period.
8. It is necessary to allow the applicant to perfect a right that existed prior to the commencement of the stay period.
9. It is in the interests of justice to do so.

(b) Application

34 Turning then to an application of all of these legal principles to the facts of the case before me, I will first consider whether the subject matter of the main motion of the GS Parties is captured by the stay and then will address whether the stay should be lifted.

35 In analyzing the applicability of the stay, I must examine the substance of the main motion of the GS Parties and the language of the stay found in paragraphs 15 and 16 of my Initial Order.

36 In essence, the GS Parties' motion seeks to:

(i) undo the transfer of the CW Investments Co. shares from 441 to CMI or
(ii) require CMI to perform and not disclaim the Shareholders Agreement as though the shares had not been transferred.

37 It seems to me that the first issue is caught by the stay of proceedings and the second issue is properly addressed if and when CMI seeks to disclaim the Shareholders Agreement.

38 The substance of the GS Parties' motion is a "proceeding" that is subject to the stay under paragraph 15 of the Initial Order which prohibits the commencement of all proceedings against or in respect of the CMI Entities, or affecting the CMI Business or the CMI Property. The relief sought would also involve "the exercise of any right or remedy affecting the CMI Business or the CMI Property" which is stayed under paragraph 16 of the Initial Order.

39 When one examines the relief requested in detail, the application of the stay is clear. The GS Parties ask first for an order setting aside and declaring void the transfer of the shares from 441. As the shares have been transferred to the CMI Entities presumably pursuant to section 6.5(a) of the Shareholders Agreement, this is relief "affecting the CMI Property". Secondly, the GS Parties ask for a declaration that the rights and remedies of the GS Parties in respect of the obligations of 441 are not affected by the CCAA proceedings. This relief would permit the GS Parties to require CMI to tender the shares for sale pursuant to section 6.10 of the Shareholders Agreement. This too is relief affecting the CMI Entities and the CMI Property. Thirdly, they ask for an order directing CMI to perform all of the obligations that bound 441 prior to the transfer. This represents the exercise of a right or remedy against CMI and would affect the CMI Business and CMI Property in violation of paragraph 16 of the Initial Order. This is also stayed by virtue of paragraph 15. Fourthly, the GS Parties seek an order declaring that the obligations that bound 441 prior to the transfer may not be disclaimed. This both violates paragraph 16 of the Initial Order and also seeks to avoid the express provisions contained in the recent amendments to the CCAA that address disclaimer.

40 Accordingly, the substance and subject matter of the GS Parties' motion are certainly encompassed by the stay. As Mr. Barnes for the CMI Entities submitted, had CMI taken the steps it did six months ago and the GS Parties commenced a lawsuit, the action would have been stayed. Certainly to the extent that the GS Parties are seeking the freedom to exercise their drag along rights, these rights should be captured by the stay.

41 The real question, it seems to me, is whether the stay should be lifted in this case. In considering the request to lift the stay, it is helpful to consider the context and the provisions of the Shareholders Agreement. In his affidavit sworn November 24, 2009, Mr. Strike, the President of Corporate Development & Strategy Implementation of Canwest Global and its Recapitalization Officer, states that the joint acquisition from Alliance Atlantis was intensely and very carefully negotiated by the parties and that the negotiation was extremely complex and difficult. "Every aspect of the deal was carefully scrutinized, including the form, substance and precise terms of the Initial Shareholders Agreement." The Shareholders Agreement was finalized following the CRTC approval hearing. Among other things:

- Article 2.2 (b) provides that CMI is responsible for ensuring the performance by 441 of its obligations under the Shareholders Agreement.
- Article 6.1 contains a restriction on the transfer of shares.
- Article 6.5 addresses permitted transfers. Subsection (a) expressly permits each shareholder to transfer shares to a parent of the shareholder. CMI was the parent of the shareholder, 441.
- Article 6.10 provides that notwithstanding the other provisions of Article 6, if an insolvency event occurs (which includes the commencement of a CCAA proceeding), the GS Parties may sell their shares and cause the Canwest parties to sell their shares on the same terms. This is the drag along provision.
- Article 6.13 prohibits the liquidation or dissolution of another company[15] without the prior written consent of one of the GS Parties[16].

42 The recital of these provisions and the absence of any prohibition against the dissolution of 441 indicate that there is a good arguable case that the Shareholders Agreement, which would inform the reasonable expectations of the parties, permitted the transfer and dissolution.

43 The GS Parties are in no worse position than any other stakeholder who is precluded from relying on rights that arise upon an insolvency default. As stated in *San Francisco Gifts Ltd.*[17]:

> "The Initial Order enjoined all of San Francisco's landlords from enforcing contractual insolvency clauses. This is a common prohibition designed, at least in part, to avoid a creditor frustrating the restructuring by relying on a contractual breach occasioned by the very insolvency that gave rise to proceedings in the first place."[18]

44 Similarly, in *Norcen Energy Resources Ltd.*[19], one of the debtor's joint venture partners in certain petroleum operations was unable to rely on an insolvency clause in an agreement that provided for the immediate replacement of the operator if it became bankrupt or insolvent.

45 If the stay were lifted, the prejudice to CMI would be great and the proceedings contemplated by the GS Parties would be extraordinarily disruptive. The GS Parties have asked to examine 4 of the 5 members of the Special Committee. The Special Committee is a committee of the Board of Directors of Canwest. Its mandate includes, among other things, responsibility for overseeing the implementation of a restructuring with respect to all, or part of the business and/or capital structure of Canwest. The GS Parties have also requested an extensive list of documentary production including all documents considered by the Special Committee and any member of that Committee relating to the matters at issue; all documents considered by the Board of Directors and any member of the Board of Directors relating to the matters at issue; all documents evidencing the deliberations, discussions and decisions of the Special Committee and the Board of Directors relating to the matters at issue; all documents relating to the matters at issue sent to or received by Leonard Asper, Derek Burney, David Drybrough, David Kerr, Richard Leipsic, John Maguire, Margot Micillef, Thomas Strike, and Hap Stephen, the Chief Restructuring Advisor appointed by the court. As stated by Mr. Strike in his affidavit sworn November 24, 2009,

> "The witnesses that the GS Parties propose to examine include the most senior executives of the CMI Entities; those who are most intensely involved in the enormously complex process of achieving a successful going concern restructuring or recapitalization of the CMI Entities. Myself, Mr. Stephen, Mr. Maguire and the others are all working flat out on trying to achieve a successful restructuring or recapitalization of the CMI Entities. Frankly, the last thing we should be doing at this point is preparing for a forensic examination, in minute detail, over events that have taken place over the past several months. At this point in the restructuring/recapitalization process, the proposed examination would be an enormous distraction and would significantly prejudice the CMI Entities' restructuring and recapitalization efforts."

46 While Mr. McElcheran for the GS Parties submits that the examinations and the scope of the examinations could be managed, in my view, the litigating of the subject matter of the motion would undermine the objective of protecting the CMI Entities while they attempt to restructure. The GS Parties continue to own their shares in CW Investments Co. as does CMI. CMI continues to operate the Specialty TV Business. Furthermore, CMI cannot sell the shares without the involvement of the Monitor and the court. None of these facts have changed. The drag along rights are stayed (although as Mr. McElcheran said, it is the cancellation of those rights that the GS Parties are concerned about.)

47 A key issue will be whether the CMI Parties can then disclaim that Agreement or whether they should be required to perform the obligations which previously bound 441. This issue will no doubt arise if and when the CMI Entities seek to disclaim the Shareholders Agreement. It is premature to address that issue now. Furthermore, section 32 of the CCAA now provides a detailed process for disclaimer. It states:

> 32.(1) Subject to subsections (2) and (3), a debtor company may -- on notice given in the prescribed form and manner to the other parties to the agreement and the monitor -- disclaim or resiliate any agreement to which the company is a party on the day on which proceedings commence under this Act. The company may not give notice unless the monitor approves the proposed disclaimer or resiliation.
>
> (2) Within 15 days after the day on which the company gives notice under subsection (1), a party to the agreement may, on notice to the other parties to the agreement and the monitor, apply to a court for an order that the agreement is not to be disclaimed or resiliated.
>
> (3) If the monitor does not approve the proposed disclaimer or resiliation, the company may, on notice to the other parties to the agreement and the monitor, apply to a court for an order that the agreement be disclaimed or resiliated.
>
> (4) In deciding whether to make the order, the court is to consider, among other things,
>
> (a) whether the monitor approved the proposed disclaimer or resiliation;
> (b) whether the disclaimer or resiliation would enhance the prospects of a viable compromise or arrangement being made in respect of the company; and
> (c) whether the disclaimer or resiliation would likely cause significant financial hardship to a party to the agreement.

48 Section 32, therefore, provides the scheme and machinery for the disclaimer of an agreement. If the monitor approves the disclaimer, another party may contest it. If the monitor does not approve the disclaimer, permission of the court must be obtained. It seems to me that the issues surrounding any attempt at disclaimer in this case should be canvassed on the basis mandated by Parliament in section 32 of the amended Act.

49 In my view, the balance of convenience, the assessment of relative prejudice and the relevant merits favour the position of the CMI Entities on this lift stay motion. As to the issue of good faith, the question is whether, absent more, one can infer a lack of good faith based on the facts outlined in the materials filed including the agreed upon admission by the CMI Entities. The onus to lift the stay is on the moving party. I decline to exercise my discretion to lift the stay on this basis.

50 Turning then to the factors listed by Professor McLaren, again I am not persuaded that based on the current state of affairs, any of the factors are such that the stay should be lifted. In light of this determination, there is no need to address the motion to strike paragraph 1(e) of the GS Parties' main motion.

51 The stay of proceedings in this case is performing the essential function of keeping stakeholders at bay in order to give the CMI Entities a reasonable opportunity to develop a restructuring plan. The motions of the GS Parties are dismissed (with the exception of that portion dealing with paragraph 59 of the Initial Order which is on consent) and the motion of the CMI Entities is granted with the exception of the strike portion which is moot.

52 The Monitor, reasonably in my view, did not take a position on these motions. Its counsel, Mr. Byers, advised the court that the Monitor was of the view that a commercial resolution was the best way to resolve the GS Parties' issues. It is difficult to disagree with that assessment.

S.E. PEPALL J.

cp/e/qlrds/qljxr/qlced/qlaxw/qlcas

1 (2000), 19 C.B.R. (4th) 1.

2 [1990] B.C.J. No. 2384 (C.A.) at p. 4.

3 (2005), 75 O.R. (3d) 5 (C.A.) at para. 36.

4 (2000), 19 C.B.R. (4th) 1.

5 (1993), 17 C.B.R. (3d) 24.

6 Ibid, at p. 32.

7 Supra, note 2

8 (1992) 14 C.B.R. (3d) 303.

9 R.S.O. 1990, c. C.43.

10 Supra, note 6 at paras. 24 and 25.

11 (Aurora: Canada Law Book, looseleaf) at para. 3.3400.

12 (2007), 33 C.B.R. (5th) 50 (Sask. C.A.) at para. 68.

13 Ibid, at para. 68.

14 Supra, note 3.

15 This was 4414641 Canada Inc. but not 4414616 Canada Inc., the company in issue before me.

16 Specifically, GS Capital Partners VI Fund, L.P.

17 5 C.B.R. (5th) 92 at para. 37.

18 Ibid, at para. 37.

19 (1988), 72 C.B.R. (N.S.) 1.

TAB 5

Case Name:

ICR Commercial Real Estate (Regina) Ltd. v. Bricore Land Group Ltd.

Between
ICR Commercial Real Estate (Regina) Ltd., Appellant,
and
Bricore Land Group Ltd., Bricore Investment Group Ltd., 624796 Saskatchewan Ltd., 603767 Saskatchewan Ltd., 583261 Saskatchewan Ltd. and Horizon West Management Ltd., Respondents

[2007] S.J. No. 313

2007 SKCA 72

[2007] 9 W.W.R. 79

299 Sask.R. 194

33 C.B.R. (5th) 50

159 A.C.W.S. (3d) 671

2007 CarswellSask 324

Dockets: 1443 and 1452

Saskatchewan Court of Appeal

Klebuc C.J.S., Jackson and Smith JJ.A.

Heard: June 7, 2007.
Judgment: June 25, 2007.

(82 paras.)

Civil procedure -- Costs -- Solicitor and client or substantial indemnity -- As damages or punishment for improper conduct -- Appeal from Supreme Court decision that awarded substantial indemnity costs to respondent -- Appeal allowed -- There was no basis upon which to order substantial indemnity costs.

Insolvency law -- Administration of estate -- Actions by or against estate -- Appeal from a Supreme Court decision that denied the appellant leave to commence an action against the bankrupt -- The claim arose on a "post-filing" basis after a restructuring order had been made under the Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act -- Appeal dismissed -- The or-

der applied to post-filing creditors -- The appellant did not reach the necessary threshold required to allow the action to proceed.

Appeal from a Supreme Court decision that denied ICR leave to commence an action against Bricore. The claim by ICR arose on a "post-filing" basis after a restructuring order had been made under the Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act. The restructuring failed. The principal assets of the companies were sold and the net proceeds were being held for distribution. The post-filing claim was asserted against (i) the companies, which were subject to the CCAA order, and (ii) against the companies' Chief Restructuring Officer. ICR claimed a real estate commission with respect to the sale of a building belonging to Bricore. Bricore and four related companies (collectively "Bricore") were all subject to an initial order granted by a Supreme Court judge in January, 2006, pursuant to s. 11(3) of the CCAA. The Chief Restructuring Officer (CRO) was appointed by the chambers judge in May, 2006 (the "CRO Order"). The Supreme Court judge remained the supervising CCAA judge from the time of the Initial Order. The Initial Order and the CRO Order imposed a stay of proceedings against Bricore and prohibited the commencement of new actions against Bricore and the CRO without leave of the Court. ICR applied to the supervising judge for directions and, in the alternative, for leave to commence actions against Bricore and the CRO. The supervising judge found that the Initial Order and the CRO Order applied to ICR and that leave of the Court was required. He refused leave and also awarded substantial indemnity costs against ICR. On appeal, ICR raised four issues. First, it alleged that the stay of proceedings imposed did not mean leave to commence an action against Bricore was required. Second, it contended that s. 11.3 of the CCAA did not require that a post-filing claimant was subject to the stay of proceedings imposed by the Initial Order. Third, it claimed that if leave was required, the supervising judge erred when he refused ICR leave to commence an action against Bricore and against the CRO. Finally, ICR contended that the supervising judge erred when he awarded costs on a substantial indemnity basis.

HELD: Appeal allowed in part. The supervising judge erred when he awarded costs on a substantial indemnity basis. All other aspects of the appeal were dismissed. The Initial Order applied to post-filing creditors. Leave was required. Ultimately, it was within the discretion of the supervising CCAA judge as to whether the proposed action ought to be allowed to proceed in the face of the stay. ICR did not reach the necessary threshold required to allow the action to proceed. It did not structure its affairs or establish a claim with the specificity that justified the development of a remedy to allow it to participate in the liquidation of the Bricore assets. With respect to costs, there was no basis upon which to order substantial indemnity costs with respect to the application to lift the stay in relation to Bricore, as bad faith was not alleged on its part. With respect to the CRO, the only basis upon which the stay could be lifted was to make an allegation of "bad faith." In the absence of some other factor, ICR could not be faulted for making the very allegation that it was required to make in order to bring its application within the ambit of the stay of proceedings that had been granted.

Statutes, Regulations and Rules Cited:

Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act, R.S.C. 1985, c. C-36, s. 11(3), s. 11(4), s. 11(6), s. 13

On appeal from Q.B.G. No. 8 of 2006, J.C. Saskatoon

Counsel:

Fred C. Zinkhan for the Appellant.

Jeffrey M. Lee for the Respondents.

Kim Anderson for the Monitor, Ernst & Young.

The judgment of the Court was delivered by

JACKSON J.A.:--

I. Introduction

1 This appeal concerns a claim arising on a "post-filing" basis after a restructuring order had been made under the *Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act*[1] (the "*CCAA*"). The restructuring failed. The principal assets of the companies have been sold and the net proceeds are being held for distribution. The post-filing claim is asserted against: (i) the companies, which are subject to the *CCAA* order; and (ii) against the companies' Chief Restructuring Officer.

2 The post-filing claimant is ICR Commercial Real Estate (Regina) Ltd. ("ICR"). ICR claims a real estate commission with respect to the sale of a building belonging to Bricore Land Group Ltd. Bricore Land and four related companies (collectively "Bricore") are all subject to an initial order ("Initial Order") granted by Koch J. on January 4, 2006 pursuant to s. 11(3) of the *CCAA*. The Chief Restructuring Officer, Maurice Duval (the "CRO"), was appointed by Koch J. on May 23, 2006 (the "CRO Order"). Koch J. has been the supervising *CCAA* judge since the Initial Order.

3 The Initial Order and the CRO Order impose the usual stay of proceedings against Bricore and prohibit the commencement of new actions against Bricore and the CRO, without leave of the Court.

4 ICR applied to Koch J. for directions and, in the alternative, for leave to commence actions against Bricore and the CRO. By fiats dated April 9, 2007 and April 25, 2007, Koch J. held that the Initial Order and the CRO Order prohibiting the commencement of actions apply to ICR and that leave of the Court is required. He refused leave and also awarded substantial indemnity costs against ICR.

5 On May 23, 2007, ICR applied in Court of Appeal chambers for leave to appeal, pursuant to s. 13 of the *CCAA,* and received leave to appeal the same day. The appeal was heard on June 7, 2007 and dismissed in relation to the lifting of the stay application and allowed in relation to the costs order on June 13, 2007, with reasons to follow. These are those reasons.

II. Issues

6 The issues are:

1. Does the stay of proceedings imposed by the supervising *CCAA* judge J. under the Initial Order apply to an action commenced by ICR, a post-filing claimant, such that leave to commence an action against Bricore is required?
2. Does s. 11.3 of the *CCAA* mean that a post-filing claimant cannot be subject to the stay of proceedings imposed by the Initial Order?
3. If leave is required, did the supervising *CCAA* judge commit a reviewable error in refusing ICR leave to commence an action against Bricore?
4. Did the supervising *CCAA* judge make a reviewable error in refusing leave to commence an action against the CRO?
5. Did the supervising *CCAA* judge err in awarding costs on a substantial indemnity basis?

III. Background

7 ICR's claim to a real estate commission arises as a result of these brief facts. Bricore owned four commercial real estate properties in Saskatoon and three such properties in Regina (the "Bricore Properties"). ICR argued that it had marketed one of the Regina properties, known as the Department of Education Building (the "Building"), to the City of Regina.

8 Bricore sold the Building, at a purchase price of $700,000,[2] to a proposed purchaser, which assigned its interest to 101086849 Saskatchewan Ltd. 101086849 Saskatchewan in its turn sold the Building to the City of Regina for a price of $1,075,000.[3] The certificate of title to the Building issued in early January, 2007 to 101086849 Saskatchewan, and the certificate of title issued to the City of Regina in late January, 2007. The Building came to be sold pursuant to a series of Court Orders made by Koch J., which I will now summarize.

9 As I have indicated, the Initial Order was made on January 4, 2006. On February 13, 2006 Koch J. appointed CMN Calgary Inc. as an Officer of the Court to pursue opportunities and to solicit offers for the sale or refinancing of the Bricore Properties. He also authorized Bricore to enter into an agreement with CMN Calgary dated as of January 30, 2006 entitled "Exclusive Authority To Solicit Offers To Purchase."

10 In May 2006, it was determined that Bricore could not be reorganized and, therefore, all the Bricore Properties should be sold. On May 23, 2006, Koch J. appointed Maurice Duval, C.A., of Saskatoon, Saskatchewan as an officer of the Court to act as CRO, and to assist with the sale of the assets.

11 The CRO Order confers these powers on the CRO pertaining to the proposed sale of the Bricore Properties:

7 ...

(e) subject to the stay of proceedings in effect in these proceedings, the power to take steps for the preservation and protection of the Bricore Properties, including, without restricting the generality of the foregoing, (i) the right to make payments to persons, if any, having charges or encumbrances on the Bricore Properties or any part or parts thereof on or after the date of this Order, which payments shall include payments in respect of realty taxes owing in respect of any of the Bricore Properties, (ii) the right to make repairs and improvements to the Bricore Properties or any parts thereof and (iii) the right to make payments for ongoing services in respect of the Bricore Properties;

...

(g) subject to paragraphs 7C, 7D and 7E hereof, **the power to work with, consult with and assist the court-appointed selling officer (CMN Calgary Inc.) to negotiate with parties who make offers to purchase** the Bricore Properties in a manner substantially in accordance with the process and proposed timeline for solicitation of such offers to purchase the Bricore Properties recommended by the Monitor in the Monitor's Third Report. ...[4] [Emphasis added.]

12 On June 19, 2006, Koch J. authorized the CRO to accept an offer to purchase the Bricore Properties, including the Building, made by an undisclosed purchaser (the "Proposed Purchaser"), which offer to purchase was filed with the Court and temporarily sealed. The order directed that any further negotiations between the CRO and the Proposed Purchaser were to be completed by August 1, 2006.

13 Negotiations were protracted resulting in a further series of orders:

(a) August 1, 2006: Koch J. extended the timeframe for due diligence and further negotiations to be completed by August 15, 2006;[5]
(b) August 18, 2006: Koch J. authorized the CRO to accept an Amended Offer to Purchase made the 15th day of August, 2006. The Amended Offer to Purchase contemplated the sale by Bricore to the Proposed Purchaser of six of the seven Bricore Properties including the Building;[6]
(c) September 25, 2006: The closing date for the proposed sale by Bricore to the Proposed Purchaser of the six properties was extended from October 15, 2006 to November 15, 2006;[7]
(d) October 10, 2006: Koch J. approved the sale of the six properties to their respective purchasers; in the case of the Building, it was sold to 101086849 Saskatchewan Ltd.[8]

Koch J. ultimately approved the sale of the Building to 101086849 Saskatchewan Ltd. as of November 30, 2006.

14 ICR said it had introduced the City of Regina to the opportunity to purchase the Building and it was therefore entitled to a real estate commission based on the sale price to the City of Regina. Once its claim was denied by the Monitor, ICR applied to Koch J. on March 22, 2007 contending that (a) "prior Orders of this Court requiring leave to commence action" against Bricore and the CRO "do not apply in the circumstances"; and (b) in the alternative, "it is entitled to an order granting leave to commence the proposed proceedings." In support of its notice of motion, ICR filed a draft statement of claim and a supporting affidavit with exhibits.

15 This is the substance of ICR's draft statement of claim against Bricore and the CRO:

4. At all material times Duval's actions in relation to the matters in issue in the within proceedings were carried out in his capacity as chief restructuring officer for the Bricore Group.

...

7. Duval, pursuant to Order of the Court under the *Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act*, was authorized in accordance in such order to market various assets of the Bricore Group, including the [Building]. [sic]
8. In the course of his efforts to market the [Building], Duval enlisted the aid of the plaintiff and its commercial realtors, licensed as brokers under *The Real Estate Act.*
9. The plaintiff, in its efforts to market the properties of the Bricore Group under the direction of Duval, including the [Building], introduced a prospective purchaser to Duval, namely the City of Regina.
10. By agreement dated September 27, 2006 made between the Plaintiff, the Bricore Group and Duval, it was agreed that the Plaintiff would be protected as the agent of record to a commission for the sale of any of the Bricore Group Properties for which the Plaintiff had located a purchaser.
11. The Plaintiff says that at the time of execution of the said Agreement by Duval on September 28, 2006, the City of Regina was in the process of doing its "due diligence" on the [Building] and it was expected that a sale of the [Building] to the City of Regina would be completed in the near future.
12. The Plaintiff says that, contrary to the Agreement entered into between the Plaintiff and the Defendants, Duval, **without the Plaintiff's knowledge and in bad faith,** proceeded to arrange to sell the [Building] to a third party, namely 101086849 Saskatchewan ltd., which became the owner of the [Building] on or about January 3, 2007.[9] [Emphasis added.]

16 While the words "bad faith" are not repeated in the affidavit evidence, Paul Mehlsen, the principal of ICR, swore an affidavit in support of the application for leave, stating that he had examined the statement of claim and that to the best of his knowledge the allegations contained therein are true. His affidavit also states:

13. Insofar as the attached letter states that "ICR is protected as agent of record", this is commonly understood in the industry as meaning that in the event a sale of the property took place in the protected period to a purchaser introduced by the agent of record, then they would receive the usual commission for such sale, which in this case would be 5%.
14. It would appear from the attached exhibit "A" that Larry Ruf arranged to have the Respondent, Maurice Duval, agree to the arrangement, as well as adding that the protection would extend to the closing of any sale or December 31, 2006, whichever was the earlier.
15. Attached hereto and marked as exhibit "B" to this my Affidavit is a true copy of an email dated October 31, 2006 from Larry Ruf to Evan Hubick, Jim Kambeitz and Jim Thompson of the proposed plaintiff, ICR. Such email states in part:

> I can confirm, on behalf of the CRO, that protection for the potential deals referenced in your letter of September 27, 2006 will be honoured to November 30, 2006.[10]

17 Exhibit "A" is a letter dated September 27, 2006 from Mr. Jim Thompson of ICR to Mr. Larry Ruf of Horizon West Management Inc. It reads, in material part, as follows:

> Please be advised that we have had ongoing discussions with potential buyers and tenants as follows:
>
> 1. 1500 - 4th Avenue [Department of Education Building] - we have been in regular contact with the City of Regina Real Estate Department for over a year regarding the possibility of this site being acquired by the City. In July a large contingent of City employees including a number from the Works and Engineering Department toured the building over several hours. We have had continuous follow up with a Real Estate Department official who confirmed recently that there still is an interest in the property and officials are in the due diligence stage. In addition, we have exposed the property to Alfords Furniture and Flooring who have an ongoing interest.
>
> ...

> The purpose of this memo is to reinforce our ongoing efforts to market and represent the Bricore assets in Regina. We are aware that the properties are under contract to sell and request that ICR be protected in the specific situations as outlined.
>
> In the event we are not able to carry on in a formal fashion we would ask that you sign where indicated to acknowledge that ICR is protected as the agent of record for the Tenants/Buyers noted herein for a period to extend to December 31, 2006.[11]

The words "December 31, 2006" are struck out and these words are added: "Date of closing of a sale or December 31, 2006 whichever is earlier." Mr. Ruf's name is crossed out and the signature of Maurice Duval, Chief Restructuring Officer is added in its place.

18 Mr. Ruf, on behalf of Bricore, refuted ICR's claim in a sworn affidavit stating:

> 3. At no time did I approach ICR Regina in 2006 to initiate discussions regarding the sale or lease of the Department of Education Building.
> 4. I received two or three unsolicited telephone calls regarding the Department of Education Building in September of 2006 from representatives of ICR Regina (including Paul Mehlsen, Jim Kambeitz and Evan Hubick). During those calls, representatives of ICR Regina informed me that they knew of certain parties who would be interested in purchasing the Department of Education Building. In response to each of these inquiries, I informed representatives of ICR:
> (a) that I had no authority to participate in communications regarding a sale of the Department of Education Building, and that all such inquiries should be directed to Maurice Duval, the court-appointed Chief Restructuring Officer of Bricore Group; and
> (b) that further information on the status of the restructuring of Bricore Group could be obtained on the website of MLT.[12]

19 The CRO filed a report in response to ICR:

> 6. At the time of my review of the September 27, 2006 letter from ICR Regina, I was working very hard to attempt to negotiate and conclude the final closing of the sale of the Bricore Properties to the purchasers identified in the Accepted Offer to Purchase. I fully expected that sale to close (as it ultimately did effective November 30, 2006). However, I determined that, in the event that such sale failed to close, Bricore Group would need to identify other potential purchasers of the Bricore Properties very quickly. I therefore decided that it would be appropriate for Bricore Group, by the CRO, to agree to protect ICR Regina for a commission in the unlikely event that the sale contemplated by the Accepted Offer to Purchase did not close, and it subsequently became necessary for Bricore Group instead to conclude a sale of the Bricore Properties to one or more of the prospective purchasers of the three Bricore Properties located in Regina (as specifically identified in Mr. Thompson's September 27, 2006 letter). For that reason, and that reason only, I agreed to sign the September 27, 2006 letter.
> 7. In signing the September 27, 2006 letter, my intention, as court-appointed CRO of Bricore Group, was to strike an agreement that, in the unlikely event that:
> (a) the sale of the Bricore Properties identified in the Accepted Offer to Purchase fell apart; and
> (b) it subsequently became necessary for Bricore Group to sell the Bricore Properties to one or more of the prospective purchasers identified in the September 27, 2006 letter;
>
> then Bricore Group would agree to pay a commission to ICR Regina. In regard to the Department of Education Building located at 1500 - 4th Avenue in Regina (the "Department of Education Building"), the two prospective purchasers in respect of which ICR Regina was protected for a commission were the City of Regina and Alford's Furniture and Flooring. The reference to closing date was to the closing of the Avenue Sale, which occurred effective November 30, 2006.
>
> 8. In January of 2007, after much effort and expenditure of resources, the sale of the Bricore Properties contemplated in the Accepted Offer to Purchase was unconditionally closed (effective November 30, 2006). The entity named as purchaser of the Department of Education Building in the

final closing documents was a numbered Saskatchewan company controlled by Avenue Commercial Group of Calgary. Such entity was a nominee corporation operating entirely at arm's length from the City of Regina and Bricore Group. At all times after June 2006, the CRO had no authority to sell the property, as it was already sold.

9. It was subsequently brought to my attention that the numbered company which purchased the Department of Education Building had promptly "flipped" such property to the City of Regina. I knew nothing of such a proposed flip prior to learning of it from ICR Regina.[13]

20 To rebut this, Mr. Mehlsen of ICR swore a further affidavit deposing:

3. As indicated in my Affidavit sworn March 22, 2007, ICR had an ongoing relationship with the Bricore Companies prior to 2006. This relationship continued after the Initial Order in January 2006 in that ICR continued to show Bricore Properties for lease or sale, including the [Building].
4. Attached hereto and marked as Exhibit E to this my Affidavit is a true copy of an e-mail from my contact at the City of Regina ... dated April 13, 2006 advising that the City was interested in purchasing the [Building].
5. I immediately passed this information along to Larry Ruf, as evidenced in the e-mail dated April 13, 2006 attached hereto and marked as Exhibit "F" to this my affidavit.
6. In reply to paras. 2 and 12 of Mr. Duval's Report, it was not known to ICR that all of the Bricore Properties were sold as claimed; rather, it was known that some of the Bricore Properties had been sold, but not the subject property, [the Building], as it was the "ugly duckling" of the Bricore Properties and therefore had been excluded from the reported sale. ICR's efforts were directed at the sale of [the Building] and leasing the other two Regina properties.
7. In response to para. 13 of Mr. Duval's Report, it is true that there were no direct communications between ICR and Mr. Duval as all communications were with Larry Ruf, who indicated that he acted under the authority and with the knowledge of Mr. Duval.
8. As a result of contact in early summer with Mr. Ruf, ICR actively marketed the [Building] by placing signage on the property, developing an "information" or "fact" sheet detailing aspects of the building, and showed the property to the City of Regina and other prospective purchasers.

. . .

11. Because of delays on the part of the City of Regina in its due diligence and the fact that ICR has been working without any formal agreement, I caused the letter of September 27, 2006 (exhibit "A" to my Affidavit sworn March 22, 2007) to be sent.
12. At no time did either Mr. Ruf or Mr. Duval advise that the [Building] was sold and that ICR's role was merely that of a "backup offer". The signed letter of September 27, 2006 and Mr. Ruf's e-mail of October 31, 2006 make no mention of these events and this was never disclosed to myself or ICR.

. . .

14. In hindsight, it would appear that the confidential information concerning the intention of the City of Regina to purchase the [Building] that was provided by myself and representatives of ICR to Mr. Ruf and Mr. Duval was communicated to the [Proposed Purchaser], who then incorporated 101086849 Saskatchewan Ltd. to take advantage of this opportunity. Attached hereto and marked as exhibit "I" to this my Affidavit is a true copy of a Profile Report from the Corporate Registry indicating that 101086849 Saskatchewan Ltd. was incorporated by solicitors as a "shelf company" on May 31, 2006, with new Directors in the form of Garry Bobke and Steven Butt taking office on August 17, 2006.
15. My understanding is that the [Proposed Purchaser] initially excluded the [Building] from their offer to purchase the Bricore Group properties and made a separate offer through 101086849 Saskatchewan Ltd. when they were made aware of the confidential information about the City of Regina's plans to purchase the property.[14]

21 In refusing ICR leave to commence action, Koch J. wrote:

[1] On January 4, 2006, I granted an initial order pursuant to the *Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act*, R.S.C. 1985, c. C-36, (the "*CCAA*") protecting the respondent corporations Bricore Land Group Ltd. et al. (collectively "Bricore"), from claims of their respective creditors. The order (paragraph 5) explicitly provides in accordance with the authority conferred upon the Court pursuant to s. 11(3) of the *CCAA* that "no Person shall commence or continue any Enforcement or Proceeding of any kind against or in respect of Bricore Group or the Property". The initial period of 30 days has been extended many times. The stay of proceedings continues in effect. Ernst & Young Inc. was appointed monitor. That appointment continues.

...

[16] Although the interpretation of s. 11.3 of the *CCAA* is not necessarily well settled in all aspects, it appears that the import of s. 11.3, which was introduced as an amendment to the Act in 1997, is this:

(a) An application to lift a stay of proceedings must be addressed in the context of the broad objectives of the *CCAA* which is to promote re-organization and restructuring of companies. If s. 11.3 is interpreted too literally, it can render the stay provisions ineffective, leaving the collective good of the restructuring process subservient to the self-interest of a single creditor. Clearly, s. 11.3 must be construed so as not to defeat the overall objectives of the Act. See *Smith Brothers Contracting Ltd. (Re)* (1998), 53 B.C.L.R. (3d) 264 (B.C.S.C.).

(b) The standard for determining whether to lift the stay of proceedings is not, as ICR contends, whether the action is frivolous, analogous to the standard which a defendant applicant under Rule 173 of *The Queen's Bench Rules* must meet to set aside a statement of claim. Rather, to obtain an order lifting the stay ad hoc to permit the suit to proceed, the proposed plaintiff must establish that the cause of action is tenable. I interpret that to mean that the proposed plaintiff has a *prima facie* case. See *Ivaco Inc. (Re)*, [2006] O.J. No. 5029 (Ont. S.C.J.).

(c) In determining whether to lift a stay, the Court must take into consideration the relative prejudice to the parties. See *Ivaco, Inc. (Re), supra*, para. 20; and Richard H. McLaren & Sabrina Gherbaz, *Canadian Commercial Reorganization: Preventing Bankruptcy* (Toronto: Canada Law Book, 1995) at 3-18.1. Counsel have cited the case of *GMAC Commercial Credit Corporation - Canada v. T.C.T. Logistics Inc.*, [2006] 2 S.C.R. 123, 2006 SCC 35. The circumstances in that case are somewhat analogous but it is of limited assistance because the *CCAA* does not contain a provision equivalent to s. 215 of the *Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act*, R.S.C. 1985, c. B-3, which expressly provides that no action lies against the superintendent, an official receiver, an interim receiver or a trustee in certain circumstances without leave of the Court.

[17] For reasons outlined *supra*, I do not find the cause of action ICR asserts against Bricore to be tenable, not even as against Bricore Land Group Ltd. Therefore, the application to lift the stay of proceedings to permit the proposed action against Bricore is dismissed.

[18] Neither is there any basis upon which to lift the stay with respect to the proposed action against Maurice Duval, the Chief Restructuring Officer. Considerations applicable to Bricore under s. 11.3 do not apply to a court- appointed restructuring officer. Maurice Duval, as an officer of the Court, has explained his position in a cogent way. I accept his explanation. He did not sell the Department of Education Building to the City of Regina. He was not aware at the relevant time that the purchaser was going to resell. Indeed, his efforts were directed toward closing a single transaction involving all six Bricore properties. Although the proposed pleading accuses Mr. Duval of acting in "bad faith", it is not suggested on behalf of ICR that Mr. Duval has been guilty of fraud, gross negligence or wilful misconduct; that is, any of the limitations or exceptions expressly listed in paragraph 20(c) of the order of May 23, 2006.

> [19] As stated previously, the overriding purpose of the *CCAA* must also be considered. That applies in the Duval situation too. The statute is intended to facilitate restructuring to serve the public interest. In many cases such as the present it is necessary for the Court to appoint officers whose expertise is required to fulfill its mandate. It is clearly in the public interest that capable people be willing to accept such assignments. It is to be expected that such acceptance be contingent on protective provisions such as are included in the order of May 23, 2006, appointing Mr. Duval. It is important that the Court exercise caution in removing such restrictions; otherwise, the ability of the Court to obtain the assistance of needed experts will necessarily be impaired. Qualified professionals will be less willing to accept assignments absent the protection provisions in the appointing order.[15]

IV. Issue #1: Does the stay of proceedings imposed by the supervising *CCAA* judge under the Initial Order apply to an action commenced by ICR, a post-filing claimant, such that leave to commence an action against Bricore is required?

22 ICR argues that, as a post-filing creditor, the Initial Order does not apply to it, either as a matter of law or on the basis of a proper interpretation of the Initial Order.

23 The authority to make an order staying and prohibiting proceedings against a debtor company is contained in s. 11(3) of the *CCAA*:

> 11.(3) A court may, on an initial application in respect of a company, make an order on such terms as it may impose, effective for such period as the court deems necessary not exceeding thirty days,
>
> (a) staying, until otherwise ordered by the court, all proceedings taken or that might be taken in respect of the company under an Act referred to in subsection (1);
> (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.

24 Pursuant to s. 11(3) of the *CCAA*, Koch J. granted the Initial Order providing for a stay and prohibition of new proceedings in these terms:

> 5. During the 30-day period from and after the date of filing of this application on January 4, 2006 or during the period of any extension of such 30-day period granted by further order of the Court (the "Stay Period"), no Person shall commence or continue any Enforcement or Proceeding of any kind against or in respect of Bricore Group or the Property. Any and all Enforcement or Proceedings already commenced (as at the date of this Order) against or in respect of Bricore Group or the Property are hereby stayed and suspended.
> 6. During the Stay Period, no person shall assert, invoke, rely upon, exercise or attempt to assert, invoke, rely upon or exercise any rights:
>
> a) against Bricore Group or the Property;
> b) as a result of any default or non-performance by Bricore Group, the making or filing of this proceeding or any admission or evidence in this proceeding, or
> c) in respect of any action taken by Bricore Group or in respect of any of the Property under, pursuant to or in furtherance of this Order.
>
> . . .
>
> 11. Notwithstanding any of the provisions of this Order:

a) no creditor of Bricore Group shall be under any obligation, by reason only of the issuance of this Order, to advance or re-advance any monies or otherwise extend any credit to Bricore Group, except as such creditor may agree; and
b) Bricore Group may, by written consent of its counsel of record, agree to waive any of the protections that this Order provides to them, whether such waiver is given in respect of a single creditor or class of creditors or is given in respect of all creditors generally.

...

13. Any act or action taken or notice given by creditors or other Persons or their agents, from and after 12:01 a.m. (local Saskatoon time) on the date of the filing of the application for this Order to the time of the granting of this Order, to commence or continue Enforcement or to take any Proceeding (including, without limitation, the application of funds in reduction of any debt, set-off or the consolidation of accounts) is, unless the Court orders otherwise, deemed not to have been taken or given.

"Proceeding" is defined in para. 22 of Schedule "A" to the Initial Order as "a lawsuit, legal action, court application, arbitration, hearing, mediation process, enforcement process, grievance, extrajudicial proceeding of any kind or other proceeding of any kind."

25 The authority to extend an initial order is contained in s. 11(4) of the *CCAA:*

> 11(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.

Koch J., pursuant to this subsection, extended the stay many times and the stay continues in force.

26 As authority for the proposition that the Initial Order does not stay proceedings with respect to claims that arise after the Initial Order, ICR's counsel cites Professor Honsberger's *Debt Restructuring Principles & Practice*:

> The scope of an order staying proceedings extends only to claims that arose prior to the order. A proceeding based on a claim that arose after an order was made staying proceedings is not affected by the stay.[16] [Footnote omitted.]

The only case footnoted is *Ramsay Plate Glass Co. v. Modern Wood Products Ltd.*[17] *In my respectful view, the facts in Ramsay Glass* narrow its application.

27 In *Ramsay Glass*, the initial *CCAA* order, dated April 12, 1951, suspended all proceedings against Modern Wood Products Ltd. Modern Wood Products made an offer of compromise that was accepted by its existing creditors and approved by the Court on May 21, 1951. Ramsay Glass sought to enforce a claim against Modern Wood Products that arose in 1953. Modern Wood Products sought to strike Ramsay Glass's claim on the basis that its proceedings were stayed by the April 1951 order.

28 In dismissing the application to strike, Prevost J. wrote:

> CONSIDERING that said claim is not provable in bankruptcy and that under *The Bankruptcy Act* an order staying proceedings would not apply to such a claim: *Richardson & Co. v. Storey*, 23 C.B.R. 145, [1942] 1 D.L.R. 182, Abr. Con. 301; *In re Bolf*, 26 C.B.R. 149, [1945] Que. S.C. 173, Abr. Con. 303;

> CONSIDERING that s. 10 of *The Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act* and the judgments rendered under its authority should receive the same interpretation in this respect as s. 40 of *The Bankruptcy Act*;
>
> CONSIDERING that the present claim is in no way affected by the judgment rendered on April 12, 1951 by Boyer J. under *The Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act*, ordering suspension of all proceedings against defendant company the present claim being posterior to said date and having not been made the subject of any compromise or arrangement homologated by this Court;
>
> CONSIDERING that the present claim arose in 1953, two years after the judgment of Boyer J. homologating the compromise following the non-payment by defendant company of merchandise purchased by it from plaintiff company during said year;[18]

I do not interpret *Ramsay Glass* as permitting a post-filing claimant to commence an action against a debtor company without obtaining leave while the *CCAA* stay is in effect. In my opinion, *Ramsay Glass* can be read as authority for the proposition that a post-filing creditor need not apply for leave after the stay has been lifted. In that respect, it parallels *360networks Inc., Re;*[19] *Stelco Inc., (Re);*[20] *and Campeau v. Olympia & York Developments Ltd.*[21]

29 In 360networks, a creditor (Caterpillar Financial Services Limited) had both pre-filing and post-filing claims. Caterpillar applied, *inter alia*, for an order lifting the stay of proceedings. Tysoe J. wrote:

> 8 On the hearing of the applications, Caterpillar continued to take the position that all of its claims could properly be determined within the *CCAA* proceedings on the first of its two applications. I agree that the Deficiency Claim and the Secured Creditor Claim are properly determinable within the *CCAA* proceedings, but it is my view that it would not be appropriate to make determinations in respect of the Trust Claim or the Post-Filing Claim in the *CCAA* proceedings. The only remaining thing to be done in the *CCAA* proceedings is the determination of the validity of claims for the purposes of the Restructuring Plan (with Caterpillar's claims being the only unresolved ones). **Neither the Trust Claim nor the Post-Filing Claim falls into this category of claim because each of these types of claim is not affected by the Restructuring Plan.** Indeed, the Post-Filing Claim was not asserted in Caterpillar's proof of claim and surely cannot be adjudicated upon within Caterpillar's appeal of the disallowance of its proof of claim. The B.C. Court of Appeal has recently affirmed, in *United Properties Ltd. v. 642433 B.C. Ltd.*, [2003] B.C.J. No. 852, 2003 BCCA 203 (B.C.C.A.), that it is appropriate for the court to decline jurisdiction to resolve a dispute in *CCAA* proceedings which, although it may relate to them, is not part and parcel of the proceedings. [Emphasis added.]
>
> . . .
>
> 11 Counsel for Caterpillar relies for the first ground on the fact that s. 12 of the *CCAA* authorizes the court to deal with secured and unsecured claims. However, s. 12 deals with the determination of claims for the purposes of the CCAA and does not authorize the court to determine claims which fall outside of *CCAA* proceedings, such as the Trust Claim and the Post-Filing Claim.[22]

In the result, Tysoe J. lifted the stay so as to permit an action to be commenced to resolve all of Caterpillar's claims. The significance of the decision for our purposes is that the Court in *360networks* considered the stay as applying to claims that arose after the initial order.

30 In *Stelco,* Farley J., relying on *360networks*, also held that the post-filing creditor's claim in that case "continues to be stayed and is to be dealt with in the ordinary course of litigation after Stelco's *CCAA* protection is terminated."[23]

31 *Campeau* does not deal with a post-filing creditor, but it does address the situation where a creditor, whose claim is not accepted as part of the plan of arrangement, wants to commence action. Blair J. (as he then was) refused an appli-

cation brought by Robert Campeau and the Campeau Corporations to lift the stay of proceeding imposed by the initial order. In doing so, he wrote:

> 24. In making these orders, I see no prejudice to the Campeau plaintiffs. The processing of their action is not being precluded, but merely postponed. Their claims may, indeed, be addressed more expeditiously than might have otherwise been the case, as they may be dealt with - at least for the purposes of that proceeding - in the C.C.A.A. proceeding itself. On the other hand, there might be great prejudice to Olympia & York if its attention is diverted from the corporate restructuring process and it is required to expend time and energy in defending an action of the complexity and dimension of this one. While there may not be a great deal of prejudice to National Bank in allowing the action to proceed against it, I am satisfied that there is little likelihood of the action proceeding very far or very effectively unless and until Olympia & York - whose alleged misdeeds are the real focal point of the attack on both sets of defendants - is able to participate.
>
> 25. In addition to the foregoing, I have considered the following factors in the exercise of my discretion:
>
> 1. Counsel for the plaintiffs argued that the Campeau claim must be dealt with, either in the action or in the C.C.A.A. proceedings and that it cannot simply be ignored. I agree. However, in my view, it is more appropriate, and in fact is essential, that the claim be addressed within the parameters of the C.C.A.A. proceedings rather than outside, in order to maintain the integrity of those proceedings. Were it otherwise, the numerous creditors in that mammoth proceeding would have no effective way of assessing the weight to be given to the Campeau claim in determining their approach to the acceptance or rejection of the Olympia & York Plan filed under the Act.
> 2. In this sense, the Campeau claim - like other secured, undersecured, unsecured, and contingent claims - must be dealt with as part of a "controlled stream" of claims that are being negotiated with a view to facilitating a compromise and arrangement between Olympia & York and its creditors. In weighing "the good management" of the two sets of proceedings - i.e. the action and the CCAA proceeding - the scales tip in favour of dealing with the Campeau claim in the context of the latter:
>
> see *Attorney General v. Arthur Andersen & Co.* (United Kingdom) (1988), [1989] E.C.C. 224 (C.A.), cited in *Arab Monetary Fund v. Hashim, [1992] O.J. No. 1330, supra.* **I am aware, when saying this, that in the initial plan of compromise and arrangement filed by the applicants with the court on August 21, 1992, the applicants have chosen to include the Campeau plaintiffs amongst those described as "Persons not Affected by the Plan".** This treatment does not change the issues, in my view, as it is up to the applicants to decide how they wish to deal with that group of "creditors" in presenting their plan, and up to the other creditors to decide whether they will accept such treatment. In either case, the matter is being dealt with, as it should be, within the context of the C.C.A.A. proceedings.[24] [Emphasis added.]

Campeau is further authority for the proposition that a supervising *CCAA* judge can refuse a prospective creditor, who is not part of the plan of arrangement, leave to commence proceedings and that the creditor may commence action after the stay is lifted.

32 Each of *360networks*[25], *Stelco*[26] *and Campeau*[27] *supports the proposition that while a stay of proceedings is extant, an application to lift the stay must be made to permit an action to be commenced against a debtor that is subject to a CCAA* order, regardless of whether the claim arises before or after the initial order, or whether the prospective creditor is able to take part in the plan of arrangement.

33 Prevost J. in *Ramsay Glass* points out that under the *Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act*[28] (*the* "*BIA*") the stay of proceedings does not extend to a claim not provable in bankruptcy. This is so, however, because of the definition of "claim provable in bankruptcy" and ss. 69.3(1) and s. 121. (See Houlden & Morawetz, *The 2007 Annotated Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act.*[29]) While s. 12 of the *CCAA* defines "claim" by reference to "claim provable in bankruptcy," it has not been interpreted as limiting the extent of the stay.

34 On the face of ss. 11(3) and (4) of the *CCAA*, the authority to safeguard the company is not limited to staying existing actions, but extends to "prohibiting, until otherwise ordered by the court, the commencement of ... any other action, suit or proceeding against the company." Unlike the *BIA* there are no words limiting this phrase to debts or claims in existence at the time of the initial order.

35 With respect to the wording of the Initial Order, there can be no question that it applies to post-filing creditors. The broad wording of paras. 5 and 6 of the Initial Order and the definition of "proceeding" confirm this. No distinction is made between creditors in existence at the time of the Initial Order and those who become creditors after. Paragraph 11(b) also establishes a mechanism for post-filing creditors to seek relief by obtaining an exemption from the protection afforded Bricore, which would include the prohibition of proceedings. The obvious implication is that the prohibition of proceedings applies to post-filing creditors, subject, of course, to obtaining leave of the Court to commence action.

V. Issue #2. Does s. 11.3 of the *CCAA* mean that a post-filing claimant cannot be subject to the stay of proceedings imposed by the Initial Order?

36 ICR argued that by the addition of s. 11.3 in 1997[30] to the *CCAA*, Parliament intended to grant a post-filing creditor the right to sue without obtaining leave.

37 In my respectful view, s. 11.3 cannot be interpreted in the way in which ICR contends. Indeed, a more logical and internally consistent reading of s. 11.3 and the other sections of the *CCAA* is to permit the supervising judge to determine, as a matter of discretion, whether an action commenced by a post-filing creditor should be permitted to proceed.

38 Section 11.3 forms part of a comprehensive series of sections addressing the question of stays added in 1997 and 2001:[31]

> No stay, etc., in certain cases
>
> 11.1 (2) No order may be made under this Act **staying or restraining** the exercise of any right to terminate, amend or claim any accelerated payment under an eligible financial contract or preventing a member of the Canadian Payments Association established by the *Canadian Payments Act* from ceasing to act as a clearing agent or group clearer for a company in accordance with that Act and the by-laws and rules of that Association. (Added by S.C. 1997, c. 12, s. 124)
>
> No stay, etc., in certain cases
>
> 11.11 No order may be made under this Act **staying or restraining**
>
> (a) the exercise by the Minister of Finance or the Superintendent of Financial Institutions of any power, duty or function assigned to them by the *Bank Act*, the *Cooperative Credit Associations Act*, the *Insurance Companies Act* or the *Trust and Loan Companies Act;*
> (b) the exercise by the Governor in Council, the Minister of Finance or the Canada Deposit Insurance Corporation of any power, duty or function assigned to them by the *Canada Deposit Insurance Corporation Act*; or
> (c) the exercise by the Attorney General of Canada of any power, assigned to him or her by the *Winding-up and Restructuring Act*. (Added by S.C. 2001, c. 9, s. 577.)
>
> No stay, etc. in certain cases
>
> 11.2 No order may be made under section 11 **staying or restraining any action, suit or proceeding** against a person, other than a debtor company in respect of which an application has been made under this Act, who is obligated under a letter of credit or guarantee in relation to the company. (Added by S.C. 1997, c. 12, s. 124)
>
> 11.3 No order made under section 11 shall have the effect of

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

(b) requiring the further advance of money or credit. (Added by S.C. 1997, c. 12, s. 124)

[Emphasis added.]

39 In ss. 11.1(2), 11.11 and 11.2, Parliament uses the words "staying or restraining" to describe those circumstances limiting the scope of the stay power, but these words are not repeated in s. 11.3. This application of the *expressio unius* principle supports the obvious implication that s. 11.3 does not limit the authority of the court to stay all proceedings.

40 While the debates of the House of Commons in Hansard do not comment on s. 11.3, several text book authors assist with the task of interpretation. Professor Honsberger states:

> A distinction is made between the compulsory supply of goods and services and the extension of credit by suppliers to a debtor company in CCAA proceedings.
>
> Suppliers may be enjoined from cutting off services or discontinuing the supply of goods by reason of there being arrears of payment provided the debtor commences regular payments for current deliveries.
>
> However, no order made under s. 11 of the Act has the effect of prohibiting a person from requiring immediate payment for goods, services, use of leased or licensed property or other valuable consideration after the order is made.
>
> . . .
>
> ... A court could make a similar order after the 1997 amendments provided it stipulated that the debtor company made immediate payment for "goods, services, use of leased or licensed property or other valuable consideration after the order is made.[32]

[Footnotes omitted.]

41 Professor McLaren similarly comments in his text "Canadian Commercial Reorganization":[33]

> 3.800 ... Section 11.3 acts as an exemption to the stay provisions of s. 11 of the CCAA. It appears the section is meant to balance the rights of creditors with debtors. The section addresses the concern that judges had too much discretion in issuing stays. Under s. 11.3(*a*), if a person supplies goods or services or if the debtor continues to occupy or use leased or licensed property, the court will not issue a stay order with respect to the payment for such goods or services or leased or licensed property. In essence, s. 11.3(*a*) will not permit the court to prohibit these individuals from demanding payment from the debtor for goods, services or use of leased property, after a court order is made.

42 Finally, Professor Sarra in *Rescue! The Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act*[34] provides this insight:

> While the court cannot compel a supplier to continue to extend credit to the debtor during a *CCAA* proceeding, the court can protect trade suppliers that choose to supply goods or credit during the stay period by granting them a charge on the assets of the debtor that will rank ahead of other claims. While section 11.3 of the *CCAA* states that no stay of proceedings can have the effect of prohibiting a person from requiring immediate payment for goods, services or the use of leased or licensed property, or requiring the further advance of money or credit, trade suppliers

> were often continuing credit only to find that they had lost further assets during the workout period because of their priority in the hierarchy of claims. Hence the practice of post-petition trade credit priority charges developed, first recognized in Alberta.[35] [Footnotes omitted.]

43 *Smith Bros. Contracting Ltd. (Re)*[36] also supports a narrow reading of s. 11.3. After citing *Chef Ready Foods Ltd. v. Hongkong Bank of Canada*[37] and *Quintette Coal Limited. v. Nippon Steel Corporation*[38] with respect to the intention of Parliament and the object and scheme of the *CCAA*, Bauman J. in *Smith Bros.* wrote:

> 45 It is interesting that Gibbs J.A. suggested that it would be unlikely that a court would exercise its s. 11 jurisdiction:
>
> > ... where the result would be to enforce the continued supply of goods and services to the debtor company without payment for current deliveries ...
>
> 46 Parliament has now precluded that by adding s. 11.3(a) to the CCAA. It is instructive to note, however, that the subsection has been added against the backdrop of jurisprudence which has underlined the very broad scope of the court's jurisdiction to stay proceedings under s. 11.

47 To repeat the relevant portion of the section:

> 11.3 No order made under s. 11 shall have the effect of
>
> (a) prohibiting a person from requiring immediate payment for ... use of leased or licenced property ... provided after the order is made;
>
> It is noted that the remedy which is preserved for creditors is a relatively narrow one; it is the right to require immediate payment for the use of the leased property.[39]

Thus, Bauman J. interpreted s. 11.3 in accordance with Parliament's intention and the object and scheme of the *CCAA* as creating a narrow right - the right to withhold services without immediate payment.

44 I agree with Bricore's counsel. When a supplier is requested to provide goods or services on a post-filing basis to a company operating under a stay of proceedings imposed by the *CCAA*, s. 11.3 allows the supplier the right:

(a) to refuse to supply any such goods or services at all;
(b) to supply such goods or services on a "cash on demand" basis only;
(c) to negotiate with the insolvent corporation for the amendment of the *CCAA* Order to create a post-filing supplier's charge on the assets of the insolvent corporation to secure the payment by the insolvent corporation of amounts owing by it to such post-filing suppliers; or
(d) to take the risk of supplying goods or services on credit.

Where the Initial Order imposes a stay of proceedings and prohibits further proceedings, s. 11.3 does not permit the supplier of goods or services to sue without obtaining leave of the court to do so.

VI. Issue #3: If leave is required, did the supervising *CCAA* judge commit a reviewable error in refusing ICR leave to commence an action against Bricore?

45 Having determined that the stay and prohibition of proceedings applies to ICR, notwithstanding its status as a post-filing creditor, the next issue is whether Koch J. erred in refusing to lift the stay on the basis that the claim was not tenable.

46 The claim against Bricore is presumably against Bricore both in its own right and pursuant to its indemnification agreement with the CRO. Paragraph 18 of the CRO Order requires Bricore to indemnify the CRO:

18. Bricore Group shall indemnify and hold harmless the CRO from and against all costs (including, without limitation, defence costs), claims, charges, expenses, liabilities and obligations of any nature whatsoever incurred by the CRO that may arise as a result of any matter directly or indirectly relating to or pertaining to any one or more of:

(a) the CRO's position or involvement with Bricore Group;
(b) the CRO's administration of the management, operations and business and financial affairs of Bricore Group;
(c) any sale of all or part of the Property pursuant to these proceedings;
(d) any plan or plans of compromise or arrangement under the CCAA between Bricore Group and one or more classes of its creditors; and/or
(e) any action or proceeding to which the CRO may be made a party by reason of having taken over the management of the business of Bricore Group.[40]

47 The authority to lift the stay imposed by the Initial Order against Bricore is contained in s. 11(4) of the *CCAA*:

> 11(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,
>
> ...
>
> (c) prohibiting, **until otherwise ordered by the court,** the commencement of or proceeding with any other action, suit or proceeding against the company. [Emphasis added.]

48 This is a discretionary power, which invokes the standard of appellate review stated as follows:

> [22] ... [T]he function of an appellate court is not to exercise an independent discretion of its own. It must defer to the judge's exercise of his discretion and must not interfere with it merely on the ground that members of the appellate court would have exercised the discretion differently. The function of the appellate court is one of review only. It may set aside the judge's exercise of his discretion on the ground that it was based on a misunderstanding of the law or of the evidence before him or on an inference that particular facts existed or did not exist, which, although it was one that might legitimately have been drawn on the evidence that was before the judge, can be demonstrated to be wrong by further evidence that has become available by the time of the appeal, or on the ground that there has been a change of circumstances after the judge made his order.[41]

It is often expressed as permitting intervention where the judge acts arbitrarily, on a wrong principle, or on an erroneous view of the facts, or when the appeal court is satisfied that there is likely to be a failure of justice as a result of the refusal. See: *Martin v. Deutch.*[42]

49 With respect to discretionary decisions made under the CCAA, there is a particular reluctance to intervene. The reluctance is justified on the basis of the specialization of the judges who have carriage of complex proceedings that are often replete with compromised solutions.[43] This does not mean that the Court of Appeal can turn a blind eye or permit an injustice, but it does provide the backdrop against which *CCAA* discretionary decisions are reviewed.

50 Unlike the *BIA*,[44] the *CCAA* contains no specific statutory test to provide guidance on the circumstances in which a *CCAA* stay of proceedings is to be lifted. Some guidance, nonetheless, can be found in the statute and in the jurisprudence.

51 Subsection 11(6) of the *CCAA* states:

> 11 (6) The court shall not make an order under subsection (3) or (4) unless
>
> (a) the applicant satisfies the court that circumstances exist that make such an order appropriate; and
> (b) in the case of an order under subsection (4), the applicant also satisfies the court that the applicant has acted, and is acting, in good faith and with due diligence.

While the reference to "order" in the opening clause "[t]he court shall not make an order under s. (3) or (4)" may very well be to the Initial Order and not to the order lifting the stay, s. 11(6) and, in particular, its legislative history, are also relevant to an application to lift the stay.

52 Subsection 11(6) was brought into effect in 1997 by Bill C-5, which enacted "An Act to amend the Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act, the Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act and the Income Tax Act." When Bill C-5 received third reading on October 23, 1996, s. 11(6) took this form:

> 11 (6) The court shall not make an order under subsection (3) or (4) unless
>
> (a) the applicant satisfies the court that circumstances exist that make such an order appropriate; and
> (b) in the case of an order under subsection (4), the applicant also satisfies the court that:
>
> (i) the applicant has acted, and is acting, in good faith and with due diligence,
> (ii) a viable compromise or arrangement could likely be made in respect of the company, if the order being applied for were made, and
> (iii) no creditor would be materially prejudiced if the order being applied for were made.

After Bill C-5 received third reading, it was referred to the Standing Senate Committee on Banking, Trade and Commerce.[45] The Committee reported:

> A number of insolvency experts were of the opinion that the proposed amendment would make it virtually impossible to obtain extensions of the initial 30-day stay under the CCAA and force companies to file plans of arrangement within 30 days after the making of the initial stay order.
>
> Others suggested that some CCAA reorganizations would have turned out differently if the amendment had been in place.
>
> . . .
>
> Of the submissions received about proposed subsection 11(6), all but one condemned the provision.
>
> ...
>
> The CLHIA [Canadian Life and Health Insurance Association] argued that the amendment to the bill would be a significant improvement to the CCAA for four reasons:
>
> (a) it would give direction to the courts as to the tests that must be met before the extension order was granted;
> (b) it would more closely align the CCAA with the BIA;
> (c) the tests are well-established under the BIA and have received extensive scrutiny and study; and
> (d) the tests would direct the courts to consider how the stay would affect creditors. [Footnote omitted.]
>
> . . .
>
> The Committee shares the concerns expressed about the potential impact of proposed subsection 11(6) of the CCAA, particularly the concern that the CCAA may no longer be a sufficiently flexible vehicle for large, complex corporate reorganizations.

> While the Committee fully supports initiatives to align the provisions of the CCAA more closely with those of the BIA, these initiatives must be the subject of thorough discussion and analysis before [making] their way into legislation. Unfortunately, such discussion did not take place prior [to] the introduction of proposed subsection 11(6).[46]

Notwithstanding the submissions of the Canadian Life and Health Insurance Association, the Standing Committee recommended that Bill C-5 be amended by striking subparagraphs 11(6)(b)(ii) and (iii).

53 The House of Commons concurred in the Amendments recommended by the Senate on April 15, 1997.[47] Bill C-5, as thus amended, received Royal Assent on April 25, 1997 and was proclaimed in its present skeletal form on September 30, 1997.[48] Neither the amending legislation[49] nor the proposed Bill presently before the Senate[50] make any change to s. 11 in this regard.

54 The Senate's and Parliament's specific rejection of a limitation on the court's discretion is a strong indication of Parliamentary intention. The fact that Parliament did not see fit to limit the discretion in any significant manner, despite having been given the opportunity to do so, confirms the broad discretion given in ss. 11(3) and (4) to the supervising *CCAA* judge. Discretion is never completely unfettered, but an appellate court should be reluctant to impose rigid tests, standards or criteria where Parliament has declined to do so. Some guidance can be taken from the jurisprudence.

55 In *Canadian Airlines Corp., Re*[51] *Paperny J. (as she then was) indicated that the obligation of the supervising CCAA* judge is to "always have regard to the particular facts" and "to balance" the interests. As Farley J. said in *Ivaco Inc., Re*,[52] the supervising *CCAA* judge must also be concerned not to permit one creditor to mount "an indirect but devastating attack on the CCAA stay" so as to give one creditor an inappropriate advantage over other unsecured creditors as well as over secured creditors with priority.

56 In *Ivaco Inc. (Re)*[53] Ground J. stated this to be the criteria to determine whether a stay should be lifted:

> 20 It appears to me that the criteria which the court must consider in determining whether to lift a stay, being whether the proposed cause of action is tenable, the balancing of interests as between the parties, the relative prejudice to the parties, and whether the proposed action would be oppressive or vexatious or an abuse of the court process, would all be met with respect to a trial of issues to resolve interpretation of the APAs with respect to the calculation of the working capital adjustments.

Ground J. went on to confirm that finding a tenable or reasonable cause of action is not the only factor to be considered:

> 30 Even if the Statement of Claim did disclose a tenable or reasonable cause of action, there are a number of other factors which this court must consider which militate against the lifting of the stay in the circumstances of this case. The institution of the Proposed Action, even if a tight timetable is imposed, would inevitably result in considerable delay and complication with respect to the full distribution of the estate to the detriment of many small trade creditors and individual creditors as well as to pension claimants. In addition, it would appear from the evidence before this court that Heico has been aware of most of the matters alleged in the Statement of Claim for approximately 2 years and there does not appear to be any valid reason given for the delay in commencing the application to lift the stay.

57 Turning back to the case before us, Koch J.'s reasons for refusing to lift the stay were:

> [16] . . .
>
> (a) An application to lift a stay of proceedings must be addressed in the context of the broad objectives of the *CCAA* which is to promote re-organization and restructuring of companies. ....
>
> (b) The standard for determining whether to lift the stay of proceedings is not, as ICR contends, whether the action is frivolous, analogous to the standard which a defendant applicant under Rule 173 of *The Queen's Bench Rules* must meet to set aside a statement of claim. Rather, to obtain an order lifting the stay ad hoc to permit the suit to proceed, the

proposed plaintiff must establish that the cause of action is tenable. I interpret that to mean that the proposed plaintiff has a *prima facie* case. See *Ivaco Inc. (Re)*, [2006] O.J. No. 5029 (Ont. S.C.J.).

(c) In determining whether to lift a stay, the Court must take into consideration the relative prejudice to the parties. See *Ivaco, Inc. (Re), supra*, para. 20; and Richard H. McLaren & Sabrina Gherbaz, *Canadian Commercial Reorganization: Preventing Bankruptcy* (Toronto: Canada Law Book, 1995) at 3-18.1. ...[54]

He went on to find that the proposed action against Bricore was not "tenable."

58 On an application made by a post-filing creditor, a supervising *CCAA* judge can refuse to lift the stay on the basis that the creditor's claim is outside the *CCAA* process and the action can be commenced after the *CCAA* order is lifted. (See *360networks*[55] and *Stelco*[56]). Koch J. did not exercise this option. He was no doubt motivated in part by the fact that by the time ICR's claim could be tried, after the stay is no longer in effect, there may be no funds for it to claim as Bricore has now liquidated all of its assets and there remains, for all intents and purposes, a pool of funds only. The funds are subject to a plan of distribution, approved by the creditors, and will be distributed over this year.

59 Instead of simply rejecting the claim, Koch J. appears to have weighed the evidence to a certain extent as a means of deciding the next step. He concluded that the claim was not frivolous within the meaning of a Queen's Bench Rule 173 striking motion, but it was nonetheless an untenable claim. The question becomes whether a supervising CCAA judge can weigh a post-filing claim in this manner.

60 Professor Sarra comments on the anomalous position of liquidating *CCAA* proceedings:

> One policy issue that has not to date been fully explored is whether the *CCAA* should be used to effect an organized liquidation that should properly occur under the *BIA* or receivership proceedings. Increasingly, there are liquidating *CCAA* proceedings, whereby the debtor corporation is for all intents and purposes liquidated, but not under the supervision of a trustee in bankruptcy or in compliance with all of the requirements of the *BIA*. While creditors still must vote in support of such plans in the requisite amounts, there may be some public policy concerns regarding the use of a restructuring statute, under the broad scope of judicial discretion, to effect liquidation. ...[57]

The issue of whether the *CCAA* should be used for a liquidating, as opposed to a restructuring purpose, is not before us. In the case at bar, when the Initial Order was granted, it was thought possible that Bricore could be restructured. It was only some months after the Initial Order that it became clear that all of the assets would have to be sold. Our task at this point is to address the position of an undetermined claim arising post-filing in such a context.

61 If a claim had some reasonable prospect of success and were otherwise meritorious in the *CCAA* context, it seems inappropriate to refuse simply to lift the stay on the basis that the claim is outside the *CCAA* process knowing that, by the time the matter is heard in the ordinary course, there will be no assets remaining. On the other hand, it also seems inappropriate to delay distribution of the assets under a plan of arrangement, or make some other accommodation, for an action that is likely to fail. I should make it clear that I am not addressing the issue of whether a meritorious claimant can share in a proposed plan of distribution as a result of the liquidation of the assets. The issue before this Court is whether a post-filing creditor should be permitted to commence action, in the context of what is now a liquidating *CCAA*, and avail itself of whatever pre-judgment remedies might be available to it as a result of its claim.

62 In the face of a liquidating plan of arrangement, given the broad jurisdiction conferred by the *CCAA* on the Court, it seems appropriate that the supervising judge establish some mechanism to weigh the post-filing claim to determine the next step. The next step might entail permitting the claimant to commence action and attempt to convince a chambers judge to grant it a pre-judgment remedy in relation to the funds. It is also possible that the supervising judge may delay distribution of the funds, or some portion thereof, with or without full security for costs, or on such other terms as seems fit. Mechanisms to test the claim could include referral to a special claims officer, examination of the pertinent principal parties, or a settlement conference, or, as in this case, a preliminary examination by the supervising *CCAA* judge in chambers based on affidavit evidence.

63 In the case at bar, having determined that it was appropriate to assess ICR's claim in some way, did Koch J. err either in his statement of the appropriate test or in its application?

64 Koch J. used *prima facie* case, which he equated with tenable cause of action. "Tenable cause of action" is taken from Ground J.'s decision in *Ivaco*,[58] but Ground J. used "reasonable cause of action" or "tenable case," as comparable

terms and as only one of four criteria to be considered. The use of "*prima facie* case" defined as "tenable cause of action" is not particularly helpful as the words have been used in different contexts with different purposes in mind. Even in the context of bankruptcy where specific guidelines are given, and the courts have had long experience with the application of the tests, the debate continues as to what is meant by *prima facie* case and whether it is too high of a standard to apply in determining whether an action may be commenced.[59]

65 Koch J. was clearly correct to hold that the threshold established by s. 173 of *The Queen's Bench Rules* is too low. On the other hand, it is also important not to decide the case. The purpose for passing on the claim is not to determine whether it will or will not succeed, but to determine whether the plan of arrangement should be delayed or further compromised to accommodate a future claim, or some other step need be taken to maintain the integrity of the *CCAA* proceeding.

66 Given the broad discretion granted to a supervisory judge under the *CCAA*, as well as the knowledge and experience he or she gains from the ongoing dealings with the parties under the proceedings, it would be contrary to the purpose of the *CCAA* for the law under it to develop in a restrictive way. Having regard for this, there ought not to be rigid requirements imposed on how a supervising *CCAA* judge must exercise his or her discretion with respect to lifting the stay.

67 Nonetheless, a broad test articulated along the lines of that in *Ma, Re*[60] *may be of assistance. The test from Ma, Re* is:

> 3 ... As stated in *Re Francisco*, [1995] O.J. No. 917, the role of the court is to ensure that there are "sound reasons, consistent with the scheme of the *Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act*" to relieve against the automatic stay. While the test is not whether there is a *prima facie* case, that does not, in our view, preclude any consideration of the merits of the proposed action where relevant to the issue of whether there are "sound reasons" for lifting the stay. For example, if it were apparent that the proposed action had little prospect of success, it would be difficult to find that there were sound reasons for lifting the stay.

While the *Ma, Re* test was developed for use under the *BIA*, a test based on sound reasons, consistent with the scheme of the *CCAA*, to relieve against the stay imposed by ss. 11(3) and (4) of the *CCAA*, may be a better way to express the task of the chambers judge faced with a liquidating *CCAA* than a test based simply on *prima facie* case. It must be kept firmly in mind that the Court is dealing with a claimant that did not avail itself of the remedy of withholding services under s. 11.3. It is also useful to remind oneself that, in a case such as this, the *CCAA* proceeding began as a restructuring exercise with the attendant possibility of creating s. 11.3 claimants. The threshold must be a significant one, but not insurmountable.

68 In determining what constitutes "sound reasons," much is left to the discretion of the judge. However, previous decisions on this point provide some guidance as to factors that may be considered:

(a) the balance of convenience;
(b) the relative prejudice to the parties;
(c) the merits of the proposed action, where they are relevant to the issue of whether there are "sound reasons" for lifting the stay (i.e., as was said in *Ma, Re*, if the action has little chance of success, it may be harder to establish "sound reasons" for allowing it to proceed).

The supervising *CCAA* judge should also consider the good faith and due diligence of the debtor company as referenced in s. 11(6). Ultimately, it is in the discretion of the supervising *CCAA* judge as to whether the proposed action ought to be allowed to proceed in the face of the stay.

69 While Koch J. did not state the test as broadly as I have, I agree that ICR does not reach the necessary threshold. ICR did not structure its affairs or establish a claim with the specificity that justifies the development of a remedy to allow it to participate in the liquidation of the Bricore assets. There is also no aspect of the liquidation that requires the Court in this case to be concerned. In particular, the stay need not be lifted, and no other step need be taken in the context of the *CCAA* proceedings in light of these facts:

1. as of January 30, 2006, the Building was subject to an exclusive Selling Officer Agreement that provided CMN Calgary with the exclusive right to sell the property and to earn a commission of

1.25% of the purchase price,[61] which is significantly less than that being claimed by ICR at a 5% commission;

2. the sale to the Proposed Purchaser was a sale of six of the seven Bricore properties;
3. the trial judge received a report dated September 25, 2006 from the CRO recommending approval of the sale, which is two days before the alleged contract with ICR was proposed;[62]
4. in the September 25 report, the CRO advised the Court that "the total aggregate purchase price for the Bricore Properties obtained by Bricore in the Accepted Offer to Purchase represented the greatest value which it would be possible to obtain for all of the Bricore Properties;"[63]
5. the September 27, 2006 letter from ICR to Bricore, states "we are aware that the properties are under contract to sell ..."; and,
6. there was no sale from Bricore to the City of Regina.

70 While ICR denies knowledge of the sale, it is important to come back to the September 27th letter from ICR to Mr. Ruf. It states:

> **We are aware that the properties are under contract to sell** and request that ICR be protected in the specific situations as outlined.[64] [Emphasis added]

The addition by the CRO of these words, "Date of closing of **a sale** or December 31, 2006 whichever is earlier," to that letter adds further support to the veracity of the CRO's report to the effect that the CRO entered into discussions with ICR to provide for the eventuality of a failed sale to the purchaser with whom Bricore already had a contractual relationship.

71 Finally, in assessing Koch J.'s decision, and in determining the deference that is owed to it, I am not unmindful that he issued some 20 orders in 2006, pertaining to the Bricore restructuring, at least five of which dealt substantively with the Building and its prospective sale to the Proposed Purchaser.

72 Thus, applying the standard of review previously articulated, I cannot say that Koch J. acted arbitrarily, on a wrong principle, or on an erroneous view of the facts, or that a failure of justice is likely to result from the exercise of his discretion in the manner he did.

VII. Issue #4. Did the supervising *CCAA* judge make a reviewable error in refusing leave to commence an action against the CRO?

73 In addition to the indemnification provided by para. 18 of the CRO Order quoted above, the Order goes on to indicate the only circumstances in which the CRO can be sued personally:

> 20. For greater clarity, the CRO [*sic*]:
>
> ...
>
> (c) the CRO shall incur no liability or obligation as a result of his appointment or as a result of the fulfillment of his powers and duties as CRO, except as a result of instances of fraud, gross negligence or wilful misconduct on his part; and
>
> (d) no Proceeding shall be commenced against the CRO as a result of or relating in any way to his appointment or to the fulfillment of his powers and duties as CRO, without prior leave of the Court on at least seven days' notice to Bricore Group, the CRO and legal counsel to Bricore Group.
>
> 21. Subject to paragraph 20 hereof, nothing in this Order shall restrict an action against the CRO for acts of gross negligence, bad faith or wilful misconduct committed by him.

Setting aside the obvious ambiguity in this Order, it can be taken that to assert a claim against the CRO personally, ICR had to claim "fraud, gross negligence, wilful misconduct or bad faith." ICR claimed "bad faith."

74 Based on para. 20(d) of the Initial Order, there is no question that ICR was required to obtain prior leave of the court. The issue thus becomes whether the supervising *CCAA* judge erred in exercising his discretion in refusing to lift the stay.

75 Koch J.'s reasons for refusing to lift the stay are these:

> [18] Neither is there any basis upon which to lift the stay with respect to the proposed action against Maurice Duval, the Chief Restructuring Officer. Considerations applicable to Bricore under s. 11.3 do not apply to a court-appointed restructuring officer. Maurice Duval, as an officer of the Court, has explained his position in a cogent way. I accept his explanation. He did not sell the Department of Education Building to the City of Regina. He was not aware at the relevant time that the purchaser was going to resell. Indeed, his efforts were directed toward closing a single transaction involving all six Bricore properties. Although the proposed pleading accuses Mr. Duval of acting in "bad faith", it is not suggested on behalf of ICR that Mr. Duval has been guilty of fraud, gross negligence or wilful misconduct; that is, any of the limitations or exceptions expressly listed in paragraph 20(c) of the order of May 23, 2006.
>
> [19] As stated previously, the overriding purpose of the *CCAA* must also be considered. That applies in the Duval situation too. The statute is intended to facilitate restructuring to serve the public interest. In many cases such as the present it is necessary for the Court to appoint officers whose expertise is required to fulfill its mandate. It is clearly in the public interest that capable people be willing to accept such assignments. It is to be expected that such acceptance be contingent on protective provisions such as are included in the order of May 23, 2006, appointing Mr. Duval. It is important that the Court exercise caution in removing such restrictions; otherwise, the ability of the Court to obtain the assistance of needed experts will necessarily be impaired. Qualified professionals will be less willing to accept assignments absent the protection provisions in the appointing order.[65]

76 Again, Koch J. employed the same mechanism that he used to assess the claim against Bricore. He considered the status of the CRO as an officer of the court, noted the ambiguity in the Order and weighed the evidence to a certain extent. The question he was answering was the sufficiency of the claim to permit an action to be commenced against the Court's officer.

77 Again, applying the standard of review with respect to discretionary orders, there is no basis upon which the Court can intervene with Koch J.'s refusal to lift the stay so as to permit an action against the CRO in his personal capacity.

> VIII. Issue #5. Did the supervising *CCAA* judge err in awarding costs on a substantial indemnity basis?

78 Koch J. awarded substantial indemnity costs for this reason:

> [6] In my view, allegations of misconduct against a court officer are rare and exceptional. Therefore costs on this motion should be imposed on a substantial indemnity scale, although not on the full solicitor and client basis sought. Bricore is entitled to costs on the motion of $2,000.00, and Maurice Duval is entitled to costs of $1,000.00, payable in each instance by the applicant, ICR Commercial Real Estate (Regina) Ltd.[66]

79 I note that Newbury J.A. in *New Skeena Forest Products Inc., Re*[67] dismissed a challenge to a costs award, holding that "these are the kinds of considerations which the [*CCAA*] Chambers judge ... was especially qualified to make." And, of course, all costs orders are discretionary orders.

80 Nonetheless in this case, it would appear that the supervising *CCAA* judge erred. There is no basis upon which to order substantial indemnity costs with respect to the application to lift the stay in relation to Bricore. Bad faith was not alleged on its part. With respect to the CRO, the only basis upon which the stay could be lifted was to make an allegation of "bad faith." In the absence of some other factor, ICR cannot be faulted for making the very allegation that it was required to make in order to bring its application within the ambit of the stay of proceedings that had been granted.

81 In addition, while Koch J. indicated he was not awarding solicitor-and- client costs, there is not a sufficient distinction between substantial indemnity costs and solicitor-and-client costs. An award approaching solicitor-and- client costs is still a punitive order and, as there is no authority for the awarding of substantial indemnity costs, relies upon the same jurisprudential base as solicitor-and-client costs. As such, the award does not seem to meet the test established in *Siemens v. Bawolin*[68] and *Hashemian v. Wilde*[69] wherein it is stated that solicitor-and-client costs are generally awarded

where there has been reprehensible, scandalous or egregious conduct on the part of one of the parties in the context of the litigation.

82 If the parties are unable to agree with respect to costs in the Court of Queen's Bench and in this Court, they may speak to the Registrar to fix a time for a conference call hearing regarding costs.

cp/e/qlrds/qlmxt/qltxp/qlcas

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

2 Appeal Book, pp. 17a and 22a [Affidavit of Paul Mehlsen].

3 *Ibid.* at pp. 27a and 32a.

4 Order (Appointment of Chief Restructuring Officer, Extension of Stay of Proceedings; Additional DIP Financing) made May 23, 2006.

5 Order (Extension of Stay of Proceedings) made August 1, 2006.

6 Order (Extension of Stay of Proceedings) made August 18, 2006.

7 Order (Extension of Stay of Proceedings, Extension of Appointment of CRO and Increase in Maximum CRO Remuneration; Increase to Administrative Charge) made September 25, 2006.

8 Order (Approving Sale; Extending Stay of Proceedings; Extending Appointment of CRO) made October 10, 2006.

9 Appeal Book, p. 7a-8a.

10 *Ibid.* at p. 12a.

11 *Ibid.* at pp. 14a-15a.

12 *Ibid.* at p. 46a.

13 *Ibid.* at pp. 38a-39a.

14 *Ibid.* at p. 51a-52a.

15 *ICR v. Bricore*, [2007] S.J. No. 154, 2007 SKQB 121.

16 John D. Honsberger, *Debt Restructuring: Principles and Practice*, looseleaf (Aurora, Ont.: Canada Law Book, 2007) at p. 9.61.

17 (1954) 34 C.B.R. 82 (Que. S.C.). There are no cases referring to Ramsay Glass on the point that Prof. Honsberger raises in his text. (*Ptarmigan Airways Ltd. v. Federated Mining Corp.*, [1973] 3 W.W.R. 723 (N.T.S.C.) mentions *Ramsay Glass* but not in reference to the point made here.)

18 *Ibid.* at p. 83.

19 (2003), 45 C.B.R. (4th) 151 (B.C.S.C.), appeal dismissed (2007), 27 C.B.R. (5th) 115 (B.C.C.A.).

20 (2005), 15 C.B.R. (5th) 283 (Ont. S.C.J. [Commercial List]).

21 (1992), 14 C.B.R. (3d) 303 (Ont. Ct. (Gen. Div.)).

22 *360networks, supra* note 19.

23 *Stelco, supra* note 20 at para. 11.

24 *Campeau, supra* note 21.

25 *360networks, supra* note 19.

26 *Stelco, supra* note 20.

27 *Campeau, supra* note 21.

28 R.S.C. 1985, c. B-3.

29 Lloyd W. Houlden & Geoffrey B. Morawetz, *The 2007 Annotated Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act* (Toronto: Thomson Carswell, 2006) at pp. 562 and 789.

30 *An Act to amend the Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act, the Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act and the Income Tax Act*, S.C. 1997, c. 12, s. 124.

31 *Financial Consumer Agency of Canada Act*, S.C. 2001, c. 9, s. 577.

32 *Debt Restructuring Principles and Practice, supra* note 16 at p. 9-88.1.

33 Richard H. McLaren, *Canadian Commercial Reorganization: Preventing Bankruptcy*, looseleaf (Aurora, Ont.: Canada Law Book, 2007) at p. 3-17.

34 Janis Sarra, *Rescue! The Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act* (Toronto: Thomson Carswell, 2007).

35 *Ibid.* at pp. 110-11.

36 (1998), 53 B.C.L.R. (3d) 264 (B.C.S.C.). See also *Air Canada, Re*, (2004), 47 C.B.R. (4th) 182 (Ont. S.C.J. [Commercial List]), and *Mosaic Group Inc., Re*. (2004), 3 C.B.R. (5th) 40 (Ont. S.C.J.).

37 [1991] 2 W.W.R. 136 (B.C.C.A.).

38 (1990), 51 B.C.L.R. (2d) 105 (C.A.).

39 *Smith Bros., supra* note 36.

40 Order (Appointment of Chief Restructuring Officer; Extension of Stay of Proceedings; Additional DIP Financing) made May 23, 2006.

41 Bayda C.J.S., for the majority, in *Smart v. South Saskatchewan Hospital Centre* (1989), 75 Sask.R. 34 (C.A.), paraphrasing Lord Diplock in *Hadmor Productions Ltd. v. Hamilton*, [1982] 1 All E.R. 1042 at 1046.

42 [1943] O.R. 683 at 698.

43 *Rescue! The Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act, supra* note 34 at pp. 88-92.

44 *Supra* note 28.

45 Twelfth Report of the Standing Senate Committee on Banking, Trade and Commerce, February 1997, unnumbered p. 3 of the Chairman's Report, and p. 18.

46 *Ibid.* at pp. 17-18.

47 Canada Legislative Index, 2nd Session, 35th Parliament, Bill C-5, S.C. 1997, c. 12, pp. 1 & 2.

48 *Ibid.*

49 *An Act to establish the Wage Earner Protection Program Act, to amend the Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act and the Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act and to make consequential amendments to other Acts*, S.C. 2005, c. 47, s. 128.

50 Bill C-62, *An Act to amend the Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act, the Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act, the Wage Earner Protection Program Act and chapter 47 of the Statutes of Canada*, 2005, 1st Sess., 39th Parl., 2006-2007.

51 (2000), 19 C.B.R. (4th) 1 (Alta. Q.B.) at para 15.

52 (2003), 1 C.B.R. (5th) 204 (Ont. S.C.J. [Commercial]) at para 3.

53 [2006] O.J. No. 5029 (Ont. S.C.J.).

54 *ICR v. Bricore, supra* note 15.

55 *360networks, supra* note 19.

56 *Stelco, supra* note 20.

57 *Rescue! The Companies' Creditors Arrangements Act, supra* note 34 at p. 82.

58 *Ivaco, supra* note 53.

59 *Ma, Re* (2001), 24 C.B.R. (4th) 68 (Ont. C.A.). See Houlden & Morawetz, *The 2007 Annotated Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act*, supra note 29 at p. 403.

60 Ibid.

61 Order (Extension of Stay, DIP Financing, Sale Process & Shareholder Proceedings) of Koch J in Chambers dated February 13, 2006.

62 Order made September 25, 2006, *supra* note 7.

63 Appeal Book, p. 37a, para. 3.

64 *Supra* note 11.

65 *ICR v. Bricore, supra* note 15.

66 *ICR v. Bricore*, [2007] S.J. No. 253, 2007 SKQB 144.

67 [2005] 8 W.W.R. 224 (B.C.C.A.) at para. 23.

68 2002 SKCA 84, [2002] 11 W.W.R. 246.

69 2006 SKCA 126, [2007] 2 W.W.R. 52.

TAB 6

Indexed as:

Luscar Ltd. v. Smoky River Coal Ltd.

IN THE MATTER OF The Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act, R.S.C. 1985, c. C-36, as amended
AND IN THE MATTER OF Smoky River Coal Limited
Allstate Insurance Company, Allstate Life Insurance Company, Security Life of Denver Insurance Company, Indiana Insurance Company, Peerless Insurance Company, Pacific Life Insurance Company, AH (Michigan) Life Insurance Company, Northern Life Insurance Company, Reliastar Life Insurance Company, Modern Woodmen of America, Phoenix Home Life Mutual Insurance Company, American International Life Assurance Company of New York, and Phoenix American Life Insurance Company, petitioners/(not parties to the appeal)
Between
Luscar Ltd. and Consol of Canada Inc., appellants, and Smoky River Coal Limited, respondent/(debtor), and Canadian National Railway Company, respondent/(creditor)

[1999] A.J. No. 676

1999 ABCA 179

175 D.L.R. (4th) 703

[1999] 11 W.W.R. 734

71 Alta. L.R. (3d) 1

237 A.R. 326

12 C.B.R. (4th) 94

89 A.C.W.S. (3d) 209

Docket: 99-18164

Alberta Court of Appeal
Calgary, Alberta

Picard and Hunt JJ.A. and McIntyre J. (ad hoc)

Heard: April 13, 1999.
Judgment: filed June 9, 1999.

(19 pp.)

Appeal from the order of LoVecchio granted February 1, 1999.

Counsel:

R.B. Davison, Q.C. and J.H. Hockin, for the appellants.
D.R. Haigh, Q.C. and B.T. Beck, for the respondent Smoky River Coal.
W.E. Cascadden, for Neptune Bulk Terminals.
T.M. Warner, for the respondent Canadian National Railway.
D.W. Mann, for the petitioners.

REASONS FOR JUDGMENT

The judgment of the Court was delivered by

1 HUNT J.A.:-- This case raises a question about the scope of the powers of a judge pursuant to the Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act ("CCAA"), R.S.C. 1985, c. C-36. Specifically, does a judge have the discretion to establish a procedure for resolving a dispute between parties who have agreed to arbitrate their disputes under a contract? In my view, the judge is granted that power by the CCAA, in this case his discretion was exercised properly, and the appeal must be dismissed.

FACTS

2 The Appellants Luscar Ltd. and Consol of Canada Inc. ("the Appellants") and the Respondent Smoky River Coal Limited ("Smoky") are owners and operators of coal mines in Western Canada. Neptune Bulk Terminals (Canada) Ltd. ("Neptune") owns and operates a port facility in Vancouver. Smoky and the Appellants are shareholders of Neptune and ship coal for export through the port facility.

3 The relationship between Neptune and its shareholders is governed by a Shareholders' Agreement ("the Agreement"), key provisions of which are reproduced below. Briefly, the Agreement restricts the manner in which a shareholder may dispose of rights arising from the Agreement. Among the consequences of a breach specified in the Agreement are that shareholders are given a right of refusal to purchase, at book value, the Neptune shares belonging to an offending shareholder. The Agreement also provides that disputes among the parties will be arbitrated in British Columbia.

4 In April 1998, a dispute arose between the Appellants and Smoky when the Appellants alleged that Smoky had breached its obligations under the Agreement. Neptune issued a Notice of Default as required by the Agreement. Over the next several months, information was exchanged among the parties concerning the facts giving rise to the alleged breach. The Appellants say it was not until September 1998 that they received information, on a "with prejudice" basis, that confirmed their view that Smoky had breached its contractual obligations. Because until September they had been unable to use the information obtained earlier, they had taken no further steps in the interim to trigger formally the default provisions of the Agreement.

5 In the meantime, on July 30, 1998, a syndicate of Smoky's lenders had filed a petition to place Smoky under the protection of the CCAA. They, along with Canadian National Railway Company (a major unsecured creditor of Smoky) are also Respondents. On August 7, 1998, an order was made retroactive to July 31, 1998, staying all actions against Smoky and its assets. This order ("the Cairns order") made specific reference to rights arising under the Agreement, even though Neptune and the Appellants had been unaware of the CCAA filing. The Cairns order, which was of limited duration, has since been extended several times. A Monitor has been appointed to oversee Smoky's affairs, although not empowered to take possession of Smoky's assets or manage Smoky's business.

6 Upon learning of the Cairns order, the Appellants became involved in the CCAA proceedings, arguing that the stay should not be extended against them and asserting that their dispute with Smoky should be resolved by arbitration pursuant to the Agreement. The chambers judge suggested that the parties attempt to resolve this issue among themselves. When they were unable to do so, cross-motions resulted. In its motion, Smoky sought various declarations concerning the status of the "dispute" under the Agreement or, alternatively, an order prohibiting arbitration proceedings under the Agreement and giving directions for the determination of issues arising under the Agreement. The Appellants' motion sought a stay of Smoky's motion pursuant to s. 15 of the Commercial Arbitration Act, R.S.B.C. 1996, c. 55 (the "B.C. Arbitration Act").

DECISION APPEALED FROM

7 The learned chambers judge dismissed the Appellants' motion, concluding that the Court of Queen's Bench (which is the "court" under s. 2 of the CCAA) has jurisdiction "to hear and determine ... whether Smoky has been or is in default under the ... Agreement and any and all related issues arising therefrom." He ordered the parties to appear before him for further directions concerning a trial of the issues arising from the Agreement.

8 Among his undisputed findings were that:

- the law of British Columbia applies to the dispute under the Agreement
- the question of whether or not Smoky was in default under the Agreement was an issue that, pursuant to the Agreement, the parties had agreed would be decided by arbitration
- Smoky's motion was a commencement of "legal proceedings" within the meaning of s. 15 (1) of the B.C. Arbitration Act
- the Appellants had applied to stay Smoky's motion

9 He framed the question this way at para. 1: "Should this Court establish a procedure to resolve a dispute between [the Appellants and Smoky] as part of its supervisory role of the reorganization of Smoky under the CCAA, or should this Court stay the pending Notice of Motion of Smoky dated January 6, 1999 while that dispute is resolved by an arbitrator in British Columbia in accordance with the Commercial Arbitration Act?"

10 He concluded that s. 15 of the B.C. Arbitration Act obliged him to stay Smoky's motion and send the matter to British Columbia for arbitration unless, in the words of that section, the agreement to arbitrate was "void, inoperative or incapable of being performed." He suggested at para. 31 that the latter condition applied because of Smoky's insolvency, the appointment of the Monitor, and the role of the Court under the CCAA. He said this incapacity was beyond the parties' control.

11 He considered that the CCAA process would be compromised if the contractual dispute was not settled within its ambit. But he noted that, in so dealing with the matter, the resolution of the dispute would be neither precluded nor postponed. Rather, it had to be addressed expeditiously because of its likely impact on the viability of a plan of arrangement. Were it not resolved under the umbrella of the CCAA, moreover, the efforts of Smoky's officers could be drained through involvement in the B.C. arbitration, at a time when they should be attending to Smoky's reorganization. Additionally, other stakeholders (including the Monitor) would be excluded from an arbitration in B.C. He rejected the Appellants' argument that their rights as non-creditors could not be affected by CCAA orders. He concluded that the dispute should be resolved as expeditiously as possible in the Court of Queen's Bench under the CCAA proceedings, "so as to permit Smoky to move forward with certainty as to its status as a shareholder of Neptune" (para. 43).

12 O'Leary J.A. subsequently granted leave to appeal pursuant to s. 13 of the CCAA. He suggested the following as the issues for the appeal:

(1) Did the chambers judge err in finding that the arbitration agreement was "incapable of performance" because Smoky is subject to proceedings under the CCAA?

(2) If [the chambers judge] erred in finding that the arbitration agreement was incapable of performance, did he nevertheless have jurisdiction under the CCAA to override the NSA arbitration agreement with respect to the forum and procedure for resolving disputes?

(3) If the Order appealed adversely affected the substantive rights of Luscar and Consol under the Commercial Arbitration Act and the arbitration rules of the British Columbia International Commercial Arbitration Centre, did the chambers judge have jurisdiction under the CCAA to make the Order?

13 Because of the approach I have taken to this case, I do not find it necessary to deal with the first issue in quite the way framed by O'Leary J.A. The second and third issues are considered in the reasons that follow.

CONTRACTUAL PROVISIONS

14 A number of provisions of the Agreement are relevant to the issue under appeal.

15 Paragraph 8.01 provides:

> Except as otherwise expressly permitted by this agreement or a Terminal Contract, no Shareholder or Affiliate shall sell, transfer or otherwise dispose of or offer to sell, transfer or otherwise dispose of, any of its Interest, or any Terminal Contract or any of its rights thereunder.

16 It is alleged that Smoky breached this provision when it transported six train loads of coal through the terminal. According to the Appellants, on this occasion Smoky "subcontracted" its capacity at the terminal.

17 Paragraph 8.04 describes the sole method by which a shareholder may dispose of its contracted shipping capacity. Briefly, it must offer that capacity to the other shareholders and only if they do not take up the right may the capacity be subcontracted to a third party.

18 Paragraph 10 deals with default:

> 10.01 It is an event of default, if a Shareholder (the "Defaulting Shareholder") (the other Shareholders being the "Non-Defaulting Shareholders"):
>
> (a) fails to observe, perform or carry out any of its obligations hereunder and such failure continues for 30 days after Neptune has given notice in writing to the Defaulting Shareholder specifying the nature of the default and requiring that the default be cured within 30 days; or
>
> (b) becomes a bankrupt or commits an act of bankruptcy, or permits or authorizes the appointment of a receiver or if a receiver-manager of its assets is appointed or if the Defaulting Shareholder makes an assignment for the benefit of creditors or otherwise.

Neptune shall give a copy of any notice under this paragraph to the Non-Defaulting Shareholders.

> 10.02 Upon the expiration of the 30 day period referred to in subparagraph 10.01(a) hereof or upon Neptune becoming aware of an event described in 10.01(b) hereof, Neptune shall declare a Default and give notice thereof to the Non-Defaulting Shareholders.

19 In the event of a continuing default, paragraph 11.01 grants other shareholders the option to purchase the defaulting shareholder's shares at book value. In this case, the evidence suggests that the book value of Smoky's shares is about $880,000, while the market value of Smoky's rights in the Neptune Terminal may exceed $46,000,000. During the course of argument, the chambers judge observed that, from a practical perspective, a plan of arrangement under the CCAA could not go forward without a resolution of the dispute between Smoky and the Appellants. (AB 83-84)

20 The relevant paragraph dealing with dispute resolution is 12.02:

> The parties agree that all disputes or differences between or among the parties hereto, other than a dispute or difference decided by the auditors pursuant to paragraph 12.01, shall be submitted to a single arbitrator under the auspices of and pursuant to the rules of the British Columbia International Commercial Arbitration Centre and pursuant to the Commercial Arbitration Act of British Columbia whose decision shall be final and binding upon the parties to the arbitration. The arbitrator may determine all questions of procedure and after hearing any evidence and representations of the parties, the arbitrator shall make an award and reduce the same to writing together with the reasons therefor.

21 Paragraph 15.11 provides that the Agreement will be governed by and construed in accordance with the laws of British Columbia.

STATUTORY PROVISIONS

22 Section 11(4) of the CCAA is central to this appeal.

> 11(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.

(Emphasis added)

23 Part I of the CCAA (ss. 4 to 8) provides for the making of a compromise or arrangement between the company and its creditors. If accepted by two-thirds of the creditors, the plan may be sanctioned by the court.

24 Section 2 of the CCAA contains the following definitions:

> "secured creditor"
>
> "secured creditor" means a holder of a mortgage, hypothec, pledge, charge, lien or privilege on or against, or any assignment, cession or transfer of, all or any property of a debtor company as security for indebtedness of the debtor company, or a holder of any bond of a debtor company secured by a mortgage, hypothec, pledge, charge, lien or privilege on or against, or any assignment, cession or transfer of, or a trust in respect of, all or any property of the debtor company, whether the holder or beneficiary is resident or domiciled within or outside Canada, and a trustee under any trust deed or other instrument securing any of those bonds shall be deemed to be a secured creditor for all purposes of this Act except for the purpose of voting at a creditors' meeting in respect of any of those bonds;
>
> "unsecured creditor"
>
> "unsecured creditor" means any creditor of a company who is not a secured creditor, whether resident or domiciled within or outside Canada, and a trustee for the holders of any unsecured bonds issued under a trust deed or other instrument running in favour of the trustee shall be deemed to be an unsecured creditor for all purposes of this Act except for the purpose of voting at a creditors' meeting in respect of any of those bonds.

25 Section 12 sets out the claims procedure. Section 12(1) states that a "claim" means "any indebtedness, liability or obligation of any kind that, if unsecured, would be a debt provable in bankruptcy within the meaning of the Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act." Section 12(2) mandates how the "amount" of a "claim" is to be determined. Section 12(2)(a) states:

> For the purposes of this Act, the amount represented by a claim of any secured or unsecured creditor shall be determined as follows:
>
> (a) the amount of an unsecured claim shall be the amount . . .
>
> (iii) in the case of any other company, proof of which might be made under the Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act, but if the amount so provable is not admitted by the

> company, the amount shall be determined by the court on summary application by the company or by the creditor . . .

26 For reasons that will become apparent, the following provisions of the Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act, R.S.C. 1985, c. B-3 ("BIA") are also relevant.

> Definitions - s. 2(1)
>
> "claim provable in bankruptcy", "provable claim" or "claim provable"
>
> > "claim provable in bankruptcy", "provable claim" or "claim provable" includes any claim or liability provable in proceedings under this Act by a creditor;
>
> "creditor"
>
> > "creditor" means a person having a claim, unsecured, preferred by virtue of priority under section 136 or secured, provable as a claim under this Act;
>
> . . .
>
> Persons claiming property in possession of bankrupt
>
> > 81(1) Where a person claims any property, or interest therein, in the possession of a bankrupt at the time of the bankruptcy, he shall file with the trustee a proof of claim verified by affidavit giving the grounds on which the claim is based and sufficient particulars to enable the property to be identified.
> >
> > Claims provable
> >
> > 121(1) All debts and liabilities, present or future, to which the bankrupt is subject on the day on which the bankrupt becomes bankrupt or to which the bankrupt may become subject before the bankrupt's discharge by reason of any obligation incurred before the day on which the bankrupt becomes bankrupt shall be deemed to be claims provable in proceedings under this Act.
> >
> > Contingent and unliquidated claims
> >
> > 121(2) The determination of whether a contingent or unliquidated claim is a provable claim and the valuation of such a claim shall be made in accordance with section 135.
> >
> > Debts payable at a future time
> >
> > 121(3) A creditor may prove a debt not payable at the date of the bankruptcy and may receive dividends equally with the other creditors, deducting only thereout a rebate of interest at the rate of five per cent per annum computed from the declaration of a dividend to the time when the debt would have become payable according to the terms on which it was contracted.

27 Section 15(2) of the B.C. Arbitration Act, referred to by the chambers judge, provides:

> In an application under subsection (1), the court
> must make an order staying the legal proceedings
> unless it determines that the arbitration agreement
> is void, inoperative or incapable of being performed. (Emphasis added)

28 Section 23 states:

> An arbitrator must adjudicate the matter before the
> arbitrator by reference to law unless the parties,
> as a term of an agreement referred to in section 35,

> agree that the matter in dispute may be decided on equitable grounds, grounds of conscience or some other basis.
> (Emphasis added)

29 Under ss. 8 and 9 of the Domestic Commercial Arbitration, Rules of Procedure of the B.C. International Commercial Arbitration Centre (as amended June 1, 1998) ("Rules"), arbitration may be commenced by a notice from one party to another and to the Centre or by the filing of a Joint Submission to Arbitrate to the Centre. The arbitration is deemed to have commenced following this filing and the payment of fees (s. 10). There is no evidence to suggest that arbitration was commenced in this case.

30 Section 33 of the Rules provides:

> An arbitration tribunal shall decide the dispute in accordance with the law unless the parties agree in writing in accordance with section 23 of the Commercial Arbitration Act that the matter in dispute may be decided on equitable grounds, grounds of conscience or some other basis.
> (Emphasis added)

ANALYSIS

1. Did the Chambers Judge Have the Authority under s. 11 of the CCAA to Order a Stay of the B.C. Arbitration Proceedings?

(A) Does the term "proceedings" in s. 11 of the CCAA include the proposed arbitration in B.C.?

31 There is little doubt that the term "proceedings" in s. 11 is broad enough to encompass extra-judicial proceedings. Trial and appellate courts have treated the term expansively, relying upon jurisprudence that takes a broad, liberal approach to the interpretation of the CCAA. Meridian Developments Inc. v. Toronto Dominion Bank; Meridian Developments Inc. v. Nu-West Group Ltd. (1984), 52 C.B.R. (N.S.) 109, [1984] 5 W.W.R. 215, 32 Alta. L.R. (2d) 150, 11 D.L.R. (4th) 576, 53 A.R. 39 (Q.B.); Quintette Coal Ltd. v. Nippon Steel Corp. (1990), 2 C.B.R. (3d) 303 (B.C. C.A.) ("Quintette Coal"). Such courts have observed that, were it otherwise, non-judicial proceedings could operate against the interests of creditors and render impossible the achievement of effective arrangements.

32 Thus, in Quintette Coal, the term "proceedings" was held to include extra-judicial conduct such as the withholding of payments to the debtor company. In Meridian, it was said to embrace payment pursuant to a letter of credit. Without specific discussion of the point, it seems also to have been assumed that "proceedings" includes the exercise of a contractual right to replace an operator of jointly-owned petroleum properties. Norcen Energy Resources Ltd. v. Oakwood Petroleums Ltd. (1988), 72 C.B.R. (N.S.) 1, 63 Alta. L.R. (2d) 361, 92 A.R. 81 (Q.B.).

33 The above jurisprudence persuades me that "proceedings" in s. 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 s. 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 s. 11 of the CCAA.

(B) Are the Appellants creditors for the purposes of the CCAA?

34 If the Appellants can be considered creditors under the CCAA, there is little doubt that the chambers judge had the power to affect their rights in the way he did. It is obvious that the contractual rights of a creditor can be affected permanently under the CCAA. To take a simple example, a plan of arrangement or compromise that is approved by the requisite number of creditors can alter permanently the contractual rights of even those creditors that have not approved the plan (CCAA, s. 6).

35 To explain my conclusion that the Appellants can be considered creditors under the CCAA, it is necessary to examine the statutory linkage between the CCAA and the BIA and the courts' view of that linkage.

36 The relevant provisions of the CCAA and the BIA have been set out above. For the purposes of the claims procedure in s. 12 of the CCAA, "claim" is defined as the BIA's meaning of "a debt provable in bankruptcy". Could the Appellants' claims in this case constitute a "debt provable in bankruptcy"?

37 The answer is not readily apparent from the BIA, since nowhere does it define "debt provable in bankruptcy". The closest definition is "claim provable in bankruptcy". A contingent and unliquidated claim recoverable by legal process is a "claim provable in bankruptcy" for the purposes of s. 121(1) of the BIA: Farm Credit Corp. v. Holowach (Trustee of), [1988] 5 W.W.R. 87 at 90, 51 D.L.R. (4th) 501 (Alta. C.A.), leave to appeal to the Supreme Court of Canada dismissed at [1989] 4 W.W.R. lxx. Section 81(1) of the BIA contemplates proof of a claim arising from "any property, or interest therein" in the possession of the bankrupt at the time of bankruptcy. Some of the Respondents argue that the Appellants' claim against Smoky under the Agreement would fall under one of these sections and is, therefore, a "claim" under the CCAA that would give the Appellants access to the s. 12 claims procedure, making them creditors under that statute.

38 This legal result is contingent on whether the terms "debt" and "claim" are interchangeable under the BIA. Both terms are used in s. 121, which is entitled "Claims Provable". There are cases which, without directly considering the point, appear to have assumed that the two terms are synonymous: Re Central Capital Corp. (1995), 22 B.L.R. (2d) 210 (Ont. Gen. Div.); affirmed (1996), 27 O.R. (3d) 494 (C.A.).

39 There are also cases where the point has been addressed directly. In Algoma Steel Corp. v. Royal Bank (1992), 11 C.B.R. (3d) 1 (Ont. Gen. Div.), the issue was whether the holder of a loan guaranteed by the debtor company should be treated as a creditor for the purposes of the plan of arrangement filed by the debtor company, notwithstanding the fact that the loan holder had made no demand of payment under the loan agreement or the guarantee. Farley J. concluded that the loan holder was a creditor. He distinguished Quebec Steel Products (Industries) Ltd. v. James United Steel Ltd., [1969] 2 O.R. 349, 5 D.L.R. (3d) 374 (H.C.) because of changes that had been made to the wording of s. 12 of the CCAA in the meantime. Specifically, he noted that the earlier wording had bundled together the concepts of "claim" and "amount", leading in Quebec Steel to the application of the common law definition of "debt" as a certain sum of money.

40 At 6-7, Farley J. said:

> It strikes me that [under the current CCAA] the double recitation in s. 12(1) and (2) of "[f]or the purposes of this Act" and the segregation of these subsections was intended to allow "claim" to be determined as any "indebtedness, liability or obligation of any kind" by reference to whether it "could be a debt provable in bankruptcy within the meaning of the Bankruptcy Act". The determination of the amount of that claim is to be determined under another provision, also "[f]or the purposes of this Act". Under the structure and context of the C.C.A.A. could there be a claim (unsecured debt provable as such under the Bankruptcy Act) without there being a creditor as the holder of that claim. I think not. I therefore conclude that the B. of M. is creditor of Algoma vis-à-vis the guarantee (see Re Film House Ltd. (1974), 19 C.B.R. (N.S.) 231 (Ont. S.C.), varied (1974), 19 C.B.R. (N.S.) 231 at 234 (Ont. S.C.); Re Froment, 5 C.B.R. 765, [1925] 2 W.W.R. 415, [1925] 3 D.L.R. 377 (Alta. T.D.), which indicate that the contingent liability of a guarantor who has not been called upon to pay or who has not in fact paid should be considered a debt provable in bankruptcy pursuant to the Bankruptcy Act).

41 He held to similar effect in Re Cadillac Fairview Inc. (1995), 30 C.B.R. (3d) 17 (Ont. Gen. Div.), where the party found to be a "claimant" for the purposes of the CCAA had merely launched a lawsuit against the debtor company, seeking, among other things, declarations concerning the validity of certain agreements and recovery of damages for the breach of the agreements by the debtor company. See also Re Quintette Coal Ltd. (1991), 7 C.B.R. (3d) 165 (B.C. S.C.) at 174 where it was held that "claim" under the CCAA included "future prospects".

42 I find this reasoning persuasive. There is a possible explanation for the fact that the CCAA refers to a "debt", rather than a "claim", provable under the BIA. At the time the CCAA was passed, the Bankruptcy Act, R.S.C. 1927, c. 11, contained s. 104, entitled "Debts provable". That section is the forerunner of s. 121, now entitled "Claims provable". The language used in the body of s. 104 was "debts provable"; in the current s. 121, it is "claims provable". The definitions at that time also referred to "debts" rather than "claims". It may be that Parliament failed to re-align the language of the CCAA when the relevant language of the Bankruptcy Act was amended in 1949, S.C. 1949, 2nd sess., c. 7.

43 Nor am I convinced there are compelling reasons why the notion of a "debt" should be treated narrowly under the CCAA, rather than as broadly as a "claim" under the BIA. It is true that, in comparison to CCAA proceedings, bankruptcy proceedings are by nature more final. If it is ever to be dealt with, a claim must be resolved during the bankruptcy proceedings. In contrast, if a CCAA plan of arrangement is accepted, there is the future possibility of a going concern against which a claim may be asserted.

44 But there may also be situations (like the present one) where it would be difficult for a plan of arrangement to be prepared and voted upon without some resolution, in the same process, of a claim that is relatively unripe. This appears to have been the reasoning of Blair J. in Campeau v. Olympia & York Developments Ltd. (1992), 14 C.B.R. (3d) 303 (Ont. Gen. Div.). There, the plaintiffs had served a statement of claim (seeking damages for breach of contract against the debtor company) before an initial stay under the CCAA was ordered. In refusing to lift the stay and permit the action to proceed, he noted that, unless the claim was dealt with in the context of CCAA proceedings, the creditors would have no way to assess whether to accept or reject the debtor company's plan (notwithstanding that the plan itself had treated the plaintiffs as parties that were unaffected by it). His language at 311 suggests a tacit acceptance of the fact that the plaintiffs were not "creditors" in the same sense as other creditors. He held, nevertheless, that their "claim" should be dealt with under the CCAA.

45 In this case, the essence of the Appellants' claim is that Smoky has breached the Agreement. Although paragraph 11.01 of the Agreement grants an option to purchase the defaulting shareholder's shares, it is clear from paragraph 11.02 that other remedies are contemplated. Viewed this way, the Appellants' claim is not significantly different than the breach of contract claims in some of the cases just discussed. To the extent that the Appellants might exercise an option to acquire Smoky's shares, moreover, it could be said that they claim a right to "property" in Smoky's possession, a right that would be provable under s. 81 of the BIA.

46 For these reasons, I conclude that the Appellant's claim against Smoky can be treated under the claims process of s. 12 and that they are creditors for the purposes of the CCAA. In case I am wrong, I will now consider whether, if the Appellants cannot be considered creditors, the chambers judge nevertheless had the power to make the order.

(C) Even if the Appellants are not creditors for the purposes of the CCAA, does s. 11 authorize the order made in this case?

47 The Appellants do not dispute that the rights of non-creditor third parties can be affected by the s. 11 power to order a stay. They agree this is the clear implication of cases such as Norcen, supra, a decision that has been followed widely and cited with approval by many Canadian courts. But they say in no case has a court altered permanently the contractual rights of a non-creditor and doing so is beyond the scope of the CCAA. They assert that, if the order is upheld, they will have lost forever the opportunity to resolve the dispute pursuant to the arbitration procedure accepted by the parties to the Agreement. As discussed later, in my view the nature of the contractual right being affected is an important factor to take into account.

48 The Respondents disagree with the Appellants' assessment of the jurisprudence. They also maintain that the impugned order affects the Appellants' procedural, not substantive, rights.

49 In my opinion, the language of s. 11(4), considered in the context of the CCAA's purpose, authorizes the order made by the chambers judge. To recapitulate, that order declared that the Alberta Court of Queen's Bench "has jurisdiction to hear and determine the issue of whether Smoky has been or is in default under the Neptune Shareholders' Agreement and any and all related issues arising therefrom", required the parties to appear before him for further directions, and dismissed the Appellants' motion for a stay pursuant to the B.C. Arbitration Act. Although there are no previous decisions on all fours with the present situation, I read the existing jurisprudence as supportive of my interpretation of s. 11(4).

50 The language of s. 11(4) is very broad. It allows the court to make an order "on such terms as it may impose". Paragraphs (a), (b) and (c) empower the court order to stay "all proceedings taken or that might be taken" against the debtor company; restrain further proceedings "in any action, suit or proceeding" against the debtor company; and prohibit "the commencement of or proceeding with any other action, suit or proceeding" (emphasis added). These words are sufficiently expansive to support the kind of discretion exercised by the chambers judge.

51 This interpretation is supported by the legislative objectives underlying the CCAA. The purpose of the CCAA and the proper approach to its interpretation have been described as follows:

> The CCAA is intended to facilitate compromises and arrangements between companies and their creditors as an alternative to bankruptcy and, as such, is remedial legislation entitled to a liberal interpretation. It seems to me that the purpose of the statute is to enable insolvent companies to carry on business in the ordinary course or otherwise deal with their assets so as to enable plan of compromise or arrangement to be prepared, filed and considered by their creditors and the court. In the interim, a judge has great discretion under the CCAA to make order [sic] 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.
>
> per Farley J. in Re Lehndorff General Partner Ltd. (1993), 17 C.B.R. (3d) 24 at 31 (Ont. Gen. Div.)

52 As has been noted often, the CCAA was enacted by Parliament in 1933 during the height of the Depression. At that time, corporate insolvency led almost inevitably to liquidation because that was the only option available under legislation such as the Bankruptcy Act and the Winding-Up Act. In the result, shareholder equity was destroyed, creditors received very little, and the social evil of unemployment was exacerbated. The CCAA was intended to provide a means of enabling the insolvent company to remain in business: Hongkong Bank of Canada v. Chef Ready Foods Ltd. (1990), 4 C.B.R. (3d) 311 (B.C. C.A.); Quintette Coal, supra.

53 The courts have underscored that the CCAA requires account to be taken of a number of diverse societal interests. Obviously, the CCAA is designed to "provide a structured environment for the negotiation of compromises between a debtor company and its creditors for the benefit of both": Re Lehndorff General Partner Ltd., supra, at 31. It is intended to "prevent any manoeuvers for positioning among creditors during the interim period which would give the aggressive creditor an advantage to the prejudice of others who were less aggressive and would further undermine the financial position of the company making it less likely that the eventual arrangement would succeed": Meridian, supra, at 114. But the CCAA also serves the interests of a broad constituency of investors, creditors and employees: Chef Ready, supra, at 320; Quintette Coal, supra, at 314. These statements about the goals and operation of the CCAA support the view that the discretion under s. 11(4) should be interpreted widely.

54 There are a number of cases where third party rights have been affected by a stay order. Norcen provides a convenient starting point.

55 Under the terms of the contract pursuant to which the debtor company (Oakwood) operated jointly owned oil and gas properties, the parties were entitled to replace the operator in the event of insolvency. Norcen was a party to the operating agreement, but not a creditor of Oakwood, nor present at the initial CCAA application. The stay order specifically enjoined Oakwood's removal as operator under any operating agreements. Norcen applied to vary the stay order and replace Oakwood pursuant to the terms of its operating agreement.

56 In denying Norcen's application, Forsyth J. agreed that, by bringing its CCAA application, Oakwood had declared itself insolvent and that, normally, this would bring into play the replacement of operator provisions. He acknowledged at 11 (C.B.R.) that Norcen's rights might be affected permanently under the operating agreement were it not prevented from replacing Oakwood: if Oakwood's plan of arrangement was approved by its creditors and its insolvency thereby "cured", Norcen might lose forever its claim to replace Oakwood as operator. While not deciding the issue of whether the insolvency was capable of being "cured", he approached the case as involving more than a mere suspension of Norcen's rights. He concluded at 12, nevertheless, that the s. 11 powers were broad enough to affect the rights of non-creditors, noting that there was much room for discretion within the application of s. 11 "to refuse a stay when third party rights will be seriously prejudiced by its terms."

57 Having determined that the s. 11 powers permitted interference with Norcen's contractual rights, Forsyth J. addressed the CCAA's constitutional validity, observing that it had been upheld by the Supreme Court of Canada in Re Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act; A.G. Can. v. A.G. Que., [1934] S.C.R. 659, 16 C.B.R.1, [1934] 4 D.L.R. 75. Thus, he said, the continuance of insolvent companies must be considered a constitutionally valid statutory objective. "[I]t follows that a stay which happens to affect some non-creditors in pursuit of that end is valid" (p. 16). He concluded that continuance of a company involves more than a consideration of creditor claims, adding that s. 11 of the CCAA could be used to interfere with some other contractual relationships in circumstances which threaten a company's existence. In obiter, he expressed the view that fairness required that such interference "should be effective only for a relatively short period of time" (p. 16).

58 A related case is Re T. Eaton Co. (1997), 46 C.B.R. (3d) 293 (Ont. Gen. Div.). Dylex (not a creditor of T. Eaton but an operator of stores in malls where T. Eaton was the anchor tenant) applied to amend a CCAA stay order so that it could exercise rights pursuant to its leases. Those leases permitted Dylex to alter the lease terms if T. Eaton ceased to operate in the shopping centres. Houlden J.A. denied the motion, noting that, if such rights were accorded to Dylex, there might be other tenants who would make the same claim. This would likely increase the claims of landlords against T. Eaton and seriously impact its re-structuring plan. He took account of T. Eaton's position as a large employer and purchaser from suppliers. At 295-96, without extensive analysis, he opined that s. 11 and the inherent jurisdiction of the Court gave him the power to make orders against non-creditor third parties when their actions would potentially prejudice the success of the plan. I acknowledge that it is not clear that his order had the effect of altering contractual rights permanently, since, depending on the outcome of the re-organization proceedings, at a future time the tenants might still be able to exercise their rights under the leases. In this regard, the situation was akin to that in Norcen.

59 In Re Dylex Ltd. (1995), 31 C.B.R. (3d) 106 (Ont. Gen. Div.), the debtor company was permitted to terminate its leases in shopping malls, as part of its restructuring program. Farley J. viewed s. 11 as giving the court the inherent jurisdiction, in the interim between the filing and the approval of a plan, to "fill in gaps in [the] legislation so as to give effect to the objects of the CCAA, including the survival program of a debtor until it can present a plan" (p. 110).

60 To summarize, the language of s. 11(4) is very broad. The CCAA must be interpreted in a remedial fashion. Cases support the view that third-party rights may be affected by a stay order, although there are none where the third-party rights appear to have been affected in quite the same way as those of the Appellants as a result of this order. I am satisfied, nevertheless, that the CCAA gives the chambers judge the discretion to make the impugned order. It remains to consider whether he properly exercised that discretion.

2. Did the Chambers Judge Properly Exercise his Discretion under s. 11(4) of the CCAA?

61 The fact that an appeal lies only with leave of an appellate court (s. 13, CCAA) suggests that Parliament, mindful that CCAA cases often require quick decision-making, intended that most decisions be made by the supervising judge. This supports the view that those decisions should be interfered with only in clear cases.

62 A similar opinion was expressed by Macfarlane J.A. in Re Pacific National Lease Holding Corp. (1992), 15 C.B.R. (3d) 265 (B.C. C.A.). In considering whether to grant leave to appeal, he observed at 272:

> . . . I am of the view that this court should exercise its powers sparingly when it is asked to intervene with respect to questions which arise under the C.C.A.A. The process of management which the Act has assigned to the trial court is an ongoing one. In this case a number of orders have been made. . . .
>
> Orders depend upon a careful and delicate balancing of a variety of interests and of problems. In that context appellate proceedings may well upset the balance, and delay or frustrate the process under the C.C.A.A.

63 The Appellants point to cases where a specific issue arising under the CCAA has been sent for resolution to a forum other than the CCAA court. In each of those cases, however, it has been determined that resolution in the other forum would promote the objectives of the CCAA. In each such case, moreover, the CCAA judge has retained control over the impact of the outside determination.

64 For example, in Re Philip's Manufacturing Ltd. (1991), 9 C.B.R. (3d) 1 (B.C. S.C.), the debtor company's landlord alleged that its leases were about to expire since the company had not given requisite notice. The judge noted that it was essential to the reorganization plan that the company be able to remain in the leased premises. He permitted the landlord to pursue proceedings under the Commercial Tenancy Act, R.S.B.C. 1979, c. 54. But that legislation contained a summary procedure for determining the issue at hand (whether the landlord was entitled to a writ of possession). The judge, moreover, maintained some control over the process by ordering that, if an order of possession was granted, it would be stayed for as long as the CCAA stay, "to be dealt with in the context of any reorganization plan ultimately brought before the court" (para. 44). Additionally, the summary procedure was to occur in the B.C. Supreme Court, the same court that supervised the CCAA.

65 Similarly, in Re Cadillac Fairview Inc. [1995] O.J. No. 138 (Ont. Gen. Div.), an issue arose about the quantification of a claim affecting the debtor company. Farley J. permitted this issue to be determined by a court in Chicago, because that court undertook to resolve the matter expeditiously and in coordination with the CCAA proceedings.

66 On the other hand, in Landawn Shopping Centres Ltd. v. Harzena Holdings Ltd. (1997), 44 O.T.C. 288 (Ont. Gen. Div.), a plan of arrangement was already in effect when a landlord sought to proceed to arbitration with its claim against the debtor company. Instead, the court ordered that the claim be dealt with by the court under the terms of the plan of arrangement.

67 These cases compel the conclusion that a judge has the discretion under the CCAA to permit issues to be determined in another forum but is under no obligation to do so. The proper exercise of the discretion will be very fact-dependent.

68 As noted by Gibbs J.A. in Quintette Coal, supra, at 312, the judicial exercise of discretion under s. 11 should "produce a result appropriate to the circumstances." The power under s. 11 should be exercised in a manner to give effect to the purpose of the CCAA, and not to "seriously ... impair the ability of the debtor company to continue in business during the compromise or arrangement negotiating period."

69 In this case, the chambers judge considered a number of matters in refusing to permit the arbitration. Among these were his view that the arbitration would compromise the CCAA process; that the effect of his order would not be to preclude or postpone the resolution of the dispute but to expedite it; that an expedited resolution of the dispute was critical to the CCAA proceedings given its possible impact on a plan of arrangement; and that it was desirable for Smoky's officers to focus on the re-organization.

70 These were all legitimate matters to consider. Another factor, not mentioned by the chambers judge, is that arbitration had not been commenced in this case by the time the initial CCAA order was made. There may be reasons why the Appellants had not moved toward arbitration more rapidly. But the fact remains that several months had elapsed between the origin of the dispute under the Agreement and the CCAA petition, during which time no steps to commence arbitration were taken by the Appellants.

71 It is also important to consider the nature of and the extent to which the Appellants' contractual rights may be compromised as a result of the order under appeal. I agree there are some potential advantages to the Appellants under arbitration. Specifically, they would be able to play a role in selecting the decision-maker. If their interpretation of s. 33 of the Rules and s. 23 of the B.C. Arbitration Act is correct, arguably the arbitration would limit Smoky's ability to rely on certain arguments that might be available in a court proceeding (for example, equitable arguments such as relief from forfeiture).

72 But as the Appellants acknowledged during argument, no decision has yet been made about what rules will apply to the resolution of this dispute under the procedures to be determined by the chambers judge. It remains open to the Appellants to argue that Rule 33 and s. 23 of B.C. Arbitration Act ought to govern the resolution of their dispute in the CCAA proceedings. The only "rights" of the Appellants that have been affected so far are that they cannot help select the decision-maker and they must participate in proceedings in the Court of Queen's Bench of Alberta. I do not consider that the order under appeal permanently affects the substantive contractual rights of the parties. It merely affects the forum in which those contractual rights will be assessed. This is a relatively minor incursion compared to the large benefit that may result from the CCAA proceedings. I assume that, in settling the details of the CCAA procedure, the chambers judge will take account of the Appellants' arguments and ensure that their substantive contractual rights are protected.

3. What is the Relationship between the Discretion of the Chambers Judge under s. 11 of the CCAA and s. 15 of the B.C. Arbitration Act?

73 It is apparent that I have taken a different approach than the chambers judge, who focussed largely on s. 15 of the B.C. Arbitration Act. He was correct in his opinion that, under that legislation, a stay must be ordered unless one of the three disabling events exists. If a case is governed by that legislation, a court should honour the choice of the parties to go to arbitration and has very limited power to refuse a stay of competing proceedings. Kaverit Steel and Crane Ltd. v. Kone Corp. (1992), 87 D.L.R. (4th) 129 (Alta. C.A.); Prince George (City) v. McElhanney Engineering Services Ltd., [1995] 9 W.W.R. 503 (B.C. C.A.).

74 He concluded that, as a result of Smoky's insolvency, the appointment of a Monitor, and the court's role under the CCAA, the agreement to arbitrate was "incapable of being performed". The Appellants say this conclusion was wrong.

75 But even if the chambers judge erred in interpreting s. 15, the outcome of this case would not change. There would then be a conflict between the CCAA and a provincial statute. The Appellants do not contest the constitutional validity of the CCAA. The authorities are clear that, in the event of a conflict with a provincial law, the CCAA must prevail.

Wynden Canada Inc. v. Gaz Métropolitain Inc. (1982), 44 C.B.R. (N.S.) 285 (Que. S.C.); Re Pacific National Lease Holding Corp., supra; Pacific National Lease Holding Corp. v. Sun Life Trust Co. (1995), 34 C.B.R. (3d) 4 (B.C. C.A.). Accordingly, it is not necessary to decide whether he misapplied s. 15.

76 For these reasons, I would dismiss the appeal.

HUNT J.A.
PICARD J.A.:-- I concur.
McINTYRE J.A.:-- I concur.

cp/i/kjm/qlsxs