TAB 10

Indexed as:
Elan Corp. v. Comiskey

**Elan Corp. and Nova Metal Products Inc.
v. Michael Comiskey, trustee of a debenture issued
to Joseph Comiskey and all secured creditors of Elan Corp.
and Nova Metal Products Inc.**

[1990] O.J. No. 2180

1 O.R. (3d) 289

41 O.A.C. 282

1 C.B.R. (3d) 101

23 A.C.W.S. (3d) 1192

Action Nos. 684/90 and 685/90

Court of Appeal for Ontario

Finlayson, Krever and Doherty JJ.A.

November 2, 1990*
*Released November 23, 1990

Counsel:

F.J.C. Newbould, Q.C., and G.B. Morawetz, for Bank of Nova Scotia.

John Little, for Elan Corp. and Nova Metal Products Inc.

Michael B. Rotsztain, for RoyNat Inc.

Kim Twohig and M. Olanow, for Ontario Development Corp.

K.P. McElcheran, for monitor Ernst & Young.

---

1 **FINLAYSON J.A.** (KREVER J.A. concurring) (orally):-- This is an appeal by the Bank of Nova Scotia (the Bank) from orders made by Mr. Justice Hoolihan as hereinafter described. The Bank of Nova Scotia was the lender to two related companies, namely, Elan Corporation (Elan) and Nova Metal Products Inc. (Nova), which commenced proceedings under the Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act,

R.S.C. 1985, c. C-36 (the CCAA) for the purposes of having a plan of arrangement put to a meeting of secured creditors of those companies.

2 The orders appealed from are:

(i) An order of September 11, 1990 which directed a meeting of the secured creditors of Elan and Nova to consider the plan of arrangement filed, or other suitable plan. The order further provided that for three days until September 14, 1990, the Bank be prevented from acting on any of its security or paying down any of its loans from accounts receivable collected by Elan and Nova and that Elan and Nova could spend the accounts receivable assigned to the Bank that would be received.

(ii) an order dated September 14, 1990 extending the terms of the order of September 11, 1990 to remain in effect until the plan of arrangement was presented to the court no later than October 24, 1990. This order continued the stay against the Bank and the power of Elan and Nova to spend the accounts receivable assigned to the Bank. Further orders dated September 27, 1990 and October 18, 1990 have extended the stay and the power of Elan and Nova to spend the accounts receivable that have been assigned to the Bank. The date of the meetings of creditors has been extended to November 9, 1990. The application to sanction the plan of arrangement must be heard by November 14, 1990.

(iii) An order dated October 18, 1990 directing that there be two classes of secured creditors for the purposes of voting at the meeting of secured creditors. The first class is to be comprised of the Bank, RoyNat Inc. (RoyNat), the Ontario Development Corporation (O.D.C.), the City of Chatham and the Village of Glencoe. The second class is to be comprised of persons related to Elan and Nova that acquired debentures to enable the companies to apply under the CCAA.

3 There is very little dispute about the facts in this matter, but the chronology of events is important and I am setting it out in some detail.

4 The Bank has been the banker to Elan and Nova. At the time of the application in August 1990 it was owed approximately $1,900,000. With interest and costs, including receivers' fees, it is now owed in excess of $2,300,000. It has a first registered charge on the accounts receivable and inventory of Elan and Nova and a second registered charge on the land, buildings and equipment. It also has security under s. 178 [am. R.S.C. 1985, c. 25 (3rd Supp.), s. 26] of the Bank Act, R.S.C. 1985, c. B-1. The terms of credit between the Bank and Elan as set out in a commitment agreement provide that Elan and Nova may not encumber their assets without the consent of the Bank.

5 RoyNat is also a secured creditor of Elan and Nova and it is owed approximately $12,000,000. It holds a second registered charge on the accounts receivable and inventory of Elan and Nova and a first registered charge on the land, buildings and equipment. The Bank and RoyNat entered into a priority agreement to define with certainty the priority which each holds over the assets of Elan and Nova.

6 The O.D.C. guaranteed payment of $500,000 to RoyNat for that amount lent by RoyNat to Elan. The O.D.C. holds debenture security from Elan to secure the guarantee which it gave to RoyNat. That security ranks third to the Bank and RoyNat. The O.D.C. has not been called upon by RoyNat to pay under its guarantee. O.D.C. has not lent any money directly to Elan or Nova.

7 Elan owes approximately $77,000 to the City of Chatham for unpaid municipal taxes. Nova owes approximately $18,000 to the Village of Glencoe for unpaid municipal taxes. Both municipalities have a lien on the real property of the respective companies in priority to every claim except the Crown under s. 369 of the Municipal Act, R.S.O. 1980, c. 302.

8 On May 8, 1990 the Bank demanded payment of all outstanding loans owing by Elan and Nova to be made by June 1, 1990. Extensions of time were granted and negotiations directed to the settlement of the debt took place thereafter. On August 27, 1990, the Bank appointed Coopers & Lybrand Ltd. as receiver and manager of the assets of Elan and Nova and as agent under the Bank's security to realize upon the security. Elan and Nova refused to allow the receiver and manager to have access to their premises on the basis that insufficient notice had been provided by the Bank before demanding payment.

9 Later on August 27, 1990 the Bank brought a motion in an action against Elan and Nova (Doc. No. 54033/90) for an order granting possession of the premises of Elan and Nova to Coopers & Lybrand. On the evening of August 27, 1990 at approximately 9:00 p.m., Mr. Justice Saunders made an order adjourning the motion on certain conditions. The order authorized Coopers & Lybrand access to the premises to monitor Elan's business and permitted Elan to remain in possession and carry on its business in the ordinary course. The Bank was restrained in the order, until the motion could be heard, from selling inventory, land, equipment or buildings or from notifying account debtors to collect receivables, but was not restrained from applying accounts receivables that were collected against outstanding bank loans.

10 On Wednesday, August 29, 1990 Elan and Nova each issued a debenture for $10,000 to a friend of the principals of the companies, Joseph Comiskey, through his brother Michael Comiskey as trustee, pursuant to a trust deed executed the same day. The terms were not commercial and it does not appear that repayment was expected. It is conceded by counsel for Elan that the sole purpose of issuing the debentures was to qualify as a "debtor company" within the meaning of s. 3 of the CCAA. Section 3 reads as follows:

> 3. This Act does not apply in respect of a debtor company unless
>
> (a) the debtor company has outstanding an issue of secured or unsecured bonds of the debtor company or of a predecessor in title of the debtor company issued under a trust deed or other instrument running in favour of a trustee; and
>
> (b) the compromise or arrangement that is proposed under section 4 or 5 in respect of the debtor company includes a compromise or an arrangement between the debtor company and the holders of an issue referred to in paragraph (a).

11 The debentures conveyed the personal property of Elan and Nova as security to Michael Comiskey as trustee. No consent was obtained from the Bank as required by the loan agreements, nor was any consent obtained from the receiver. Cheques for $10,000 each, representing the loans secured in the debentures were given to Elan and Nova on Wednesday, August 29, 1990 but not deposited until six days later on September 4, 1990 after an interim order had been made by Mr. Justice Farley in favour of Elan and Nova staying the Bank from taking proceedings.

12 On August 30, 1990 Elan and Nova applied under s. 5 of the CCAA for an order directing a meeting of secured creditors to vote on a plan of arrangement. Section 5 provides:

> 5. Where a compromise or an arrangement is proposed between a debtor company and its secured creditors or any class of them, the court may, on the application in a

> summary way of the company or of any such creditor or of the trustee in bankruptcy or liquidator of the company, order a meeting of the creditors or class of creditors, and, if the court so determines, of the shareholders of the company, to be summoned in such manner as the court directs.

13 The application was heard by Farley J. on Friday, August 31, 1990 at 8:00 a.m. Farley J. dismissed the application on the grounds that the CCAA required that there be more than one debenture issued by each company. Later on the same day, August 31, 1990, Elan and Nova each issued two debentures for $500 to the wife of the principal of Elan through her sister as trustee. The debentures provided for payment of interest to commence on August 31, 1992. Cheques for $500 were delivered that day to the companies but not deposited in the bank account until September 4, 1990. These debentures conveyed the personal property in the assets of Elan and Nova to the trustee as security. Once again it is conceded that the debentures were issued for the sole purpose of meeting the requirements of s. 3 of the CCAA. No consent was obtained from the Bank as required by the loan terms, nor was any consent obtained from the receiver.

14 On August 31, 1990, following the creation of the trust deeds and the issuance of the debentures, Elan and Nova commenced new applications under the CCAA which were heard late in the day by Farley J. He adjourned the applications to September 10, 1990 on certain terms, including a stay preventing the Bank from acting on its security and allowing Elan to spend up to $321,000 from accounts receivable collected by it.

15 The plan of arrangement filed with the application provided that Elan and Nova would carry on business for three months, that secured creditors would not be paid and could take no action on their security for three months and that the accounts receivable of Elan and Nova assigned to the Bank could be utilized by Elan and Nova for purposes of its day to day operations. No compromise of any sort was proposed.

16 On September 11, 1990, Hoolihan J. ordered that a meeting of the secured creditors of Elan and Nova be held no later than October 22, 1990 to consider the plan of arrangement that had been filed, or other suitable plan. He ordered that the plan of arrangement be presented to the secured creditors no later than September 27, 1990. He made further orders effective for three days until September 14, 1990, including orders:

> (i) that the companies could spend the accounts receivable assigned to the Bank that would be collected in accordance with a cash flow forecast filed with the court providing for $1,387,000 to be spent by September 30, 1990; and
> (ii) a stay of proceedings against the Bank acting on any of its security or paying down any of its loans from accounts receivable collected by Elan and Nova.

17 On September 14, 1990, Hoolihan J. extended the terms of his order of September 11, 1990 to remain in effect until the plan of arrangement was presented to the court no later than October 24, 1990 for final approval. This order continued the power of Elan and Nova to spend up to $1,387,000 of the accounts receivable assigned to the Bank in accordance with the projected cash flow to September 30, 1990, and to spend a further amount to October 24, 1990 in accordance with a cash flow to be approved by Hoolihan J. prior to October 1, 1990. Further orders dated September 27 and October 18 have extended the power to spend the accounts receivable to November 14, 1990.

18 On September 14, 1990 the Bank requested Hoolihan J. to restrict his order so that Elan and Nova could use the accounts receivable assigned to the Bank only so long as they continued to operate within the borrowing guidelines contained in the terms of the loan agreements with the Bank. These guidelines

require a certain ratio to exist between Bank loans and the book value of the accounts receivable and inventory assigned to the Bank and are designed in normal circumstances to ensure that there is sufficient value in the security assigned to the Bank. Hoolihan J. refused to make the order.

19 On October 18, 1990 Hoolihan J. ordered that the composition of the classes of secured creditors for the purposes of voting at the meeting of secured creditors shall be as follows:

(a) The Bank, RoyNat, O.D.C., the City of Chatham and the Village of Glencoe shall comprise one class.
(b) The parties related to the principal of Elan that acquired their debentures to enable the companies to apply under the CCAA shall comprise a second class.

20 On October 18, 1990, at the request of counsel for Elan and Nova, Hoolihan J. further ordered that the date for the meeting of creditors of Elan and Nova be extended to November 9, 1990 in order to allow a new plan of arrangement to be sent to all creditors, including unsecured creditors of those companies. Elan and Nova now plan to offer a plan of compromise or arrangement to the unsecured creditors of Elan and Nova as well as to the secured creditors.

21 There are five issues in this appeal.

(1) Are the debentures issued by Elan and Nova for the purpose of permitting the companies to qualify as applicants under the CCAA, debentures within the meaning of s. 3 of the CCAA?

(2) Did the issue of the debentures contravene the provisions of the loan agreements between Elan and Nova and the Bank? If so, what are the consequences for CCAA purposes?

(3) Did Elan and Nova have the power to issue the debentures and make application under the CCAA after the Bank had appointed a receiver and after the order of Saunders J.?

(4) Did Hoolihan J. have the power under s. 11 of the CCAA to make the interim orders that he made with respect to the accounts receivable?

(5) Was Hoolihan J. correct in ordering that the Bank vote on the proposed plan of arrangement in a class with RoyNat and the other secured creditors?

22 It is well established that the CCAA is intended to provide a structured environment for the negotiation of compromises between a debtor company and its creditors for the benefit of both. Such a resolution can have significant benefits for the company, its shareholders and employees. For this reason the debtor companies, Elan and Nova, are entitled to a broad and liberal interpretation of the jurisdiction of the court under the CCAA. Having said that, it does not follow that, in exercising its discretion to order a meeting of creditors under s. 5 of the CCAA, the court should not consider the equities in this case as they relate to these companies and to one of its principal secured creditors, the Bank.

23 The issues before Hoolihan J. and this court were argued on a technical basis. Hoolihan J. did not give effect to the argument that the debentures described above were a "sham" and could not be used for the purposes of asserting jurisdiction. Unfortunately, he did not address any of the other arguments presented to him on the threshold issue of the availability of the CCAA. He appears to have acted on the premise that if the CCAA can be made available, it should be utilized.

24 If Hoolihan J. did exercise any discretion overall, it is not reflected in his reasons. I believe,

therefore, that we are in a position to look at the uncontested chronology of these proceedings and exercise our own discretion. To me, the significant date is August 27, 1990 when the Bank appointed Coopers & Lybrand Ltd. as receiver and manager of the undertaking, property and assets mortgaged and charged under the demand debenture and of the collateral under the general security agreement, both dated June 20, 1979. On the same date it appointed the same company as receiver and manager for Nova under a general security agreement dated December 5, 1988. The effect of this appointment is to divest the companies and their boards of directors of their power to deal with the property comprised in the appointment (Kerr on Receivers, 16th ed. by Raymond Walton (London: Sweet & Maxwell, 1983), p. 292). Neither Elan nor Nova had the power to create further indebtedness and thus to interfere with the ability of the receiver to manage the two companies (Re Hat Development Ltd. (1988), 64 Alta. L.R. (2d) 17, 71 C.B.R. (N.S.) 264 (Q.B.), affd (1989), 65 Alta. L.R. (2d) 374 (C.A.)).

25 Counsel for the debtor companies submitted that the management powers of the receiver were stripped from the receiver by Saunders J. in his interim order when he allowed the receiver access to the companies' properties but would not permit it to realize on the security of the Bank until further order. He pointed out that the order also provided that the companies were entitled to remain in possession and "to carry on business in the ordinary course" until further order.

26 I do not agree with counsel's submission covering the effect of the order. It certainly restricted what the receiver could do on an interim basis, but it imposed restrictions on the companies as well. The issue of these disputed debentures in support of an application for relief as insolvent companies under the CCAA does not comply with the order of Saunders J. This is not carrying on business in the ordinary course. The residual power to take all of these initiatives for relief under the CCAA remained with the receiver, and if trust deeds were to be issued, an order of the court in Action 54033/90 was required permitting their issuance and registration.

27 There is another feature which, in my opinion, affects the exercise of discretion and that is the probability of the meeting achieving some measure of success. Hoolihan J. considered the calling of the meeting at one hearing, as he was asked to do, and determined the respective classes of creditors at another. This latter classification is necessary because of the provisions of s. 6(a) of the CCAA which reads as follows:

> 6. Where a majority in number representing three-fourths in value of the creditors, or class of creditors, as the case may be, present and voting either in person or by proxy at the meeting or meetings thereof respectively held pursuant to sections 4 and 5, or either of those sections, agree to any compromise or arrangement either as proposed or as altered or modified at the meeting or meetings, the compromise or arrangement may be sanctioned by the court, and if so sanctioned is binding
>
> (a) on all the creditors or the class of creditors, as the case may be, and on any trustee for any such class of creditors, whether secured or unsecured, as the case may be, and on the company ...

28 If both matters had been considered at the same time, as in my view they should have been, and if what I regard as a proper classification of the creditors had taken place, I think it is obvious that the meeting would not be a productive one. It was improper, in my opinion, to create one class of creditors made up of all the secured creditors save the so-called "sham" creditors. There is no true community of interest among them and the motivation of Elan and Nova in striving to create a single class is clearly designed to avoid the classification of the Bank as a separate class.

29 It is apparent that the only secured creditors with a significant interest in the proceeding under the

CCAA are the Bank and RoyNat. The two municipalities have total claims for arrears of taxes of less than $100,000. They have first priority in the lands of the companies. They are in no jeopardy whatsoever. The O.D.C. has a potential liability in that it can be called upon by RoyNat under its guarantee to a maximum of $500,000 and this will trigger default under its debentures with the companies, but its interests lie with RoyNat.

30 As to RoyNat, it is the largest creditor with a debt of some $12,000,000. It will dominate any class it is in because under s. 6 of the CCAA the majority in a class must represent three- quarters in value of that class. It will always have a veto by reason of the size of its claim but requires at least one creditor to vote for it to give it a majority in number (I am ignoring the municipalities). It needs the O.D.C.

31 I do not base my opinion solely on commercial self-interest but also on the differences in legal interest. The Bank has first priority on the receivables referred to as the "quick assets", and RoyNat ranks second in priority. RoyNat has first priority on the buildings and realty, the "fixed assets", and the Bank has second priority.

32 It is in the commercial interests of the Bank with its smaller claim and more readily realizable assets to collect and retain the accounts receivable. It is in the commercial interests of RoyNat to preserve the cash flow of the business and sell the enterprise as a going concern. It can only do that by overriding the prior claim of the Bank to these receivables. If it can vote with the O.D.C. in the same class as the Bank it can achieve that goal and extinguish the prior claim of the Bank to realize on the receivables. This it can do despite having acknowledged its legal relationship to the Bank in the priority agreement signed by the two. I can think of no reason why the legal interest of the Bank as the holder of the first security on the receivables should be overridden by RoyNat as holder of the second security.

33 The classic statement on classes of creditors is that of Lord Esher M.R. in Sovereign Life Assurance Co. v. Dodd, [1892] 2 Q.B. 573, [1891-4] All E.R. Rep. 246, 41 W.R. 4 (C.A.), at pp. 579-80 Q.B.:

> The Act (Joint Stock Companies Arrangement Act, 1870) says that the persons to be summoned to the meeting (all of whom, be it said in passing, are creditors) are persons who can be divided into different classes -- classes which the Act of Parliament recognises, though it does not define them. This, therefore, must be done: they must be divided into different classes. What is the reason for such a course? It is because the creditors composing the different classes have different interests; and, therefore, if we find a different state of facts existing among different creditors which may differently affect their minds and their judgment, they must be divided into different classes.

34 The Sovereign Life case was quoted with approval by Kingstone J. in Re Wellington Building Corp. Ltd., [1934] O.R. 653, 16 C.B.R. 48, [1934] 4 D.L.R. 626 (H.C.J.), at p. 659 O.R. He also quoted another English authority [Re Alabama, New Orleans, Texas & Pacific Junction Railway Co., [1891] 1 Ch. 213, [1886-90] All E.R. Rep. Ext. 1143, 60 L.J. Ch. 221 (C.A.)] at p. 658 O.R.:

> In In re Alabama, New Orleans, Texas and Pacific Junction Ry. Co., [1891] 1 Ch. 213, a scheme and arrangement under the Joint Stock Companies Arrangement Act (1870), was submitted to the Court for approval. Lord Justice Bowen, at p. 243, says: --
>
> Now, I have no doubt at all that it would be improper for the Court to allow an arrangement to be forced on any class of creditors, if the arrangement cannot

> reasonably be supposed by sensible business people to be for the benefit of that class as such, otherwise the sanction of the Court would be a sanction to what would be a scheme of confiscation. The object of this section is not confiscation. ... Its object is to enable compromises to be made which are for the common benefit of the creditors as creditors, or for the common benefit of some class of creditors as such.

35 Kingstone J. set aside a meeting where three classes of creditors were permitted to vote together. He said at p. 660 O.R.:

> It is clear that Parliament intended to give the three-fourths majority of any class power to bind that class, but I do not think the Statute should be construed so as to permit holders of subsequent mortgages power to vote and thereby destroy the priority rights and security of a first mortgagee.

36 We have been referred to more modern cases including two decisions of Trainor J. of the British Columbia Supreme Court, both entitled Re Northland Properties Ltd. One case is reported in (1988), 31 B.C.L.R. (2d) 35, 73 C.B.R. (N.S.) 166, and the other in the same volume [of C.B.R.] at p. 175. Trainor J. was upheld on appeal on both judgments. The first judgment of the British Columbia Court of Appeal is unreported (September 16, 1988) [now reported 32 B.C.L.R. (2d) 309]. The judgment in the second appeal is reported sub nom. Northland Properties Ltd. v. Excelsior Life Insurance Co. of Canada at (1989), 34 B.C.L.R. (2d) 122, 73 C.B.R. (N.S.) 195, [1989] 3 W.W.R. 363.

37 In the first Northland case, Trainor J. held that the difference in the terms of parties to and priority of different bonds meant that they should be placed in separate classes. He relied upon Re Wellington Building Corp., supra. In the second Northland case he dealt with 15 mortgagees who were equal in priority but held different parcels of land as security. Trainor J. held that their relative security positions were the same notwithstanding that the mortgages were for the most part secured by charges against separate properties. The nature of the debt was the same, the nature of the security was the same, the remedies for default were the same, and in all cases they were corporate loans by sophisticated lenders. In specifically accepting the reasoning of Trainor J., the Court of Appeal held that the concern of the various mortgagees as to the quality of their individual securities was "a variable cause arising not by any difference in legal interests, but rather as a consequence of bad lending, or market values, or both" (p. 203 C.B.R.).

38 In Re NsC Diesel Power Inc. (1990), 79 C.B.R. (N.S.) 1, 97 N.S.R. (2d) 295, 258 A.P.R. 295 (T.D.) the court stressed that a class should be made up of persons "whose rights are not so dissimilar as to make it impossible for them to consult together with a view to a common interest" (p. 8 C.B.R.).

39 My assessment of these secured creditors is that the Bank should be in its own class. This being so, it is obvious that no plan of arrangement can succeed without its approval. There is no useful purpose to be served in putting a plan of arrangement to a meeting of creditors if it is known in advance that it cannot succeed. This is another cogent reason for the court declining to exercise its discretion in favour of the debtor companies.

40 For all the reasons given above, the application under the CCAA should have been dismissed. I do not think that I have to give definitive answers to the individual issues numbered (1) and (2). They can be addressed in a later case where the answers could be dispositive of an application under the CCAA. The answer to (3) is that the combined effect of the receivership and the order of Saunders J. disentitled the companies to issue the debentures and bring the application under the CCAA. It is not necessary to answer issue (4) and the answer to (5) is no.

41 Accordingly, I would allow the appeal, set aside the three orders of Hoolihan J., and in their place,

issue an order dismissing the application under the CCAA. The Bank should receive its costs of this appeal, the applications for leave to appeal, and the proceedings before Farley and Hoolihan JJ., to be paid by Elan, Nova and RoyNat.

42 Ernst & Young were appointed monitor in the order of Hoolihan J. dated September 14, 1990 to monitor the operations of Elan and Nova and give effect to and supervise the terms and conditions of the stay of proceedings in accordance with Appendix C appended to the order. The monitor should be entitled to be paid for all services performed to date including whatever is necessary to complete its reports for past work as called for in Appendix C.

DOHERTY J.A. (dissenting):--

I. BACKGROUND

43 On November 2, 1990, this court allowed the appeal brought by the Bank of Nova Scotia (the Bank) and vacated several orders made by Hoolihan J. Finlayson J.A. delivered oral reasons on behalf of the majority. At the same time, I delivered brief oral reasons dissenting in part from the conclusion reached by the majority and undertook to provide further written reasons. These are those reasons.

44 The events relevant to the disposition of this appeal are set out in some detail in the oral reasons of Finlayson J.A. I will not repeat that chronology but will refer to certain additional background facts before turning to the legal issues.

45 Elan Corporation (Elan) owns the shares of Nova Metal Products Inc. (Nova Inc.). Both companies have been actively involved in the manufacture of automobile parts for a number of years. As of March 1990, the companies had total annual sales of about $30,000,000 and employed some 220 people in plants located in Chatham and Glencoe, Ontario. The operation of these companies no doubt plays a significant role in the economy of these two small communities.

46 In the four years prior to 1989, the companies had operated at a profit ranging from $287,000 (1987) to $1,500,000 (1986). In 1989, several factors, including large capital expenditures and a downturn in the market, combined to produce an operational loss of about $1,333,000. It is anticipated that the loss for the year ending June 30, 1990, will be about $2.3 million. As of August 1, 1990, the companies continued in full operation and those in control anticipated that the financial picture would improve significantly later in 1990 when the companies would be busy filling several contracts which had been obtained earlier in 1990.

47 The Bank has provided credit to the companies for several years. In January of 1989 the Bank extended an operating line of credit to the companies. The line of credit was by way of a demand loan that was secured in the manner described by Finlayson J.A. Beginning in May 1989, and from time to time after that, the companies were in default under the terms of the loan advanced by the Bank. On each occasion the Bank and the companies managed to work out some agreement so that the Bank continued as lender and the companies continued to operate their plants.

48 Late in 1989, the companies arranged for a $500,000 operating loan from RoyNat Inc. It was hoped that this loan, combined with the operating line of $2.5 million from the Bank, would permit the company to weather its fiscal storm. In March 1990, the Bank took the position that the companies were in breach of certain requirements under their loan agreements and warned that if the difficulties were not rectified the Bank would not continue as the company's lender. Mr. Patrick Johnson, the president of both companies, attempted to respond to these concerns in a detailed letter to the Bank dated March 15, 1990. The response did not placate the Bank. In May 1990, the Bank called its loan and made a demand for immediate payment. Mr. Spencer, for the Bank, wrote: "We consider your financial condition

continues to be critical and we are not prepared to delay further making formal demand". He went on to indicate that, subject to further deterioration in the companies' fiscal position, the Bank was prepared to delay acting on its security until June 1, 1990.

49 As of May 1990, Mr. Johnson, to the Bank's knowledge, was actively seeking alternative funding to replace the Bank. At the same time, he was trying to convince the union which represented the workers employed at both plants to assist in a co-operative effort to keep the plants operational during the hard times. The union had agreed to discuss amendment of the collective bargaining agreement to facilitate the continued operation of the companies.

50 The June 1, 1990, deadline set by the Bank passed without incident. Mr. Johnson continued to search for new financing. A potential lender was introduced to Mr. Spencer of the Bank on August 13, 1990, and it appeared that the Bank, through Mr. Spencer, was favourably impressed with this potential lender. However, on August 27, 1990, the Bank decided to take action to protect its position. Coopers & Lybrand Ltd. was appointed by the Bank as receiver-manager under the terms of the security agreements with the companies. The companies denied the receiver access to their plants. The Bank then moved before the Honourable Mr. Justice E. Saunders for an order giving the receiver possession of the premises occupied by the companies. On August 27, 1990, after hearing argument from counsel for the Bank and the companies, Mr. Justice Saunders refused to install the receivers and made the following interim order:

> 1. THIS COURT ORDERS that the receiver be allowed access to the property to monitor the operations of the defendants but shall not take steps to realize on the security of The Bank of Nova Scotia until further Order of the Court.
>
> 2. THIS COURT ORDERS that the defendants shall be entitled to remain in possession and to carry on business in the ordinary course until further Order of this Court.
>
> 3. THIS COURT ORDERS that until further order the Bank of Nova Scotia shall not take steps to notify account debtors of the defendants for the purpose of collecting outstanding accounts receivable. This Order does not restrict The Bank of Nova Scotia from dealing with accounts receivable of the defendants received by it.
>
> 4. THIS COURT ORDERS that the motion is otherwise adjourned to a date to be fixed.

51 The notice of motion placed before Saunders J. by the Bank referred to "an intended action" by the Bank. It does not appear that the Bank took any further steps in connection with this "intended action".

52 Having resisted the Bank's efforts to assume control of the affairs of the companies on August 27, 1990, and realizing that their operations could cease within a matter of days, the companies turned to the Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act, R.S.C. 1985, c. C-36 (the Act) in an effort to hold the Bank at bay while attempting to reorganize their finances. Finlayson J.A. has described the companies' efforts to qualify under that Act, the two appearances before the Honourable Mr. Justice Farley on August 31, 1990, and the appearances before the Honourable Mr. Justice Hoolihan in September and October 1990, which resulted in the orders challenged on this appeal.

II. THE ISSUES

53 The dispute between the Bank and the companies when this application came before Hoolihan J.

was a straightforward one. The Bank had determined that its best interests would be served by the immediate execution of the rights it had under its various agreements with the companies. The Bank's best interest was not met by the continued operation of the companies as going concerns. The companies and their other two substantial secured creditors considered that their interests required that the companies continue to operate, at least for a period which would enable the companies to place a plan of reorganization before its creditors.

54 All parties were pursuing what they perceived to be their commercial interests. To the Bank these interests entailed the "death" of the companies as operating entities. To the companies these interests required "life support" for the companies through the provisions of the Act to permit a "last ditch" effort to save the companies and keep them in operation.

55 The issues raised on this appeal can be summarized as follows:

(i) Did Hoolihan J. err in holding that the companies were entitled to invoke the Act?
(ii) Did Hoolihan J. err in exercising his discretion in directing that a meeting of creditors should be held under the Act?
(iii) Did Hoolihan J. err in directing that the Bank and RoyNat Inc. should be placed in the same class of creditors for the purposes of the Act?
(iv) Did Hoolihan J. err in the terms of the interim orders he made pending the meeting of creditors and the submission to the court of a plan of reorganization?

III. THE PURPOSE AND SCHEME OF THE ACT

56 Before turning to these issues, it is necessary to understand the purpose of the Act and the scheme established by the Act for achieving that purpose. The Act first appeared in the midst of the Great Depression (Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act, 1933, S.C. 1932-33, c. 36). The Act was intended to provide a means whereby insolvent companies could avoid bankruptcy and continue as ongoing concerns through a reorganization of their financial obligations. The reorganization contemplated required the co-operation of the debtor companies' creditors and shareholders: Re Avery Construction Co. (1942), 24 C.B.R. 17, [1942] 4 D.L.R. 558 (Ont. H.C.J.), Stanley E. Edwards, "Reorganizations under the Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act" (1947), 25 Can. Bar Rev. 587, at pp. 592-93; David H. Goldman, "Reorganizations Under the Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act (Canada)" (1985), 55 C.B.R. (N.S.) 36, at pp. 37-39.

57 The legislation is remedial in the purest sense in that it provides a means whereby the devastating social and economic effects of bankruptcy or creditor-initiated termination of ongoing business operations can be avoided while a court-supervised attempt to reorganize the financial affairs of the debtor company is made.

58 The purpose of the Act was artfully put by Gibbs J.A., speaking for the British Columbia Court of Appeal (Carrothers, Cumming and Gibbs JJ.A.) in Chef Ready Foods Ltd. v. HongKong Bank of Canada, an unreported judgment released October 29, 1990 [summarized 23 A.C.W.S. (3d) Paragraph976], at pp. 11 and 6 of the reasons. In referring to the purpose for which the Act was initially proclaimed, he said:

> Almost inevitably liquidation destroyed the shareholders' investment, yielded little by way of recovery to the creditors, and exacerbated the social evil of devastating levels of unemployment. The government of the day sought, through the C.C.A.A. (the

> Act), to create a regime whereby the principals of the company and the creditors could be brought together under the supervision of the court to attempt a reorganization or compromise or arrangement under which the company could continue in business ...

In an earlier passage His Lordship had said:

> The purpose of the C.C.A.A. 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.

59 Gibbs J.A. also observed (at p. 13 of the reasons) that the Act was designed to serve a "broad constituency of investors, creditors and employees". Because of that "broad constituency" the court must, when considering applications brought under the Act, have regard not only to the individuals and organizations directly affected by the application, but also to the wider public interest. That interest is generally, but not always, served by permitting an attempt at reorganization: see Edwards, "Reorganizations under the Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act", supra, at p. 593.

60 The Act must be given a wide and liberal construction so as to enable it to effectively serve this remedial purpose: Interpretation Act, R.S.C. 1985, c. I-21, s. 12; Chef Ready Foods Ltd. v. HongKong Bank of Canada, supra, at p. 14 of the reasons.

61 The Act is available to all insolvent companies, provided the requirements of s. 3 of the Act are met. That section provides:

> 3. This Act does not apply in respect of a debtor company unless
>
> (a) the debtor company has outstanding an issue of secured or unsecured bonds of the debtor company or of a predecessor in title of the debtor company issued under a trust deed or other instrument running in favour of a trustee; and
>
> (b) the compromise or arrangement that is proposed under section 4 or 5 in respect of the debtor company includes a compromise or an arrangement between the debtor company and the holders of an issue referred to in paragraph (a).

62 A debtor company, or a creditor of that company, invokes the Act by way of summary application to the court under s. 4 or s. 5 of the Act. For present purposes, s. 5 is the relevant section:

> 5. Where a compromise or an arrangement is proposed between a debtor company and its secured creditors or any class of them, the court may, on the application in a summary way of the company or of any such creditor or of the trustee in bankruptcy or liquidator of the company, order a meeting of the creditors or class of creditors, and, if the court so determines, of the shareholders of the company, to be summoned in such manner as the court directs.

63 Section 5 does not require that the court direct a meeting of creditors to consider a proposed plan. The court's power to do so is discretionary. There will no doubt be cases where no order will be made, even though the debtor company qualifies under s. 3 of the Act.

64 If the court determines that a meeting should be called, the creditors must be placed into classes for the purpose of that meeting. The significance of this classification process is made apparent by s. 6 of the Act.

> 6. Where a majority in number representing three-fourths in value of the creditors, or class of creditors, as the case may be, present and voting either in person or by proxy at the meeting or meetings thereof respectively held pursuant to sections 4 and 5, or either of those sections, agree to any compromise or arrangement either as proposed or as altered or modified at the meeting or meetings, the compromise or arrangement may be sanctioned by the court, and if so sanctioned is binding
>
> (a) on all the creditors or the class of creditors, as the case may be, and on any trustee for any such class of creditors, whether secured or unsecured, as the case may be, and on the company; and
>
> (b) in the case of a company that has made an authorized assignment or against which a receiving order has been made under the Bankruptcy Act or is in the course of being wound up under the Winding-up Act, on the trustee in bankruptcy or liquidator and contributories of the company.

65 If the plan of reorganization is approved by the creditors as required by s. 6, it must then be presented to the court. Once again, the court must exercise a discretion and determine whether it will approve the plan of reorganization. In exercising that discretion, the court is concerned not only with whether the appropriate majority has approved the plan at a meeting held in accordance with the Act and the order of the court, but also with whether the plan is a fair and reasonable one: Re Northland Properties Ltd. (1988), 73 C.B.R. (N.S.) 175 (B.C. S.C.) [affd sub nom Northland Properties Ltd. v. Excelsior Life Insurance Co. of Canada (1989), 34 B.C.L.R. (2d) 122, 73 C.B.R. (N.S.) 195, [1989] 3 W.W.R. 363 (C.A.)], at pp. 182-85 C.B.R.

66 If the court chooses to exercise its discretion in favour of calling a meeting of creditors for the purpose of considering a plan of reorganization, the Act provides that the rights and remedies available to creditors, the debtor company, and others during the period between the making of the initial order and the consideration of the proposed plan may be suspended or otherwise controlled by the court.

67 Section 11 gives a court wide powers to make any interim orders:

> 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.

68 Viewed in its totality, the Act gives the court control over the initial decision to put the reorganization plan before the creditors, the classification of creditors for the purpose of considering the

plan, conduct affecting the debtor company pending consideration of that plan, and the ultimate acceptability of any plan agreed upon by the creditors. The Act envisions that the rights and remedies of individual creditors, the debtor company, and others may be sacrificed, at least temporarily, in an effort to serve the greater good by arriving at some acceptable reorganization which allows the debtor company to continue in operation: Icor Oil & Gas Co. v. Canadian Imperial Bank of Commerce (No. 1) (1989), 102 A.R. 161 (Q.B.), at p. 165.

IV. DID HOOLIHAN J. ERR IN HOLDING THAT THE DEBTOR COMPANIES WERE ENTITLED TO INVOKE THE ACT?

69 The appellant advances three arguments in support of its contention that Elan and Nova Inc. were not entitled to seek relief under the Act. It argues first that the debentures issued by the companies after August 27, 1990, were "shams" and did not fulfil the requirements of s. 3 of the Act. The appellant next contends that the issuing of the debentures by the companies contravened their agreements with the Bank in which they undertook not to further encumber the assets of the companies without the consent of the Bank. Lastly, the appellant maintains that once the Bank had appointed a receiver-manager over the affairs of the companies on August 27, 1990, the companies had no power to create further indebtedness by way of debentures or to bring an application on behalf of the companies under the Act.

(i) Section 3 and "instant" trust deeds

70 The debentures issued in August 1990, after the Bank had moved to install a receiver-manager, were issued solely and expressly for the purpose of meeting the requirements of s. 3 of the Act. Indeed, it took the companies two attempts to meet those requirements. The debentures had no commercial purpose. The transactions did, however, involve true loans in the sense that monies were advanced and debt was created. Appropriate and valid trust deeds were also issued.

71 In my view, it is inappropriate to refer to these transactions as "shams". They are neither false nor counterfeit, but rather are exactly what they appear to be, transactions made to meet jurisdictional requirements of the Act so as to permit an application for reorganization under the Act. Such transactions are apparently well known to the commercial bar: B. O'Leary, "A Review of the Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act" (1987), 4 National Insolvency Review 38, at p. 39; C. Keith Ham, " 'Instant' Trust Deeds Under the CCAA" (1988), 2 Comm. Insol. R. 25; G. Morawetz, "Emerging Trends in the Use of the Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act" (1990), Proceedings of the First Annual General Meeting and Conference of the Insolvency Institute of Canada.

> Mr. Ham, supra, writes at p. 25, continued on p. 30:
>
> Consequently, some companies have recently sought to bring themselves within the ambit of the CCAA by creating "instant" trust deeds, i.e., trust deeds which are created solely for the purpose of enabling them to take advantage of the CCAA.

72 Applications under the Act involving the use of "instant" trust deeds have been before the courts on a number of occasions. In no case has any court held that a company cannot gain access to the Act by creating a debt which meets the requirements of s. 3 for the express purpose of qualifying under the Act. In most cases, the use of these "instant" trust deeds has been acknowledged without comment.

73 The decision of Chief Justice Richard in Re United Maritime Fishermen Co-op (1988), 67 C.B.R. (N.S.) 44, 84 N.B.R. (2d) 415, 214 A.P.R. 415 (Q.B.), at pp. 55-56 C.B.R., speaks directly to the use of "instant" trust deeds. The Chief Justice refused to read any words into s. 3 of the Act which would limit the availability of the Act depending on the point at which, or the purpose for which, the debenture or

bond and accompanying trust deed were created. He accepted [p. 56 C.B.R.] the debtor company's argument that the Act:

> ... does not impose any time restraints on the creation of the conditions as set out in s. 3 of the Act, nor does it contain any prohibition against the creation of the conditions set out in s. 3 for the purpose of obtaining jurisdiction.

74 It should, however, be noted that in Re United Maritime Fishermen Co-op, supra, the debt itself was not created for the purpose of qualifying under the Act. The bond and the trust deed, however, were created for that purpose. The case is therefore factually distinguishable from the case at bar.

75 The Court of Appeal reversed the ruling of the Chief Justice ((1988), 69 C.B.R. (N.S.) 161, 51 D.L.R. (4th) 618 sub nom. Canadian Co-operative Leasing Services v. United Maritime Fishermen Co-op, 88 N.B.R. (2d) 253, 224 A.P.R. 253) on the basis that the bonds required by s. 3 of the Act had not been issued when the application was made, so that on a precise reading of the words of s. 3 the company did not qualify. The court did not go on to consider whether, had the bonds been properly issued, the company would have been entitled to invoke the Act. Hoyt J.A., for the majority, did, however, observe without comment that the trust deeds had been created specifically for the purpose of bringing an application under the Act.

76 The judgment of MacKinnon J. in Re Stephanie's Fashions Ltd. and Children's Corner Fashions Ltd., released January 24, 1990 (B.C. S.C.), is factually on all fours with the present case. In that case, as in this one, it was acknowledged that the sole purpose for creating the debt was to effect compliance with s. 3 of the Act. After considering the judgment of Chief Justice Richard in Re United Maritime Fishermen Co-op, supra, MacKinnon J. held, at p. 4 of the reasons:

> The reason for creating the trust deed is not for the usual purposes of securing a debt but when one reads it, on its face, it does that. I find that it is a genuine trust deed and not a fraud and that the petitioners have complied with s. 3 of the statute.

77 Re Metals & Alloys Co. is a recent example of a case in this jurisdiction in which "instant" trust deeds were successfully used to bring a company within the Act. The company issued debentures for the purpose of permitting the company to qualify under the Act so as to provide it with an opportunity to prepare and submit a reorganization plan. The company then applied for an order, seeking inter alia a declaration that the debtor company was a corporation within the meaning of the Act. Houlden J.A., hearing the matter at first instance, granted the declaration requested in an order dated February 16, 1990. No reasons were given. It does not appear that the company's qualifications were challenged before Houlden J.A.; however, the nature of the debentures issued and the purpose for their issue was fully disclosed in the material before him. The requirements of s. 3 of the Act are jurisdictional in nature and the consent of the parties cannot vest a court with jurisdiction it does not have. One must conclude that Houlden J.A. was satisfied that "instant" trust deeds suffice for the purposes of s. 3 of the Act.

78 A similar conclusion is implicit in the reasons of the British Columbia Court of Appeal in Chef Ready Foods Ltd. and HongKong Bank of Canada, supra. In that case, a debt of $50, with an accompanying debenture and trust deed, was created specifically to enable the company to make application under the Act. The court noted that the debt was created solely for that purpose in an effort to forestall an attempt by the bank to liquidate the assets of the debtor company. The court went on to deal with the merits and to dismiss an appeal from an order granting a stay pending a reorganization meeting. The court could not have reached the merits without first concluding that the $50 debt created by the company met the requirements of s. 3 of the Act.

79 The weight of authority is against the appellant. Counsel for the appellant attempts to counter that

authority by reference to the remarks of the Minister of Justice when s. 3 was introduced as an amendment to the Act in the 1952-53 sittings of Parliament (House of Commons Debates, 1952-53 (1-2 Eliz. 2), vol. II, pp. 1268-69). The interpretation of words found in a statute by reference to speeches made in Parliament at the time legislation is introduced has never found favour in our courts: Re Residential Tenancies Act, 1979, [1981] 1 S.C.R. 714, 123 D.L.R. (3d) 554, 37 N.R. 158, at p. 721 S.C.R., p. 561 D.L.R. Nor, with respect to Mr. Newbould's able argument, do I find the words of the Minister of Justice at the time the present s. 3 was introduced to be particularly illuminating. He indicated that the amendment to the Act left companies with complex financial structures free to resort to the Act, but that it excluded companies which had only unsecured mercantile creditors. The Minister does not comment on the intended effect of the amendment on the myriad situations between those two extremes. This case is one such situation. These debtor companies had complex secured debt structures but those debts were not, prior to the issuing of the debentures in August 1990, in the form contemplated by s. 3 of the Act. Like Richard C.J.Q.B. in Re United Maritime Fishermen Co-op, supra, at pp. 52-53 C.B.R., I am not persuaded that the comments of the Minister of Justice assist in interpreting s. 3 of the Act in this situation.

80 The words of s. 3 are straightforward. They require that the debtor company have, at the time an application is made, an outstanding debenture or bond issued under a trust deed. No more is needed. Attempts to qualify those words are not only contrary to the wide reading the Act deserves but can raise intractable problems as to what qualifications or modifications should be read into the Act. Where there is a legitimate debt which fits the criteria set out in s. 3, I see no purpose in denying a debtor company resort to the Act because the debt and the accompanying documentation was created for the specific purpose of bringing the application. It must be remembered that qualification under s. 3 entitles the debtor company to nothing more than consideration under the Act. Qualification under s. 3 does not mean that relief under the Act will be granted. The circumstances surrounding the creation of the debt needed to meet the s. 3 requirement may well have a bearing on how a court exercises its discretion at various stages of the application, but they do not alone interdict resort to the Act.

81 In holding that "instant" trust deeds can satisfy the requirements of s. 3 of the Act, I should not be taken as concluding that debentures or bonds which are truly shams, in that they do not reflect a transaction which actually occurred and do not create a real debt owed by the company, will suffice. Clearly, they will not. I do not, however, equate the two. One is a tactical device used to gain the potential advantages of the Act. The other is a fraud.

82 Nor does my conclusion that "instant" trust deeds can bring a debtor company within the Act exclude considerations of the good faith of the debtor company in seeking the protection of the Act. A debtor company should not be allowed to use the Act for any purpose other than to attempt a legitimate reorganization. If the purpose of the application is to advantage one creditor over another, to defeat the legitimate interests of creditors, to delay the inevitable failure of the debtor company, or for some other improper purpose, the court has the means available to it, apart entirely from s. 3 of the Act, to prevent misuse of the Act. In cases where the debtor company acts in bad faith, the court may refuse to order a meeting of creditors, it may deny interim protection, it may vary interim protection initially given when the bad faith is shown, or it may refuse to sanction any plan which emanates from the meeting of the creditors: see L. Crozier "Good Faith and the Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act" (1989), 15 Can. Bus. L.J. 89.

(ii) Section 3 and the prior agreement with the Bank limiting creation of new debt

83 The appellant also argues that the debentures did not meet the requirements of s. 3 of the Act because they were issued in contravention of a security agreement made between the companies and the Bank. Assuming that the debentures were issued in contravention of that agreement, I do not understand

how that contravention affects the status of the debentures for the purposes of s. 3 of the Act. The Bank may well have an action against the debtor company for issuing the debentures, and it may have remedies against the holders of the debentures if they attempted to collect on their debt or enforce their security. Neither possibility, however, negates the existence of the debentures and the related trust deeds. Section 3 does not contemplate an inquiry into the effectiveness or enforceability of the s. 3 debentures, as against other creditors, as a condition precedent to qualification under the Act. Such inquiries may play a role in a judge's determination as to what orders, if any, should be made under the Act.

(iii) Section 3 and the appointment of a receiver-manager

84 The third argument made by the Bank relies on its installation of a receiver-manager in both companies prior to the issue of the debentures. I agree with Finlayson J.A. that the placement of a receiver, either by operation of the terms of an agreement or by court order, effectively removes those formerly in control of the company from that position and vests that control in the receiver-manager: Re Hat Development Ltd. (1988), 64 Alta. L.R. (2d) 17, 71 C.B.R. (N.S.) 264 (Q.B.), affirmed without deciding this point (1989), 65 Alta. L.R. (2d) 374 (C.A.). I cannot, however, agree with his interpretation of the order of Saunders J. I read that order as effectively turning the receiver into a monitor with rights of access, but with no authority beyond that. The operation of the business is specifically returned to the companies. The situation created by the order of Saunders J. can usefully be compared to that which existed when the application was made in Re Hat Development Ltd., supra. Forsyth J., at p. 268 C.B.R., states:

> The receiver-manager in this case and indeed in almost all cases is charged by the court with the responsibility of managing the affairs of a corporation. It is true that is appointed pursuant, in this case, to the existence of secured indebtedness and at the behest of a secured creditor to realize on its security and retire the indebtedness. Nonetheless, this receiver-manager was court-appointed and not by virtue of an instrument. As a court-appointed receiver it owed the obligation and the duty to the court to account from time to time and to come before the court for the purposes of having some of its decisions ratified or for receiving advice and direction. It is empowered by the court to manage the affairs of the company and it is completely inconsistent with that function to suggest that some residual power lies in the hands of the directors of the company to create further indebtedness of the company and thus interfere however slightly, with the receiver-manager's ability to manage.

(Emphasis added)

85 After the order of Saunders J., the receiver-manager in this case was not obligated to manage the companies. Indeed, it was forbidden from doing so. The creation of the "instant" trust deeds and the application under the Act did not interfere in any way with any power or authority the receiver-manager had after the order of Saunders J. was made.

86 I also find it somewhat artificial to suggest that the presence of a receiver-manager served to vitiate the orders of Hoolihan J. Unlike many applications under s. 5 of the Act, the proceedings before Hoolihan J. were not ex parte and he was fully aware of the existence of the receiver-manager, the order of Saunders J., and the arguments based on the presence of the receiver-manager. Clearly, Hoolihan J. considered it appropriate to proceed with a plan of reorganization despite the presence of the receiver-manager and the order of Saunders J. Indeed, in his initial order he provided that the order of Saunders J. "remains extant". Hoolihan J. did not, as I do not, see that order as an impediment to the application for the granting of relief under the Act. Had he considered that the receiver-manager was in control of the

affairs of the company he could have varied the order of Saunders J. to permit the applications under the Act to be made by the companies: Re Hat Development Ltd., supra, at pp. 268-69 C.B.R. It is clear to me that he would have done so had he felt it necessary. If the installation of the receiver-manager is to be viewed as a bar to an application under this Act, and if the orders of Hoolihan J. were otherwise appropriate, I would order that the order of Saunders J. should be varied to permit the creation of the debentures and the trust deeds and the bringing of this application by the companies. I take this power to exist by the combined effect of s. 14(2) of the Act and s. 144(1) of the Courts of Justice Act, 1984, S.O. 1984, c. 11.

87 In my opinion, the debentures and "instant" trust deeds created in August of 1990 sufficed to bring the company within the requirements of s. 3 of the Act, even if in issuing those debentures the companies breached a prior agreement with the Bank. I am also satisfied that given the terms of the order of Saunders J., the existence of a receiver-manager installed by the Bank did not preclude the application under s. 3 of the Act.

V. DID HOOLIHAN J. ERR IN EXERCISING HIS DISCRETION IN FAVOUR OF DIRECTING THAT A CREDITORS MEETING BE HELD TO CONSIDER THE PROPOSED PLAN OF REORGANIZATION?

88 As indicated earlier, the Act provides a number of points at which the court must exercise its discretion. I am concerned with the initial exercise of discretion contemplated by s. 5 of the Act by which the court may order a meeting of creditors for purposes of considering a plan of reorganization. Hoolihan J. exercised that discretion in favour of the debtor companies. The factors relevant to the exercise of that discretion are as variable as the fact situations which may give rise to the application. Finlayson J.A. has concentrated on one such factor, the chance that the plan, if put before a properly constituted meeting of the creditors, could gain the required approval. I agree that the feasibility of the plan is a relevant and significant factor to be considered in determining whether to order a meeting of creditors: Edwards, "Reorganizations Under the Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act", supra, at pp. 594-95. I would not, however, impose a heavy burden on the debtor company to establish the likelihood of ultimate success from the outset. As the Act will often be the last refuge for failing companies, it is to be expected that many of the proposed plans of reorganization will involve variables and contingencies which will make the plan's ultimate acceptability to the creditors and the court very uncertain at the time the initial application is made.

89 On the facts before Hoolihan J. there were several factors which supported the exercise of his discretion in favour of directing a meeting of the creditors. These included the apparent support of two of the three substantial secured creditors, the companies' continued operation, and the prospect (disputed by the Bank) that the companies' fortunes would take a turn for the better in the near future, the companies' ongoing efforts, that eventually met with some success, to find alternate financing, and the number of people depending on the operation of the company for their livelihood. There were also a number of factors pointing in the other direction, the most significant of which was the likelihood that a plan of reorganization acceptable to the Bank could not be developed.

90 I see the situation which presented itself to Hoolihan J. as capable of a relatively straightforward risk-benefit analysis. If the s. 5 order had been refused by Hoolihan J., it was virtually certain that the operation of the companies would have ceased immediately. There would have been immediate economic and social damage to those who worked at the plants and those who depended on those who worked at the plants for their well-being. This kind of damage cannot be ignored, especially when it occurs in small communities like those in which these plants are located. A refusal to grant the application would also have put the investments of the various creditors, with the exception of the Bank,

at substantial risk. Finally, there would have been obvious financial damage to the owner of the companies. Balanced against these costs inherent in refusing the order would be the benefit to the Bank, which would then have been in a position to realize on its security in accordance with its agreements with the companies.

91 The granting of the s. 5 order was not without its costs. It has denied the Bank the rights it had bargained for as part of its agreement to lend substantial amounts of money to the companies. Further, according to the Bank, the order has put the Bank at risk of having its loans become under-secured because of the diminishing value of the accounts receivable and inventory which it holds as security and because of the ever increasing size of the companies' debt to the Bank. These costs must be measured against the potential benefit to all concerned if a successful plan of reorganization could be developed and implemented.

92 As I see it, the key to this analysis rests in the measurement of the risk to the Bank inherent in the granting of the s. 5 order. If there was a real risk that the loan made by the Bank would become undersecured during the operative period of the s. 5 order, I would be inclined to hold that the Bank should not have that risk forced on it by the court. However, I am unable to see that the Bank is in any real jeopardy. The value of the security held by the Bank appears to be well in excess of the size of its loan on the initial application. In his affidavit, Mr. Gibbons of Coopers & Lybrand asserted that the companies had over-stated their cash flow projections, that the value of the inventory could diminish if customers of the companies looked to alternate sources for their product, and that the value of the accounts receivable could decrease if customers began to claim set-offs against those receivables. On the record before me, these appear to be no more than speculative possibilities. The Bank has had access to all of the companies' financial data on an ongoing basis since the order of Hoolihan J. was made almost two months ago. Nothing was placed before this court to suggest that any of the possibilities described above had come to pass.

93 Even allowing for some over-estimation by the companies of the value of the security held by the Bank, it would appear that the Bank holds security valued at approximately $4 million for a loan that was, as of the hearing of this appeal, about $2.3 million. The order of Hoolihan J. was to terminate no later than November 14, 1990. I am not satisfied that the Bank ran any real risk of having the amount of the loan exceed the value of the security by that date. It is also worth noting that the order under appeal provided that any party could apply to terminate the order at any point prior to November 14. This provision provided further protection for the Bank in the event that it wished to make the case that its loan was at risk because of the deteriorating value of its security.

94 Even though the chances of a successful reorganization were not good, I am satisfied that the benefits flowing from the making of the s. 5 order exceeded the risk inherent in that order. In my view, Hoolihan J. properly exercised his discretion in directing that a meeting of creditors should be held pursuant to s. 5 of the Act.

95 VI. DID HOOLIHAN J. ERR IN DIRECTING THAT THE BANK AND ROYNAT INC. SHOULD BE PLACED IN THE SAME CLASS FOR THE PURPOSES OF THE ACT?

96 I agree with Finlayson J.A. that the Bank and RoyNat Inc., the two principal creditors, should not have been placed in the same class of secured creditors for the purposes of ss. 5 and 6 of the Act. Their interests are not only different, they are opposed. The classification scheme created by Hoolihan J. effectively denied the Bank any control over any plan of reorganization.

97 To accord with the principles found in the cases cited by Finlayson J.A., the secured creditors should have been grouped as follows:

Class 1 -- The City of Chatham and the Village of Glencoe

Class 2 -- The Bank of Nova Scotia

Class 3 -- RoyNat Inc., Ontario Development Corporation, and those holding debentures issued by the company on August 29 and 31, 1990.

VII. DID HOOLIHAN J. ERR IN MAKING
VII. THE INTERIM ORDERS HE MADE?

98 Hoolihan J. made a number of orders designed to control the conduct of all of the parties pending the creditors' meeting and the placing of a plan of reorganization before the court. The first order was made on September 11, 1990, and was to expire on or before October 24, 1990. Subsequent orders varied the terms of the initial order somewhat and extended its effective date until November 14, 1990.

99 These orders imposed the following conditions pending the meeting:

(a) all proceedings with respect to the debtor companies should be stayed, including any action by the Bank to realize on its security;
(b) the Bank could not reduce its loan by applying incoming receipts to those debts;
(c) the Bank was to be the sole banker for the companies;
(d) the companies could carry on business in the normal course, subject to certain very specific restrictions;
(e) a licensed trustee was to be appointed to monitor the business operations of the companies and to report to the creditors on a regular basis; and
(f) any party could apply to terminate the interim orders, and the orders would be terminated automatically if the companies defaulted on any of the obligations imposed on them by the interim orders.

100 The orders placed significant restrictions on the Bank for a two-month period but balanced those restrictions with provisions limiting the debtor companies' activities and giving the Bank ongoing access to up-to-date financial information concerning the companies. The Bank was also at liberty to return to the court to request any variation in the interim orders which changes in financial circumstances might merit.

101 These orders were made under the wide authority granted to the court by s. 11 of the Act. L.W. Houlden and C.H. Morawetz in Bankruptcy Law in Canada, 3rd ed. (Toronto: Carswell, looseleaf), at p. 2-103, describe the purpose of the section:

> The legislation is intended to have wide scope and allows a judge to make orders which will effectively maintain the status quo for a period while the insolvent company attempts to gain the approval of its creditors for a proposed arrangement which will enable the company to remain in operation for what is, hopefully, the future benefit of both the company and its creditors. This aim is facilitated by s. 11 of the Act which enables the court to restrain further proceedings in any action, suit or

> proceeding against the company upon such terms as the court sees fit.

102 A similar sentiment appears in Chef Ready Foods Ltd. v. HongKong Bank of Canada, supra. Gibbs J.A., in discussing the scope of s. 11, said at p. 7 of the reasons:

> When a company has recourse to the C.C.A.A. the court is called upon to play a kind of supervisory role to preserve the status quo and to move the process along to the point where a compromise or arrangement is approved or it is evident that the attempt is doomed to failure. Obviously time is critical. Equally obviously, if the attempt at compromise or arrangement is to have any prospect of success there must be a means of holding the creditors at bay, hence the powers vested in the court under s. 11.

103 Similar views of the scope of the power to make interim orders covering the period when reorganization is being attempted are found in Meridian Developments Inc. v. Toronto-Dominion Bank (1984), 32 Alta. L.R. (2d) 150, 53 A.R. 39, 52 C.B.R. (N.S.) 109, 11 D.L.R. (4th) 576, [1984] 5 W.W.R. 215 (Q.B.), at pp. 42-45 A.R., pp. 114-18 C.B.R.; Norcen Energy Resources Ltd. v. Oakwood Petroleums Ltd. (1988), 63 Alta. L.R. (2d) 361, 72 C.B.R. (N.S.) 1 (Q.B.), at pp. 12-15 C.B.R.; Quintette Coal Ltd. v. Nippon Steel Corp. B.C. S.C., Thackray J., released June 18, 1990, at pp. 5-9 of the reasons [now reported 47 B.C.L.R. (2d) 193; and O'Leary, B., "A Review of the Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act", supra, at p. 41.

104 The interim orders made by Hoolihan J. are all within the wide authority created by s. 11 of the Act. The orders were crafted to give the company the opportunity to continue in operation pending its attempt to reorganize while at the same time providing safeguards to the creditors, including the Bank, during that same period. I find no error in the interim relief granted by Hoolihan J.

VIII. CONCLUSION

105 In the result, I would allow the appeal in part, vacate the order of Hoolihan J. of October 18, 1990, insofar as it purports to settle the class of creditors for the purpose of the Act, and I would substitute an order establishing the three classes referred to in Part VI of these reasons. I would not disturb any of the other orders made by Hoolihan J.

Appeal allowed.