

COURT FILE NO.: CV-09-8396-OOCL

DATE: 20091027

**ONTARIO
SUPERIOR COURT OF JUSTICE
COMMERCIAL LIST**

IN THE MATTER OF THE COMPANIES' CREDITORS ARRANGEMENT ACT,

R.S.C. 1985, C-36. AS AMENDED

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

BEFORE: PEPALL J.

COUNSEL: *Lyndon Barnes and Shawn Irving* for the Applicants
Alan Merskey for the Special Committee of the Board of Directors
David Byers and Maria Konyukhova for the Monitor, FTI Consulting Canada Inc.
Benjamin Zarnett for the Ad Hoc Committee of Notcholders
Hilary Clarke for Bank of Nova Scotia,
Steve Weisz for CIT Business Credit Canada Inc.
Hugh O'Reilly and Amanda Darrach for the CHCH Retirees
Douglas Wray and Jesse Kugler for Communications, Energy and Paperworkers
Union of Canada
Deborah McPhail for FSCO

Endorsement

Relief Requested

[1] The CMI Entities seek an order appointing David Cremasco, Rose Stricker and Lawrence Schnurr as representatives of certain retirees ("Retirees"). The Retirees are all former employees of the CMI Entities (or their predecessors) or their surviving spouses who receive or are entitled to receive a pension from a pension plan sponsored by a CMI Entity or who, prior to October 6, 2009, were entitled to receive non-pension benefits from a CMI Entity. The proposed order would encompass former members of the Communications, Energy and Paper-workers Union of Canada ("CEP") who are entitled to benefits under the Global Communications Limited Retirement Plan for CH Employees (the "CH Employees Plan") but not otherwise. They are referred to as the CH Employees. Put differently, the proposed representatives do not plan to represent former

- 2 -

unionized employees (or their surviving spouses) who were represented by CEP when they were active employees other than those who were entitled to benefits under the CH Employees Plan, namely the CH Employees. The CMI Entities also request an order appointing the law firm of Cavalluzzo Hayes Shilton McIntyre & Cornish LLP as representative counsel for the Retirees. It is proposed that the CMI Entities provide funding for this representation.

- [2] The CEP seeks an order appointing it and the law firm of CaleyWray to represent current and former members of the CEP who are employed or who were formerly employed by the CMI Entities¹ but not including the aforementioned CH Employees. It also requests funding by the CMI Entities and a charge over their property for this representation. It further requests that the claims bar date established in my order of October 14, 2009 be extended from November 19, 2009.

Brief Outline of Facts

- [3] Since the date of the Initial Order, the CMI Entities have paid and intend to continue to pay: (a) salaries, commissions, bonuses and outstanding employee expenses;
- (b) current service and special payments with respect to the active defined benefit pension plans; and
- (c) post-employment and post-retirement benefit payments to former employees who were represented by a union when they were employed by the CMI Entities.
- [4] That said, certain former employees are affected by the CMI Entities' discontinuance or proposed discontinuance of employee related obligations and it is intended that they be assisted by the granting of the order requested by the CMI Entities. Approximately 81 former non-unionized employees have been advised that the CMI Entities propose to cease making all post-employment and post-retirement benefit payments in relation to claims incurred after November 13, 2009. There are also 2 out of 15 beneficiaries of the Canwest Global Communications Corp. and Related Companies Retirement

¹ In its materials, CEP uses the term "Applicants" but for consistency, I have used the term "CMI Entities".

- 3 -

Compensation Arrangement Plan who will not have received the entire present value of their entitlement under that plan.

- [5] In addition, the CMI Entities purported to terminate the CH Employees Plan when they sold CHCH TV effective August 31, 2009. 120 former employees or spouses received a pension or were entitled to receive a deferred vested pension under this plan. OSFI has directed CMI to prepare without delay a valuation report for the CH Employees Plan effective as of December 31, 2008 to establish additional amounts to accrue from January 1, 2009 which may need to be funded through special payments. The CMI Entities anticipate that the valuation will identify an unfunded liability. Currently, special payments are not contemplated in the cash flow projections for that unfunded liability and a shortfall is anticipated to exist on the filing of the termination report for the plan.
- [6] Some former employees of CHCH TV have established a committee representing union and non-unionized former employees. Committee members include the proposed representatives. Rose Stricker is a non-unionized deferred vested member of the CH Plan. David Cremasco is a formerly unionized retiree with entitlement to post-retirement benefits and Lawrence Schnurr is a formerly salaried employee with entitlement to post-retirement benefits. If appointed, they will seek to form a broader committee with a member from each of the major population centres in which the Retirees reside and with at least one additional formerly unionized member.
- [7] Cavalluzzo LLP acts for about 100 retired participants in the CH Employees Plan, 30 to 40 of whom were not previously represented by a union and 60 to 70 of whom were. Other than those 100, most other Retirees are not represented by counsel in this CCAA proceeding.
- [8] The CMI Entities request that Cavalluzzo LLP be appointed as representative counsel to assist the Retirees.
- [9] CEP represents 1000 bargaining unit employees employed by the Applicants. It intends to facilitate and advance the claims of both its current members and its former members (but not including the CH Employees). CEP states that as a result of the current economic crisis, it has had to incur significant costs in representing its current and former

- 4 -

members in CCAA proceedings. This is particularly so given the union's strong presence in the forestry and media industries and the degree to which they have been impacted by the state of the economy. CEP states that the costs have been substantial and have adversely affected its financial position. CEP states that its ability to provide effective representation in these proceedings is dependent on receipt of funding. In the past 6 months, CEP has spent about \$250,000 on legal costs in connection with different CCAA proceedings. Furthermore, former members do not pay union dues and their representation, although part of the union's internal mandate, creates costs that are outside CEP's cost structure. In addition, over the past 12 months, CEP has lost approximately 12,000 members due to economic conditions. This obviously has a negative impact on union revenues. Faced with these conditions, CEP seeks funding.

[10] CEP requests that CaleyWray be appointed as representative counsel. It also requests a charge or security over the property of the CMI Entities to cover the costs of CEP and its counsel although it did not press this point on learning that no such charge is proposed for the Cavaluzzo representation order.

[11] Lastly, CEP requests that the claims bar date be extended to provide it with additional time to identify, value and process claims.

Issues

[12] The issues to consider are:

(a) Should the representatives and Cavalluzzo LLP be appointed to represent the interests of the Retirees and should Cavalluzzo LLP be provided with funding for such representation?

(b) Should CEP and Caley Wray be appointed on behalf of CEP's current and former members (not including the CH Employees) and provided with funding and a charge over the property of the CMI Entities for such representation?

(c) Should the claims bar date be extended as requested by CEP?

Discussion

(a) Cavalluzzo LLP

- [13] No one opposes the motion of the CMI Entities. The Monitor and the Ad Hoc Committee of 8% Noteholders support the request and others are unopposed to the relief requested. CIT has agreed to a variation of the cash flow in this regard as well.
- [14] Dealing firstly with the representation component of the order, in my view, the order requested should be granted. I have jurisdiction under Rule 10 of the Rules of Civil Procedure and section 11 of the CCAA. The balance of convenience favours the granting of the order and it is in the interests of justice to do so. The Retirees are a particularly vulnerable group and without professional and legal resources, they are likely at risk of being unable to understand and protect their interests in the restructuring. Clearly there is a social benefit associated with them being represented. The appointment of a single representative counsel will facilitate the administration of the proceedings and provide for efficiency. Cavalluzzo LLP is experienced in this area, has a considerable reputation, and is fully qualified to act.
- [15] As for funding, the CMI Entities propose that, subject to fee arrangements agreed to by the CMI Entities and Cavalluzzo LLP, reasonable legal, actuarial and financial expert and advisory fees and other incidental fees and disbursements be paid by the CMI Entities on a monthly basis. Funding for such representation should be provided by the CMI Entities. I am satisfied that the moving parties have established that such an order is beneficial. I accept the evidence before me to the effect that most individual Retirees likely do not have the means to obtain actuarial and/or benefit experts and would benefit from the assistance offered by representative counsel and its pension expert. Absent such an order, there would likely be a multiplicity of lawyers acting for various Retirees, stress and inconvenience for those who could ill afford such representation, no representation for some, and the disorganization and inefficiency associated with multiple representation

- 6 -

of substantially similar interests. A single counsel diminishes the likelihood of “overlawyering” and funding of such representation is a recognition of that desirable objective. It is fair and just to grant such an order.

(b) CEP and CaleyWray

- [16] CEP requests a separate representation order for all current and former CEP members other than the CH Employees and an order that CaleyWray be appointed as representative counsel funded by the CMI Entities.
- [17] Again, there is no issue that CaleyWray is experienced and well equipped to act for these individuals. Similarly, the union may appropriately represent its members and former members.
- [18] CEP intends to facilitate and advance the interests of both its members and former members. It is of the view that it has no conflict of interest as all of the aforementioned may ultimately have unsecured claims. It clearly already represents its current members and plans to represent its former members. In that sense, they are not vulnerable. I do not see the need for a representation order particularly with respect to current members. To the extent, if any, that it is necessary to do so, and given that no one opposes the request, it and CaleyWray are authorized to represent CEP’s current and former members (but not including the CH Employees).
- [19] As for funding, as I indicated in the *Fraser Papers* case, it should only be provided for the benefit of those former employees who otherwise would have no legal representation. Here, CEP intends to represent its current and former members (except for the CH Employees). But for this desire and subject to the agreement of Cavalluzzo LLP to act, there is no principled reason for separate representation. It arises by choice not out of necessity. Furthermore, this is an insolvency. Absent a clear and compelling reason such as the existence of an obvious conflict of interest, the general rule should be that funding by applicant debtors should only be available for one representative counsel. Even if one disagrees with that proposition, in this case, the CMI Entities have paid and intend to continue to pay, amongst other things, salaries, current service and special payments with respect to the defined benefit pension plans and post-employment and post-retirement

- 7 -

benefit payments. Based on the materials before me, there are approximately 9 CEP members who were recently terminated and who have been advised that they will no longer receive salary continuance. In essence, the evidentiary support that might merit a funding request is absent. As noted in the factum of the CMI Entities, if they should change their position with respect to employee related obligations, the need for funding could be addressed at that time. I am also not persuaded that funding should be granted to pay for CEP's costs for outstanding grievances. No one else including the Monitor supports the requested order and I do not believe that it should be granted.


[20] As mentioned, no charge is being requested or granted with respect to the Cavalluzzo representation order and none should be given here. In addition, the Term Sheet as described in the materials restricts the granting of a charge absent the agreement of others including the Ad Hoc Committee.

(c) Claims Bar Extension

[21] The last issue to consider is whether the claims bar date contained in my order of October 14, 2009, should be extended as requested by CEP. Based on the evidence before me, I am not persuaded that such an extension is necessary at this time.

Conclusion

[22] In conclusion, the CMI Entities' motion is granted except that the third and last sentences of paragraph 2 are to be subject to any further or other order. The CEP motion is dismissed although authorization to represent current and former members (excluding the CH Employees) is granted.


Pcpall J.

Released: October 27, 2009

- 8 -

On a last unrelated issue, I would like counsel to give some thought to the following suggestion. For future time sensitive motions brought by the CMI Entities, it would be helpful in situations where interested parties do not have time to file a factum if, before the return date, those opposing filed with the court a 1 to 2 page memo (maximum) outlining their respective positions. Interested parties are not obliged to do so but the court would consider this to be of assistance.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be 'S. J. P.', located in the lower right quadrant of the page.