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"

APPLICANTS

BOOK OF AUTHORITIES OF THE APPLICANTS

(Motion returnable September 8, 2010)

September 2, 2010

Osler, Hoskin & Harcourt LLP
P.O. Box 50
1 First Canadian Place
Toronto, ON M5X 1B8

Lyndon A.J. Barnes (LSUC#: 13350D)
Tel: (416) 862-6679

Jeremy E. Dacks (LSUC#: 41851R)
Tel: (416) 862-4923

Duncan Ault (LSUC# 53916R)
Tel: (416) 862.4733

Fax: (416) 862-6666

Lawyers for the Applicants

INDEX

INDEX

List of Cases

TAB 1

Case Name:

Canwest Global Communications Corp. (Re)

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

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

[2009] O.J. No. 4286

Court File No. CV-09-8241-OOCL

Ontario Superior Court of Justice
Commercial List

S.E. Pepall J.

October 13, 2009.

(60 paras.)

Counsel:

Lyndon Barnes, Edward Sellers and Jeremy Dacks, for the Applicants.

Alan Merskey, for the Special Committee of the Board of Directors.

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

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

Edmond Lamek, for the Asper Family.

Peter H. Griffin and Peter J. Osborne, for the Management Directors and Royal Bank of Canada.

Hilary Clarke, for Bank of Nova Scotia,

Steve Weisz, for CIT Business Credit Canada Inc.

REASONS FOR DECISION

S.E. PEPALL J.:--

Relief Requested

1 Canwest Global Communications Corp. ("Canwest Global"), its principal operating subsidiary, Canwest Media Inc. ("CMI"), and the other applicants listed on Schedule "A" of the Notice of Application apply for relief pursuant to the *Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act.*[1] The applicants also seek to have the stay of proceedings and other provisions extend to the following partnerships: Canwest Television Limited Partnership ("CTLP"), Fox Sports World Canada Partnership and The National Post Company/La Publication National Post ("The National Post Company"). The businesses operated by the applicants and the aforementioned partnerships include (i) Canwest's free-to-air television broadcast business (ie. the Global Television Network stations); (ii) certain subscription-based specialty television channels that are wholly owned and operated by CTLP; and (iii) the National Post.

2 The Canwest Global enterprise as a whole includes the applicants, the partnerships and Canwest Global's other subsidiaries that are not applicants. The term Canwest will be used to refer to the entire enterprise. The term CMI Entities will be used to refer to the applicants and the three aforementioned partnerships. The following entities are not applicants nor is a stay sought in respect of any of them: the entities in Canwest's newspaper publishing and digital media business in Canada (other than the National Post Company) namely the Canwest Limited Partnership, Canwest Publishing Inc./Publications Canwest Inc., Canwest Books Inc., and Canwest (Canada) Inc.; the Canadian subscription based specialty television channels acquired from Alliance Atlantis Communications Inc. in August, 2007 which are held jointly with Goldman Sachs Capital Partners and operated by CW Investments Co. and its subsidiaries; and subscription-based specialty television channels which are not wholly owned by CTLP.

3 No one appearing opposed the relief requested.

Backround Facts

4 Canwest is a leading Canadian media company with interests in twelve free-to-air television stations comprising the Global Television Network, subscription-based specialty television channels and newspaper publishing and digital media operations.

5 As of October 1, 2009, Canwest employed the full time equivalent of approximately 7,400 employees around the world. Of that number, the full time equivalent of approximately 1,700 are employed by the CMI Entities, the vast majority of whom work in Canada and 850 of whom work in Ontario.

6 Canwest Global owns 100% of CMI. CMI has direct or indirect ownership interests in all of the other CMI Entities. Ontario is the chief place of business of the CMI Entities.

7 Canwest Global is a public company continued under the *Canada Business Corporations Act*[2]. It has authorized capital consisting of an unlimited number of preference shares, multiple voting shares, subordinate voting shares, and non-voting shares. It is a "constrained-share company" which means that at least 66 2/3% of its voting shares must be beneficially owned by Canadians. The Asper family built the Canwest enterprise and family members hold various classes of shares. In April and May, 2009, corporate decision making was consolidated and streamlined.

8 The CMI Entities generate the majority of their revenue from the sale of advertising (approximately 77% on a consolidated basis). Fuelled by a deteriorating economic environment in Canada and elsewhere, in 2008 and 2009, they experienced a decline in their advertising revenues. This caused problems with cash flow and circumstances were exacerbated by their high fixed operating costs. In response to these conditions, the CMI Entities took steps to improve cash flow and to strengthen their balance sheets. They commenced workforce reductions and cost saving measures, sold certain interests and assets, and engaged in discussions with the CRTC and the Federal government on issues of concern.

9 Economic conditions did not improve nor did the financial circumstances of the CMI Entities. They experienced significant tightening of credit from critical suppliers and trade creditors, a further reduction of advertising commitments, demands for reduced credit terms by newsprint and printing suppliers, and restrictions on or cancellation of credit cards for certain employees.

10 In February, 2009, CMI breached certain of the financial covenants in its secured credit facility. It subsequently received waivers of the borrowing conditions on six occasions. On March 15, 2009, it failed to make an interest payment of US$30.4 million due on 8% senior subordinated notes. CMI entered into negotiations with an ad hoc committee of the 8% senior subordinated noteholders holding approximately 72% of the notes (the "Ad Hoc Committee"). An agreement was reached wherein CMI and its subsidiary CTLP agreed to issue US$105 million in 12% secured notes to members of the Ad Hoc Committee. At the same time, CMI entered into an agreement with CIT Business Credit Canada Inc. ("CIT") in which CIT agreed to provide a senior secured revolving asset based loan facility of up to $75 million. CMI used the funds generated for operations and to repay amounts owing on the senior credit facility with a syndicate of lenders of which the Bank of Nova Scotia was the administrative agent. These funds were also used to settle related swap obligations.

11 Canwest Global reports its financial results on a consolidated basis. As at May 31, 2009, it had

total consolidated assets with a net book value of $4.855 billion and total consolidated liabilities of $5.846 billion. The subsidiaries of Canwest Global that are not applicants or partnerships in this proceeding had short and long term debt totalling $2.742 billion as at May 31, 2009 and the CMI Entities had indebtedness of approximately $954 million. For the 9 months ended May 31, 2009, Canwest Global's consolidated revenues decreased by $272 million or 11% compared to the same period in 2008. In addition, operating income before amortization decreased by $253 million or 47%. It reported a consolidated net loss of $1.578 billion compared to $22 million for the same period in 2008. CMI reported that revenues for the Canadian television operations decreased by $8 million or 4% in the third quarter of 2009 and operating profit was $21 million compared to $39 million in the same period in 2008.

12 The board of directors of Canwest Global struck a special committee of the board ("the Special Committee") with a mandate to explore and consider strategic alternatives in order to maximize value. That committee appointed Thomas Strike, who is the President, Corporate Development and Strategy Implementation of Canwest Global, as Recapitalization Officer and retained Hap Stephen, who is the Chairman and CEO of Stonecrest Capital Inc., as a Restructuring Advisor ("CRA").

13 On September 15, 2009, CMI failed to pay US$30.4 million in interest payments due on the 8% senior subordinated notes.

14 On September 22, 2009, the board of directors of Canwest Global authorized the sale of all of the shares of Ten Network Holdings Limited (Australia) ("Ten Holdings") held by its subsidiary, Canwest Mediaworks Ireland Holdings ("CMIH"). Prior to the sale, the CMI Entities had consolidated indebtedness totalling US$939.9 million pursuant to three facilities. CMI had issued 8% unsecured notes in an aggregate principal amount of US$761,054,211. They were guaranteed by all of the CMI Entities except Canwest Global, and 30109, LLC. CMI had also issued 12% secured notes in an aggregate principal amount of US$94 million. They were guaranteed by the CMI Entities. Amongst others, Canwest's subsidiary, CMIH, was a guarantor of both of these facilities. The 12% notes were secured by first ranking charges against all of the property of CMI, CTLP and the guarantors. In addition, pursuant to a credit agreement dated May 22, 2009 and subsequently amended, CMI has a senior secured revolving asset-based loan facility in the maximum amount of $75 million with CIT Business Credit Canada Inc. ("CIT"). Prior to the sale, the debt amounted to $23.4 million not including certain letters of credit. The facility is guaranteed by CTLP, CMIH and others and secured by first ranking charges against all of the property of CMI, CTLP, CMIH and other guarantors. Significant terms of the credit agreement are described in paragraph 37 of the proposed Monitor's report. Upon a CCAA filing by CMI and commencement of proceedings under Chapter 15 of the Bankruptcy Code, the CIT facility converts into a DIP financing arrangement and increases to a maximum of $100 million.

15 Consents from a majority of the 8% senior subordinated noteholders were necessary to allow the sale of the Ten Holdings shares. A Use of Cash Collateral and Consent Agreement was entered

into by CMI, CMIH, certain consenting noteholders and others wherein CMIH was allowed to lend the proceeds of sale to CMI.

16 The sale of CMIH's interest in Ten Holdings was settled on October 1, 2009. Gross proceeds of approximately $634 million were realized. The proceeds were applied to fund general liquidity and operating costs of CMI, pay all amounts owing under the 12% secured notes and all amounts outstanding under the CIT facility except for certain letters of credit in an aggregate face amount of $10.7 million. In addition, a portion of the proceeds was used to reduce the amount outstanding with respect to the 8% senior subordinated notes leaving an outstanding indebtedness thereunder of US$393.25 million.

17 In consideration for the loan provided by CMIH to CMI, CMI issued a secured intercompany note in favour of CMIH in the principal amount of $187.3 million and an unsecured promissory note in the principal amount of $430.6 million. The secured note is subordinated to the CIT facility and is secured by a first ranking charge on the property of CMI and the guarantors. The payment of all amounts owing under the unsecured promissory note are subordinated and postponed in favour of amounts owing under the CIT facility. Canwest Global, CTLP and others have guaranteed the notes. It is contemplated that the debt that is the subject matter of the unsecured note will be compromised.

18 Without the funds advanced under the intercompany notes, the CMI Entities would be unable to meet their liabilities as they come due. The consent of the noteholders to the use of the Ten Holdings proceeds was predicated on the CMI Entities making this application for an Initial Order under the CCAA. Failure to do so and to take certain other steps constitute an event of default under the Use of Cash Collateral and Consent Agreement, the CIT facility and other agreements. The CMI Entities have insufficient funds to satisfy their obligations including those under the intercompany notes and the 8% senior subordinated notes.

19 The stay of proceedings under the CCAA is sought so as to allow the CMI Entities to proceed to develop a plan of arrangement or compromise to implement a consensual "pre-packaged" recapitalization transaction. The CMI Entities and the Ad Hoc Committee of noteholders have agreed on the terms of a going concern recapitalization transaction which is intended to form the basis of the plan. The terms are reflected in a support agreement and term sheet. The recapitalization transaction contemplates amongst other things, a significant reduction of debt and a debt for equity restructuring. The applicants anticipate that a substantial number of the businesses operated by the CMI Entities will continue as going concerns thereby preserving enterprise value for stakeholders and maintaining employment for as many as possible. As mentioned, certain steps designed to implement the recapitalization transaction have already been taken prior to the commencement of these proceedings.

20 CMI has agreed to maintain not more than $2.5 million as cash collateral in a deposit account with the Bank of Nova Scotia to secure cash management obligations owed to BNS. BNS holds first

ranking security against those funds and no court ordered charge attaches to the funds in the account.

21 The CMI Entities maintain eleven defined benefit pension plans and four defined contribution pension plans. There is an aggregate solvency deficiency of $13.3 million as at the last valuation date and a wind up deficiency of $32.8 million. There are twelve television collective agreements eleven of which are negotiated with the Communications, Energy and Paperworkers Union of Canada. The Canadian Union of Public Employees negotiated the twelfth television collective agreement. It expires on December 31, 2010. The other collective agreements are in expired status. None of the approximately 250 employees of the National Post Company are unionized. The CMI Entities propose to honour their payroll obligations to their employees, including all pre-filing wages and employee benefits outstanding as at the date of the commencement of the CCAA proceedings and payments in connection with their pension obligations.

Proposed Monitor

22 The applicants propose that FTI Consulting Canada Inc. serve as the Monitor in these proceedings. It is clearly qualified to act and has provided the Court with its consent to act. Neither FTI nor any of its representatives have served in any of the capacities prohibited by section of the amendments to the CCAA.

Proposed Order

23 I have reviewed in some detail the history that preceded this application. It culminated in the presentation of the within application and proposed order. Having reviewed the materials and heard submissions, I was satisfied that the relief requested should be granted.

24 This case involves a consideration of the amendments to the CCAA that were proclaimed in force on September 18, 2009. While these were long awaited, in many instances they reflect practices and principles that have been adopted by insolvency practitioners and developed in the jurisprudence and academic writings on the subject of the CCAA. In no way do the amendments change or detract from the underlying purpose of the CCAA, namely to provide debtor companies with the opportunity to extract themselves from financial difficulties notwithstanding insolvency and to reorganize their affairs for the benefit of stakeholders. In my view, the amendments should be interpreted and applied with that objective in mind.

(a) Threshhold Issues

25 Firstly, the applicants qualify as debtor companies under the CCAA. Their chief place of business is in Ontario. The applicants are affiliated debtor companies with total claims against them exceeding $5 million. The CMI Entities are in default of their obligations. CMI does not have the necessary liquidity to make an interest payment in the amount of US$30.4 million that was due on September 15, 2009 and none of the other CMI Entities who are all guarantors are able to make

such a payment either. The assets of the CMI Entities are insufficient to discharge all of the liabilities. The CMI Entities are unable to satisfy their debts as they come due and they are insolvent. They are insolvent both under the *Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act*[3] definition and under the more expansive definition of insolvency used in Re Stelco[4]. Absent these CCAA proceedings, the applicants would lack liquidity and would be unable to continue as going concerns. The CMI Entities have acknowledged their insolvency in the affidavit filed in support of the application.

26 Secondly, the required statement of projected cash-flow and other financial documents required under section 11(2) of the CCAA have been filed.

(b) Stay of Proceedings

27 Under section 11 of the CCAA, the Court has broad jurisdiction to grant a stay of proceedings and to give a debtor company a chance to develop a plan of compromise or arrangement. In my view, given the facts outlined, a stay is necessary to create stability and to allow the CMI Entities to pursue their restructuring.

(b) Partnerships and Foreign Subsidiaries

28 The applicants seek to extend the stay of proceedings and other relief to the aforementioned partnerships. The partnerships are intertwined with the applicants' ongoing operations. They own the National Post daily newspaper and Canadian free-to-air television assets and certain of its specialty television channels and some other television assets. These businesses constitute a significant portion of the overall enterprise value of the CMI Entities. The partnerships are also guarantors of the 8% senior subordinated notes.

29 While the CCAA definition of a company does not include a partnership or limited partnership, courts have repeatedly exercised their inherent jurisdiction to extend the scope of CCAA proceedings to encompass them. See for example Re Lehndorff General Partners Ltd.[5]; Re Smurfit-Stone Container Canada Inc.[6]; and *Re Calpine Canada Energy Ltd.*[7]. In this case, the partnerships carry on operations that are integral and closely interrelated to the business of the applicants. The operations and obligations of the partnerships are so intertwined with those of the applicants that irreparable harm would ensue if the requested stay were not granted. In my view, it is just and convenient to grant the relief requested with respect to the partnerships.

30 Certain applicants are foreign subsidiaries of CMI. Each is a guarantor under the 8% senior subordinated notes, the CIT credit agreement (and therefore the DIP facility), the intercompany notes and is party to the support agreement and the Use of Cash Collateral and Consent Agreement. If the stay of proceedings was not extended to these entities, creditors could seek to enforce their guarantees. I am persuaded that the foreign subsidiary applicants as that term is defined in the affidavit filed are debtor companies within the meaning of section 2 of the CCAA and that I have jurisdiction and ought to grant the order requested as it relates to them. In this regard, I note that they are insolvent and each holds assets in Ontario in that they each maintain funds on deposit at the

Bank of Nova Scotia in Toronto. See in this regard *Re Cadillac Fairview*[8] and *Re Global Light Telecommunications Ltd.*[9]

(c) DIP Financing

31 Turning to the DIP financing, the premise underlying approval of DIP financing is that it is a benefit to all stakeholders as it allows the debtors to protect going-concern value while they attempt to devise a plan acceptable to creditors. While in the past, courts relied on inherent jurisdiction to approve the terms of a DIP financing charge, the September 18, 2009 amendments to the CCAA now expressly provide jurisdiction to grant a DIP financing charge. Section 11.2 of the Act states:

> (1) On application by a debtor company and on notice to the secured creditors who are likely to be affected by the security or charge, a court may make an order declaring that all or part of the company's property is subject to a security or charge -- in an amount that the court considers appropriate -- in favour of a person specified in the order who agrees to lend to the company an amount approved by the court as being required by the company, having regard to its cash-flow statement. The security or charge may not secure an obligation that exists before the order is made.
>
> (2) The court may order that the security or charge rank in priority over the claim of any secured creditor of the company.
>
> (3) The court may order that the security or charge rank in priority over any security or charge arising from a previous order made under subsection (1) only with the consent of the person in whose favour the previous order was made.
>
> (4) In deciding whether to make an order, the court is to consider, among other things,
>
> > (*aa*) the period during which the company is expected to be subject to proceedings under this Act;
> >
> > (*b*) how the company's business and financial affairs are to be managed during the proceedings;
> >
> > (*c*) whether the company's management has the confidence of its major creditors;
> >
> > (*d*) whether the loan would enhance the prospects of a viable compromise or arrangement being made in respect of the company;

(*e*) the nature and value of the company's property;

(*f*) whether any creditor would be materially prejudiced as a result of the security or charge; and

(*g*) the monitor's report referred to in paragraph 23(1)(*b*), if any.

32 In light of the language of section 11.2(1), the first issue to consider is whether notice has been given to secured creditors who are likely to be affected by the security or charge. Paragraph 57 of the proposed order affords priority to the DIP charge, the administration charge, the Directors' and Officers' charge and the KERP charge with the following exception: "any validly perfected purchase money security interest in favour of a secured creditor or any statutory encumbrance existing on the date of this order in favour of any person which is a "secured creditor" as defined in the CCAA in respect of any of source deductions from wages, employer health tax, workers compensation, GST/QST, PST payables, vacation pay and banked overtime for employees, and amounts under the Wage Earners' Protection Program that are subject to a super priority claim under the BIA". This provision coupled with the notice that was provided satisfied me that secured creditors either were served or are unaffected by the DIP charge. This approach is both consistent with the legislation and practical.

33 Secondly, the Court must determine that the amount of the DIP is appropriate and required having regard to the debtors' cash-flow statement. The DIP charge is for up to $100 million. Prior to entering into the CIT facility, the CMI Entities sought proposals from other third party lenders for a credit facility that would convert to a DIP facility should the CMI Entities be required to file for protection under the CCAA. The CIT facility was the best proposal submitted. In this case, it is contemplated that implementation of the plan will occur no later than April 15, 2010. The total amount of cash on hand is expected to be down to approximately $10 million by late December, 2009 based on the cash flow forecast. The applicants state that this is an insufficient cushion for an enterprise of this magnitude. The cash-flow statements project the need for the liquidity provided by the DIP facility for the recapitalization transaction to be finalized. The facility is to accommodate additional liquidity requirements during the CCAA proceedings. It will enable the CMI Entities to operate as going concerns while pursuing the implementation and completion of a viable plan and will provide creditors with assurances of same. I also note that the proposed facility is simply a conversion of the pre-existing CIT facility and as such, it is expected that there would be no material prejudice to any of the creditors of the CMI Entities that arises from the granting of the DIP charge. I am persuaded that the amount is appropriate and required.

34 Thirdly, the DIP charge must not and does not secure an obligation that existed before the order was made. The only amount outstanding on the CIT facility is $10.7 in outstanding letters of credit. These letters of credit are secured by existing security and it is proposed that that security

rank ahead of the DIP charge.

35 Lastly, I must consider amongst others, the enumerated factors in paragraph 11.2(4) of the Act. I have already addressed some of them. The Management Directors of the applicants as that term is used in the materials filed will continue to manage the CMI Entities during the CCAA proceedings. It would appear that management has the confidence of its major creditors. The CMI Entities have appointed a CRA and a Restructuring Officer to negotiate and implement the recapitalization transaction and the aforementioned directors will continue to manage the CMI Entities during the CCAA proceedings. The DIP facility will enhance the prospects of a completed restructuring. CIT has stated that it will not convert the CIT facility into a DIP facility if the DIP charge is not approved. In its report, the proposed Monitor observes that the ability to borrow funds from a court approved DIP facility secured by the DIP charge is crucial to retain the confidence of the CMI Entities' creditors, employees and suppliers and would enhance the prospects of a viable compromise or arrangement being made. The proposed Monitor is supportive of the DIP facility and charge.

36 For all of these reasons, I was prepared to approve the DIP facility and charge.

(d) Administration Charge

37 While an administration charge was customarily granted by courts to secure the fees and disbursements of the professional advisors who guided a debtor company through the CCAA process, as a result of the amendments to the CCAA, there is now statutory authority to grant such a charge. Section 11.52 of the CCAA states:

> (1) On notice to the secured creditors who are likely to be affected by the security or charge, the court may make an order declaring that all or part of the property of a debtor company is subject to a security or charge -- in an amount that the court considers appropriate -- in respect of the fees and expenses of
>
> > (*a*) the monitor, including the fees and expenses of any financial, legal or other experts engaged by the monitor in the performance of the monitor's duties;
> >
> > (*b*) any financial, legal or other experts engaged by the company for the purpose of proceedings under this Act; and
> >
> > (*c*) any financial, legal or other experts engaged by any other interested person if the court is satisfied that the security or charge is necessary for their effective participation in proceedings under this Act.

(2) The court may order that the security or charge rank in priority over the claim of any secured creditor of the company.

38 I must therefore be convinced that (1) notice has been given to the secured creditors likely to be affected by the charge; (2) the amount is appropriate; and (3) the charge should extend to all of the proposed beneficiaries.

39 As with the DIP charge, the issue relating to notice to affected secured creditors has been addressed appropriately by the applicants. The amount requested is up to $15 million. The beneficiaries of the charge are: the Monitor and its counsel; counsel to the CMI Entities; the financial advisor to the Special Committee and its counsel; counsel to the Management Directors; the CRA; the financial advisor to the Ad Hoc Committee; and RBC Capital Markets and its counsel. The proposed Monitor supports the aforementioned charge and considers it to be required and reasonable in the circumstances in order to preserve the going concern operations of the CMI Entities. The applicants submit that the above-note professionals who have played a necessary and integral role in the restructuring activities to date are necessary to implement the recapitalization transaction.

40 Estimating quantum is an inexact exercise but I am prepared to accept the amount as being appropriate. There has obviously been extensive negotiation by stakeholders and the restructuring is of considerable magnitude and complexity. I was prepared to accept the submissions relating to the administration charge. I have not included any requirement that all of these professionals be required to have their accounts scrutinized and approved by the Court but they should not preclude this possibility.

(e) Critical Suppliers

41 The next issue to consider is the applicants' request for authorization to pay pre-filing amounts owed to critical suppliers. In recognition that one of the purposes of the CCAA is to permit an insolvent corporation to remain in business, typically courts exercised their inherent jurisdiction to grant such authorization and a charge with respect to the provision of essential goods and services. In the recent amendments, Parliament codified the practice of permitting the payment of pre-filing amounts to critical suppliers and the provision of a charge. Specifically, section 11.4 provides:

(1) On application by a debtor company and on notice to the secured creditors who are likely to be affected by the security or charge, the court may make an order declaring a person to be a critical supplier to the company if the court is satisfied that the person is a supplier of goods or services to the company and that the goods or services that are supplied are critical to the company's continued operation.

(2) If the court declares a person to be a critical supplier, the court may make an

order requiring the person to supply any goods or services specified by the court to the company on any terms and conditions that are consistent with the supply relationship or that the court considers appropriate.

(3) If the court makes an order under subsection (2), the court shall, in the order, declare that all or part of the property of the company is subject to a security or charge in favour of the person declared to be a critical supplier, in an amount equal to the value of the goods or services supplied under the terms of the order.

(4) The court may order that the security or charge rank in priority over the claim of any secured creditor of the company.

42 Under these provisions, the Court must be satisfied that there has been notice to creditors likely to be affected by the charge, the person is a supplier of goods or services to the company, and that the goods or services that are supplied are critical to the company's continued operation. While one might interpret section 11.4 (3) as requiring a charge any time a person is declared to be a critical supplier, in my view, this provision only applies when a court is compelling a person to supply. The charge then provides protection to the unwilling supplier.

43 In this case, no charge is requested and no additional notice is therefore required. Indeed, there is an issue as to whether in the absence of a request for a charge, section 11.4 is even applicable and the Court is left to rely on inherent jurisdiction. The section seems to be primarily directed to the conditions surrounding the granting of a charge to secure critical suppliers. That said, even if it is applicable, I am satisfied that the applicants have met the requirements. The CMI Entities seek authorization to make certain payments to third parties that provide goods and services integral to their business. These include television programming suppliers given the need for continuous and undisturbed flow of programming, newsprint suppliers given the dependency of the National Post on a continuous and uninterrupted supply of newsprint to enable it to publish and on newspaper distributors, and the American Express Corporate Card Program and Central Billed Accounts that are required for CMI Entity employees to perform their job functions. No payment would be made without the consent of the Monitor. I accept that these suppliers are critical in nature. The CMI Entities also seek more general authorization allowing them to pay other suppliers if in the opinion of the CMI Entities, the supplier is critical. Again, no payment would be made without the consent of the Monitor. In addition, again no charge securing any payments is sought. This is not contrary to the language of section 11.4 (1) or to its purpose. The CMI Entities seek the ability to pay other suppliers if in their opinion the supplier is critical to their business and ongoing operations. The order requested is facilitative and practical in nature. The proposed Monitor supports the applicants' request and states that it will work to ensure that payments to suppliers in respect of pre-filing liabilities are minimized. The Monitor is of course an officer of the Court and is always able to seek direction from the Court if necessary. In addition, it will report on any such additional payments when it files its reports for Court approval. In the circumstances outlined, I am prepared to grant the relief requested in this regard.

(f) Directors' and Officers' Charge

44 The applicants also seek a directors' and officers' ("D &O") charge in the amount of $20 million. The proposed charge would rank after the administration charge, the existing CIT security, and the DIP charge. It would rank pari passu with the KERP charge discussed subsequently in this endorsement but postponed in right of payment to the extent of the first $85 million payable under the secured intercompany note.

45 Again, the recent amendments to the CCAA allow for such a charge. Section 11.51 provides that:

> (1) On application by a debtor company and on notice to the secured creditors who are likely to be affected by the security or charge, the court may make an order declaring that all or part of the property of the company is subject to a security or charge -- in an amount that the court considers appropriate -- in favour of any director or officer of the company to indemnify the director or officer against obligations and liabilities that they may incur as a director or officer of the company
>
> (2) The court may order that the security or charge rank in priority over the claim of any secured creditor of the company.
>
> (3) The court may not make the order if in its opinion the company could obtain adequate indemnification insurance for the director or officer at a reasonable cost.
>
> (4) The court shall make an order declaring that the security or charge does not apply in respect of a specific obligation or liability incurred by a director or officer if in its opinion the obligation or liability was incurred as a result of the director's or officer's gross negligence or wilful misconduct or, in Quebec, the director's or officer's gross or intentional fault.

46 I have already addressed the issue of notice to affected secured creditors. I must also be satisfied with the amount and that the charge is for obligations and liabilities the directors and officers may incur after the commencement of proceedings. It is not to extend to coverage of wilful misconduct or gross negligence and no order should be granted if adequate insurance at a reasonable cost could be obtained.

47 The proposed Monitor reports that the amount of $20 million was estimated taking into consideration the existing D&O insurance and the potential liabilities which may attach including certain employee related and tax related obligations. The amount was negotiated with the DIP lender and the Ad Hoc Committee. The order proposed speaks of indemnification relating to the failure of any of the CMI Entities, after the date of the order, to make certain payments. It also excludes gross negligence and wilful misconduct. The D&O insurance provides for $30 million in coverage and $10 million in excess coverage for a total of $40 million. It will expire in a matter of weeks and Canwest Global has been unable to obtain additional or replacement coverage. I am advised that it also extends to others in the Canwest enterprise and not just to the CMI Entities. The

directors and senior management are described as highly experienced, fully functional and qualified. The directors have indicated that they cannot continue in the restructuring effort unless the order includes the requested directors' charge.

48 The purpose of such a charge is to keep the directors and officers in place during the restructuring by providing them with protection against liabilities they could incur during the restructuring: *Re General Publishing Co.*[10] Retaining the current directors and officers of the applicants would avoid destabilization and would assist in the restructuring. The proposed charge would enable the applicants to keep the experienced board of directors supported by experienced senior management. The proposed Monitor believes that the charge is required and is reasonable in the circumstances and also observes that it will not cover all of the directors' and officers' liabilities in the worst case scenario. In all of these circumstances, I approved the request.

(g) Key Employee Retention Plans

49 Approval of a KERP and a KERP charge are matters of discretion. In this case, the CMI Entities have developed KERPs that are designed to facilitate and encourage the continued participation of certain of the CMI Entities' senior executives and other key employees who are required to guide the CMI Entities through a successful restructuring with a view to preserving enterprise value. There are 20 KERP participants all of whom are described by the applicants as being critical to the successful restructuring of the CMI Entities. Details of the KERPs are outlined in the materials and the proposed Monitor's report. A charge of $5.9 million is requested. The three Management Directors are seasoned executives with extensive experience in the broadcasting and publishing industries. They have played critical roles in the restructuring initiatives taken to date. The applicants state that it is probable that they would consider other employment opportunities if the KERPs were not secured by a KERP charge. The other proposed participants are also described as being crucial to the restructuring and it would be extremely difficult to find replacements for them.

50 Significantly in my view, the Monitor who has scrutinized the proposed KERPs and charge is supportive. Furthermore, they have been approved by the Board, the Special Committee, the Human Resources Committee of Canwest Global and the Ad Hoc Committee. The factors enumerated in *Re Grant Forest*[11] have all been met and I am persuaded that the relief in this regard should be granted.

51 The applicants ask that the Confidential Supplement containing unredacted copies of the KERPs that reveal individually identifiable information and compensation information be sealed. Generally speaking, judges are most reluctant to grant sealing orders. An open court and public access are fundamental to our system of justice. Section 137(2) of the *Courts of Justice Act* provides authority to grant a sealing order and the Supreme Court of Canada's decision in *Sierra Club of Canada v. Canada (Minister of Finance)*[12] provides guidance on the appropriate legal principles to be applied. Firstly, the Court must be satisfied that the order is necessary in order to prevent a serious risk to an important interest, including a commercial interest, in the context of litigation

because reasonable alternative measures will not prevent the risk. Secondly, the salutary effects of the order should outweigh its deleterious effects including the effects on the right to free expression which includes the public interest in open and accessible court proceedings.

52 In this case, the unredacted KERPs reveal individually identifiable information including compensation information. Protection of sensitive personal and compensation information the disclosure of which could cause harm to the individuals and to the CMI Entities is an important commercial interest that should be protected. The KERP participants have a reasonable expectation that their personal information would be kept confidential. As to the second branch of the test, the aggregate amount of the KERPs has been disclosed and the individual personal information adds nothing. It seems to me that this second branch of the test has been met. The relief requested is granted.

Annual Meeting

53 The CMI Entities seek an order postponing the annual general meeting of shareholders of Canwest Global. Pursuant to section 133 (1)(b) of the CBCA, a corporation is required to call an annual meeting by no later than February 28, 2010, being six months after the end of its preceding financial year which ended on August 31, 2009. Pursuant to section 133 (3), despite subsection (1), the corporation may apply to the court for an order extending the time for calling an annual meeting.

54 CCAA courts have commonly granted extensions of time for the calling of an annual general meeting. In this case, the CMI Entities including Canwest Global are devoting their time to stabilizing business and implementing a plan. Time and resources would be diverted if the time was not extended as requested and the preparation for and the holding of the annual meeting would likely impede the timely and desirable restructuring of the CMI Entities. Under section 106(6) of the CBCA, if directors of a corporation are not elected, the incumbent directors continue. Financial and other information will be available on the proposed Monitor's website. An extension is properly granted.

Other

55 The applicants request authorization to commence Chapter 15 proceedings in the U.S. Continued timely supply of U.S. network and other programming is necessary to preserve going concern value. Commencement of Chapter 15 proceedings to have the CCAA proceedings recognized as "foreign main proceedings" is a prerequisite to the conversion of the CIT facility into the DIP facility. Authorization is granted.

56 Canwest's various corporate and other entities share certain business services. They are seeking to continue to provide and receive inter-company services in the ordinary course during the CCAA proceedings. This is supported by the proposed Monitor and FTI will monitor and report to the Court on matters pertaining to the provision of inter-company services.

57 Section 23 of the amended CCAA now addresses certain duties and functions of the Monitor including the provision of notice of an Initial Order although the Court may order otherwise. Here the financial threshold for notice to creditors has been increased from $1000 to $5000 so as to reduce the burden and cost of such a process. The proceedings will be widely published in the media and the Initial Order is to be posted on the Monitor's website. Other meritorious adjustments were also made to the notice provisions.

58 This is a "pre-packaged" restructuring and as such, stakeholders have negotiated and agreed on the terms of the requested order. That said, not every stakeholder was before me. For this reason, interested parties are reminded that the order includes the usual come back provision. The return date of any motion to vary, rescind or affect the provisions relating to the CIT credit agreement or the CMI DIP must be no later than November 5, 2009.

59 I have obviously not addressed every provision in the order but have attempted to address some key provisions. In support of the requested relief, the applicants filed a factum and the proposed Monitor filed a report. These were most helpful. A factum is required under Rule 38.09 of the Rules of Civil Procedure. Both a factum and a proposed Monitor's report should customarily be filed with a request for an Initial Order under the CCAA.

Conclusion

60 Weak economic conditions and a high debt load do not a happy couple make but clearly many of the stakeholders have been working hard to produce as desirable an outcome as possible in the circumstances. Hopefully the cooperation will persist.

S.E. PEPALL J.

cp/e/qlafr/qljxr/qljxh

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

2 R.S.C. 1985, c.C.44.

3 R.S.C. 1985, c. B-3, as amended.

4 *(2004), 48 C.B.R. (4th) 299; leave to appeal refused 2004 CarswellOnt 2936 (C.A.).*

5 *(1993), 9 B.L.R. (2d) 275.*

6 [2009] O.J. No. 349.

7 (2006), 19 C.B.R. (5th) 187.

8 (1995), 30 C.B.R. (3d) 29.

9 (2004), 33 B.C.L.R. (4th) 155.

10 *(2003), 39 C.B.R. (4th) 216.*

11 [2009] O.J. No. 3344. That said, given the nature of the relationship between a board of directors and senior management, it may not always be appropriate to give undue consideration to the principle of business judgment.

12 [2002] 2 S.C.R. 522.

TAB 2

Court File Number: CV-09-8396-00CL

Superior Court of Justice
Commercial List

FILE/DIRECTION/ORDER

Canwest - CMI Entities
Plaintiff(s)

AND

Defendant(s)

Case Management ☑ Yes ☐ No by Judge: Pepall

Counsel	Telephone No.:	Facsimile No.:
See attached		

☑ Order ☐ Direction for Registrar **(No formal order need be taken out)**
☐ Above action transferred to the Commercial List at Toronto **(No formal order need be taken out)**

☐ Adjourned to: _____
☐ Time Table approved (as follows):

The CMI Entities seek an order approving the Aircraft sale Agreement with First Canadian Aviation Inc + Tribal Councils Investment Group of Manitoba Ltd dated May 1, 2010, a vesting order, + a sealing order. The subject matter of the sale agreement is a 1988 Hawker 800A corporate aircraft.

Section 36 of the CCAA is applicable. Notice pursuant to s36(2) has been given to secured creditors likely affected. The sale is not to a related person as described in s36(4).

As to the factors enumerated in s36(3), I note the following. The aircraft was not formally listed for sale nor ~~did~~ was an aircraft broker retained. That said, the primary market is in the US + $100,000 in modifications would be required for a sale there; a 5% listing fee would be required; + the CMI Entities were aware already of parties

March 4/2010
Date

K. Pepall
Judge's Signature

☑ Additional Pages 1

Court File Number: _____

Superior Court of Justice
Commercial List

FILE/DIRECTION/ORDER

Judges Endorsement Continued amayst other things,

with an interest. They obtained a 2008/09 marketing report & an Aircraft Blue Book Price Digest + a Zinc - Dec 09 Marketing Report containing market data. They had discussions with a number of possible purchasers + received 3 formal offers. The Monitor concluded that a satisfactory + good faith efforts had been made to obtain the best price + the sale under a bankruptcy would not be more beneficial to the creditors of the CMI Entities. The Monitor considered the process leading to the proposed sale + the proposed consideration + supports the subject transaction.

The consideration exceeds that offered by any other + is the same as that offered by another bidder with fewer conditions. The conditions to closing have all been satisfied subject to final approval of the monitor

The transaction is supported by the CMI CRA, the Ad Hoc Group, CIT + Bluequest + is monitored, the Monitor. It divests the CMI Entities of a non-core asset, avoids expenses + eliminates significant fixed + ongoing operating costs.

Section 36(3) is applicable. I am satisfied that there has been compliance with the remaining requirements of s 36 + that the sale should be authorized + the order requested granted.

As to the request for a sealing order for the confidential supplement filed by the Monitor, the 2 branches of the Sierra Club v Canada [2002] 2 SCR 522 test have been met + I accept the arguments in that regard set forth - paragraphs 60-62 of the Applicants factum.

SO Pepall, J

Page 2 of 2

Judges Initials _____

TAB 3

[Indexed as: Royal Oak Mines Inc., Re]

In the Matter of the Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act, R.S.C. 1985, c. C-36, as amended

In the Matter of the Courts of Justice Act, R.S.O., 1990, C. C-43, as amended

In the Matter of a Plan of Compromise or Arrangement of Royal Oak Mines Inc., and others

Ontario Court of Justice, General Division [Commercial List]

Blair J.

Judgment: March 10, 1999

Docket: 99-CL-003278

David E. Baird, Q.C., and *Mario J. Forte*, for Applicants.
Peter H. Griffin, for Trilon Financial Corporation and Northgate Exploration Limited.
Ronald N. Robertson, Q.C., for Unofficial Senior Subordinated Noteholders' Committee.
Sean Dunphy, for Bankers Trust and Macquarrie Limited.
Hilary Clarke, for Bank of Nova Scotia.

Corporations — Arrangements and compromises — Under Companies' Creditors Arrangements Act — Arrangements — Approval by court — Miscellaneous issues — Debtor company applied for initial order pursuant to Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act — Relief sought included debtor-in-possession financing super-priority, stay of proceedings, and permission to conduct certain operations and take certain restructuring steps — Relief sought also included power to borrow and charge property, to impose charge as liability protection in favour of directors, to not pay creditors, permission to file plan of arrangement, appointment of monitor and inclusion of general terms, including come back clauses — Debtor was supported by two senior secured lenders and by unofficial creditors' committee of senior secured subordinated noteholders — Group of hedge lenders opposed scope and extent of relief as being broad and overreaching — Other creditors received short notice or no notice of application — Application granted — Initial order approved but in more limited scope than requested — Relief sought extended beyond bounds of procedural fairness — Language of order not to read like trust indenture but to be clear, simple and readily understandable — Initial order to contain declaration that applicant had standing to apply, authorization to file plan of compromise, appointment of monitor and its duties and to contain comeback clause — Initial order to put in place stay provisions and operating, financing and restructuring terms reasonably necessary for continued operation of debtor during brief but realistic sorting-out period on urgent basis — Proliferation of advisory committees and extension of broad protection to directors are better left for orders other than initial order — Comeback clauses not to be used to provide answer to overreaching initial orders — Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act, R.S.C. 1985, c. C-36, s. 11(3), (4).

Cases considered by *Blair J.*:

Bank of America Canada v. Willann Investments Ltd. (February 6, 1991), Doc. B22/91 (Ont. Gen. Div.) — referred to

Canadian Asbestos Services Ltd. v. Bank of Montreal, 16 C.B.R. (3d) 114, [1992] G.S.T.C. 15, 11 O.R. (3d) 353, 93 D.T.C. 5001, 5 C.L.R. (2d) 54, [1993] 1 C.T.C. 48, 5 T.C.T. 4328 (Ont. Gen. Div.) — referred to

Canadian Asbestos Services Ltd. v. Bank of Montreal, 13 O.R. (3d) 291, 10 C.L.R. (2d) 204, [1993] G.S.T.C. 23, 1 G.T.C. 6169 (Ont. Gen. Div.) — referred to

Dylex Ltd., Re (January 23, 1995), Doc. B-4/95 (Ont. Gen. Div.) — referred to

Lehndorff General Partner Ltd., Re (1993), 17 C.B.R. (3d) 24, 9 B.L.R. (2d) 275 (Ont. Gen. Div. [Commercial List]) — referred to

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

Quintette Coal Ltd., Re (1992), 13 C.B.R. (3d) 146, 68 B.C.L.R. (2d) 219 (B.C. S.C.) — referred to

Statutes considered:

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

Generally — considered

s. 3(1) — referred to

s. 11 [rep. & sub. 1997, c. 12, s. 124] — considered

s. 11(3) [rep. & sub. 1997, c. 12, s. 124] — considered

s. 11(3)(a)-11(3)(c) [en. 1997, c. 12, s. 124] — considered

s. 11(4) [en. 1997, c. 12, s. 124] — considered

APPLICATION by debtor company for initial order pursuant to s. 11 of *Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act.*

Blair J.:

1 These reasons are an expanded version of an endorsement made at the time of the granting of an Initial Order in favour of the Applicants under the Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act, R.S.C. 1985, c. C-36, as amended, on February 15, 1999. At the time, I indicated that I would release additional reasons with respect to certain of the issues raised on the Initial Application at a later date. In doing so, I propose to incorporate significant portions of the earlier handwritten endorsement.

2 Royal Oak Mines Inc. ("Royal Oak"), and a series of related corporations, applied for the protection of the Court afforded by the Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act (the "CCAA") while they endeavour to negotiate a restructuring of their debt with their creditors. Royal Oak is a publicly traded mining company of considerable import in the mining industry. It currently operates four gold and copper mines (two in the Timmins area of Ontario, one in Yellowknife in the North West Territories, and one (the

Kemess mine) in the interior of British Columbia). The Company employs approximately 960 people (about 300 in Ontario, 280 in the North West Territories, 348 in British Columbia, 27 at its corporate headquarters in Seattle, and 5 in the Province of Newfoundland).

3 Royal Oak is supported in this CCAA Application by Trilon Financial Corporation and Northgate Exploration Limited, the senior secured lenders who are owed approximately $180 million, and by the unofficial creditors' committee of the Senior Secured Subordinated Noteholders who are owed about $264 million. A group of three other lenders, known in the jargon of the industry as the "Hedge Lenders", and who have advanced approximately $50 million to Royal Oak, stands between the former two groups, in terms of priority. The three Hedge Lenders — Bankers Trust, Macquarrie Limited of Australia, and Bank of Nova Scotia — did not strenuously oppose the granting of an Initial CCAA Order in principle; however, they questioned the scope and extent of some of the relief sought, arguing that it was unnecessarily broad and "overreaching", particularly where they had only been given short notice of the Application and where some creditors had been given none.

4 There are construction lien claimants in the Province of British Columbia, they point out, who have lien claims against the Kemess Mine totalling about $18 million, and whose claims are admittedly prior to those of *any* other secured creditor in relation to that asset. Yet the lien claimants were not given notice of these proceedings. In addition, Export Development Corporation has a claim for about $19.5 million and had not been given notice.

5 Falling world prices for gold and copper, environmental concerns with their attendant costs, and construction and start-up costs relating to the Kemess Mine in particular, have led to Royal Oak's current financial crunch. It is insolvent. I was quite satisfied on the evidence in Ms. Witte's affidavit, and on the other materials filed, that the Applicants met the statutory requirements for the granting of an Initial Order under section 11 of the CCAA, and that it was appropriate and just in the circumstances for the Court to grant the protection sought on an Initial Order basis, while the Applicants attempt to restructure their affairs and to elicit the approval and support of their creditors to such a restructuring. Accordingly, an Initial Order was granted on February 15, 1999. There have been certain adjustments and variations made to that Order since then.

6 In view of some of the important concerns raised by Mr. Dunphy and Ms. Clarke on behalf of the Hedge Lenders about the details and reach of the Order sought, however, I indicated that the Court was not prepared to

approve it in its entirely at this stage. The Initial Order as granted was therefore somewhat more limited in scope than that requested. Somewhat more expanded reasons than those set out in the handwritten endorsement made at the time were to follow. These are those reasons.

Initial CCAA Orders

7 Section 11 of the CCAA is the provision of the Act embodying the broad and flexible statutory power invested in the court to "grant its protection" to an applicant by imposing a stay of proceedings against the applicant company, subject to terms, while the company attempts to negotiate a restructuring of its debt with its creditors. It is well established that the provisions of the Act are remedial in nature, and that they should be given a broad and liberal interpretation in order to facilitate compromises and arrangements between companies and their creditors, and to keep companies in business where that end can reasonably be achieved: see, *Nova Metal Products Inc. v. Comiskey (Trustee of)* (1990), 1 C.B.R. (3d) 101 (Ont. C.A.), per Doherty J.A.; *Lehndorff General Partner Ltd., Re* (1993), 17 C.B.R. (3d) 24 (Ont. Gen. Div. [Commercial List]), at p. 31; "*Reorganizations Under the Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act*", Stanley E. Edwards, (1947) 25 Can. Bar Rev. 587 at p. 593 referred to with approval by Thackray J. in *Quintette Coal Ltd., Re* (1992), 13 C.B.R. (3d) 146 (B.C. S.C.) at p. 173.

8 In the utilization of the CCAA for this broad purpose a practice has developed whereby the application is "pre-packaged" to a significant extent before relief is sought from the Court. That is, the debtor company seeks to obtain the consent and support of its major creditors to a CCAA process, and to its major terms and conditions, before the application is launched. This has been my experience in the course of supervising more than a few such proceedings. The practice is a healthy and effective one in my view, and is to be commended and encouraged. Nonetheless, it has led in some ways to the problem which is the subject of these reasons.

9 The problem centers around the growing complexity of the Initial Orders sought under s. 11(3) of the Act, and the increasing tendency to attempt to incorporate into such orders provisions to meet every eventuality that might conceivably arise during the course of the CCAA process. Included in this latter category is the matter of debtor-in-possession ("DIP") financing, calling — as it frequently does — for a "super priority" position over all other secured lending then in place.

10 Initial Orders under the CCAA are almost invariably sought on short notice to many of the creditors and, not infrequently, without any notice to

others. I note as well that the Court is also asked in most cases to respond on short notice and with little advance opportunity to examine the materials filed in support of the application. This is because the materials, for very practical reasons, are not usually ready for filing until just before the filing is made. I make these observations not to be critical in any way, but simply to point out the realities of the context in which the application for the Initial Order is usually determined.

11 This case falls into both the "short notice" and "no notice" categories. The Hedge Lenders, at least, received only very short notice of the Application on February 15th. Neither the Kemess Lien Claimants in British Columbia nor Export Development Corporation were given any notice. Yet the Court was asked to grant super priority funding, which would rank ahead of even the Lien Claimants (who have admitted priority over everyone), without their knowledge or consent, and which would rank ahead of the Hedge Lenders who had not yet had a reasonable opportunity to consider their position or (given an American holiday) for their counsel to obtain meaningful instructions. The Initial Order which was originally sought in the proceeding consisted of 58 paragraphs of highly complex and sophisticated language. It was 28 pages in length. In addition, it had an 11 page Term Sheet annexed as a Schedule to it. It dealt with,

(a) the stay of proceedings (7 paragraphs, 4½; pages);

(b) permitted operations by the Applicants during the CCAA period (4 paragraphs, 3½; pages);

(c) restructuring steps permitted (8 paragraphs, 3 pages);

(d) the power to borrow and the charging of property (15 paragraphs, 5 pages);

(e) a charge to be imposed as a liability protection in favour of directors (2 elaborate paragraphs, spanning 4 pages);

(f) non-payment of creditors (one paragraph, ⅓ page);

(g) permission to file a plan of arrangement (2 paragraphs, ⅓ pages);

(h) appointment and duties of the Monitor (9 paragraphs, 5 pages); and,

(i) general terms, including the "come back" clauses (6 paragraphs, 1½; pages).

12 What is at issue here is not the principle of the Court granting relief of the foregoing nature in CCAA proceedings. That principle is well enough imbedded in the broad jurisdiction referred to earlier in these reasons. In particular, it is not the tenet of DIP financing itself, or super priority financ-

ing, which were being questioned. There is sufficient authority for present purposes to justify the granting of such relief in principle: see, *Canadian Asbestos Services Ltd. v. Bank of Montreal* (1992), 11 O.R. (3d) 353 (Ont. Gen. Div.), (Chadwick J.) at pp. 359-361, supplemental reasons and leave to appeal granted (1993), 13 O.R. (3d) 291 (Ont. Gen. Div.); *Bank of America Canada v. Willann Investments Ltd.* (February 6, 1991), Doc. B22/91 (Ont. Gen. Div.), (Austin J); *Dylex Ltd., Re* (January 23, 1995), Doc. B-4/95 (Ont. Gen. Div.), (Houlden J.A.). It was the granting of such relief on the broad terms sought here, and the wisdom of that growing practice — without the benefit of interested persons having the opportunity to review such terms and, if so advised, to comment favourably or neutrally or unfavourably, on them — which was called into question.

13 There is justification in the call for caution, in my view. The scope and the parameters of the relief to be granted at the Initial Order stage — in conjunction with the dynamics of no notice, short notice, and the initial statutory stay period provided for in subsection 11(3) of the Act — require some consideration.

14 I have alluded to the highly complex and sophisticated nature of the Initial Order which was originally sought in this proceeding. The statutory source from which this emanation grew, however, is relatively simple and straightforward. Subsection 11(3) of the CCAA — which is the foundation of the Court's "protective" jurisdiction — states:

> 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.

15 Conceptually, then, the applicant is provided with the protections of a stay, a restraining order and a prohibition order for a period "not exceeding 30 days" in order to give it time to muster support for and justify the relief granted in the Initial Order, all interested persons by then having received reasonable notice and having had a reasonable opportunity to consider their respective positions. The difficulties created by *ex parte* and short notice proceedings are thereby attenuated.

16 Subsection 11(4) of the Act provides for the making of additional orders in the CCAA process. The Court is granted identical powers to those set out in paragraphs (a) through (c) of subsection 11(3), except that there is no limit on the time period during which a subsection 11(4) order may remain in effect. The only other difference between the two subsections is that in respect of an Initial order under subsection 11(3) the onus on the applicant is to show that it is appropriate in the circumstances for the order to issue, whereas in respect of an order under subsection 11(4) there is an additional requirement to show that the applicant "has acted, and is acting, in good faith and with due diligence" in the CCAA process.

17 The Initial Order sought in this case was not unlike those sought -- and, indeed, those which have been granted -- in numerous other CCAA applications. While the relief granted is always a matter for the exercise of judicial discretion, based upon the statutory and inherent jurisdiction of the Court, it seems to me that considerable relief now sought at the Initial Order stage extends beyond what can appropriately be accommodated within the bounds of procedural fairness. It was at least partially for that reason that I declined to grant the Initial Order relief sought at the outset of this proceeding.

18 Upon reflection, it seems to me that the following considerations might usefully be kept in mind by those preparing for an Initial Order application, and by the Court in granting such an order.

19 First, recognition must be given to the reality that CCAA applications for the most part involve substantial corporations with large indebtedness and often complex debtor-creditor structures. Indeed, the threshold for applying for relief under the CCAA is a debt burden of at least $5 million[1]. Thus, I do not mean to suggest by anything said in these reasons that either the process itself or the corporate/commercial/financial issues which must be addressed and resolved, are simple or easily articulated. Therein lies a challenge, however.

20 CCAA orders will of necessity involve a certain complexity. Nevertheless, at least a nod in the direction of plainer language would be helpful to those having to review the draft on short notice, or to react to the order in quick fashion after it has been made on no notice. It would also be helpful to the Court, which — as I have noted — is not infrequently asked to give its approval and grant the order with very little advance opportunity for review or consideration. The language of orders should be clear and as sim-

---

[1] CCAA, subsection 3(1).

ple and readily understandable to creditors and others affected by them as possible in the circumstances. They should not read like trust indentures. These comments are relevant to all orders, but to Initial CCAA Orders in particular.

21 The Initial Order will, of course, contain the necessary declaration that the applicant is a company to which the CCAA applies, the authorization to file a plan of compromise and arrangement, the appointment of the monitor and its duties, and such things as the "comeback" clause. In other respects, however, what the Initial Order should seek to accomplish, in my view, is to put in place the necessary stay provisions and such further operating, financing and restructuring terms as are reasonably necessary for the continued operation of the debtor company during a brief but realistic period of time, on an urgency basis. During such a period, the ongoing operations of the company will be assured, while at the same time the major affected stakeholders are able to consider their respective positions and prepare to respond.

22 Having sought only the reasonably essential minimum relief required for purposes of the Initial Order, the applicant then has the discretion as to when to ask for more extensive relief. It may well be helpful, though, if the nature of the more extensive relief to be sought is signalled in the Initial application, so that interested and affected persons will know what is in the offing in that regard.

23 Subsection 11(3) of the Act does not stipulate that the Initial Order shall be granted for a period of 30 days. It provides that the Court in its discretion may grant an order for a period *not exceeding* 30 days. Each case must be approached on the basis of its own circumstances, and an agreement in advance on the part of all affected secured creditors, at least, may create an entirely different situation. In the absence of such agreement, though, the preferable practice on applications under subsection 11(3) is to keep the Initial Order as simple and straightforward as possible, and the relief sought confined to what is essential for the continued operations of the company during a brief "sorting-out" period of the type referred to above. Further issues can then be addressed, and subsequent orders made, if appropriate, under the rubric of the subsection 11(4) jurisdiction.

24 It follows from what I have said that, in my opinion, extraordinary relief such as DIP financing with super priority status should be kept, in Initial Orders, to what is reasonably necessary to meet the debtor company's urgent needs over the sorting-out period. Such measures involve what may be a significant re-ordering of priorities from those in place before the application is made, not in the sense of altering the existing priorities as between

the various secured creditors but in the sense of placing encumbrances ahead of those presently in existence. Such changes should not be imported lightly, if at all, into the creditors mix; and affected parties are entitled to a reasonable opportunity to think about their potential impact, and to consider such things as whether or not the CCAA approach to the insolvency is the appropriate one in the circumstances — as opposed, for instance, to a receivership or bankruptcy — and whether or not, or to what extent, they are prepared to have their positions affected by DIP or super priority financing. As Mr. Dunphy noted, in the context of this case, the object should be to "keep the lights [of the company] on" and enable it to keep up with appropriate preventative maintenance measures, but the Initial Order itself should approach that objective in a judicious and cautious matter.

25 For similar reasons, things like the proliferation of advisory committees and the attendant professional costs accompanying them, and the extension of broad protection to directors, are better left for orders other than the Initial order.

26 I conclude these observations with a word about the "comeback clause". The Initial Order as granted in this case contained the usual provision which is known by that description. It states:

> THIS COURT ORDERS that, notwithstanding any other provision of this Order, the Applicants may apply at any time to this Court to seek any further relief, *and any interested Person may apply to this Court to vary or rescind this Order or seek other relief* on seven days' notice to the Applicants, the Monitor, the CCAA Lender and to any other Person likely to be affected by the Order sought or on such other notice, if any, as this Court may order. (emphasis added)

27 The Initial Order also contained the usual clause permitting the Applicants or the Monitor to apply for directions in relation to the discharge of the Monitor's powers and duties or in relation to the proper execution of the Initial Order. This right is not afforded to others.

28 The comeback provisions are available to sort out issues as they arise during the course of the restructuring. However, they do not provide an answer to overreaching Initial Orders, in my view. There is an inherent disadvantage to a person having to rely on those provisions. By the time such a motion is brought the CCAA process has often taken on a momentum of its own, and even if no formal "onus" is placed on the affected person in such a position, there may well be a practical one if the relief sought goes against the established momentum. On major security issues, in particular, which arise at the Initial Order stage, the occasions where a creditor is required to rely upon the comeback clause should be minimized.

29 These reasons are intended to compliment and to elaborate upon those set out in the brief endorsement made at the time the Initial Order was

granted on February 15, 1999, in favour of the Royal Oak Applicants, but in a form more limited than that sought.

Application granted.

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"

APPLICANTS

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

Ontario
SUPERIOR COURT OF JUSTICE
COMMERCIAL LIST

Proceeding commenced at Toronto

BOOK OF AUTHORITIES OF THE APPLICANTS

(Motion returnable September 8, 2010)

OSLER, HOSKIN & HARCOURT LLP
Box 50, 1 First Canadian Place
Toronto, Ontario, Canada M5X 1B8

Lyndon A.J. Barnes (LSUC#: 13350D)
Tel: (416) 862-6679

Jeremy Dacks (LSUC#:41851R)
Tel: (416) 862-4923

Duncan Ault (LSUC# 53916R)
Tel: (416) 862.4733

Fax: (416) 862-6666

Lawyers for the Applicants

F. 1114233