Court File No. CV-09-8122-00CL

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 INDALEX LIMITED, INDALEX HOLDINGS (B.C.) LTD., 6326765 CANADA INC. and NOVAR INC.

Applicants

BOOK OF AUTHORITIES

(Motion for Reinstatement of Supplementary Pension Benefits, returnable July 2, 2009)

KOSKIE MINSKY LLP
20 Queen Street West, Suite 900, Box 52
Toronto, Ontario M5H 3R3

Andrew J. Hatnay LSUC#: 31885W
Email: ahatnay@kmlaw.ca
Tel: 416-595-2083
Fax: 416-204-2872

Demetrios Yiokaris LSUC#: 45852L
Email: dyiokaris@kmlaw.ca
Tel: 416-595-2130
Fax: 416-204-2810

Andrea McKinnon LSUC#: 55900A
Email: amckinnon@kmlaw.ca
Tel: 416-595-2150
Fax: 416-204-2874

Lawyers for Keith Carruthers, Leon Kozierok, Bertram McBride, Max Degen, Eugene D'Iorio, Richard Smith, Robert Leckie and Neil Fraser (the "SERP Group")

Court File No. CV-09-8122-00CL

ONTARIO
SUPERIOR COURT OF JUSTICE
(COMMERCIAL LIST)

B E T W E E N :

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 INDALEX LIMITED, INDALEX HOLDINGS (B.C.) LTD., 6326765 CANADA INC. and NOVAR INC.

Applicants

SERVICE LIST

TO:	**BLAKE, CASSELS & GRAYDON LLP** 199 Bay Street, Suite 2800 Box 25, Commerce Court West Toronto, ON M5L 1A9 **Linc Rogers** Tel: (416) 863-4168 E-mail: linc.rogers@blakes.com **Katherine McEachern** Tel: (416) 863-2566 E-mail: katherine.mceachern@blakes.com **Jackie Moher** Tel: (416) 863-3174 Fax: (416) 863-2653 E-mail: jackie.moher@blakes.com Lawyers for the Applicants
AND TO:	**McMILLAN LLP** Brookfield Place, Suite 4400 181 Bay Street 42nd Floor Toronto, ON M5J 2T3 **Paul Macdonald** Tel: (416) 865-7167 Fax: (416) 865-7048 E-mail: paul.macdonald@mcmillan.ca **Wael Rostom** Tel: (416) 865-7790 Fax: (647) 722-6736 E-mail: wael.rostom@mcmillan.ca

	Larry Crozier Tel: (416) 865-7178 Fax: (416) 865-7048 E-mail: lawrence.crozier@mcmillan.ca **Tushara Weerasooriya** Tel: (416) 865-7262 Fax: (416) 865-7048 E-mail: tushara.weerasooriya@mcmillan.ca Lawyers for **JPMorgan Chase Bank, N.A.**
AND TO:	**STIKEMAN ELLIOTT LLP** Suite 5300, Commerce Court West 199 Bay Street Toronto, ON M5L 1B9 **Ashley Taylor** Tel: (416) 869-5236 E-mail: ataylor@stikeman.com **Lesley Mercer** Tel: (416) 869-6859 Fax: (416) 947-0866 E-mail: lmercer@stikeman.com Lawyers for **the Monitor, FTI Consulting Canada ULC**
AND TO:	**WEIRFOULDS LLP** The Exchange Tower, Suite 1600 Box 480, 130 King Street West Toronto, ON M5X 1J5 **Paul D. Guy** Tel: (416) 947-5045 Fax: (416) 365-1876 E-mail: pguy@weirfoulds.com Lawyers for **Alcoa**
AND TO:	**OGILVY RENAULT LLP** Suite 1100 1981 McGill College Avenue Montreal, QC H3A 3C1 **Sylvian Rigaud** Tel: (514) 847-4702 Fax: (514) 286-5474 E-mail: srigaud@ogilvyrenault.com Lawyers for **Rio Tinto Alcan Inc.**

AND TO:	**GREAT-WEST LIFE** 330 University Avenue Suite 400 Toronto, ON M5G 1R8 **Geoff Maier** Tel: (416) 552-5575 E-mail: geoff.maier@gwl.ca
AND TO:	**GREAT WEST LIFE** Great-West Life Centre 100 Osborne Street North Winnipeg, MB R3C 3A5 **Gary Senft** Tel: (204) 946-2943 Fax: (204) 946-4405 E-mail: gars@gwl.ca
AND TO:	**YOUNG CONAWAY STARGATT & TAYLOR LLP** The Brandywine Building 1000 West Street, 17th Floor Wilmington, DE 19801 **Donald J. Bowman, Jr.** Tel: (302) 571-5033 Fax: (302) 576-3504 E-mail: dbowman@ycst.com **Michael R. Nestor** Tel: (302) 571-6699 Fax: (302) 576-3321 E-mail: mnestor@ycst.com
AND TO:	**FASKEN MARTINEAU DUMOULIN LLP** 66 Wellington Street West Suite 4200, Toronto Dominion Bank Tower Box 20, Toronto Dominion Centre Toronto, ON M5K 1N6 **Edmond F.B. Lamek** Tel: (416) 865-4506 Fax: (416) 364-7813 E-mail: elamek@fasken.com Lawyers for the **Directors of the Applicants**

AND TO:	**MILLER THOMSON LLP** One London Place 255 Queens Avenue, Suite 2010 London, ON N6A 5R8 **Alissa K. Mitchell** Tel: (519) 931-3510 Fax: (519) 858-8511 E-mail: amitchell@millerthomson.com Lawyers for **GE Capital Canada Leasing Services Inc.**
AND TO:	**DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE** The Exchange Tower 130 King Street West, Suite 3400, P.O. Box 36 Toronto, ON M5X 1K6 **Diane Winters** Tel: (416) 973-3172 Fax: (416) 973-0810 E-mail: diane.winters@justice.gc.ca
AND TO:	**HER MAJESTY THE QUEEN IN RIGHT OF THE PROVINCE OF ONTARIO AS REPRESENTED BY THE MINISTER OF FINANCE** (Income Tax, PST) PO Box 620 33 King Street West, 6th Floor Oshawa, ON L1H 8E9 **Kevin J. O'Hara** E-mail: kevin.ohara@ontario.ca
AND TO:	**MINISTRY OF ATTORNEY GENERAL** Revenue & Taxation Group, Legal Services Branch 601 – 1175 Douglas Street PO Box 9289 Stn., Provincial Government Victoria, BC V8W 9J7 **Aaron Welch** Tel: (250) 356-8589 Fax: (250) 387-0700 E-mail: Aaron.Welch@gov.bc.ca
AND TO:	**HER MAJESTY THE QUEEN IN RIGHT OF THE PROVINCE OF ALBERTA AS REPRESENTED BY THE MINISTER OF FINANCE** (Income Tax) The Tax and Revenue Administration 9811-109 Street Edmonton, AB T5K 2L5 **John Chiarella** Tel: (780) 644-4122 Fax: (780) 422-3770 E-mail: john.chiarella@gov.ab.ca

AND TO:	**MONSIEUR LE MINISTRE** **MINISTERE DU REVENU** (QST, Income Tax, GST) Centre de perception fiscale 3800, rue de Marly Quebec City, QC G1X 4A5 **Claude Provencher** **Maryse Boucher** Fax: (514) 215-3672/(416) 643-0381 E-mail: maryse.boucher@mrq.gouv.qc.ca
AND TO:	**HER MAJESTY THE QUEEN IN RIGHT OF THE PROVINCE OF SASKATCHEWAN AS REPRESENTED BY THE MINISTER OF FINANCE** (PST Saskatchewan) Revenue Division 2350 Alberta Street, 5th Floor Regina, SK S4P 4A6 **Larry Fowler, Collections and Enforcement** E-mail: Larry.Fowler@gov.sk.ca **Ken Gorchinski, Collections and Enforcement** E-mail: Ken.Gorchinski@gov.sk.ca Fax: (306) 787-0241
AND TO:	**HER MAJESTY THE QUEEN IN RIGHT OF THE PROVINCE OF MANITOBA AS REPRESENTED BY THE MINISTER OF FINANCE** (Income Tax), Taxation Division 101-401 York Ave. Winnipeg, MB R3C 0P8 **Anita Huhn** Tel: (204) 945-4625 Fax: (204) 948-2200 E-mail: anita.huhn@gov.mb.ca
AND TO:	**ROYAL BANK OF CANADA** Senior Markets, Corporate Accounts 8th Floor, 320 Front Street Toronto, ON M5V 3B7 **Kevin Moore** Tel: (416) 974-5927 Fax: (416) 974-7673 E-mail: kevin.moore@rbc.com **Fiona Dubsky** Tel: (514) 874-2826 Fax: (514) 874-5315 E-mail: fiona.dubsky@rbc.com **Carla Swansburg** Tel: (416) 974-6712 Fax: (416) 974-2217 E-mail: carla.swansburg@rbc.com

AND TO:	**FTI CONSULTING CANADA ULC** Suite 2733, TD Canada Trust Tower 161 Bay Street Toronto, ON M5J 2S1 **Nigel D. Meakin** Senior Managing Director Tel: (416) 572-2285 Fax: (416) 572-2201 E-mail: nigel.meakin@fticonsulting.com
AND TO:	**HEENAN BLAIKIE LLP** Suite 2600, 200 Bay Street South Tower, Royal Bank Plaza Toronto, ON M5J 2J4 **John J. Salmas** Tel: (416) 360-3570 Fax: (416) 360-8425 E-mail: jsalmas@heenan.ca **Kenneth Kraft** Tel: (416) 643-6822 Fax: (416) 360-8425 E-mail: kkraft@heenan.ca **Henry Bertossi** Tel: (416) 643-6862 Fax: (416) 360-8425 E-mail: hbertossi@heenan.ca Lawyers for the **Stalking Horse Bidder**
AND TO:	**GOODMANS LLP** 250 Yonge Street, Suite 2400 Toronto, ON M5B 2M6 **Brian Empey** (LSUC No. 30640G) Tel: (416) 979-2211 Fax: (416) 979-1234 E-mail: bempey@goodmans.ca Lawyers for the Respondent, **Sun Indalex Finance, LLC**
AND TO:	**MACLEOD DIXON LLP** 3700 Canterra Tower 400 Third Avenue SW Calgary, AB T2P 4H2 **Steven H. Leitl** Tel: (403) 267-8140 Fax: (403) 264-5973 E-mail: steven.leitl@macleoddixon.com

	Kyle D. Kashuba Tel: (403) 267-8399 Fax: (403) 264-5973 E-mail: kashuba@macleoddixon.com Lawyers for **Constellation NewEnergy Capital Inc.**
	LIST OF PPSA REGISTRANTS:
AND TO:	**Woodbine Truck Centre Ltd. o/a Woodbine Indealease** 8240 Woodbine Avenue Markham, ON L3R 2N8 **Greg Kearns** E-mail: gkearns@woodbinetruck.com
AND TO:	**NRB Inc.** 115 South Service Road West, P.O. Box 129 Grimsby, ON L3M 4G3 **Richard DiAngelo** E-mail: richarddiangelo@nrb-inc.com
AND TO:	**De Lage Landen Financial Services Canada Inc.** 100-1235 North Service Road West Oakville, ON L6M 2W2 **Jacqueline Perron** E-mail: jperron@leasedirect.com
AND TO:	**GE Canada Equipment Financing G.P.** 123 Front Street West, 16th Floor Toronto, ON M5J 2M2 **Syenny Jeliana** Tel: (905) 858-4966 Fax: (416) 947-5303 Email: Syenny1.Jeliana@ge.com
AND TO:	**Penske Truck Leasing Canada Inc./** **Locations de Camions Penske Canada Inc.** RT 10 Green Hills, PO Box 791 Reading, PA 19603 **Denise Sanford** Tel: (905) 564-2176 E-mail: denise.sanford@penske.com
AND TO:	**Citicorp Vendor Finance, Ltd.** 123 Front Street West, 16th Floor Toronto, ON M5J 2M3 **Syenny Jeliana** Fax: (416) 947-5303 Email: Syenny1.Jeliana@ge.com

AND TO:	**GE Canada Leasing Services Company** 2300 Meadowvale Boulevard, Suite 100 Mississauga, ON L5N 5P9 **Dean Langley** Tel: (905) 858-4916 E-mail: dean.langley@ge.com
AND TO:	**VFS Canada Inc.** 73 Industrial Parkway North Aurora, ON L4G 4C4 **Murielle Graff** E-mail: murielle.graff@vfsco.com
AND TO:	**PHH Vehicle Management Services Inc.** 2233 Argentia Road, Suite 400 Mississauga, ON L5N 2X7 **Dominic Monaco** E-mail: dominic.monaco@phh.com
AND TO:	**CIT Financial Ltd.** 5045 South Service Road Burlington, ON L7R 4C8 **Anne Neuert** Tel: (888) 563-4321 E-mail: anne.neuert@cit.com **Isobel Fraser** Tel: (905) 633-2097 E-mail: isobel.fraser@cit.com
AND TO:	**Liftcapital Corporation/Corporation Liftcapital** 300 The East Mall, Suite 401 Toronto, ON M9B 6B7 **Doug Chau** Tel: (416) 621-5522 ext. 224 or 225 E-mail: dchau@liftcapital.ca
AND TO:	**IKON Office Solutions Inc.** 2300 Meadowvale Boulevard, Suite 200 Mississauga, ON L5N 5P9 **Darlene Milligan** Tel: (905) 858-6289 E-mail: Darlene.milligan@ge.com

	LIST OF UNIONS:
AND TO:	**United Steelworkers – District 3** 150 – 2880 Glenmore Trail S.E. Calgary, AB T2C 2E7 **Keith Turcotte, Area Supervisor** Tel: (403) 279-9397 E-mail: kturcotte@usw.ca
AND TO:	**United Steelworkers 2952** Suite 202 9292 – 200th Street Langley, BC V1M 3A6 **Steve Dewell** Tel: (604) 513-1850 E-mail: sdewell@usw.ca **R. Gatzka** E-mail: rgatzka@usw.ca
AND TO:	**Syndiat des Metallos** 2350, avenue De LaSalle Quebec, QC H1V 2L1 **Pierre Arseneau** Tel: (514) 599-2006 E-mail: parseneau@usw.ca
AND TO:	**United Steelworkers** 1158 Aerowood Drive Mississauga, ON L4W 1Y5 **Terry Bea, Staff Representative** Tel: (905) 629-4991 ext. 27 E-mail: tbea@usw.ca **F. Falbo** E-mail: ffalbo@usw.ca
AND TO:	**United Steelworkers** 25 Cecil Street Toronto, ON M5T 1N1 **Lawrence Hay, Staff Representative** E-mail: lhay@usw.ca
AND TO:	**United Steelworkers (Counsel)** **Rob Champagne** E-mail: rchampagne@usw.ca
AND TO:	**United Steelworkers (Counsel to Local 7785 and 7785-01)** **P. Lalonde** E-mail: plalonde@usw.ca

	WITH A COURTESY COPY TO: **BENNETT JONES LLP** Suite 3400 1 First Canadian Place P.O. Box 130 Toronto, ON M5X 1A4 **Raj S. Sahni** Tel: (416) 777-4804 E-mail: sahnir@bennettjones.com **Gavin Finlayson** Tel: (416) 777-5762 Fax: (416) 863-1716 E-mail: finlaysong@bennettjones.com Canadian Counsel to US Bank in its capacity as trustee for bondholders
	MILLER CANFIELD Suite 300 443 Ouellette Avenue Windsor, ON N9A 6R4 **John D. Leslie** Tel: (519) 561-7422 Fax: (519) 977-1565 E-mail: leslie@millercanfield.com Canadian Co-Counsel with McGuire Woods to the Unsecured Creditors Committee

INDEX

LIST OF AUTHORITIES

1. Ari N. Kaplan, *Pension Law* (2006: Irwin Law, Toronto).
2. *Doman Industries et al*, 2004 BSCS 733 (BCSC).
3. *Re United Air Lines Inc.* (2005), 9 C.B.R. (5th) 159 (Ont. S.C.J.).
4. *Cliffs Over Maple Bay Investments Ltd. v. Fisgard Capital Corp.*, 2008 BCCA 327 (BCCA).
5. *Chef Ready Foods Ltd.* v. *Hongkong Bank of Canada* (1990), 4 C.B.R. (3d) 311 (BCCA).
6. *Woodward's Ltd. (Re),* [1993] B.C.J. No. 42 (S.C.).
7. *Collins & Aikman Automotive Canada (Re)*, 2007 CanLII 45908 (Ont. S.C.J.).

TAB 1

ESSENTIALS OF CANADIAN LAW

PENSION LAW

ARI N. KAPLAN

Partner, Koskie Minsky LLP

Faculty of Law,
University of Western Ontario

employee interests should be "balanced" under the *PBA*, having regard to the voluntary nature of the Canadian pension system and the "soundness" of the financial and social policy objectives encompassed therein.

> ... pension standards legislation is a complex administrative scheme, which seeks to strike a delicate balance between the interests of employers and employees, while advancing the public interest in a thriving private pension system ...
>
> ...
>
> Statutory interventions in pension law have sought to clarify and regulate the relationship between employers and employees in order to promote the pension system while adjusting imbalances of power.
>
> ...
>
> ... The vital importance of pension schemes in the modern labour market is evident. Pension funds are a significant asset for employers and an invaluable nest egg for an aging workforce. Legislative schemes that establish minimum standards and ensure the protection of employee benefits are an element of sound financial and social policy. The facilitation and encouragement of pension plan participation advance the interests of employees, employers, and the public.[26]

What is sure to generate debate is the extent to which a particular statutory provision should be construed in a manner that presumptively leans toward preserving employee rights, relying on the social policy objectives of pension legislation or, alternatively, should be read under a lens that aims to "balance" employer business interests, having regard to the nature of pension plans as voluntary and commercial instruments.

3) Contract Law

a) Introduction

Because the establishment of a pension plan is voluntary in Canada, a pension plan is, in essence, a contract between an employer and its employees. The Supreme Court of Canada has observed that "pensions are now generally given for consideration rather than being merely gratuitous rewards" from an employer.[27] An employee's consideration is the promise and performance of work.[28] An employer's consideration

---

26 *Monsanto*, above note 13 at paras. 14, 49, and 50.

27 *Ibid.* at 211; *Schmidt v. Air Products of Canada Ltd.* (1994), 115 D.L.R. (4th) 631 at 659 (S.C.C.) [*Schmidt*]. See also *Huus*, above note 18 at para. 25.

28 *Bathgate*, above note 15 at 375.

is the promise to contribute towards future income, deferred until retirement.[29] While it is sometimes said, strictly speaking, that "pension entitlements are separate and collateral to contracts of employment,"[30] it is nevertheless accepted that pension rights and employment rights do not operate in a legal vacuum. The pension is an important component of the contract of employment.[31] It is a negotiated benefit forming part of the employee's total wage package and, in this regard, "there is a close relationship between salaries and pensions."[32]

Because the law of contracts and employment apply to pension plans, parties' rights under these instruments can be determined by reference to basic contract and employment law principles. Contractual rights applicable to pension plans include the right to sue for specific performance to enforce the terms of the plan and the right to sue for damages for breach of contract. An employee's right to claim damages for pension loss in connection with a wrongful dismissal is a classic example of where employment law rights extend into the realm of pension entitlements.[33]

Pension rights established under a contract arise independently of rights under other legal instruments or the *PBA*. While other legal principles and, in particular, the law of equity and trusts may apply to the pension plan relationship, pension promises can result, "as a matter of employment or contract law, in the earning of pension rights independent of the law of trusts."[34] In some circumstances, an employer's communications to an employee may approach the level of a binding promise notwithstanding that the communication may be inconsistent with or not provided for under the strict terms of the pension plan.[35] Fi-

---

29 *Schmidt*, above note 27 at 654.

30 *Taggart v. The Canada Life Assurance Company*, [2006] O.J. No. 310 at paras. 13 and 14 (C.A.) [*Taggart*].

31 *Huus*, above note 18 at para. 25.

32 *Beauregard v. Canada*, [1986] 2 S.C.R. 56 at 83, and *McKinney v. University of Guelph*, [1990] 3 S.C.R. 229 at 310–11.

33 *Taggart*, above note 30.

34 *Bathgate*, above note 15 at 375. See also *Potash Corp. of Saskatchewan Inc. v. Crown Investments Corp. of Saskatchewan* (2003), 36 C.C.P.B. 272 at paras. 128–41 (Sask. Q.B.).

35 *Taggart v. Canada Life Assurance Co.* (2005), 45 C.C.P.B. 138 (Ont. S.C.J.), supplementary reasons at (2005), 48 C.C.P.B. 137 (Ont. S.C.J.), aff'd in *Taggart*, above note 30 (Ont. C.A.). See also *White v. Halifax (Regional Municipality) Pension Committee* (2005), 48 C.C.P.B. 310 (N.S.S.C.) [*White*]; *Cabot Canada Ltd. v. Cabot Canada Ltd. (Deloro Stellite Division, Pension Plan)* (1993), 99 D.L.R. (4th) 679 (Ont. C.A.); *Ford v. Laidlaw Carriers Inc.* (1993), 1 C.C.P.B. 97 (Ont. Ct. Gen. Div.), aff'd (1994), 12 C.C.P.B. 179 (Ont. C.A.); *Caie v. Caterpillar of Canada Ltd.*

TAB 2

Citation: Doman Industries et al
2004 BCSC 733

Date: 20040525
Docket: L023489
Registry: Vancouver

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF BRITISH COLUMBIA

Oral Reasons for Judgment
The Honourable Mr. Justice Tysoe
Pronounced in Chambers
May 25, 2004

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

AND

IN THE MATTER OF THE *COMPANY ACT*
R.S.B.C. 1996, c. 62

AND

IN THE MATTER OF THE *CANADA BUSINESS CORPORATIONS ACT*
R.S.C. 1985, c. C-44

AND

IN THE MATTER OF THE *PARTNERSHIP ACT*
R.S.B.C. 1996, c. 348

AND

IN THE MATTER OF DOMAN INDUSTRIES LIMITED,
ALPINE PROJECTS LIMITED,
DIAMOND LUMBER SALES LIMITED, DOMAN FOREST PRODUCTS LIMITED,
DOMAN'S FREIGHTWAYS LTD., DOMAN HOLDINGS LIMITED,
DOMAN INVESTMENTS LIMITED, DOMAN LOG SUPPLY LTD.,
DOMAN-WESTERN LUMBER LTD., EACOM TIMBER SALES LTD.,
WESTERN FOREST PRODUCTS LIMITED,
WESTERN PULP INC.,
WESTERN PULP LIMITED PARTNERSHIP,
and QUATSINO NAVIGATION COMPANY LIMITED

PETITIONERS

Counsel for the Petitioner, Western Forest Products Ltd.:	E.J. Harris, Q.C. and P.D. McLean
Counsel for Hayes Forest Services Ltd.:	I.G. Nathanson, Q.C. and S.R. Schachter, Q.C.
Counsel for Tricap Restructuring Fund:	M.I. Buttery
Counsel for Strathcona Contracting Ltd.:	S.R. Ross
Counsel for Committee of Unsecured Noteholders:	K. Zych
Counsel for Petro-Canada Inc.:	C.E. Hirst

[1] **THE COURT:** One of the Petitioners, Western Forest Products Ltd., ("Western") applies, in these proceedings under the ***Companies Creditors Arrangement Act*** (the "***CCAA***") involving the Doman group of companies, for authorization or approval of the termination of contracts it has with Hayes Forest Services Ltd. ("Hayes") and Strathcona Contracting Ltd. ("Strathcona").

[2] The Doman group of companies ("Doman") carry on business in the B.C. forestry industry. Doman encountered financial difficulties and has been in the process of attempting to restructure under the ***CCAA*** for approximately one and a half years. The liabilities of ***Doman*** consist of secured term debt in the principal amount of U.S. $160 million, unsecured term notes in the principal amount of U.S. $513 million, unsecured

trade debt in excess of $20 million, a secured operating line of credit and other miscellaneous obligations.

[3] The restructuring process is nearing completion. A plan of compromise and arrangement (the "Restructuring Plan") has been filed and the meeting of creditors to consider it has been scheduled to be held in approximately two weeks. The deadline for creditors to file proofs of claim is today.

[4] In very simple terms, the Restructuring Plan contemplates that the lumber and pulp assets of Doman will be transferred into new corporations and that the unsecured noteholders, trade creditors and other unsecured creditors will have their debt converted into shares in one of the new corporations, which will own the lumber assets and the shares of the other corporation holding the pulp assets. The secured term debt is to be refinanced and the secured operating line of credit will be unaffected. The existing shareholders of Doman are to receive warrants entitling them to purchase a limited number of shares in the new parent corporation.

[5] The implementation of the Restructuring Plan is subject to the fulfilment of numerous conditions precedent. One of the conditions is the termination of the contracts with Hayes and Strathcona which are the subject matter of this application.

[6] Western holds certain forest tenure, including licenses relating to an area known as the Nootka Region on Vancouver Island and at least one island off the coast of Vancouver Island called Nootka Island. In 1991, the B.C. government decided that logging contractors should have a form of security similar to the tenure enjoyed by license holders and created the concept of replaceable contracts under the ***Forest Act***.

[7] The attributes of replaceable contracts were discussed at length by the B.C. Court of Appeal in ***Clear Creek Contracting Ltd. v. Skeena Cellulose Inc.*** 2003 BCCA 344 and I will not repeat all of them here. In short, a replaceable contract is a form of evergreen contract which contains statutorily mandated provisions, the most important of which is that the license holder must offer a new or replacement contract to the contractor upon each expiry of the term of the contract as long as the contractor is not in default under the contract. If the parties are not able to agree on the new rates under the replacement contract, an arbitrator will determine the rates, which are mandated to be competitive within the industry and to permit the contractor to earn a reasonable profit on top of its costs. The contractors with such contracts are known in the industry as Bill 13 contractors. A

license holder must have at least 50% of its annual allowable cut harvested by Bill 13 contractors.

[8] Western has 7 full-phase Bill 13 logging contracts with 6 contractors for the Nootka Region. Hayes is one of those contractors and it has the full-phase contract for the Plumper Harbour area of the Nootka Region. A full-phase contract includes all aspects of logging ranging from road construction, falling, hauling, sorting and delivery to transportation points. Hayes sold the road construction aspect of its contract, and the replaceable contract for road construction was assigned to Strathcona.

[9] When Doman first commenced these ***CCAA*** proceedings, it was anticipated that the restructuring process would be completed in a relatively short period of time. It was contemplated that all unsecured debt other than the unsecured bondholders would be paid in full and that the unsecured bondholders would take most, but not all, of the equity in Doman in exchange for some of the indebtedness owed to them and would take security for the remainder of their indebtedness. The confirmation or come-back Order of December 6, 2002 authorized a downsizing process for Doman, but it was not instituted in view of the anticipated restructuring.

[10] The restructuring initially contemplated by Doman did not take place, in part because I made a ruling that the covenants in the trust deed for the secured term debt could not be overridden into the future. By the beginning of April 2004, the unsecured bondholders were pressing for their own restructuring plan and had made it clear that there should be some downsizing in Doman's operations, particularly the closure of Doman's pulp mill in Port Alice. On April 6, 2004, I declined Doman's application for an extension of the stay for the sole purpose of pursuing refinancing of its debt and the sale of the Port Alice pulp mill, but I also declined an application of the unsecured bondholders to call a meeting of creditors to consider its plan of arrangement. I extended the stay for the purpose of allowing Doman to file its own restructuring plan while still pursuing refinancing and sale alternatives, but I imposed a fairly concrete deadline by directing that the creditors meeting be held on June 7. In my April 6 Order, I authorized Doman to reinstitute its downsizing process with special emphasis on the closure of the Port Alice pulp mill if a purchaser was not located. I also placed a restriction on any downsizing by providing that any termination of a replaceable contract under the ***Forest Act*** was not to be effective unless authorized by the court.

[11] By letters dated April 27, 2004, Western terminated its contracts with Hayes and Strathcona effective upon court approval of the terminations. An affidavit of Mr. Zimmerman, a Western employee, provided the following rationale for the decision to terminate these replaceable contracts:

> As part of the reorganization and "downsizing" processes of [Western], we have looked at methods to rationalize harvesting operations in the Nootka Region so as to reduce costs and improve profitability of [Western]. [Western] has worked in conjunction with representatives of the Bondholder committee who have asked for recommendations so as to increase profitability. [Western] has determined that within the Nootka Region, operational efficiencies can be achieved and significant cost savings can be achieved if the number of contractors is reduced and if that contractor's allocated volume is re-allocated to the remaining contractors. [Western] has recommended this reduction to the Bondholders Committee and the representatives of the Committee have asked that [Western] institute a rationalization and termination of contract, which is subject to Court approval as provided in this Court's Order of April 6, 2004.

The affidavit goes on to state that the rationalization can best be carried out by the termination of the Plumper Harbour contracts, principally because the contractor costs associated with this location are the highest in the Nootka Region. The volume under the contracts would then be re-allocated to other Bill 13 contractors in the Nootka Region. The average contract rate for logging a cubic metre of timber under the Hayes contract for the period from 1998 to 2001, as determined

by arbitration, was approximately $4 higher than the average rate under the other contracts for the Nootka Region.

[12] Mr. Zimmerman's affidavit indicated that Western did not intend to harvest at Plumper Harbour for the next three years and set out the savings that Western would be able to achieve by terminating the Hayes and Strathcona contracts. These savings were estimated at $5 million over the next three years and $800,000 for each year thereafter. These included annual savings of approximately $165,000 in road building costs, but the main reason Western wants to terminate its contract with Strathcona is that the full-phase contractor replacing Hayes may have its own road building capabilities. Mr. Zimmerman also exhibited to his affidavit a proposal which Hayes had made to Western in 1999 whereby Hayes offered to exchange its rights under its Bill 13 contract for the exclusive right to do helicopter logging in the Nootka Region with an annual minimum guarantee. In the proposal, Hayes stated that the average cut for many of the Bill 13 contractors had been reduced below an efficient economic operating level and that higher costs were being passed on to Western. The proposal was not accepted by Western because it did not want to give exclusive rights for helicopter logging with a guaranteed entitlement.

[13] Representatives of Hayes and Strathcona swore affidavits disputing that the savings would be of the magnitude estimated by Mr. Zimmerman. They also set out the prejudice which their companies would suffer if the contracts were terminated, including the loss of employment and the inability to utilize fixed assets. Mr. Hayes deposed that there is no reasonable or rational economic reason for Western to forego harvesting in Plumper Harbour this year because most of the engineering and road construction costs have already been incurred. Mr. Hayes estimated that if Western harvested the timber on its logging plan for this year in Plumper Harbour, it would receive revenue, net of additional harvesting costs, of approximately $2 million.

[14] The affidavit of Mr. Hayes also stated that Hayes recognized that the operations of the Bill 13 contractors in the Nootka Region are inefficient, unwieldy and costly. Despite this acknowledgment, Mr. Hayes expressed a view that the termination of its contract will not have a material impact on cost reduction in the Nootka Region when one takes into account that the Province will be taking back approximately 20% of Western's annual allowable cut in the Nootka Region pursuant to the recently enacted ***Forestry Revitalization Act*** and will thereby cause a reduction in the

volumes harvested by all of the Bill 13 contractors. No affidavit was sworn by a Western representative to dispute this statement.

[15] Mr. Zimmerman, Mr. Hayes and the deponent on behalf of Strathcona were cross-examined on their affidavits. In his cross-examination, Mr. Zimmerman stated that Western did intend to liquidate the developed timber at Plumper Harbour of approximately 130,000 cubic metres over the next two years before putting the area in abeyance for a three year period. Western has not introduced any evidence with respect to the anticipated costs if this developed timber is harvested or is harvested by other Bill 13 contractors rather than Hayes.

[16] In addition to the ***Skeena Cellulose*** decision which dealt with the termination of replaceable contracts in ***CCAA*** proceedings, counsel referred me to several other cases involving the termination of contracts, leases or licenses in ***CCAA*** proceedings.

[17] In ***Re Dylex Ltd.,*** [1995] O.J. No. 595 (Q.L.) (Ont. Ct. of Jus.), Farley J. authorized the insolvent company to repudiate the leases of three of its stores as part of a program to close 200 of its stores across Canada. The three stores had been a financial drain on Dylex. Although the closures were going to have a detrimental effect on the shopping centres in

which the stores were located, Farley J. held that in weighing the balancing of interests in a ***CCAA*** context, the court's discretion should be exercised in favour of Dylex over the landlord, which was in sound financial condition. Farley J. declined to import into the ***CCAA*** the requirement applicable to proposals under the ***Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act*** that the insolvent company has to show that it would not be able to make a viable proposal unless it terminated the leases in question.

[18] In ***Re Blue Range Resource Corp.*** 1999 ABQB 1038, the insolvent company had been authorized by the court under the initial stay order to terminate such of its contracts as it deemed appropriate to permit it to proceed with an orderly restructuring of its business. Blue Range terminated some of its natural gas supply contracts and three of the parties to such contracts sought to challenge the termination of their contracts. One of the issues they raised was that the stay order should be varied to provide that Blue Range would only be permitted to terminate the contracts if it was incapable of performing them or if the termination was essential to the success of their restructuring. Lo Vecchio J. dismissed the application to vary the stay order in this fashion. He made

the following comments at paras. 36 through 38, which have been quoted in subsequent cases:

> The purpose of the CCAA proceedings generally and the stay in particular is to permit a company time to reorganize its affairs. This reorganization may take many forms and they need not be listed in this decision. A common denominator in all of them is frequently the variation of existing contractual relationships. Blue Range might, as any person might, breach a contract to which they are a party. They must however bear the consequences. This is essentially what has happened here.
>
> A unilateral termination, as in any case of breach, may or may not give rise to a legitimate claim in damages. Although the Order contemplates and to a certain extent permits unilateral termination, nothing in Section 16.e or in any other part of the Order would suggest that Blue Range is to be relieved of this consequence; indeed Blue Range's liability for damages seems to have been assumed by Duke and Engage in their set-off argument. The application amounts to a request for an order of specific performance or an injunction which ought not to be available indirectly. In my view, an order authorizing the termination of contracts is appropriate in a restructuring, particularly given that it does not affect the creditors' rights to claim for damages.
>
> The Applicants are needless to say not happy about having to look to a frail and struggling company for a potentially significant damages claim. They will be relegated to the ranks of unsecured judgment creditors and may not, indeed likely will not, have their judgments satisfied in full. While I sympathize with the Applicants' positions, they ought not to, in the name of equity, the guide in CCAA proceedings, be able to elevate their claim for damages above the claims of all the other unsecured creditors through this route.

[19] Lo Vecchio J. held that the court has the necessary jurisdiction to permit termination of contracts and that the termination of the contracts in question was necessary to the company's survival program.

[20] In ***Re T. Eaton Co.***, [1999] O.J. No. 4216 (Q.L.) (Ont. Sup. Ct. of Jus.), Farley J. refused to order specific performance of an exclusive license to provide credit card services that had been repudiated by the insolvent company as part of a sale of its assets which was the foundation of its restructuring plan. He held that the licensee could be adequately compensated in damages and should not have a higher claim than any other unsecured creditor. In the course of his reasons, he quoted the above portions of the ***Blue Range*** decision, and said the following at para. 7:

> It is clear that under CCAA proceedings debtor companies are permitted to unilaterally terminate in the sense of repudiate leases, and contracts without regard to the terms of those leases and contracts including any restrictions conferred therein that might ordinarily (i.e. outside CCAA proceedings) prevent the debtor company from so repudiating the agreement. To generally restrict debtor companies would constitute an insurmountable obstacle for most debtor companies attempting to effect compromises and reorganizations under the CCAA. Such a restriction would be contrary to the purposive approach to CCAA proceedings followed by the courts to this date.

Farley J. also spoke about being cognizant of the function of a balancing of prejudices within the general approach to the ***CCAA***.

[21] The issue of the court's jurisdiction to authorize the termination of replaceable contracts under the ***B.C. Forest Act*** was first addressed in the predecessor to the ***CCAA*** proceedings of Skeena Cellulose, ***Re Repap British Columbia Inc.,*** June 11, 1997, Docket No. A970588 (B.C.S.C.). Thackray J. held that the court had the jurisdiction under the ***CCAA*** to authorize the insolvent company to terminate replaceable contracts. None of the replaceable contracts in question were actually terminated until the subsequent Skeena Cellulose proceedings.

[22] In the Skeena Cellulose proceedings, the come-back order authorized the company to terminate replaceable contracts in order to facilitate the downsizing and consolidation of its business and operations. As part of Skeena Cellulose's plan of compromise and arrangement, a third party agreed to purchase the shares in the company for $8 million, which was to be used for distribution to the creditors having claims in excess of $400 million. It was a condition precedent to the purchase that two of Skeena Cellulose's five replaceable contracts be terminated, and letters of termination were sent.

The two contractors applied to the court for a declaration that the terminations were invalid.

[23] Brenner C.J.S.C. dismissed the application. In his decision (cited at 2002 BCSC 1280), he said the following at para. 25:

> SCI has no authority to decline to replace the applicants' replaceable contracts under the terms of those contracts, or in accordance with the provisions of the Regulation that deal with when and how a replaceable contract can be terminated. The only authority for SCI to terminate, or indeed, jurisdiction for this court to approve such terminations, must be found in the terms of the Come-back Order, and in the provisions of the CCAA. To be effective, the terminations must:
>
> (a) comply with the procedures and conditions stipulated in the Come-back Order; and,
>
> (b) conform to the broader principles of economic necessity and fairness which underlie the court's discretionary jurisdiction under the CCAA.

Brenner C.J.S.C. expressed the view that the statutory privileges given to the Bill 13 contractors are not sufficient to justify the creation or recognition of a preference in favour of the contractors over other creditors.

[24] The appeal from Brenner C.J.S.C.'s decision was dismissed. In its decision, the B.C. Court of Appeal held that the court had an equitable jurisdiction to supplement the ***CCAA*** by approving a plan of arrangement which contemplates the

termination of contracts by the debtor corporation. Newbury J.A. held that in approving such a plan involving the termination of replaceable contracts, the court was not overriding provincial legislation because nothing in the legislation purported to invalidate a termination of a replaceable contract but that, in any event, the doctrine of paramountcy would result in preference being given to the ***CCAA*** over the ***B.C. Forest Act*** in the case of a conflict.

[25] The Court of Appeal found no error in the exercise of discretion by Brenner C.J.S.C. Newbury J.A. said the following about the concept of fairness at para. 60:

> I have no difficulty in accepting the appellants' argument that fairness as between them and the other three evergreen contractors and as between the appellants and Skeena was a legitimate consideration in the analysis of this case. (Indeed, I believe the Chief Justice considered this aspect of fairness, even though he did not mention it specifically in this part of his Reasons.) The appellants are obviously part of the "broad constituency" served by the CCAA. But the key to the fairness analysis, in my view, lies in the very breadth of that constituency and wide range of interests that may be properly asserted by individuals, corporations, government entities and communities. Here, it seems to me, is where the flaw in the appellants' case lies: essentially, they wish to limit the scope of the inquiry to fairness as between five evergreen contractors or as between themselves and Skeena, whereas the case-law decided under the CCAA, and its general purposes discussed above, require that the views and interests of the "broad constituency" be considered. In the case at bar, the Court was concerned with the

> deferral and settlement of more than $400 million in debt, failing which hundreds of Skeena's employees and hundreds of employees of logging and other contractors stood to lose their livelihoods. The only plan suggested at the end of the extended negotiation period to save Skeena from bankruptcy was NWBC's acquisition of its common shares for no consideration and the acceptance by its creditors of very little on the dollar for their claims.

The Court of Appeal concluded that there was a business case for the terminations. Newbury J.A. stated that the situation in ***Dylex*** was no different in principle because, like the leases in ***Dylex***, the replaceable contracts were too costly for Skeena Cellulose to continue operating under them.

[26] Although the Court of Appeal's decision in ***Skeena Cellulose*** settles that the court has the necessary jurisdiction to deal with the termination of contracts, none of the above decisions includes any detailed discussion with respect to the basis upon which the court becomes involved in decisions to terminate contracts. Newbury J.A. discussed the jurisdiction in terms of the court approving a plan of arrangement which involves the termination of contracts, but the court will often authorize the termination of contracts prior to the formulation of a plan of arrangement.

[27] If a debtor company repudiated a contract prior to commencing ***CCAA*** proceedings, the court would not have any direct involvement in the termination of the contract unless,

possibly, the other party to the contract sought specific performance of the contract (which, as Brenner C.J.S.C. pointed out in ***Skeena Cellulose,*** is particularly inappropriate in an insolvency). The other party to the contract would have a claim for damages in respect of the repudiation and would be treated like any other unsecured creditor for the purposes of the plan of arrangement.

[28] Once an insolvent company seeks the assistance of the court by commencing ***CCAA*** proceedings, the company comes under the supervision of the court. The supervision also involves a consideration of the interests of the broad constituency served by the ***CCAA*** mentioned in ***Skeena Cellulose*** by Newbury J.A. These interests, when coupled with the exercise by the court of its equitable jurisdiction, bring into play the requirements for fairness and reasonableness in weighing the interests of affected parties.

[29] Generally speaking, the indebtedness compromised in ***CCAA*** proceedings is the debt which is in existence at the time of the ***CCAA*** filing, and the debtor company is expected to honour all of its obligations which become owing after the ***CCAA*** filing. It is common for the initial stay order or the come-back order to provide that the debtor company is to continue

carrying on its business and to honour its ongoing obligations unless the court authorizes exceptions.

[30] In many reorganizations under the ***CCAA,*** it is necessary for the insolvent company to restructure its business affairs as well as its financial affairs. Even if the financial affairs are restructured, the company may not be able to survive because portions of the business will continue to incur ongoing losses. In such cases, it is appropriate for the court to authorize the company to restructure its business operations, either during the currency of the ***CCAA*** proceedings or as part of a plan of arrangement. The process is commonly referred to as a downsizing if it involves certain aspects of the business coming to an end. The liabilities which are incurred as a result of the restructuring of the business operations, for such things as termination of leases and other contracts, are included in the obligations compromised by the plan of arrangement even though the debtor company will have been honouring its ongoing commitments under the leases and other contracts after the commencement of the ***CCAA*** proceedings. The inclusion of these liabilities in the plan of arrangement is an exception to the general practice of debtor companies paying the full extent of post-filing liabilities and compromising only the pre-filing liabilities.

[31] It is within this context that the court is called upon to authorize the termination of contracts which the debtor company could have repudiated without any authorization prior to the commencement of ***CCAA*** proceedings. The liabilities to be compromised have, in general terms, been crystallized by the filing of the ***CCAA*** petition, and the affairs of the debtor company are under the supervision of the court, which is required to exercise its equitable jurisdiction fairly and reasonably.

[32] I do not approach the matter in the same fashion as Lo Vecchio J. did in ***Blue Range***. I do not see the resistance of a party to the termination of a contract with the debtor company to be an attempt to elevate their claim for damages above the claims of all the other unsecured creditors. Apart from any monies which may have been outstanding under the contract at the time of the ***CCAA*** filing, the party to the contract was not an unsecured creditor who was going to be subjected to a compromise under a plan of arrangement. The party only becomes a creditor in respect of its damage claim if the contract is terminated. Although Lo Vecchio J. could be interpreted as suggesting in the quoted paragraphs 36 to 38 that a debtor company may terminate contractual relations as long as the resulting damage claim is included in its plan of

arrangement, I do note that he subsequently commented that the termination of the contracts in that case was necessary to the company's survival program.

[33] I prefer the approach of Farley J. in ***Dylex,*** which involves the court weighing the competing interests and prejudices in deciding what is fair and reasonable. I would anticipate that in the majority of cases a debtor company will be able to persuade the court to exercise its discretion in favour of the termination of contracts and other steps required to downsize or rationalize its business affairs. A debtor company must be insolvent to qualify under the ***CCAA*** and the insolvency may have been caused by over-expansion or continual losses by a part of the business. If the company is to have a reasonable prospect of surviving into the indefinite future, it will be appropriate to downsize its operations or bring an end to the losing aspects of the business. The interests of the broad constituency of stakeholders in taking reasonable steps to ensure the ongoing viability of the business will often outweigh the prejudice caused to parties having their contracts or other arrangements with the debtor company terminated and their consequential damage claim being included in the plan of arrangement. There is no single test for the debtor company to satisfy apart from demonstrating

that the termination is fair and reasonable in all of the circumstances. As held in ***Dylex***, it is not necessary for the debtor company to demonstrate that the termination of the contract is essential to the making of a viable plan of arrangement.

[34] An example of this type of situation has already occurred in these proceedings. Doman's pulp mill at Port Alice has been losing money for a significant period of time and causing a financial drain on Doman's resources. At the suggestion of the bondholders, it was decided that the mill should be closed and should not be part of the restructured company. Although the closure of the mill would have had a devastating effect on the employees of the pulp mill and the Village of Port Alice as a whole, I authorized the closure because it would not have been reasonable to require the restructured company to operate a division of its business which was anticipated to continue to lose money. Fortunately, Doman was able to find another party who was willing to take over the pulp mill prior to its closure.

[35] On the other hand, there will be circumstances where it will not be appropriate to authorize the debtor company to terminate contracts. For example, suppose that a debtor company became insolvent because its business had been

operating at a loss but market conditions had changed and, with a financial restructuring of its existing debt, it was expected to be profitable in the future. Suppose further that the debtor company was party to a contract which did not cause the company to operate the relevant aspect of its business at a loss but the contract was not as favourable as the market would permit the company to obtain if it could divest itself of the existing contract. If the company could terminate the contract and enter into a new one with different rates, it could become substantially more profitable into the future. In these circumstances, it may well be inappropriate for the court to authorize the termination of the contract. The risk of the failure of the debtor company after its restructuring would be relatively low and, depending on the terms of the plan of arrangement, the future benefit of the contract termination may accrue to the shareholders of the company or to the creditors of the company who took risks in exchange for high rates of return.

[36] On the present application, all that the evidence establishes is that Doman will likely be able to reduce its costs to some extent at some point in the future if it can terminate the two contracts in question. Mr. Zimmerman's affidavit states that the reason Western made the

recommendation to terminate the two contracts was to improve or increase its profitability. There is no evidence on this application with respect to the following points:

(a) whether the logging at Plumper Harbour under the existing contracts has produced a loss in the past or is expected to produce a loss in the future;

(b) whether other logging operations of Doman produce a greater loss;

(c) whether other aspects of Doman's business produce a loss and, if so, what consideration has been given to rationalizing that loss in comparison to the termination of the contracts in question;

(d) whether it is expected that the restructured company will operate at a profit;

(e) what parts of the constituency of stakeholders will benefit from the termination of the contracts in question;

(f) whether the developed timber at Plumper Harbour can be harvested in the next two years by other contractors at a cost less than the cost under the contracts in question; and

(g) what is the fallacy, if any, in the assertion of Mr. Hayes that the termination of the contracts will have no material impact on cost reduction after taking into account the 20% government take-back.

[37] Some reliance was placed by counsel on the fact that the termination of these contracts is a condition precedent of the Restructuring Plan. In my view, this condition precedent is materially different than the condition precedent in ***Skeena Cellulose***. In that case, it was an independent purchaser of the shares in ***Skeena*** that negotiated the condition on the basis that it was not prepared to purchase the shares unless two of the five replaceable contracts were terminated. The condition resulted from an arm's length negotiation which required the purchaser to put up funds to purchase the shares. In the present case, the bondholder committee produced the initial draft of the Restructuring Plan, which was finalized after a limited negotiation that served to advance the interests of the existing directors and shareholders of Doman. The condition precedent in question was not contained in the initial draft of the Restructuring Plan put forward by the bondholders and there is no evidence as to why the condition was inserted in the Restructuring Plan. I am unable to conclude that the condition precedent was the result of a

truly adversarial negotiation and that, unlike the situation in ***Skeena Cellulose,*** the restructuring is unlikely to proceed if the condition is not satisfied.

[38] In my opinion, therefore, there is insufficient evidence for me to conclude that the proposed contract terminations are fair and reasonable in all of the circumstances. All that the evidence available to me supports is a conclusion that the restructured company will have an opportunity of being more profitable if the contracts are terminated. It has not been demonstrated that the loss of this opportunity will outweigh the prejudice which will be suffered by Hayes and Strathcona if the contracts are terminated. In weighing the competing interests on the evidence before me, it is my conclusion that I should exercise my discretion against approving the contract terminations. I dismiss the application with costs.

"D.F. Tysoe, J."
The Honourable Mr. Justice D.F. Tysoe

TAB 3

Case Name:

United Air Lines, Inc. (Re)

IN THE MATTER OF the Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act, R.S.C. 1985, c. C.36, as amended AND IN THE MATTER OF United Air Lines, Inc. of the State of Delaware, in the United States of America and the other entities listed on Schedule "A"* APPLICATION UNDER Section 18.6 of the Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act, R.S.C. 1985, c. C-36 [* Editor's note: Schedule "A" was not attached to the copy received from the Court and therefore is not included in the judgment.]

[2005] O.J. No. 1044

[2005] O.T.C. 206

9 C.B.R. (5th) 159

45 C.C.P.B. 151

137 A.C.W.S. (3d) 1097

2005 CarswellOnt 1078

Court File No. 03-CL-5003

Ontario Superior Court of Justice - Commercial List

J.M. Farley J.

Heard: February 10, 2005.
Judgment: February 26, 2005.

(15 paras.)

Creditors and debtors law -- Legislation -- Debtors' relief -- Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act -- Pensions and benefits law -- Pensions -- Bankruptcy, effect of.

Application by the applicant, United Air Lines, for an order authorizing it to cease making contributions to its Canadian funded pension plans. United was in intense negotiations with its American workforce unions and was continuing to deal with its insolvency proceedings. Except for in the United States and Canada, United had kept up its pension funding commitments because under the pension and legal structures of the other countries, it had no choice but to do so. There was no evidence that United did not have sufficient funds to make the pension funding payments in Canada.

HELD: Application dismissed. Payment of the Canadian funding obligation would not in any way cause stress on the American restructuring given the relatively insignificant amounts in question. On the basis of fairness and equity, there was

no reason to excuse United from its obligation to fund its pension funding commitments in Canada.

Statutes, Regulations and Rules Cited:

Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act, R.S.C. 1985, c. C-36, s. 18.6.

Pension Benefits Standards Act, R.S.C. 1985, c. 32, s. 8(1), 8(2).

Counsel:

Scott A. Bomhof and Marc Lavigne, for United Air Lines, Inc.

Hugh M.B. O'Reilly, for the International Association of Machinists and Aerospace Workers ("IAMAW")

Barry Wadsworth, for the CAW-Canada

Ian Dick, for the Attorney General of Canada representing the Office of the Superintendent of Financial Institutions ("OSFI")

ENDORSEMENT

1 **J.M. FARLEY J.** (endorsement):-- United Air Lines, Inc. (UAL) moved for an order authorizing it to cease making contributions to its Canadian funded pension plans. It had originally brought on its motion on September 16, 2004 as to which there had been some advance preliminary discussion as to the "necessity" for it having to obtain some relief. The somewhat chaotic circumstances surrounding UAL and its insolvency proceedings in the U.S.A. and elsewhere in all probability contributed to its haste in bringing on the September motion and most certainly with respect to its method of giving notice to its two Canadian unions, the CAW and IAMAW, as well as OSFI. Given the exigencies of the circumstances, while unfortunate that there was not an appropriate length of and "proper" notice, one cannot be too critical of UAL as to providing something better. The CAW and OSFI attended at the September hearing; IAMAW did not in the relative confusion. There was then negotiated among UAL, CAW and OSFI a form of interim order granted by Pepall J. on September 16, 2004. This consent order, as is not uncommon with courtroom-drafted orders, is a little "awkward." It provided that pending the return of the motion, UAL could cease making pension plan funding payments notwithstanding the terms of any previous order or any direction of OSFI. I am of the view that, given that this motion was not brought back on until February 10, 2005, this shows that OSFI and the unions (IAMAW being cognizant of the September 16, 2004 order shortly thereafter) are quite understanding of the financial predicament in which UAL finds itself - and continues to find itself given a number of setbacks especially in its U.S. proceedings situation.

2 UAL as an airline has fallen on hard times. In this regard it is like a number of airlines worldwide both in recent times and at various stages in the past. The unions recognize that they have both long-term and short-term objectives in dealing with an employer - essentially they want a long term stable employer who is able to employ their workers at a fair wage and for this the company must remain in business and be competitive, but also in the short run, they do not wish to see a situation where commitments related to the employment arrangement are neglected. In the latter case, if matters take a turn for the worse, in this subject case, there would be relatively significant pension deficiencies (relative to the size of the Canadian workforce) which would be unsecured claims. In this regard "cash in the bank" is always better than an IOU. At the present time, UAL is no golden goose; indeed it is a rather bald bird (keeping in mind the taxation principle of plucking the squawking taxpayer) - but it is a bird which the unions have no interest in killing.

3 Allow me to observe a number of practical elements in this situation. UAL is in very intensive discussions/negotiations in the U.S.A. with its American workforce unions and it is continuing to deal with the morass its insolvency proceedings have become over the time since it commenced its Chapter 11 proceedings in December 2002. It has an international workforce, including that in Canada, of significantly less magnitude. It has in all countries except for the U.S.A. and Canada kept up its pension funding commitments because under the pension and legal structures of those other countries, it had no choice but to do so. UAL has it would seem devoted most of its time and energy to attempting to solve its U.S. based problems. It seems that it has taken the approach as to Canada, both in terms of the pension arrangements - but also with respect to discussions/negotiations as to concessions with its Canadian workforce (e.g. wage cuts or productivity improvement commitments), that this will and must await the outcome of the U.S. situation. On a functional basis, I do not criticize UAL for that approach. Indeed it may be the only practical one available to it. However, the unfortunate outcome of such an approach is that in essence Canada is ignored in the interim. This is contrary to the philosophy of our insolvency

proceedings approach which encompasses and balances the many elements including labour relations and balances the competing aspects of those elements - the key to which as to the labour relations element is that the company and the unions actively engage in a dialogue to see if the particular difficulty(ies) may be worked out and the aims of each side be accommodated with some give and take on a rational basis.

4 UAL has not run out of money nor of liquidity, albeit that it must husband its available funds and liquidity in a very prudent manner. However, there is no evidence before me that UAL either (i) does not have sufficient funds to make the pension funding payments or (ii) that its DIP arrangements are such that it cannot make such payments (in this latter (ii) situation, neither is there any evidence that even if it were up against the ceiling of its DIP requirements, that an application was made to the DIP lenders for consent to make such payments).

5 In other situations where a company has been in dire circumstances, it is not uncommon for a union to consent to a deferral of pension funding in order to facilitate the bona fide restructuring efforts of an employer (eg. the USWA in Ivaco). However, this is achieved on a consensual basis after negotiation; it is not a "given right" of the company. In the present case, the CAW and IAMAW have attempted to engage UAL in such discussions, but while UAL attended a meeting, it said it could not make any commitment. As UAL put it in its factum when speaking generally of its situation in Canada vis-à-vis the U.S.A.:

> 6. United has also commenced discussions with representatives of its unionized workforce in Canada and OSFI with respect to United's Canadian labour issues and pension obligations. However, United has not been in a position to determine its course of action in Canada at this time given that its Chapter 11 emergence business plan, and any further cost cutting measures required thereunder, cannot be finalized until its substantial U.S. labour and pension issues are resolved.

As discussed above, fair enough, the tail cannot be expected to wag to dog. But the dog must appreciate that it has a tail.

6 Allow me to make a further observation as to the difference between Canada and the U.S.A. In the U.S.A., the parties are dealing under an umbrella which most significantly includes the Pension Benefits Guarantee Corp. which generally protects the workforce/pensioner side in an insolvency where there is a pension deficit. In Canada, in this federally regulated situation, there is no such backstop; the workforce/pensioners are naked. While I appreciate that as UAL points out, the pensioners in Canada continue to receive their pension cheques, that is as it should be. However, the result of that equation is that with all outflow from the fund and no inflow, it is not realistic to think that the investment income side will radically improve so that the pension deficit does not become larger with every pension cheque mailed, thereby weakening the pension fund to the detriment of future calls on it by existing pensioners and new pensioners upon retirement from the active workforce.

7 As discussed above, the relative size of the Canadian problems vis-à-vis the U.S.A. problems is rather insignificant. It would not seem on the evidence before me that payment of funding obligations would in any way cause any particular stress or strain on the U.S. restructuring - given their relatively insignificant amounts in question. UAL had no qualms about making such payments in the other countries internationally. Additionally there is the issue of the U.S. situation having the benefit of the Pension Benefits Guarantee Corp. (as to which UAL would have paid premiums) but there being no such safety net in Canada on the federal level (and thus no previous premium obligation on UAL).

8 In the end result on the basis of fairness and equity, I find no reason to excuse UAL from its obligation to fund its pension funding commitments in Canada and I therefore direct it to resume such funding.

9 I would also note that OSFI is at liberty to, if it feels it necessary, request a lift of stay so that it may issue a direction if it thinks that warranted (as opposed to the mere demand of September 3, 2004; the direction having a legal consequence).

10 I recognize that with the effluxion of time, the pension funding arrears have mounted up and therefore are greater than the interim payments at any one time which you would have in a pay as you go situation. It may therefore be desirable for UAL and its unions (with or without the assistance of OSFI) to have discussions about the mechanics of such payment regarding funding of arrears; including a schedule if necessary or desirable and the question of future obligation payments. However, recognizing the dog and its tail problem, it is conceivable that UAL would continue to conclude that it would not be practicably feasible to do so. Thus if no such arrangement is put in place by March 31, 2005, all arrears are to be paid up by April 1, 2005. I would note the definite difference between "suspend" and "cease."

11 What then of the s. 8(2) Pension Benefits Standards Act, R.S.C. 1985, c. 32 (2nd Supp)? It provides as follows:

> 8(2) In the event of any liquidation, assignment or bankruptcy of an employer, an amount equal to the amount that by subsection (1) is deemed to be held in trust shall be deemed to be separate from and form no part of the estate in liquidation, assignment or bankruptcy, whether or not that amount has in fact been kept separate and apart from the employer's own moneys or from the assets of the estate.

I agree with the submissions of UAL as set out in its factum at para. 85:

> 85. Also, United submits that there are a number of issues which raise doubts about the application of the deemed trust set out in subsection 8(2) of the PBSA to the current situation. In particular, subsection 8(2) states that a deemed trust arises where there is a "liquidation, assignment or bankruptcy" of an employer. None of the parties to this motion have provided any evidence that United (the employer) is in liquidation, has made an assignment or is in bankruptcy.

However, UAL should also keep in mind the provisions of s. 8(1):

> 8(1) An employer shall ensure, with respect to its pension plan, that
>
> (a) the moneys in the pension fund,
> (b) an amount equal to the aggregate of the prescribed payments that have accrued to date, and
> (c) all
>
> (i) amounts deducted by the employer from members' remuneration, and
> (ii) other amounts due to the pension fund from the employer that have not been remitted to the pension fund
>
> are kept separate and apart from the employer's own moneys, and shall be deemed to hold the amounts referred to in paragraphs (a) to (c) in trust for members of the pension plan, former members, and any other persons entitled to pension benefits or refunds under the plan.

This of course may have fall out for officers and directors as to whom no stay protection is available.

12 In the end result, I dismiss the UAL motion to cease making contributions to its pension plans involving its Canadian workforce but rather to make good on its arrears unless otherwise agreed between its unions (who will have to keep in mind that UAL at some stage will come calling for concessions if it gets its U.S.A. house in order) and OSFI.

13 OSFI itself did not request a lift of stay vis-a-vis itself and so I do not find it appropriate to deal with the unions' request that I do so. OSFI is well able to speak for itself in this regard. It made no such motion; nor did it refer to same in its factum.

14 Orders accordingly (this endorsement also deals with the motions of the CAW and IAMAW).

15 All parties to this motion - UAL, the unions and OSFI - are labouring under the difficulties of fulfilling their valid legitimate mandates at a time where functionally there are pressing financial problems, compounded by UAL's being functionally distracted from Canada (and elsewhere) by the necessity of having to deal with its U.S.A. problems on a prioritized basis. I appreciate their difficulties. I would also wish to express my appreciation for the thorough and helpful submissions I received from counsel as they attempted to deal with their own clients' difficulties in dealing effectively with this situation on both a legal and functional basis.

J.M. FARLEY J.

cp/e/qljxh

TAB 4

COURT OF APPEAL FOR BRITISH COLUMBIA

Citation: ***Cliffs Over Maple Bay Investments Ltd. v. Fisgard Capital Corp.,*** 2008 BCCA 327

Date: 20080815
Docket: CA036261

Between:

Cliffs Over Maple Bay Investments Ltd.

Respondent
(Petitioner/Respondent)

And

Fisgard Capital Corp. and Liberty Holdings Excel Corp.

Appellants
(Respondents/Applicants)

Before: The Honourable Mr. Justice Frankel
The Honourable Mr. Justice Tysoe
The Honourable Madam Justice D. Smith

Oral Reasons for Judgment

G.J. Tucker A. Frydenlund	Counsel for the Appellants
H.M.B. Ferris P.J. Roberts	Counsel for the Respondent
M. Sennott	Counsel for Century Services Inc.
M.B. Paine	Counsel for the Monitor, The Bowra Group
Place and Date of Hearing:	Vancouver, British Columbia 12 August 2008
Place and Date of Judgment:	Vancouver, British Columbia 15 August 2008

[1] **TYSOE, J.A.**: The appellants appeal from the order dated June 27, 2008, by which the chambers judge extended the stay of proceedings that was initially granted on May 26, 2008, until October 20, 2008, and authorized financing in the amount of $2,350,000.

[2] The proceeding was commenced by The Cliffs Over Maple Bay Investments Ltd. (the "Debtor Company") under the ***Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act***, R.S.C. 1985, c. C-36, (the "***CCAA***") after the appellants appointed a receiver on May 23, 2008. As is often the case for initial applications under the ***CCAA***, no notice was given to the appellants or any other of the Debtor Company's creditors of the application giving rise to the May 26 stay order. In accordance with section 11(3) of the ***CCAA***, the stay contained in the order was expressed to expire on June 25.

[3] The Debtor Company then made application for further relief at the hearing commonly called the comeback hearing. The Debtor Company requested an extension of the stay until October 20, 2008, and authorization for financing in the amount of $2,350,000. This financing, which, following upon American terminology, is commonly referred to as "debtor-in-possession" or "DIP" financing, was to be secured by a charge having priority over the security held by the appellants and all other secured and unsecured creditors. The appellants made a concurrent application requesting that the May 26 order be set aside and that an interim receiver be appointed pursuant to s. 47(1) of the ***Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act***, R.S.C. 1985, c. B-3. The chambers judge granted the Debtor Company's application and dismissed the appellants' application.

Background

[4] The business of the Debtor Company is the development of a 300 acre site near Duncan, British Columbia, consisting of single family lots and multi-residential units, a hotel and apartments and a golf course. The business plan was to build the golf course and to construct servicing for subdivided lots, which were to be sold to purchasers.

[5] The development of the non-golf course lands was to be carried out in five phases. Phase I consists of 70 single family lots and 60 multi-residential units. Its construction is 95% complete and 54 of the 70 single family lots have been sold and conveyed to the purchasers, with the sale proceeds being applied towards the Debtor Company's mortgage financing.

[6] Phase II consists of 76 single family lots and is 50% complete. Phase III consists of 69 single family lots, 112 multi-residential lots and 225 hotel units, and it is 5% complete. Phases IV and V consist of 131 single family lots and 60 multi-residential units, and each is 1% complete.

[7] The golf course, which is the focal point of the development, is approximately 60 to 70% complete. A restrictive covenant in favour of the District of North Cowichan stipulates that the golf course must be at least 80% complete before more than 200 lots can be sold.

[8] There are four mortgages registered against the development. The first two mortgages are not significant – the first mortgage secures an amount of $900,000

that is also secured by a cash collateral deposit, and the second mortgage secured a loan from Liberty Mortgage Services Ltd. that has not yet been discharged because there is a dispute between the Debtor Company and Liberty Mortgage Services Ltd. as to whether $85,000 of interest is still owing.

[9] The third mortgage is held by the appellants. It is in the principal sum of $19,500,000 and has an interest rate of 19.75% per annum. It matured on March 1, 2008, and its balance is approximately $21,160,000 as of June 15, 2008. The fourth mortgage is held by the appellant, Liberty Holdings Excell Corp., and The Canada Trust Company. It is in the principal sum of $7,650,000 and has an interest rate of 28% per annum. It matured on January 1, 2008, and its balance is approximately $8,800,000 as of June 15, 2008.

[10] In addition to the indebtedness secured by the mortgages, the Debtor Company has liabilities in the following approximate amounts:

$4,460,000	– trade creditors
1,700,000	– equipment leases
1,135,000	– loans from related parties
45,000	– unpaid source deductions
$7,340,000	

[11] The Debtor Company was having some difficulties with respect to the development prior to March 2008 as a result of delays and substantial budget overruns. Ongoing construction on the development was limited. The main two mortgages had matured or were about to mature, and the Debtor was unsuccessful in its efforts to obtain refinancing. However, matters came to a head in March 2008

when the Debtor Company learned that its anticipated water source for the irrigation of the golf course was problematic.

[12] It had been contemplated that the Debtor Company would obtain water for the golf course's irrigation from a joint utilities board consisting of representatives of the City of Duncan, the District of North Cowichan and the Cowichan First Nation. The joint utilities board had jurisdiction over reclaimed water from sewage lagoons located on the lands of the Cowichan First Nation. The joint utilities board was apparently prepared to provide water from the sewage lagoons for the irrigation of the golf course but it was unable to enter into an agreement with the Debtor Company because three members of the Cowichan First Nation had rights of possession over part of the sewage lagoons and were being advised by their consultant that they should not agree to an extension of the lease of the lagoons.

[13] The Debtor Company advised the mortgage lenders of the water problem, and the lenders reacted by serving the Debtor Company with notices of intention to enforce their security in April 2008. On May 23, 2008, the mortgage lenders appointed a receiver, which precipitated the commencement of the ***CCAA*** proceeding by the Debtor Company. On May 26, 2008, the chambers judge granted the Debtor Company's *ex parte* application under the ***CCAA*** and directed the holding of the comeback hearing after notice had been given to the Debtor Company's creditors. The Debtor Company applied for authorization of the DIP financing at the comeback hearing.

[14] When the chambers judge granted the *ex parte* application on May 26, 2008, he appointed The Bowra Group Inc. as monitor pursuant to s. 11.7 of the ***CCAA*** (the "Monitor"). The first report of the Monitor dated June 16, 2008, was before the chambers judge at the comeback hearing. Based on two previous appraisals and discussions with the realtor having the listing for the development, the Monitor estimated the value of the development under the following three scenarios:

(a) liquidation value with no source of water for irrigation - $10 million;

(b) liquidation value with a source of water for irrigation - $28 million;

(c) going concern value with completion of the development - $50 million.

The Monitor also reported that the realtor believes that if the development were to be completed, there would be sufficient sale proceeds to satisfy all obligations of the Debtor Company. The appellants took issue with the going concern valuation and submitted that the development should be re-appraised by an appraiser they consider to be trustworthy.

[15] In its report, the Monitor also recommended that the court authorize the DIP financing to enable it to pursue a water source for the irrigation of the golf course. The Monitor stated that it believes that the existing management of the Debtor Company will be unable to execute the restructuring in the absence of assistance and direction. The Monitor requested that it be given additional powers so that it could pursue the water source and to receive any offers for the purchase of all or part of the development, with the view that once a water source is secured, it would make further recommendations to the court with respect to the completion of the

development. The application of the Debtor Company at the comeback hearing included a request for the expansion of the Monitor's powers.

Decision of the Chambers Judge

[16] The appellants argued before the chambers judge, as they did on this appeal, that this matter should not be under the ***CCAA*** because the business of the Debtor Company is a single real estate development and the business was essentially dormant as at the date of the application. The chambers judge considered s. 11(6) of the ***CCAA***, which reads as follows:

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

The chambers judge concluded that the preconditions contained in s. 11(6) had been met. He did not state why he considered a stay order to be appropriate in the circumstances, although his reasons reflect that he understood the nature and state of the Debtor Company's business.

[17] The chambers judge considered various authorities in relation to the application for the DIP financing. After considering the benefits and prejudice of the DIP financing, the chambers judge concluded that it was appropriate to authorize it.

[18] Finally, the chambers judge granted the expanded powers to the Monitor. This aspect of the order was not directly challenged on appeal, but it may be affected by the outcome on the first ground of appeal.

Appraisal Evidence

[19] The affidavit of the principal of the Debtor Company filed at the time of the commencement of the ***CCAA*** proceeding exhibited the first 11 pages of two appraisals of portions of the development. As a result of the dispute between the parties over the value of the development, the Debtor Company applied for leave to file a supplemental appeal book containing complete copies of the appraisals. We tentatively received the supplemental appeal book subject to a subsequent ruling on the leave application.

[20] In view of my conclusion on this appeal, the value of the development is not relevant. I would decline to grant the requested leave.

Standard of Review

[21] Both aspects of the order challenged on appeal were discretionary in nature. The standard of review in respect of discretionary orders has been expressed in various ways. In ***Reza v. Canada***, [1994] 2 S.C.R. 394, 116 D.L.R. (4th) 61, the standard of review was expressed in terms of whether the judge at first instance "has given sufficient weight to all relevant circumstances" (¶ 20).

[22] In ***Friends of the Oldman River Society v. Canada (Minister of Transport)***, [1992] 1 S.C.R. 3 at 76-7, 88 D.L.R. (4th) 1, the Court quoted the

following statement in ***Charles Osenton & Co. v. Johnston***, [1942] A.C. 130 at 138 with approval:

> The law as to the reversal by a court of appeal of an order made by the judge below in the exercise of his discretion is well-established, and any difficulty that arises is due only to the application of well-settled principles in an individual case. The appellate tribunal is not at liberty merely to substitute its own exercise of discretion for the discretion already exercised by the judge. In other words, appellate authorities ought not to reverse the order merely because they would themselves have exercised the original discretion, had it attached to them, in a different way. But if the appellate tribunal reaches the clear conclusion that there has been a wrongful exercise of discretion in that no weight, or no sufficient weight, has been given to relevant considerations such as those urged before us by the appellant, then the reversal of the order on appeal may be justified.

This passage was also referred to by this Court in a case involving the ***CCAA***, ***Re New Skeena Forest Products Inc.***, 2005 BCCA 192 at ¶ 20. Newbury J.A. also made reference in that paragraph to the principle that appellate courts should accord a high degree of deference to decisions made by chambers judges in ***CCAA*** matters and will not exercise their own discretion in place of that already exercised by the chambers judge. She also stated at ¶ 26 that appellate courts should not interfere with an exercise of discretion where "the question is one of the weight or degree of importance to be given to particular factors, rather than a failure to consider such factors or the correctness, in the legal sense, of the conclusion."

[23] In my opinion, the comments of Newbury J.A. in ***New Skeena*** were directed at ongoing ***CCAA*** matters and do not necessarily apply to the granting and continuation of a stay of proceedings at the hearing of the initial *ex parte* application or the comeback hearing. However, in view of my conclusion on this appeal, I need

not decide whether a different standard of review applies in respect of threshold decisions to grant or continue stays of proceedings in the early stages of ***CCAA*** proceedings.

Analysis

[24] On this appeal, the appellants challenge the decision of the chambers judge to continue the stay of proceedings until October 20, 2008, on the same basis as they opposed the application before the chambers judge. They say that the ***CCAA*** should not apply to companies whose sole business is a single land development or to companies whose business is essentially dormant. However, the real question is not whether the ***CCAA*** applies to the Debtor Company because it falls within the definition of "debtor company" in s. 2 of the ***CCAA*** and it satisfies the criterion contained in s. 3(1) of the ***CCAA*** of having liabilities in excess of $5 million. The ***CCAA*** clearly applies to the Debtor Company, and it is entitled to propose an arrangement or compromise to its creditors pursuant to the ***CCAA***. The real question is whether a stay of proceedings should have been granted under s. 11 of the ***CCAA*** for the benefit of the Debtor Company.

[25] I agree with the submission on behalf of the Debtor Company that the nature and state of its business are simply factors to be taken into account when considering under s. 11(6) whether it is appropriate to grant or continue a stay. If the more deferential standard of review is applicable to the granting and continuation of the stay of proceedings at the initial and comeback hearings, there would be insufficient basis to interfere with the decision of the chambers judge because he did

give weight to these factors. However, there is another, more fundamental, factor that was not considered by the chambers judge.

[26] In my opinion, the ability of the court to grant or continue a stay under s. 11 is not a free standing remedy that the court may grant whenever an insolvent company wishes to undertake a "restructuring", a term with a broad meaning including such things as refinancings, capital injections and asset sales and other downsizing. Rather, s. 11 is ancillary to the fundamental purpose of the ***CCAA***, and a stay of proceedings freezing the rights of creditors should only be granted in furtherance of the ***CCAA***'s fundamental purpose.

[27] The fundamental purpose of the ***CCAA*** is expressed in the long title of the statute:

> "An Act to facilitate compromises and arrangements between companies and their creditors".

[28] This fundamental purpose was articulated in, among others, two decisions quoted with approval by this Court in ***Re United Used Auto & Truck Parts Ltd.***, 2000 BCCA 146, 16 C.B.R. (4th) 141. The first is ***A.G. Can. v. A.G. Que.***(*sub. nom.* ***Reference re Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act***), [1934] S.C.R. 659, 16 C.B.R. 1 at 2, [1934] 4 D.L.R. 75, where the following was stated:

> . . . the aim of the Act is to deal with the existing condition of insolvency in itself to enable arrangements to be made in view of the insolvent condition of the company under judicial authority which, otherwise, might not be valid prior to the initiation of proceedings in bankruptcy. *Ex facie* it would appear that such a scheme in principle does not radically depart from the normal character of bankruptcy legislation."

> The legislation is intended to have wide scope and allow 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.

[29] The second decision is ***Hongkong Bank v. Chef Ready Foods*** (1990), 4 C.B.R. (3d) 311 (B.C.C.A.) at 315-16, where Gibbs J.A. said the following:

> 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. It is available to any company incorporated in Canada with assets or business activities in Canada that is not a bank, a railway company, a telegraph company, an insurance company, a trust company, or a loan company. 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. ll.

[30] Sections 4 and 5 of the ***CCAA*** provide that the court may order meetings of creditors if a debtor company proposes a compromise or an arrangement between it and its unsecured or secured creditors or any class of them. Section 6 authorizes the court to sanction a compromise or arrangement if a majority in number representing two-thirds in value of each class of creditor has voted in favour of it, in which case the compromise or arrangement is binding on all of the creditors.

[31] The filing of a draft plan of arrangement or compromise is not a prerequisite to the granting of a stay under s. 11: see ***Re Fairview Industries Ltd.*** (1991), 109

N.S.R. (2d) 12, 11 C.B.R. (3d) 43 (S.C.). In my view, however, a stay should not be granted or continued if the debtor company does not intend to propose a compromise or arrangement to its creditors. If it is not clear at the hearing of the initial application whether the debtor company is intending to propose a true arrangement or compromise, a stay might be granted on an interim basis, and the intention of the debtor company can be scrutinized at the comeback hearing. The case of ***Re Ursel Investments Ltd.*** (1990), 2 C.B.R. 2 C.B.R. (3d) 260 (Sask. Q.B.), rev'd on a different point (1991), 89 D.L.R. (4th) 246 (Sask. C.A.) is an example of where the court refused to direct a vote on a reorganization plan under the ***CCAA*** because it did not involve an element of mutual accommodation or concession between the insolvent company and its creditors.

[32] Counsel for the Debtor Company has cited two decisions containing comments approving the use of the ***CCAA*** to effect a sale, winding up or liquidation of a company such that its business would not be ongoing following an arrangement with its creditors: namely, ***Re Lehndorff General Partner Ltd.*** (1992), 17 C.B.R. (3d) 24 at ¶ 7(Ont. Ct. Jus. – Gen. Div.) and ***Re Anvil Range Mining Corp.*** (2001), 25 C.B.R. (4th) 1 at ¶ 11 (Ont. Sup. Ct. Jus.), aff'd (2002) 34 C.B.R. (4th) 157 at ¶ 32 (Ont. C.A.). I agree with these comments if it is intended that the sale, winding up or liquidation is part of the arrangement approved by the creditors and sanctioned by the court. I need not decide the point on this appeal, but I query whether the court should grant a stay under the ***CCAA*** to permit a sale, winding up or liquidation without requiring the matter to be voted upon by the creditors if the plan of arrangement intended to be made by the debtor company will simply propose that

the net proceeds from the sale, winding up or liquidation be distributed to its creditors.

[33] Counsel for the Debtor Company also relies upon the decision in ***Re Skeena Cellulose Inc.*** (2001), 29 C.B.R. (4th) 157 (B.C.S.C.), where a creditor unsuccessfully opposed an extension of the stay of proceedings on the basis that the restructuring plan was wholly dependent upon the debtor company finding a purchaser of its assets. I note that the debtor company in that case was planning to make an arrangement with its creditors. I again query, without deciding, whether the court should continue the stay to allow the debtor company to attempt to fulfil a critical prerequisite to its plan of arrangement without requiring a vote by the creditors. I appreciate that it is frequently necessary for insolvent companies to satisfy certain prerequisites before negotiating a plan of arrangement with its creditors, but some prerequisites may be so fundamental that they should properly be regarded as an element of the debtor company's overall plan of arrangement.

[34] In the present case, the Debtor Company described its proposed restructuring plan in the following paragraphs of the petition commencing the ***CCAA*** proceeding:

> 47 The Petitioner intends to proceed with a three-part strategic restructuring plan consisting of:
>
> (a) securing sufficient funds to complete Phase 2 and 3;
>
> (b) securing access to water for the irrigation system of the golf course; and
>
> (c) finishing the construction of the golf course.
>
> 48. Upon completion of the matters described in the preceding paragraph, the Petitioner believes that proceeds generated from the sale of the remaining units in Phases 1 – 3, will be sufficient

> to fund the balance of the costs that will be incurred in completing the remaining portions of the Development.

[35] It was not suggested in the petition, nor in the Monitor's report before the chambers judge at the comeback hearing, that the Debtor Company intended to propose an arrangement or compromise to its creditors before embarking on its restructuring plan. In my opinion, in the absence of such an intention, it was not appropriate for a stay to have been granted or extended under s. 11 of the ***CCAA***. The chambers judge failed to take this important factor into account, and it is open for this Court to interfere with his exercise of discretion. To be fair to the chambers judge, I would point out that this factor was not drawn to his attention by counsel, and it was raised for the first time at the hearing of the appeal.

[36] Although the ***CCAA*** can apply to companies whose sole business is a single land development as long as the requirements set out in the ***CCAA*** are met, it may be that, in view of the nature of its business and financing arrangements, such companies would have difficulty proposing an arrangement or compromise that was more advantageous than the remedies available to its creditors. The priorities of the security against the land development are often straightforward, and there may be little incentive for the creditors having senior priority to agree to an arrangement or compromise that involves money being paid to more junior creditors before the senior creditors are paid in full. If the developer is insolvent and not able to complete the development without further funding, the secured creditors may feel that they will be in a better position by exercising their remedies rather than by letting the developer remain in control of the failed development while attempting to rescue

it by means of obtaining refinancing, capital injection by a new partner or DIP financing.

[37] The failure of the chambers judge to consider the fundamental purpose of the ***CCAA*** and his error in extending the stay also infects his exercise of discretion in authorizing the DIP financing. If a stay under the ***CCAA*** should not be extended because the debtor company is not proposing an arrangement or compromise with its creditors, it follows that DIP financing should not be authorized to permit the debtor company to pursue a restructuring plan that does not involve an arrangement or compromise with its creditors. It also follows that expanded powers should not have been given to the Monitor.

[38] I wish to add that it was open, and continues to be open, to the Debtor Company to propose to its creditors an arrangement or compromise along the lines of the restructuring plan described in paragraph 47 of the petition, although it may be a challenge to make such a plan attractive to its creditors. The creditors could then vote on such an arrangement or compromise which would involve, on their part, the concession that their rights would remain frozen while the Debtor Company carried out its restructuring. What the Debtor Company was endeavouring to accomplish in this case was to freeze the rights of all of its creditors while it undertook its restructuring plan without giving the creditors an opportunity to vote on the plan. The ***CCAA*** was not intended, in my view, to accommodate a non-consensual stay of creditors' rights while a debtor company attempts to carry out a restructuring plan

that does not involve an arrangement or compromise upon which the creditors may vote.

Other Matters

[39] In addition to the appellants and the Debtor Company, two persons appeared at the hearing of the appeal without having obtained intervenor status. The first was the Monitor, which also filed a factum. Other than clarifying certain facts, the factum was limited to the issue of preserving the charge against the assets of the Debtor Company as security for the Monitor's fees and disbursements in the event that the appeal was allowed on the appellants' first ground. In my opinion, the Monitor should have obtained intervenor status if it wished to make submissions on appeal, but the issue became academic when counsel for the appellants advised that his clients did not object to the Monitor retaining the priority charge for its fees and disbursements up to the day on which the decision on appeal is pronounced.

[40] The second additional person appearing at the hearing of the appeal was Century Services Inc., which is the lender arranged by the Debtor Company to provide the DIP financing authorized by the chambers judge. Century Services Inc. wished to make submissions with respect to the priority charge for its financing, the first tranche of which was apparently advanced last week. After counsel for the appellants advised us that there were evidentiary matters subsequent to the decision of the chambers judge bearing on this issue, we declined to hear submissions on behalf of Century Services Inc. We did not have affidavits dealing with this matter, and the Supreme Court is better suited to deal with issues that may turn on the evidence.

Disposition

[41] I would allow the appeal and set aside the order dated June 27, 2008. I would declare that the powers and duties of the Monitor contained in the orders dated May 26, 2008, and June 27, 2008, continued until today's date and that the Administration Charge created by the May 26 order shall continue in effect until all of the Monitor's fees and disbursements, including the fees and disbursements of its counsel, have been paid. I would remit to the Supreme Court any issues relating to the DIP financing that has been advanced.

[42] **FRANKEL, J.A.**: I agree.

[43] **D. SMITH, J.A.**: I agree.

[44] **FRANKEL, J.A.**: The respondent's application to file a supplemental appeal book is dismissed. The appeal is allowed in the terms stated by Mr. Justice Tysoe.

"The Honourable Mr. Justice Tysoe"

TAB 5

Indexed as:

Chef Ready Foods Ltd. v. Hongkong Bank of Canada

IN THE MATTER of The Company Act R.S.B.C. 1979, C. 59
AND IN THE MATTER of The Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act, R.S.C. 1985 c. C-36
AND IN THE MATTER of Chef Ready Foods Ltd. and Istonio Foods Ltd.
Between
Chef Ready Foods Ltd., Respondent, (Petitioner), and
Hongkong Bank of Canada, Appellant, (Respondent)

[1990] B.C.J. No. 2384

[1991] 2 W.W.R. 136

51 B.C.L.R. (2d) 84

4 C.B.R. (3d) 311

23 A.C.W.S. (3d) 976

1990 CanLII 529

Vancouver Registry: CA12944

British Columbia Court of Appeal

Carrothers, Cumming and Gibbs JJ.A.

Heard: October 12, 1990
Judgment: October 29, 1990

Debtor and creditor -- Arrangement under companies' creditors arrangement act -- Bank Act security -- Priority.

Appeal from a stay order issued under the Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act. Bank supplying credit and services to Chef Ready, and holding security under section 178 of the Bank Act. Bank commencing proceedings upon its security. Chef Ready petitioning for relief under the Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act. Order issued staying realization on any security of Chef Ready. Issue whether Bank Act security should be exempt from the order.

HELD: Appeal dismissed. Nothing in the Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act exempted any creditors from the provisions of the Act, and nothing in the Bank Act excluded the impact of the Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act. Bank's interest not defeated, but its right to seize and sell postponed. Broad protection of creditors in the Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act to prevail over the Bank Act. Section 178 security included in the term "security" in the Companies' Creditors Relief Act.

STATUTES, REGULATIONS AND RULES CITED:

Bank Act, R.S.C. 1985, c. B-1, s. 178, 179.
Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act, R.S.C. 1985, c. C-36, ss. 8, 11.

Counsel for the Appellant: D.I. Knowles and H.M. Ferris.
Counsel for the Respondent: R.H. Sahrmann and L.D. Goldberg.

GIBBS J.A. (for the Court, dismissing the appeal):-- The sole issue on this appeal is whether a stay order made by a Chambers judge under s. 11 of the Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act, R.S.C. 1985, Chap. C-36 is a bar to realization by the Hongkong Bank of Canada (the "Bank") on security granted to it under s. 178 of the Bank Act, R.S.C. 1985, Chap. B-1.

The facts relevant to resolution of the issue are not in dispute. The respondent Chef Ready Foods Ltd. ("Chef Ready") is in the business of manufacturing and wholesaling fresh and frozen pizza products. The appellant Bank provided credit and other banking services to Chef Ready. As part of the security for its indebtedness Chef Ready executed the appropriate documentation and filed the appropriate notices under s. 178 of the Bank Act. Accordingly the Bank holds what is commonly referred to as "section 178 security".

Chef Ready encountered financial difficulties. On August 22, 1990, following upon some fruitless negotiations, the Bank, through its solicitors, demanded payment from Chef Ready. The debt then stood at $365,318.69 with interest accruing thereafter at $150.443 per day. Chef Ready did not pay.

On August 27, 1990 the Bank commenced proceedings upon debenture security which it held and upon guarantees by the principals of Chef Ready. Also on August 27, 1990, the Bank appointed an agent under a general assignment of book debts which it held, with instructions to the agent to realize upon the accounts. In the meantime, on August 23, 1990, so as to qualify under the Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act (the "C.C.A.A."), Chef Ready had granted a trust deed to a trustee and issued an unsecured $50 bond. On August 28, 1990, the day after the Bank commenced its debenture and guarantee proceedings, Chef Ready filed a petition seeking various forms of relief under the C.C.A.A. On the same day Chef Ready filed an application, ex parte, as they were entitled to do under the C.C.A.A. for an order to be issued that day granting the relief claimed in the petition.

The application was heard in Chambers in the afternoon of August 28, 1990 and the following day. The Bank learned "on the grapevine" of the application and appeared on the hearing and was given standing to make submissions. It also filed affidavit evidence which appears to have been taken into account by the Chambers judge. The affidavit evidence had appended to it, inter alia, the s. 178 security documentation. On August 30, 1990 the Chambers judge granted the order and delivered oral reasons at the end of which he said:

> "I therefore conclude that the Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act is an overriding statute which gives the court power to stay all proceedings including the right of the bank to collect the accounts receivable."

The reasons refer specifically to the accounts receivable because the Bank was then poised ready to take possession of those accounts and collect the amounts owing. Its right to do so arose under the general assignment of book debts and under clause 4 of the s. 178 security instrument:

> " 4. If the Customer shall sell the property or any part thereof, the proceeds of any such sale, including cash, bills, notes, evidence of title, and securities, and the indebtedness of any purchaser in connection with such sales shall be the property of the Bank to be forthwith paid or transferred to the Bank, and until so paid or transferred to be held by the Customer on behalf of and in trust for the Bank. Execution by the Customer and acceptance by the Bank of an assignment of book debts shall be deemed to be in furtherance of this declaration and not an acknowledgement by the Bank of any right or title on the part of the Customer to such book debts."

The formal order made by the Chambers judge contains a paragraph which stays realization upon or otherwise dealing with any securing on "the undertaking, property and assets" of Chef Ready:

> " THIS COURT FURTHER ORDERS THAT all proceedings taken or that might be taken by any of the Petitioners' creditors or any other person, firm or corporation under the Bankruptcy Act (Canada) or the Winding-Up Act (Canada) shall be stayed until further Order of this Court upon 2 days notice to the Petitioners and that further proceedings in any action, suit or proceeding commenced by any person, firm or corporation against any of the Petitioners be stayed until the further Order of this Court upon 2 days notice to the Petitioners, that no action, suit or other proceeding may be proceeded with or commenced against any of the Petitioners by any person, firm or corporation except with leave of this Court upon 2 days notice to the Petitioners and subject to such terms as this Court may impose and that the right of any person, firm or corporation to realize upon or otherwise deal with any property right or security held by that person firm or corporation on the undertaking, property and assets of the Petitioners be and the same is postponed;"
>
> (Emphasis added.)

The jurisdiction in the court to make such a stay order is found in s. 11 of the C.C.A.A.:

> " ii. 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."

The question of whether a step, not involving any court or litigation process, taken to realize upon the accounts receivable is a "suit, action or other proceeding ... against the company" is not before the court on this appeal. The Bank does not put its case forward on that footing. Its contention is more general in nature. It is that s. 178 security is beyond the reach of the C.C.A.A.; put another way, that whatever the scope of the C.C.A.A. it does not go so far as to impede or qualify, or give jurisdiction to make orders which will impede or qualify, the rights of realization of a holder of s. 178 security. Consistent with that position, by way of relief on the appeal the Bank asks only that the stay order be varied to free up the s. 178 security:

> "NATURE OF ORDER SOUGHT
>
> An order that the appeal of the Appellant be allowed and an order be made the Order of the Judge in the Court below be set aside insofar as it restrains the Appellant from exercising its rights under its section 178 security..."

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. It is available to any company incorporated in Canada with assets or business activities in Canada that is not a bank, a railway company, a telegraph company, an insurance company, a trust company, or a loan company. 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.

There is nothing in the C.C.A.A. which exempts any creditors of a debtor company from its provisions. The all encompassing scope of the Act qua creditors is even underscored by s. 8 which negates any contracting out provisions in a security instrument. And Chef Ready emphasizes the obvious, that if it had been intended that s. 178 security or the holders of s. 178 security be exempt from the C.C.A.A. it would have been a simple matter to say so. But that does not dispose of the

issue. There is the Bank Act to consider.

There is nothing in the Loans and Security division of the Bank Act either, where s. 178 is found, which specifically excludes direct or indirect impact by the C.C.A.A. Nonetheless the Bank's position, in essence, is that there is a notional cordon sanitaire around s. 178 and other sections associated with it such that neither the C.C.A.A. or orders made under it can penetrate. In support of its position the Bank relies heavily upon the recent unanimous judgment of the Supreme Court of Canada in Bank of Montreal v. Hall, [1990 1 S.C.R. 121, and to a lesser degree upon an earlier unanimous Supreme Court of Canada judgment in Flintoft v. Royal Bank of Canada (1964), S.C.R. 631.

The principal issue in Hall was whether ss. 19 to 36 of the Saskatchewan Limitation of Civil Rights Act applied to a security taken under ss. 178 and 179 of the Bank Act. The court held that it was beyond the competence of the Saskatchewan Legislature "to superadd conditions governing realization over and above those found within the confines of the Bank Act" (p. 154). In the course of arriving at its decision the court considered the property interest acquired by a bank under s. 178 security, the legislative history leading up to the present ss. 178 and 179, the purposes intended to be achieved by the legislation, and the rights of a bank holding s. 178 security. All of those considerations have application to the issue here, and the judgment merits reading in full to appreciate the relevance of all of its parts. However a few extracts will serve to illustrate the Bank's reliance:

> "... a bank taking security under section 178 effectively acquires legal title to the borrower's interest in the present and after-acquired property assigned to it by the borrower" (p. 134)
>
> "... the Parliament of Canada has enacted these sections not so much for the benefit of banks as for the benefit of manufacturers" (p. 139)
>
> "... These sections of the Bank Act have become an integral part of bank lending activities and are a means of providing support in many fields of endeavour to an extent which otherwise would not be practical from the standpoint of prudent banking" (p. 139)
>
> "The bank obtains and may assert its right to the goods and their proceeds against the world, except as only Parliament itself may reduce or modify those rights" (p. 143)
>
> "... the rights, duties and obligations of creditor and debtor are to be determined solely by reference to the Bank Act ..." (p. 143)
>
> "The essence of that regime [ss. 178 and 179], it hardly needs repeating, is to assign to the bank, on the taking out of the security, right and title to the goods in question, and to confer, on default of the debtor, and immediate right to seize and sell those goods ..." (p. 152)
>
> "... it was Parliament's manifest legislative purpose that the sole realization scheme applicable to the s. 178 security interest be that contained in the Bank Act itself" (p. 154)
>
> "... Parliament, under its power to regulate banking, has enacted a complete code that at once defines and provides for the realization of a security interest" (p. 155).

It is the insular theme which runs through these propositions that the Bank seizes upon to support its claim for immunity. But, it must be asked, in what respect does the preservation of the status quo qua creditors under the C.C.A.A. for a temporary period infringe upon the rights of the Bank under ss. 178 and 179? It does not detract from the Bank's title; it does not distort the mechanics of realization of the security in the sense of the steps to be taken; it does not prevent immediate crystallization of the right to seize and sell; it does not breach the "complete code". All that it does is postpone the exercise of the right to seize and sell. And here the Bank had already allowed at least five days to expire between the accrual of the right and the taking of a step to exercise. It follows from this analysis that there is no apparent bar in the Bank Act to the application of the C.C.A.A. to s. 178 security and the Bank's rights in respect of it.

Having regard to the broad public policy objectives of the C.C.A.A. there is good reason why s. 178 security should not be excluded from its provisions. The C.C.A.A. was enacted by Parliament in 1933 when the nation and the world were in the grip of an economic depression. When a company became insolvent liquidation followed because that was the consequence of the only insolvency legislation which then existed - the Bankruptcy Act and the Winding-Up Act. 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., 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. These excerpts from an article by Stanley E. Edwards at p. 587 of 1947 Vol. 25 of the Canadian Bar Review, entitled "Reorganizations Under The Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act", explain very well the historic and continuing purposes of the Act:

> " It is important in applying the C.C.A.A. to keep in mind its purpose and several fundamental principles which may serve to accomplish that purpose. Its object, as one Ontario judge has stated in a number of cases, is to keep a company going despite insolvency. Hon. C. H. Cahan when he introduced the bill into the House of Commons indicated that it was designed to permit a corporation, through reorganization, to continue its business, and thereby to prevent its organization being disrupted and its goodwill lost. It may be that the main value of the assets of a company is derived from their being fitted together into one system and that individually they are worth little The trade connections associated with the system and held by the management may also be valuable. In the case of a large company it is probable that no buyer can be found who would be able and willing to buy the enterprise as a whole and pay its going concern value. The alternative to reorganization then is often a sale of the property piecemeal for an amount which would yield little satisfaction to the creditors and none at all to the shareholders." (p. 592)
>
> " There are a number of conditions and tendencies in this country which underline the importance of this statute. There has been over the last few years a rapid and continuous growth of industry, primarily manufacturing. The tendency here, as in other expanding private enterprise countries, is for the average size of corporations to increase faster than the number of them, and for much of the new wealth to be concentrated in the hands of existing companies or their successors. The results of permitting dissolutions of companies without giving the parties an adequate opportunity to reorganize them would therefore likely be more serious in the future than they have been in the past.
>
> Because of the country's relatively small population, however, Canadian industry is and will probably continue to be very much dependent on world markets and consequently vulnerable to world depressions. If there should be such a depression it will become particularly important that an adequate reorganization procedure should be in existence, so that the Canadian economy will not be permanently injured by discontinuance of its industries, so that whatever going concern value the insolvent companies have will not be lost through dismemberment and sale of their assets, so that their employees will not be thrown out of work, and so that large numbers of investors will not be deprived of their claims and their opportunity to share in the fruits of the future activities of the corporations. While we hope that this dismal prospect will not materialize, it is nevertheless a possibility which must be recognized. But whether it does or not, the growing importance of large companies in Canada will make it important that adequate provision be made for reorganization of insolvent corporations." (p. 590)

It is apparent from these excerpts and from the wording of the statute that, in contrast with ss. 178 and 179 of the Bank Act which are preoccupied with the competing rights and duties of the borrower and the lender, the C.C.A.A. serves the interests of a broad constituency of investors, creditors and employees. If a bank's rights in respect of s. 178 security are accorded an unique status which renders those rights immune from the provisions of the C.C.A.A. the protection afforded that constituency for any company which has granted s. 178 security will be largely illusory. It will be illusory because almost inevitably the realization by the bank on its security will destroy the company as a going concern. Here, for example, if the Bank signifies and collects the accounts receivable Chef Ready will be deprived of working capital. Collapse and liquidation must necessarily follow. The lesson will be that where s. 178 security is present a single creditor can frustrate the public policy objectives of the C.C.A.A. There will be two classes of debtor companies: those for whom there are prospects for recovery under the C.C.A.A.; and those for whom the C.C.A.A. may be irrelevant dependant upon the whim of the s. 178 security holder. Given the economic circumstances which prevailed when the C.C.A.A. was enacted it is difficult to imagine that the legislators of the day intended that result to follow.

In the exercise of their functions under the C.C.A.A. Canadian courts have shown themselves partial to a standard of liberal construction which will further the policy objectives. See such cases as Meridian Developments Inc. v. T.D. Bank (1984), 52 C.B.R. 109 (Alta. Q.B.); Northland Properties Limited v. Excelsior Life Insurance Company (1989), 34 B.C.L.R. (2d) 122 (B.C.C.A.); Re Feifer and Frame Manufacturing Corporation (1947), 28 C.B.R. 124 (Que. C.A.); Wynden Canada Inc. v. Gaz Metropolitaine (1982), 44 C.B.R. 285 (Que. S.C.); and Norcen Energy Resources v. Oakwood Petroleums (1988) 72 C.B.R. 2 (Alta. Q.B.). The trend demonstrated by these cases is entirely consistent with the object and purpose of the

C.C.A.A.

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

For these reasons the disposition by the Chambers judge of the application made by Chef Ready will be upheld. it follows that the appeal is dismissed.

GIBBS J.A.
CARROTHERS J.A.:-- I agree.
CUMMING J.A.:-- I agree.

TAB 6

Indexed as:

Woodward's Ltd. (Re)

IN THE MATTER OF the Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act, R.S.C. 1985, c. C-36
AND IN THE MATTER OF the Company Act, R.S.B.C. 1979, c. 59
IN THE MATTER OF Woodward's Limited, Woodward Stores Limited and Abercrombie & Fitch Co. (Canada) Ltd.

[1993] B.C.J. No. 42

79 B.C.L.R. (2d) 257

17 C.B.R. (3d) 236

37 A.C.W.S. (3d) 1040

Vancouver Registry No. A924791

British Columbia Supreme Court
Vancouver, British Columbia
(In Chambers)

Tysoe J.

Heard: January 8, 1993
Judgment: January 11, 1993; filed January 12, 1993

(25 pp.)

Counsel for Woodward's Limited, Woodward Stores Limited and Abercrombie & Fitch Co. (Canada) Ltd.:R.A. Millar, M.A. Fitch and J. Irving.
Counsel for W.J. Woodward and others: D.B. Kirkham, Q.C. and G. Tucker.
Counsel for H.J. Zayadi: E.J. Adair.

---

1 **TYSOE J.**:-- The aspect of these proceedings presently under consideration is whether the Court should grant a stay in respect of payments owing to retired or terminated senior executives of Woodward's Limited ("Woodward's") which are secured by letters of credit issued by Woodward's banker in favour of two trust companies acting as trustees pursuant to agreements or plans benefitting Woodward's senior executives.

2 On December 11, 1992 I granted an interim stay Order pursuant to the Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act (the "CCAA") in favour of Woodward's, Woodward Stores Limited and Abercrombie & Fitch Co. (Canada) Ltd. The Order was granted on an ex parte basis and it was expressed to expire at 6 p.m. on January 8, 1993, the day on which the hearing of the Petition in this matter was intended to take place. On December 17 and 24, 1992 I made further interim Orders which, among other things, contained a stay in relation to the letters of credit held by the two trust companies.

3 The hearing of the Petition began on January 8, 1993 but there were also between 10 and 15 related applications scheduled to be heard on January 8 and the following days. On January 8, when it was clear that the hearing of the Petition and related applications would take several days, I extended the interim Orders until further Order with the intent that they would continue until I made my determinations on the various issues to be decided. There appears to be little doubt that there will be an extension of the stay Order generally and it is the terms of the continuing stay Order that are in dispute. These Reasons for Judgment relate to one of the issues that is in dispute. I will approach this matter on the basis that the CCAA stay is going to be extended and the issue to be determined is whether the stay can or should apply in relation to the former senior executives and the trust companies acting as the trustees of the letters of credit.

4 Woodward's decided at some point in the past that it would make provision for retiring allowances to benefit its senior executives when they retired or when they were terminated without cause. Until 1991 Woodward's entered into individual agreements with certain senior executives in relation to the retiring allowances. In 1991 Woodward's established its Retiring Allowance Plan which applied to designated senior executives.

5 Mr. Kirkham's clients entered into the individual agreements prior to 1991. Letters of credit have been lodged with The Canada Trust Company ("Canada Trust") pursuant to these agreements as security for the payment of the retiring allowances. Ms. Adair's client was covered by the Retiring Allowance Plan which continues in effect and also applies to senior executives who are still employed by Woodward's. A letter of credit has been lodged with Montreal Trust Company of Canada ("Montreal Trust") pursuant to the Retiring Allowance Plan as security for the payment of the retiring allowances.

6 All of the letters of credit have been issued to the two trust companies by Woodward's banker, Canadian Imperial Bank of Commerce (the "Bank") which holds security against the assets of Woodward's for these contingent obligations. Counsel for Woodward's advised the Court that approximately $10.2 million has been paid by Woodward's to the Bank to "cash collateralize" the letters of credit. Counsel was unable to advise me when this payment was made but I believe that it was made recently and that it was not made at the time of the issuance of the letters of credit.

7 Woodward's entered into trust agreements with both of Canada Trust and Montreal Trust in relation to the letters of credit. It is useful to refer to the relevant portions of the trust agreements dealing with the calling of the letters of credit. Paragraphs 3, 4 and 5 of the trust agreement with Canada Trust (the "Canada Trust Agreement") read, in part, as follows:

> 3. The Trustee shall be entitled at any time and from time to time to draw on the Letter of Credit comprised in the Fund, either in whole or in part, to obtain money for the purpose of making any payment required to be made by it hereunder.....
> 4. If from time to time the Company shall for any reason whatsoever fail to pay or cause to be paid to the Executive or to a Beneficiary, as the case may be, any amount owing to the Executive or a Beneficiary under the Retiring Allowance Agreement for a period of ten days after its due date, the Executive may deliver to the Trustee an executed or certified true copy of the Retiring Allowance Agreement and concurrently certify in writing to the Trustee that the amount has not been paid thereunder and that he or she is entitled to receive the payment. The Trustee shall within five days after receipt of the certificate report in writing to the Company the claim so submitted. If within seven days after delivery of the Trustee's report to the Company the Trustee has not been notified by the Company that the Company has made the payment and has not received the certificate of the Company hereinafter mentioned, the Trustee shall pay the claimed amount out of the Fund to the Executive or the Beneficiary, as the case may be, in full discharge of the Company's liability for the payment....
> 5. If the Company ..... becomes insolvent ..... and the Executive certifies to the Trustee that such an event has occurred, the Trustee shall draw the full amount of the Letter of Credit comprised in the Fund .....

8 Paragraphs 8 and 9 of the trust agreement with Montreal Trust (the "Montreal Trust Agreement") read, in part, as follows:

> 8. If the Company ..... becomes bankrupt or insolvent ..... and any officer of the Company or any Senior Executive ..... certifies in writing ..... to the Trustee that such an event has occurred and giving particulars thereof, the Trustee shall within five days after receipt of the certificate deliver a copy to the Company. Subject to any order of a court of competent jurisdiction, the Trustee shall, after the expiration of 14 days from the date of delivery of the certificate to the Company, draw the full amount of all Letters of Credit comprised in the Trust Fund .....
> 9. If the Company shall from time to time for any reason whatsoever fail to pay or cause to be

> paid to a Senior Executive or a Beneficiary, as the case may be, any amount owing to the Senior Executive or Beneficiary under the Retiring Allowance Plan for a period of ten days after its due date, the Senior Executive or Beneficiary ..... may certify in writing ..... to the Trustee that the amount has not been paid thereunder and that the Senior Executive or Beneficiary named in the certificate, as the case may be, is entitled to receive the payment. The Trustee shall within five days after receipt of the certificate report in writing to the Company the claim so submitted. If, within seven days after delivery of the Trustee's report to the Company, the Trustee has not been notified in writing by the Company that the Company has made the payment and has not received the certificate of the Company hereafter mentioned, the Trustee shall draw under the Letter of Credit .....

9 It not disputed by Woodward's that monthly retirement allowances owing to the former senior executives are overdue or that it has become insolvent.

10 It is the position of Woodward's that the calling of the letters of credit can and should be stayed pursuant to s. 11 of the CCAA or, alternatively, that the Court has the inherent jurisdiction to grant such a stay. Counsel for the former senior executives submit that the Court has no jurisdiction to grant a stay preventing the trust companies from calling on the letters of credit.

11 Section 11 of the CCAA reads as follows:

> 11. Notwithstanding anything in the Bankruptcy Act or the Winding-up Act, whenever an application has been made under this Act in respect of any company, the court, on the application of any person interested in the matter, may, on notice to any other person or without notice as it may see fit,
>
> (a) make an order staying, until such time as the court may prescribe or until any further order, all proceedings taken or that might be taken in respect of the company under the Bankruptcy Act and the Winding-up Act or either of them; (b) restrain further proceedings in any action, suit or proceeding against the company on such terms as the court sees fit; and (c) make an order that no suit, action, or other proceeding shall be proceeded with or commenced against the company except with the leave of the court and subject to such terms as the court imposes.

12 Section 11 of the CCAA has received a very broad interpretation. The main purpose of s. 11 is to preserve the status quo among the creditors of the company so that no creditor will have an advantage over other creditors while the company attempts to reorganize its affairs. The CCAA is intended to facilitate reorganizations involving compromises between an insolvent company and its creditors and s. 11 is an integral aspect of the reorganization process.

13 An example of the broad interpretation given to s. 11 is Quintette Coal Limited v. Nippon Steel Corporation (1990), 51 B.C.L.R. (2d) 105 (B.C.C.A. - leave to appeal to S.C.C. dismissed). The B.C. Court of Appeal held that s. 11 was sufficiently broad to prevent a creditor from exercising a right of set-off against the insolvent company. The Court confirmed that the word "proceeding" in s. 11 encompassed extrajudicial conduct and it held that the exercise of a right of set-off was a "proceeding" within the meaning of s. 11. Gibbs J.A. commented on s. 11 in the following general terms at p. 113:

> To the extent that a general principle can be extracted from the few cases directly on point, and the others in which there is persuasive obiter, it would appear to be that the courts have concluded that under s. 11 there is a discretionary power to restrain judicial or extra judicial conduct against the debtor company the effect of which is, or would be, seriously to impair the ability of the debtor company to continue in business during the compromise or arrangement negotiating period. The power is discretionary and therefore to be exercised judicially.

14 Coincidentally, the authority that is generally considered to be the landmark decision in respect of the broad interpretation to be given to s. 11 is a case involving a letter of credit issued by a bank at the request of the insolvent company in favour of a creditor, Meridian Developments Inc. v. Toronto Dominion Bank (1984), 11 D.L.R. (4th) 576, [1984] 5 W.W.R. 215 (Alta. Q.B.). Wachowich J. posed the issues before him in the following manner at pp. 579-580 of D.L.R. and p. 219 of W.W.R.:

> 1. Is payment of the letter of credit a "proceeding" within the meaning of cl. 2 or 3 of the 21st

March order?

2. If so, is it a proceeding "against the Petitioner" [Nu-West] so as to be restrained by cls. 2 or 3 of that order?

3. If it is found to be a "proceeding" should the court in any case give leave to Meridian in the circumstances to obtain payment of the letter of credit?

Cls. 2 and 3 of the Order referred to by Wachowich J. followed the wording of s. 11 of the CCAA.

15 Wachowich J. first decided that the payment of a letter of credit fell within the meaning of the word "proceeding" in s. 11 of the CCAA and it is this portion of his judgment that deals with the broad interpretation to be given to s. 11. However, Wachowich J. went on to conclude that the payment of the letter of credit could not be termed "a proceeding against the company" with the result that the stay Order did not prevent the calling of the letter of credit.

16 Counsel for Woodward's submitted that the present situation falls within an exception enunciated by Wachowich J. He first points to the following passage at p. 584 of D.L.R. and p. 224 of W.W.R.:

> It must be noted, however, that by the terms of the March 21, 1984 order it is only "further proceedings in any action, suit or proceeding against the petitioner" that are restrained. Unless the payment of the letter of credit is a "proceeding against the petitioner" (Nu-West) it was not restrained by this order. I agree with counsel for Meredian that the payment of the letter of credit cannot be termed a proceeding against Nu-West unless the money to be paid is Nu-West's property. (my italics)

Counsel next points to points to a passage on p. 588 of D.L.R. and p. 227 of W.W.R. where Wachowich J. is reviewing the American authority of Page v. First National Bank of Maryland (1982), 18 B.R. 713:

17 At p. 4 of the (unreported) decision the court stated:

> In issuing the letter of credit the bank entered into an independent contractual obligation to pay W.C.C. out of its own assets. Although cashing the letter will immediately give rise to a claim by the bank against the debtors pursuant to the latter's indemnification obligation, that claim will not divest the debtors of any property since any attempt to enforce that claim would be subject to an automatic stay pursuant to 11 U.S.C., para. 362(4).

In my view, the Toronto-Dominion Bank is in the same position. It is obliged to honour its contract with Meridian even though the cashing of the letter of credit will increase Nu-West's debt to the bank and even though the bank has no method of enforcing its claim against Nu-West because of the March 21st order.

18 Counsel for Woodward's submits that the present situation falls within the exception recognized in the Meridian case in the sense that the money to be paid under the letter of credit is the property of Woodward's and that payment on the letters of credit will divest Woodward's of its property because the letters of credit are "cash collateralized" by $10.2 million of Woodward's money. I do not accept this submission.

19 The fact that Woodward's may have secured its obligations to the Bank in respect of the letters of credit does not mean that the letters of credit will be paid with Woodward's money. The letter of credit is an independent obligation of its issuer which is obliged to honour a call on the letter of credit with its own money. After being required to make a payment under a letter of credit, the issuer of the letter of credit is then entitled to look to its customer pursuant to the indemnification agreement that usually exists in relation to a letter of credit. If the issuer of the letter of credit holds a cash deposit from its customer as security for the obligations under the indemnification agreement, it may indemnify itself from the cash deposit. This involves the issuer of the letter of credit utilizing the money of its customer to indemnify itself but it is not the money on deposit that is to be used to make payment under the letter of credit.

20 After Wachowich J. made his statement that payment of the letter of credit cannot be termed to be a proceeding against Nu- West "unless the money to be paid is Nu-West's property", he proceeded to review the general nature of a letter of credit and he then reached his conclusion that payment of the letter of credit could not be termed a proceeding against Nu-West. It is my view that Wachowich J. was not creating an exception when he made the statement. Rather, he was stating the issue to be determined in deciding whether it could be termed a proceeding against Nu-West. After he review the general nature of a

letter of credit and immediately before stating his conclusion, Wachowich J. said the following at p. 587 of D.L.R. and p. 226 of W.W.R.:

> The customer of the bank has, in my view, never had "ownership" of any funds represented by the letter of credit. He can lay claim only to the debt that has been thereby created.

In addition, it should be noted that in the Parker v. First National Bank of Maryland decision relied upon by Wachowich J., the bank held a certificate of deposit as security for the indemnification obligations of its customer and the U.S. District Court held that a claim on the letter of credit would not divest the debtor of any of its property.

21 Accordingly, I do not think that the letters of credit presently under consideration fall within any exception in Meridian. However, that does not end the s. 11 analysis in my view.

22 Section 11 cannot be utilized to prevent the holder of a letter of credit from requiring the third party who issued the letter of credit to honour it because no steps are taken against the insolvent company when a call is made on the letter of credit. But there will be circumstances where the holder of the letter of credit will not be entitled to call on it unless he or she first does take some step that is a prerequisite to a drawing under the letter of credit. If such a step constitutes a proceeding against the insolvent company, it may be stayed by the Court under s. 11. For example, the step taken against the insolvent company could be the making of demand on the company. Stay Orders under the CCAA frequently prevent creditors from making demand on the insolvent company.

23 The issue thus becomes whether any proceeding must be taken against Woodward's before the letters of credit may be called upon. The prerequisites under paragraph 4 of the Canada Trust Agreement are the following:

(a) the Company has failed to make a payment;
(b) the Executive has delivered to the Trustee a copy of the Retiring Allowance Agreement and a certificate to the effect that he or she has not been paid;
(c) the Trustee has reported in writing to the Company that a claim has been submitted;
(d) the Company has not notified the Trustee that the payment has been made.

The prerequisites under paragraph 5 of the Canada Trust Agreement are that the Company has become insolvent and that the Executive has certified the occurrence of that event to the Trustee.

24 The prerequisites under paragraph 8 of the Montreal Trust Agreement are as follows:

(a) the Company has become insolvent;
(b) the Executive has certified the occurrence of the event to the Trustee;
(c) the Trustee has delivered a copy of the Executive's certificate to the Company:
(d) a court of competent jurisdiction has not made an order preventing the Trustee from drawing on the letters of credit.

The prerequisites under paragraph 9 of the Montreal Trust Agreement are the same as the prerequisites under paragraph 4 of the Canada Trust Agreement.

25 It is clear that paragraph 5 of the Canada Trust Agreement does not require that any proceeding be taken against the Company before the Trustee can draw on the letter of credit. Paragraph 4 of the Canada Trust Agreement becomes academic because Woodward's is insolvent and Canada Trust can call on the letter of credit pursuant to paragraph 5.

26 Both of paragraphs 8 and 9 of the Montreal Trust Agreement require a step to be taken vis-a-vis the Company before the Trustee can call on the letter of credit. Paragraph 8 requires that the Trustee deliver to the Company a copy of the certificate of the Senior Executive. Paragraph 9 requires that the Trustee must report to the Company that a claim has been made. It is my view that the delivery of a copy of the certificate to the Company and the making of a report to the Company are both proceedings against Woodward's that can be stayed pursuant to s. 11 of the CCAA.

27 If a step must be taken vis-a-vis the insolvent company before a creditor (or a trustee on behalf of a creditor) may enforce its rights, the form of the step should make no difference for the purposes of s. 11 of the CCAA. It should not matter whether the step is a demand for payment on the company, the delivery to the company of a notice of acceleration or the delivery to the company of some other type of document such as a copy of a certificate or a report. In the Meridian case, supra, Wachowich J. quoted the following portion of the definition of the word "proceeding" in Black's Law Dictionary, 5th

ed. (1979) (at p. 582 of D.L.R. and p. 221 of W.W.R.):

> Term "proceeding" may refer not only to a complete remedy but also to a mere procedural step that is part of a larger action or special proceeding. Rooney v. Vermont Invt. Corp. (1973), 10 Cal. (3d) 351, 110 Cal. Rptr. 353, 515 P. (2d) 297 (Cal. S.C.).

The delivery of a copy of a certificate or a report to Woodward's is no less a proceeding than the payment of a letter of credit (Meridian) or the exercise of a right of set-off (Quintette). It is a proceeding against Woodward's because the copy of the certificate or the report must be delivered to Woodward's.

28 The result is that a stay under s. 11 of the CCAA can effectively prevent Montreal Trust from calling on the letters of credit held by it but Canada Trust cannot be restrained by such a stay from calling on the letters of credit held by it. It is therefore necessary to consider Woodward's alternative argument that the Court has the inherent jurisdiction to grant a stay that prevents a creditor (or a trustee on behalf of a creditor) from taking proceedings against third parties.

29 To my knowledge, the only example of the Court exercising its inherent jurisdiction in relation to the CCAA is Re Westar Mining Ltd., [1992] B.C.J. No. 1360 (June 15, 1992, B.C. Supreme Court Action No. A921164). In that case Macdonald J. exercised the inherent jurisdiction of the Court in order to create a charge against the assets of Westar for the benefit of suppliers which were continuing to provide goods and services to Westar after the commencement of the CCAA proceedings. Macdonald J. created the charge on June 10, 1992 without giving extensive reasons. His Order was made without prejudice to the claims of the Crown which did oppose the creation of the charge a few days later on the basis that it altered the priorities in the event that Westar went into bankruptcy. In his Reasons for Judgment dated June 16, 1992 Macdonald J. first explained how and why he created the charge (at p. 3):

> The charge has already been created. In doing so, I purported to exercise the inherent jurisdiction of this court. The Company would have no chance of completing a successful reorganization without the ability to continue operations through the period of the stay. It must be able to arrange for further limited credit from its suppliers if it is to continue operations. Thus, security which is sufficient, in the eyes of its suppliers, to justify the extension of some further credit is a condition precedent to any acceptable plan of reorganization.

Macdonald J. rejected the argument of the Crown and he elaborated on the use of the Court's inherent jurisdiction at pp. 9 and 10:

> The issue is whether or not those suppliers who are prepared (or have been compelled, between May 14 and June 10) to extend credit which will hopefully keep the Company operating during the period of the stay, should be secured. I have concluded that "justice dictates" they should, and that the circumstances call for the exercise of this court's inherent jurisdiction to achieve that end. (See, Winnipeg Supply & Fuel v. Genevieve Mortgage Corp. [1972] 1 W.W.R. 651 (Man. C.A. at p. 657).
>
> The circumstances in which this court will exercise its inherent jurisdiction are not the subject of an exhaustive list. The power is defined by Halsbury's (4th ed., volume 23, para. 14) as:
>
> > ...the reserve or fund of powers, a residual source of powers, which the Court may draw upon as necessary whenever it is just or equitable to do so...
>
> Proceedings under the CCAA are a prime example of the kind of situations where the court must draw upon such powers to "flesh out" the bare bones of an inadequate and incomplete statutory provision in order to give effect to its objects.

30 Mr. Kirkham submitted that Westar is distinguishable on the basis that the assets against which the Court created a charge were within the jurisdiction of the Court because they belonged to Westar and that in this case his clients and Canada Trust are not before the Court. I do not think that this is a valid distinction because the charge against Westar's assets affected the Crown which was not before the Court any more than Mr. Kirkham's clients and Canada Trust.

31 It may be argued that the Court should only exercise its inherent jurisdiction to "flesh out the bare bones" of the CCAA and that the Court should not utilize its inherent jurisdiction to grant stays because s. 11 of the CCAA already deals with the subject matter of stays and it contains Parliament's full intentions in that regard. This potential argument has not been given

effect in analogous circumstances in the United States when proceedings under Chapter 11 of the U.S. Bankruptcy Code are pending. Under Chapter 11 there is an automatic stay of proceedings and, like s. 11 of the CCAA, it is a stay of proceedings against the debtor company only. The U.S. Courts have used an equivalent of inherent jurisdiction (i.e., a general provision in the U.S. Bankruptcy Code to make necessary or appropriate orders) to grant stays in relation to proceedings against third parties. The most common example is a proceeding against the principals of the insolvent company whose efforts are required to attempt to reorganize the company. One of the leading U.S. authorities is Re Johns-Manville Corp. (1984), 40 B.R. 219 which was referred to by Macdonald J. in the decision of Re Philip's Manufacturing Ltd. (1991), 60 B.C.L.R. (2d) 311 where he declined to continue a stay of all proceedings against the directors and officers of the insolvent company. In that case Macdonald J. expressed a reservation about whether the inherent jurisdiction of the Court could be utilized but this predated his decision in Westar, supra.

32 Hence, it is my view that the inherent jurisdiction of the Court can be invoked for the purpose of imposing stays of proceedings against third parties. However, it is a power that should be used cautiously. In Westar Macdonald J. relied upon the Court's inherent jurisdiction to create a charge against Westar's assets because he was of the view that Westar would have no chance of completing a successful reorganization if he did not create the charge. I do not think that it is a prerequisite to the Court exercising its inherent jurisdiction that the insolvent company will not be able to complete a reorganization unless the inherent jurisdiction is exercised. But I do think that the exercise of the inherent jurisdiction must be shown to be important to the reorganization process.

33 In deciding whether to exercise its inherent jurisdiction the Court should weigh the interests of the insolvent company against the interests of the parties who will be affected by the exercise of the inherent jurisdiction. If, in relative terms, the prejudice to the affected party is greater than the benefit that will be achieved by the insolvent company, the Court should decline to exercise its inherent jurisdiction. The threshold of prejudice will be much lower than the threshold required to persuade the Court that it should not exercise its discretion under s. 11 of the CCAA to grant or continue a stay that is prejudicial to a creditor of the insolvent company (or other party affected by the stay).

34 In this case I am persuaded that it is important to the reorganization process that the former senior executives not be allowed to be paid the entire amounts of their retirement allowances at this time. On the day of the hearing of this matter Woodward's took the first step in implementing the reorganization of its business affairs (which involves a downsizing of its operations) by terminating approximately 1,200 of its 6,000 employees. These terminated employees will be entitled to severance pay which will be a significant obligation of Woodward's. They will be creditors of Woodward's who will be involved in the reorganization of its financial affairs and who will be entitled to vote on the reorganization plan. These former employees will undoubtedly be unhappy when they realize that their severance pay entitlement is an unsecured obligation of Woodward's that will be compromised as part of the reorganization while the former senior executives have security for the entire amounts of their retirement allowances (which are in reality severance payments in the cases of the senior executives who were terminated). If the former senior executives are paid the full amounts of their retirement allowances at this time, the recently terminated employees may not be understanding and it may cause them to vote against Woodward's reorganization plan even if it is in their economic interests to vote in favour of the plan. Negotiations under the CCAA require a delicate balance and payment of the full amounts of the retirement allowances at this time could well irreparably upset the balance.

35 The former senior executives will not be materially prejudiced if the full amounts of the letters of credit are not paid at this time. The amounts owed to them are fully secured by the letters of credit and there will not be any deterioration in the security if the right to draw on the full amounts of the letters of credit is postponed pending the outcome of Woodward's reorganization effort. There was some evidence that there may be adverse income tax consequences if the full amounts of the letters of credit are drawn upon.

36 Another consideration is the dominant intention of the two trust agreements in allowing the full amounts of the letters of credit to be drawn upon. In quoting the relevant provisions of the two trust agreements, I only make reference to the triggering event of Woodward's becoming insolvent. The other triggering events are as follows:

(a) if Woodward's ceases operations;
(b) if Woodward's makes a general assignment for the benefit of creditors or files an assignment in bankruptcy or otherwise becomes bankrupt;
(c) if Woodward's is wound up or dissolved;
(d) if any receiver, trustee, liquidator of or for Woodward's or any substantial portion of its property is appointed and is not discharged within a period of 60 days.

The primary purpose of these triggering events in my view was to allow the former senior executives to cause the full amounts of the letters of credit to be paid if Woodward's has effectively come to an end. The draftspersons of the trust agreements happened to chose insolvency as one of the triggering events because insolvency of a company frequently

signifies its end. However, in this case, it will not be known whether Woodward's insolvency will result in its demise until it has made an attempt to reorganize pursuant to the CCAA. I am not saying that the Court should ignore the wording of the agreements but it is open to the Court to take into consideration the overall intent of the parties when deciding whether it is just and equitable to invoke its inherent jurisdiction.

37 The decision in Meridian, supra, is distinguishable from this case. In Meridian the Court was interpreting an Order that it had previously made and it was not considering whether a further Order could be made pursuant to its inherent jurisdiction.

38 Although I have concluded that the relative benefit of staying the calling of the letters of credit in their entirety outweighs the prejudice to the former senior executives and that I should exercise the Court's inherent jurisdiction to grant a stay to prevent the letters of credit from being fully drawn, it does not necessarily follow that the stay should prevent partial draws upon the letters of credit. In exercising its inherent jurisdiction in these circumstances the Court should endeavour to exercise the jurisdiction in a manner that balances the interests of the parties as much as possible.

39 The main prejudice to the former senior executives if they are not permitted to cause any call to be made on the letters of credit is the fact that the monthly payments of the retiring allowances will not be made. The monthly payments provide a source of income to the former senior executives and they will be prejudiced if the payments cease. Both of Mr. Kirkham and Ms. Adair indicated that if I did grant a stay of proceedings with respect to the letters of credit, one or more of their clients may make an application to have the stay discontinued on the basis that it creates a hardship to them.

40 On the other hand, the continuation of the monthly payments of the retiring allowances is much less likely to create a difficulty in the negotiations with the recently terminated employees than the payment of the retiring allowances in full. Although the former senior executives will be paid the monthly amounts of the retiring allowances without compromise pending the reorganization attempt, they will have to accept payment over a period of time. In addition, the recently terminated employees will hopefully appreciate that Woodward's would not be voluntarily making the monthly payments to the former senior executives and that it is the Court which is allowing the payments to be made.

41 It is my view that the interests of the parties can be largely balanced if the Court exercises its inherent jurisdiction to grant a stay that prevents payment on the letters of credit except to the extent of satisfying the obligation of Woodward's to make the monthly payments of the retiring allowances. In exercising the Court's discretion in this fashion I appreciate that a stay under s. 11 of the CCAA could effectively prevent the calling on the letters of credit for the purpose of paying the monthly amounts. In view of the fact that the Court is exercising its inherent jurisdiction to prevent the letters of credit being drawn in their entire amounts, I am exercising my discretion to decline to grant a stay under s. 11 which would prevent the calling on the letters of credit for the purpose of paying the monthly amounts.

42 It is necessary for the Court to exercise its inherent jurisdiction because a stay under s. 11 could not be utilized to prevent Canada Trust from drawing the full amounts of the letters of credit that are held by it. However, a stay under s. 11 could effectively prevent Montreal Trust from making any call on the letter of credit in its favour. I must now decide whether I should exercise my discretion under s. 11 to prevent Montreal Trust from making the partial draws on its letter of credit that I am permitting Canada Trust to make on each of its letters of credit.

43 As I have indicated above, the main purpose of s. 11 is to preserve the status quo among the creditors of the insolvent company. Huddart J. commented on the status quo in Re Alberta- Pacific Terminals Ltd. (1991), 8 C.B.R. (3d) 99 (B.C.S.C.) at p. 105:

> The status quo is not always easy to find. It is difficult to freeze any ongoing business at a moment in time long enough to make an accurate picture of its financial condition. Such a picture is at best an artist's view, more so if the real value of the business, including goodwill, is to be taken into account. Nor is the status quo easy to define. The preservation of the status quo cannot mean merely the preservation of the relative pre-stay debt status of each creditor. Other interests are served by the CCAA. Those of investors, employees, and landlords among them, and in the case of the Fraser Surrey terminal, the public too, not only of British Columbia, but also of the prairie provinces. The status quo is to be preserved in the sense that manoeuvres by creditors that would impair the financial position of the company while it attempts to reorganize are to be prevented, not in the sense that all creditors are to be treated equally or to be maintained at the same relative level. It is the company and all the interests its demise would affect that must be considered.

44 In that case Huddart J. dismissed the application of the owner of the insolvent company's operating facilities for payment of ongoing amounts owing under the operating agreement between the two parties. In essence, the payments were the equivalent of rental payments under a lease. Huddart J. dismissed the application because there were insufficient funds to

make the payments and the owner of the facilities had not shown hardship. The circumstances in that case were quite unusual because the insolvent company was continuing to pay interest to one of its lenders. In more normal cases under the CCAA one would expect during the reorganization period that rental payments for the ongoing use of facilities would be made and that interest on debt would not be paid. In any event, the case is an example of a situation where the status quo was maintained by way of different treatment of creditors.

45 In the present case I have decided to exercise my discretion under s. 11 of the CCAA so that Montreal Trust is treated in the same fashion as Canada Trust. It is my view that the status quo is best maintained in this case by giving equal treatment to creditors within the same class irrespective of the different wording in the two trust agreements. I add that Woodward's does have surplus cash at the present time and that other creditors will not be materially prejudiced by allowing partial payments to be made under the letter of credit held by Montreal Trust.

46 In the result, I continue the stay to prevent Canada Trust from calling on the letters of credit held by it except to the extent that it may be necessary to obtain payment of the monthly retiring allowances that are overdue. I grant a stay restraining Montreal Trust from delivering to Woodward's a copy of any certificate provided to it under paragraph 8 of the Montreal Trust Agreement.

47 The Order dated December 11, 1992 stipulates that Woodward's is to retain its funds in its operating accounts with the Bank and that Woodward's may only use the funds for certain specified purposes. I anticipate that the continuing stay Order will have a similar provision. If it does contain a similar provision, the permitted purposes for use of funds may include the payment of the monthly retiring allowances to the former senior executives. I appreciate that Woodward's may prefer to require that the letters of credit be called upon so that there is no appearance to the recently terminated employees that Woodward's is voluntarily making payments to the former senior executives. On the other hand, Woodward's may not want to create an administrative nuisance for the Bank by having numerous calls being made on the letters of credit. Woodward's may exercise its discretion as to whether the monthly payments to the former senior executives are made voluntarily or involuntarily, recognizing of course that they will be made involuntarily if they are not made voluntarily.

TYSOE J.

TAB 7

Case Name:

Collins & Aikman Automotive Canada Inc. (Re)

IN THE MATTER OF the Companies Creditors Arrangement Act, R.S.C. 1985, c. C-36, as amended
AND IN THE MATTER OF a Plan of Compromise or Arrangement of Collins & Aikman Automotive Canada Inc.
APPLICATION UNDER the Companies Creditors Arrangement Act, R.S.C. 1985, c. C-36, as amended

[2007] O.J. No. 4186

37 C.B.R. (5th) 282

63 C.C.P.B. 125

161 A.C.W.S. (3d) 675

2007 CarswellOnt 7014

Court File No. 07-CL-7105

Ontario Superior Court of Justice

J.M. Spence J.

Heard: September 20 and 26, 2007.
Judgment: October 31, 2007.

(141 paras.)

Insolvency law -- Legislation -- Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act -- Motion by Superintendent of Financial Services, United Steelworkers, and CAW - Canada for relief relating to Initial Order made under Companies Creditors Arrangement Act dismissed -- Collins & Aikman Automotive filed for protection under CCAA -- Collins had obtained funding from lender subject to certain terms, which terms were approved in Initial Order -- Court declined to order changes to paragraphs in Initial Order, as moving parties provided insufficient basis for their objections -- Court could not compel Collins to make "special payments" ordinarily required under statutory pension law when terms of financing did not contemplate such payments.

Insolvency law -- Receivers, managers and monitors -- Liability -- Motion by Superintendent of Financial Services, United Steelworkers, and CAW - Canada for relief relating to Initial Order made under Companies Creditors Arrangement Act dismissed -- Collins & Aikman Automotive filed for protection under CCAA -- Court declined to alter paragraphs of Initial Order and Order approving engagement of Chief Restructuring Officer that provided limitation of liability for monitor and CRO because moving parties failed to show that Court lacked jurisdiction to make such provision -- Established practice indicated that Court did have authority to grant such protection.

Motion by Superintendent of Financial Services, United Steelworkers, and CAW - Canada for relief relating to Initial Order made under Companies Creditors Arrangement Act -- Collins & Aikman Automotive filed for protection under CCAA -- Collins had obtained funding from a lender subject to certain terms, which terms were approved in Initial Order of July 19,

2007 -- Moving parties objected to wording of certain paragraphs of Initial Order, and also sought to compel Collins to make "special payments" contemplated under statutory pension law -- HELD: Motion dismissed -- Paragraph 4 of Initial Order allowing Collins to hire further individuals was not altered, since USW provided no basis for its concern that paragraph authorized unilateral contracting out of union positions -- Paragraph 6 of Initial Order stating that Collins was "not required" to make various employee compensation payments was not altered because terms of financing that Collins obtained specifically set out what disbursements were contemplated in cash flow, and "special payments" at issue were not included -- Collins was precluded by terms of financing agreement from making any material disbursements not contemplated in cash flow approved by lender -- Even if the "not required" provision resulted in abrogation of statutory pension plan law by permitting Collins to refrain from making "special payments" ordinarily required by Pension Benefits Act, Court had jurisdiction to approve an order under CCAA which conflicted with, and overrode provincial legislation -- Further, it was a proper exercise of Court's discretion to approve provision because moving parties had opportunity to object to Court's approval of financing terms, but did not do so -- Ordering Collins to make "special payments" would constitute a collateral attack on Initial Order that approved financing because Collins had no alternative funds available and such an order would require it to use funds for a purpose which was not permitted pursuant to Initial Order -- Paragraph 11 of Initial Order allowing Collins to terminate employment arrangements as it deemed appropriate was not altered, since USW did not establish that paragraph would allow Collins to repudiate its collective agreements -- Paragraph 26 of Initial Order providing that monitor was not to be deemed to have become an employer was not altered because if monitor started to act as de facto employer, motion could be brought at that time to consider matter in context of actual fact situation, rather than in current abstract circumstances -- Paragraph 29 of Initial Order providing for limitation of monitor's liability to gross negligence or willful misconduct was not altered because Court did not agree with USW's argument that such provision was beyond Court's jurisdiction to make under CCAA -- Similar limitation of liability that was provided for Chief Restructuring Officer in paragraph 4 of Order approving engagement of CRO was not altered for the same reason, and since established practice showed that Court did have authority to grant such protection to CRO.

Statutes, Regulations and Rules Cited:

Companies Creditors Arrangement Act, R.S.C. 1985, c. C-36, s. 11(3), s. 11(4), s. 11(6), s. 11.3, s. 11.8(1)

Labour Relations Act, 1995, S.O. 1995, c. 1, Sched. A, s. 69(1), s. 69(2), s. 69(12), s. 116

Pension Benefits Act, R.S.O. 1990, c. P.8, s. 55(2)

Pension Benefits Act, General Regulation, R.R.O. 1990, Reg.909, s. 4, s. 5

Counsel:

M.E. Bailey, for the Superintendent of Financial Services (Ontario).

K.T. Rosenberg and M.C. Starnino, for the United Steelworkers.

C.E. Sinclair, for the National Automobile, Aerospace, Transportation and General Workers Union of Canada (CAW - Canada).

R.J. Chadwick, for Ernst & Young Inc., as Monitor of Collins & Aikman Automotive Canada Inc.

A.J. Taylor and K.L. Mah, for Collins & Aikman Automotive Canada Inc.

J.E. Dacks, for JP Morgan Chase Bank NA.

C.J. Hill, for Chrysler LLC.

REASONS FOR DECISION

1 **J.M. SPENCE J.**:-- Each of the three moving parties, the Superintendent of Financial Services, the USW and the CAW - Canada, seeks relief relating to the Initial Order made by this Court under the *Companies Creditors Arrangement Act*, R.S.C. 1985, c. C-36, as amended (the "CCAA") on July 19, 2007 (the "Initial Order") with respect to Collins & Aikman

Automotive Canada Inc. ("Automotive" or the "Applicant").

2 On July 19, 2007, Collins & Aikman Automotive Canada Inc. ("Automotive") filed for protection from its creditors pursuant to the CCAA. The Applicant is insolvent. It was clear at the time of the CCAA filing that Automotive would not be able to reorganize and the Court was informed by counsel to Automotive and the Monitor that this proceeding is effectively a liquidation. The Court is advised that the CCAA is being utilized by the Applicant to attempt to maximize the potential recovery for the benefit of all creditors by creating the opportunity to attempt to sell some or all of its remaining operating facilities on a going concern basis.

3 Chrysler LLC (previously known as DaimlerChrysler Company LLC) ("Chrysler") is Automotive's largest remaining customer. In order to provide Automotive with the stability to pursue the sale of its facilities, Automotive, Chrysler, the U.S. Debtors and JPMorgan Chase Bank, N.A. as Agent for the U.S. Debtors' pre-petition secured creditors negotiated a comprehensive funding agreement whereby Chrysler (the "DIP Lender") will fund the costs of this CCAA filing.

4 The relief sought by the moving parties concerns, *inter alia*, the pension plans of Automotive. The Superintendent advises that Automotive maintains seven pension plans which are registered in Ontario,

The Impugned Provisions of the Initial Order

Paragraph 4

5 Paragraph 4 of the Initial Order provides as follows:

> Applicants shall be authorized and empowered to continue to retain and employ the employees, consultants, agents, experts, accountants, counsel and such other persons (collectively "Assistants") currently retained or employed by it, with liberty to retain such further Assistants as it deems reasonably necessary or desirable in the ordinary course of business or for the carrying out of the terms of this Order.

The USW is concerned that, as presently worded, paragraph 4 of the Initial Order is open to an interpretation that permits the Applicant to employ individuals in a manner inconsistent with the terms of the Collective Agreement, contrary to applicable labour legislation. In particular, paragraph 4 could be taken to authorize the unilateral contracting out of union positions. Accordingly, the USW proposes that the following text should be appended at the end of paragraph 4: ", provided that such further retainers are not in breach of any of its collective agreements."

6 The CAW supports the Superintendent and the USW with respect to their submissions in respect of the above provisions of the Order.

Paragraph 6

7 Paragraph 6 of the Initial Order provides as follows:

> THIS COURT ORDERS that the Applicants shall be entitled but not required to pay the following expenses whether incurred prior to or after this Order:
>
> (a) all outstanding and future wages, salaries, employee benefits, contributions to pension plans, vacation pay, bonuses and expenses payable on or after the date of this Order, in each case incurred in the ordinary course of business and consistent with existing compensation policies and arrangements ...

8 The Superintendent objects to any provision that would be inconsistent with the Applicant being required to make any and all required employee contributions to its pension plans.

9 The USW objects to the foregoing provision of the Initial Order on the basis that Automotive appears to be interpreting that provision so as to amend the terms of their employment by staying Automotive's obligation to pay compensation accruing due to employees post filing, including, wages, benefits and special payments to the pension plan. Accordingly, the USW proposes that the words "but not required" be struck from paragraph 6.

Paragraph 11

10 Paragraph 11 of the Initial Order provides as follows:

> THIS COURT ORDERS that the Applicants shall, subject to such covenants as may be contained in the Definitive Documents (as hereinafter defined), have the right to:
>
> ...
>
> b. Terminate the employment of such of its employees or temporarily lay off such of its employees as it deems appropriate on such terms as may be agreed upon between the Applicants and such employee, or failing such agreement, to deal with the consequences thereof in any plan of arrangement or compromise filed by the Applicants under the CCAA (the "Plan"); ...
>
> d. Repudiate such of its arrangements or agreement of any nature whatsoever, whether oral or written, as the Applicants deem appropriate on such terms as may be agreed upon between the Applicants and such counter-parties, or failing such agreement, to deal with the consequences thereof in the Plan; ...

The USW is concerned that these provisions are open to an interpretation that permits Automotive to repudiate its collective agreements with the USW's members. Accordingly, the USW proposes that the following text be added at paragraph 11, following the phrase "(as hereinafter defined)":

> "and any and all applicable collective agreements (including, without limitation, all employee benefit, pension and related agreements, compensation policies, and arrangements), and labour laws ...."

11 The Superintendent seeks an order directing the Applicant to make all required employer contributions to its Pension Plans in accordance with the *Pension Benefits Act*, R.S.O. 1990, c. P.8 (the "PBA") and an order amending the Initial Order as is necessary to reflect this relief.

12 The CAW seeks an order compelling the Applicant to make the special payments due to the pension plans operated for the benefit of the CAW's members. The special payments that are referred to include the special payments that are provided for under s. 5(1)(b) and section 5(1)(e) of the Regulation under the PBA. These payments are required to be made to liquidate any unfunded liability in the plan by reason of a going concern deficiency and any insolvency deficiency based on actuarial valuation of the plan. The other special payments referred to are those dealt with in s. 31 of the Regulation. These payments are post wind-up special payments owing under s. 75 of the PBA to address a wind-up deficit. Section 31 states that annual special payments are to commence at the "effective date of wind up" and are equal to "the amount required in the year to fund the employer's liabilities under section 75 of the [PBA] in equal payments, payable annually in advance, over not more than five years".

13 As stated in *Toronto-Dominion Bank v. Usarco Ltd.*, (1991), 42 E.T.R. 235 at paragraph 25 (Ont. Gen. Div.), in the context of going concern special payments, special payments "may fluctuate depending upon the investment results of the pension fund and the employer's ongoing contributions, together with estimated demands on the fund by the beneficiaries" and other factors. The true position of the plan cannot, in fact, be known until the crystallization of all benefits when benefits are settled after a wind-up at which time "it will be known what are the assets in the fund and the liabilities to be set against such funds by those beneficiaries who are then established as being legally entitled to claim".

14 Accordingly, special payments are better understood as the payments which (in accordance with the PBA and Regulations and actuarial practice) have to be made to a pension plan now to meet the plan's benefit obligations which do not arise until some point in the future (either on retirement or termination for individual members or when benefits are settled in a plan wind up for the plan as a whole).

15 Likewise, post-wind-up special payments to address a wind up deficit are based on an actuarial estimate of the position of the plan as of the wind up date. Again, the actual liabilities of the pension plan are not determined until benefits are settled and the funds in the plan are used to actually purchase annuities from an insurance company (at then prevailing annuity rates) to provide the monthly pension benefit to the member.

16 The Applicant has indicated that monthly special payments for the Pension Plans are approximately $345,000 as of June 2007. The Superintendent is not in a position to confirm this amount precisely but advises that, owing to the funded position of the Plans it is clear that special payments are required for all the Pension Plans on the basis of the actuarial

valuation reports last filed with the FSCO. The requirement to make special payments also applies to two of the Pension Plans which have been wound up, the Gananoque and Stratford Plans, although the special payment requirement arises on an annual rather than a monthly basis.

17 The factums of the USW and the CAW state that the most recently filed valuations for Automotive's various pension plans identify an aggregate wind-up deficiency of approximately $18.2 million.

Paragraph 26

18 Paragraph 26 provides as follows:

> THIS COURT ORDERS that the Monitor shall not take possession of the Property and shall take no part whatsoever in the management or supervision of the management of the Business and shall not, by fulfilling its obligations hereunder, be deemed to have taken or maintained possession or control of the Business or Property, or any part thereof - or be deemed to have been or become an employer of any of the Applicant's employees.

The USW is concerned that this provision usurps the exclusive jurisdiction of the Labour Relations Board (the "Board" or the "OLRB") to determine, on a full factual record, whether someone is a successor employer. Accordingly, the USW proposes that the following text be deleted from paragraph 26: "or be deemed to have been or become an employer of any of the Applicant's employees"; and that the following words be added: ", provided that the foregoing is without prejudice to any rights pursuant to the *Labour Relations Act, 1995*, (Ontario)."

19 The CAW seeks the same order.

Paragraph 29

20 Paragraph 29 provides as follows:

> THIS COURT ORDERS that, in addition to the rights and protections afforded the Monitor under the CCAA or as an officer of this Court, the Monitor shall incur no liability or obligation as a result of its appointment or the carrying out of the provisions on this Order, save and except for any gross negligence or willful misconduct on its part. Nothing in this Order shall derogate from the protections afforded the Monitor by the CCAA or any applicable legislation.

The USW is concerned that this provision provides the Monitor with a blanket immunity on a prospective basis, and that the court has no jurisdiction to provide this immunity and should not provide this immunity even if it did have such authority. Accordingly, the USW proposes that paragraph 29 be deleted and replaced with the following:

> THIS COURT ORDERS that nothing in this Order shall derogate from the protections afforded the Monitor by the CCAA or any other applicable legislation.

The CRO Order

21 On September 11, 2007, Automotive returned a motion for an order approving its engagement of Axis Consulting Group Inc. ("Axis") and Allan Rutman ("Rutman") as Chief Restructuring Officer of Automotive (the "CRO Approval Motion")

22 On September 11, 2007, this court made an order approving Automotive and Axis' engagement (the "CRO Order"), subject to a reservation of rights by the USW to challenge paragraph 4 of the CRO Order.

23 Paragraph 4 of the CRO Order is similar to paragraph 29 of the Automotive Initial Order and the USW objects to it for the same reason. That paragraph provides as follows:

> THIS COURT ORDERS that the CRO shall not incur any liability or obligation as a result of the fulfillment of its duties, save and except for any liability or obligation arising from the gross negligence or willful misconduct of the CRO, and no action or other proceedings may be commenced against the CRO relating to its appointment or its conduct as CRO except with the prior leave of this Court obtained on at least seven (7) days' notice to Automotive and the CRO and provided further that

any liability of the CRO hereunder shall not in any event exceed the quantum of the fees and disbursements paid to or incurred by the CRO in connection herewith. This last limitation of liability will be effective up until + including Sept. 20/07 + thereafter as directed by the judge hearing the motion on Sept. 20/07.

24 The USW proposes that this paragraph be deleted and replaced with the following:

> THIS COURT ORDERS that no action or other proceedings may be commenced against the CRO relating to its appointment or its conduct as CRO except with the prior leave of this Court obtained on at least seven (7) days' notice to Automotive and the CRO.

Relevant Statutory and Regulatory Provisions

The *Companies Creditors Arrangement Act*

25 Section 11(1) of the CCAA provides as follows:

> Notwithstanding anything in the Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act or the Winding-up Act, where an application is made under this Act in respect of a company, the court, on the application of any person interested in the matter, may, subject to this Act, on notice to any other person or without notice as it may see fit, make an order under this section.

26 Subsections 11(3) and (4) of the CCAA provide as follows:

> (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.
>
> Other than initial application court orders -
>
> (4) A court may, on an application in respect of a company other than an initial application, make an order on such terms as it may impose,
>
> (a) staying, until otherwise ordered by the court, for such period as the court deems necessary, all proceedings taken or that might be taken in respect of the company under an Act referred to in subsection (1);
> (b) restraining, until otherwise ordered by the court, further proceedings in any action, suit or proceeding against the company; and
> (c) prohibiting, until otherwise ordered by the court, the commencement of or proceeding with any other action, suit or proceeding against the company.

27 Section 11(6) of the CCAA provides as follows:

> Burden of Proof on Application -
>
> (6) The court shall not make an order under subsection (3) or (4) unless
>
> (a) the applicant satisfies the court that circumstances exist that make such an order appropriate; and
> (b) in the case of an order under subsection (4), the applicant also satisfies the court that the

applicant has acted, and is acting, in good faith and with due diligence.

28 Section 11.3 of the CCAA provides as follows:

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

The *Pension Benefits Act*

29 Section 55(2) of the PBA provides as follows:

> An employer required to make contributions under a pension plan, or a person or entity required to make contributions under a pension plan on behalf of an employer, shall make the contributions in accordance with the prescribed requirements for funding and shall make the contributions in the prescribed manner and at the prescribed times, ...

30 The General Regulation to the Act, R.R.O. 1990, Reg. 909, provides in part as follows:

> 4. (2) Subject to subsection (2.1), an employer who is required to make contributions under a pension plan ... shall make payments to the pension fund or to an insurance company, as applicable, that are not less than the sum of,
>
> (a) all contributions, including contributions in respect of any going concern unfunded liability and solvency deficiency and money withheld by payroll deduction or otherwise from an employee, that are received from employees as the employees' contributions to the pension plan;
> (b) all contributions required to pay the normal cost;
> (c) all special payments determined in accordance with section 5; and
> (d) all special payments determined in accordance with sections 31, 32 and 35 and all payments determined in accordance with section 31.1.
>
> ...
>
> 5. (1) Except as otherwise provided in this section and in sections 4, 5.1 and 7, the special payments required to be made after the initial valuation date under clause 4(2)(c) shall be not less than the sum of,
>
> ...
>
> (b) with respect to any going concern unfunded liability not covered by clause (a), the special payments required to liquidate the liability, with interest at the going concern valuation interest rate, by equal monthly instalments over a period of fifteen years beginning on the valuation date of the report in which the going concern unfunded liability was determined;
>
> ...
>
> (e) with respect to any solvency deficiency arising on or after the Regulation date, the special payments required to liquidate the solvency deficiency, with interest at the rates described in subsection (2), by equal monthly instalments over the period beginning on the valuation date of the report in which the solvency deficiency was determined and ending on the 31st day of December, 2002, or five years, whichever is longer.

The *Labour Relations Act, 1995*, S.O. 1995, c. 1, Sched. A (the "LRA")

31 Section 69 of the LRA provides in part as follows:

> 69. (1) In this section,
>
> "business" includes a part or parts thereof; ("enterprise")
>
> "sells" includes leases, transfers and any other manner of disposition, and "sold" and "sale" have corresponding meanings. ("vend", "vendu", "vente")
>
> Successor employer
>
> (2) Where an employer who is bound by or is a party to a collective agreement with a trade union or council of trade unions sells his, her or its business, the person to whom the business has been sold is, until the Board otherwise declares, bound by the collective agreement as if the person had been a party thereto and, where an employer sells his, her or its business while an application for certification or termination of bargaining rights to which the employer is a party is before the Board, the person to whom the business has been sold is, until the Board otherwise declares, the employer for the purposes of the application as if the person were named as the employer in the application.
>
> ...
>
> Power of Board to determine whether sale
>
> (12) Where, on any application under this section or in any other proceeding before the Board, a question arises as to whether a business has been sold by one employer to another, the Board shall determine the question and its decision is final and conclusive for the purposes of this Act.

32 Section 116 of the LRA provides as follows:

> Board's orders not subject to review
>
> 116. No decision, order, direction, declaration or ruling of the Board shall be questioned or reviewed in any court, and no order shall be made or process entered, or proceedings taken in any court, whether by way of injunction, declaratory judgment, certiorari, mandamus, prohibition, *quo warranto*, or otherwise, to question, review, prohibit or restrain the Board or any of its proceedings.

Jurisdiction of the Court under the *Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act*

33 In *Canadian Red Cross Society (Re)*, [1998] O.J. No. 3306 (Gen. Div. [Commercial List]), Blair J. adopted, at paragraph 46, the following passage from the decision of Farley J. in *Lehndorff General Partner Ltd. (Re)* (1993), 17 C.B.R. (3d) 24, at p. 31 (Ont. Gen. Div.):

> The CCAA is intended to facilitate compromises and arrangements between companies and their creditors as an alternative to bankruptcy and, as such, is remedial legislation entitled to a liberal interpretation. It seems to me that the purpose of the statute is to enable insolvent companies to carry on business in the ordinary course *or otherwise deal with their assets* so as to enable plan of compromise or arrangement to be prepared, filed and considered by their creditors for the proposed compromise or arrangement which will be to the benefit of both the company and its creditors. See the preamble to and sections 4, 5, 7, 8 and 11 of the CCAA (a lengthy list of authorities cited here is omitted).
>
> The CCAA is intended to provide a structured environment for the negotiation of compromises between a debtor company and its creditors for the benefit of both. Where a debtor company

realistically plans to continue operating *or to otherwise deal with its assets* but it requires the protection of the court in order to do so and it is otherwise too early for the court to determine whether the debtor company will succeed, relief should be granted under the CCAA (citations omitted)

[emphasis added]

34 In *Sulphur Corp. of Canada Ltd. (Re)*, [2002] 35 C.B.R. (4th) 304 (Alta. Q.B.), Lovecchio J. considered the jurisdiction of the Court to make an order under s. 11 of the CCAA with provisions that conflicted with provisions of the *Builders Lien Act* of British Columbia (the "BLA"), a conflict which arose because of the grant under a CCAA order of a priority to the financing charge of a debtor in possession ("DIP financing") over all other creditors of the applicant company. Lovecchio J. decided that the Court has jurisdiction to grant a change under the CCAA to secure DIP financing which ranks in priority to a statutory lien under the BLA of British Columbia (paragraph 16).

35 After noting that, apart from the circumstances of the case, the lien under the BLA would have priority, Lovecchio J. provided the following analysis under the headings set out below in the following excerpt which addresses the jurisdiction of the Court in helpful detail and is therefore set out fully here:

The Paramountcy Argument and the Jurisdiction of the Courts

para. 23 Sections 11(3) and 11(4) of the CCAA read as follows:

> 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 a period as the Court deems necessary not exceeding 30 days, ... [staying proceedings, restraining proceedings and prohibiting proceedings against the debtor company].
>
> 11(4) A court may on application in respect of a company other than an initial application, make an order on such terms as it may impose, ... [staying proceedings, restraining proceedings and prohibiting proceedings against the debtor company].

para. 24 It is clear that the power of the Court to create a charge to support a DIP financing is not mentioned. Are the words "such terms as it may impose" sufficient to give inherent jurisdiction a statutory cloak?

para. 25 The facts at bar are similar to those that were before Associate Chief Justice Wachowich (as he then was) in *Re Hunters Trailer & Marine Ltd.*[3] In that case, Wachowich C.J.Q.B. granted Hunters an *ex parte*, 30 day stay of proceedings under the CCAA and, further, granted a DIP financing and Administrative Charge with a super-priority ranking over the claims of the other creditors.

Note 3: (2002) 94 Alta. L.R.(3d) 389.

---

para. 26 In discussing the objective of the CCAA, Wachowich C.J.Q.B. stated the following at para. 15:

> The aim of the CCAA is to maintain the status quo while an insolvent company attempts to bring its creditors on side in terms of a plan of arrangement which will allow the company to remain in business to the mutual benefit of the company and its creditors ...

At para 18:

> I agree with the statement made by Mackenzie J.A. in United Used Auto & Truck Parts Ltd., Re (2000), 16 C.B.R. (4th) 141 (BCCA), at 146 that: "... the CCAA's effectiveness in achieving its objectives is dependent on a broad and flexible exercise of jurisdiction to facilitate a restructuring and continue the debtor as a going concern in the interim.

Later, at para.32:

> Having reviewed the jurisprudence on this issue, I am satisfied that the Court has the inherent or equitable jurisdiction to grant a super-priority for DIP financing and administrative charges, including the fees and disbursements of the professional advisors who guide a debtor company through the CCAA process. Hunters brought its initial CCAA application *ex parte* because it was insolvent and there was a threat of seizure by some of its major floor planners. If super-priority cannot be granted without the consent of secured creditors, the protection of the CCAA effectively would be denied a debtor company in many cases.

...

para. 27 In addressing the Court's jurisdiction to grant an order, the Court of Appeal in *Luscar Ltd. v. Smoky River Coal Ltd.*[4] confirmed the conclusion that s. 11(4) confers broad powers on the Court to exercise a wide discretion to make an order "on such terms as it may impose". At p. 11, para 53 of the decision, Hunt J.A. for the Court wrote:

> These statements about the goals and operations of the CCAA support the view that the discretion under s. 11(4) should be interpreted widely.

Note 4: [1999] A.J. No. 185 (C.A.), online: (AJ).

---

para. 28 As indicated by Wachowich C.J.Q.B., numerous decisions in Canada have supported the proposition that s. 11 provides the courts with broad and liberal power to be used to help achieve the overall objective of the CCAA. It is within this context that my initial Order and the June 19 Order were based.

para. 29 Counsel for the Applicants referred to *Royal Oak Mines Inc., Re*[5] as an authority supporting their submission that the Courts cannot use inherent jurisdiction to override a provincial statute. ...

Note 5: (1999), 7 C.B.R. (4th) 293 (Ont. Gen. Div.).

---

para. 30 In *Royal Oak*, Farley J. also relied on *Baxter Student Housing Ltd. v. College Housing Co-operative Ltd.*[6], where the Supreme Court of Canada remarked that there is a limit to the inherent jurisdiction of superior courts and, in the circumstances of that particular case, the Court's inherent jurisdiction should not be applied to override an express statutory provision. At p. 480 the Court wrote the following:

> Inherent jurisdiction cannot, of course, be exercised so as to conflict with a statute or a Rule. Moreover, because it is a special and extraordinary power, it should be exercised only sparingly and in a clear case.

Note 6: (1975), [1976] 2 S.C.R. 475.

---

para. 31 *Baxter* may be distinguished from the case at hand since, in that particular case, the contest came down to the Court's inherent jurisdiction pursuant to s. 59 of the *Court of Queen's Bench Act*[7], a provincial statute which, the Supreme Court of Canada noted, was not intended to empower the Court to negate the unambiguous expression of the legislative will found in s. 11(1) of the *Mechanics' Liens Act*[8], also a provincial statute.

Note 7: R.S.M. 1970, c. C280.

Note 8: R.S.M. 1970, c. M80.

---

para. 32 ... In *Smoky*, Hunt J.A. used the words the exercise of discretion - a discretion she found to have been broad and one provided for in the statute.

para. 33 It is clear that the Court's power to attach conditions was envisioned by Parliament. The intent of Parliament, through the enactment of the CCAA, was to help foster restructuring which, in turn, fosters the preservation and enhancement of the insolvent corporation's value.

para. 34 In *Re United Used Auto & Truck Parts Ltd.*[9], Mackenzie J.A., of the Court of Appeal, wrote the following at p. 152, para. 29:

> When, as here, the cash flow from operations is insufficient to assure payment and asset values exceeding secured charges are in doubt, granting a super-priority is the only practical means of securing payment. In such circumstances, if a super-priority cannot be granted without the consent of secured creditors, then those creditors would have an effective veto over CCAA relief. I do not think that Parliament intended that the objects of the Act could be indirectly frustrated by secured creditors.

Note 9: (2000), 16 C.B.R. (4th) 141 (BCCA).

---

para. 35 Parliament's way of ensuring that the CCAA would have the necessary force to meet this objective was to entitle the Courts, pursuant to s. 11, to exercise its discretion and no specific limitations were placed on the exercise of that discretion. There is a logic to the lack of specificity as what is required to be done is often dictated at least in part by the particular circumstances of the case. Whether the Court should exercise that discretion is obviously a different matter and that will be discussed below.

para. 36 For the foregoing reasons, I find that in the circumstances of this case, there is a federal statute versus a provincial statute conflict.

Paramountcy

para. 37 Having established that the Court has a statutory basis to use its inherent jurisdiction in the exercise of a discretion granted under the CCAA, the next question is whether this jurisdiction can be used to override an express provincial statutory provision, in this case s. 32 of the BLA.

para. 38 The case of *Pacific National Lease Holding Corp. v. Sun Life Trust Co.*[10] was raised by Sulphur's Counsel to draw an analogy to the paramountcy issue at bar. While the facts are not identical, the case involved a conflict between the Court's power pursuant to the federal CCAA and the Legal Professions Act of British Columbia. In that decision, the Court found that it is within the Court's jurisdiction, pursuant to the CCAA, to exercise broad "power and flexibility", and proceeded to comment on p. 6 that the CCAA "will prevail should a conflict arise between this and another federal or provincial statute". I agree with that conclusion and would apply it in this case.

Note 10: [1995] B.C.J. No. 1535 (C.A.)

---

36 More recently, the Court of Appeal, in its decision in its decision in *Stelco Inc. (Re)* (2005), 75 O.R. (3d) 5, considered the jurisdiction of the Court under s. 11 of the CCAA in connection with an order given under that section removing directors from the board of the applicant company. Paragraphs 31ff of the decision dealt first with the jurisdiction of the Court and then with the exercise of its discretion. The following passages from that decision are relevant with respect to the jurisdiction of the Court:

Jurisdiction

[31] The motion judge concluded that he had the power to rescind the appointments of the two directors on the basis of his "inherent jurisdiction" and "the discretion given to the court pursuant to the CCAA". He was not asked to, nor did he attempt to rest his jurisdiction on other statutory powers imported into the CCAA.

[32] The CCAA is remedial legislation and is to be given a liberal interpretation to facilitate its objectives: *Babcock & Wilcox Canada Ltd. (Re)*, [2000] O.J. No. 786, 5 B.L.R. (3d) 75 (S.C.J.), at para. 11. See also, *Chef Ready Foods Ltd. v. Hong Kong Bank of Canada*, [1990] B.C.J. No. 2384, 4 C.B.R.(3d) 311 (C.A.), at p. 320 C.B.R.; *Re Lehndorff General Partners Ltd.*, [1993] O.J. No. 14, 17 C.B.R.(3d) 24 (Gen. Div.). [page17] Courts have adopted this approach in the past to rely on inherent jurisdiction, or alternatively on the broad jurisdiction under s. 11 of the CCAA, as the source of judicial power in a CCAA proceeding to "fill in the gaps" or to "put flesh on the bones" of that Act: see *Re Dylex Ltd.*, [1995] O.J. No. 595, 31 C.B.R. (3d) 106 (Gen. Div. (Commercial List)), *Royal Oak Mines Inc. (Re)*, [1999] O.J. No. 864, 7 C.B.R. (4th) 293 (Gen. Div. (Commercial List); and *Westar Mining Ltd. (Re)*, [1992] B.C.J. No. 1360, 70 B.C.L.R. (2d) 6 (S.C.).

[33] It is not necessary, for purposes of this appeal, to determine whether inherent jurisdiction is excluded for all supervisory purposes under the CCAA, by reason of the existence of the statutory discretionary regime provided in that Act. In my opinion, however, the better view is that in carrying out his or her supervisory functions under the legislation, the judge is not exercising inherent jurisdiction but rather the statutory discretion provided by s. 11 of the CCAA and supplemented by other statutory powers that may be imported into the exercise of the s. 11 discretion from other statutes through s. 20 of the CCAA.

...

[35] ... [I]nherent jurisdiction does not operate where Parliament or the legislature has acted. As Farley J. noted in Royal Oak Mines, supra, inherent jurisdiction is "not limitless; if the legislative body has not left a functional gap or vacuum, then inherent jurisdiction should [page18] not be brought into play" (para. 4). See also, *Baxter Student Housing Ltd. v. College Housing Co-operative Ltd.*, [1976] 2 S.C.R. 475, 57 D.L.R. (3d) 1, at p. 480 S.C.R.; *Richtree Inc.* (Re) (2005), 74 O.R. (3d) 174, [2005] O.J. No. 251 (S.C.J.).

[36] In the CCAA context, Parliament has provided a statutory framework to extend protection to a company while it holds its creditors at bay and attempts to negotiate a compromised plan of arrangement that will enable it to emerge and continue as a viable economic entity, thus benefiting society and the company in the long run, along with the company's creditors, shareholders, employees and other stakeholders. The s. 11 discretion is the engine that drives this broad and flexible statutory scheme, and that for the most part supplants the need to resort to inherent jurisdiction. In that regard, I agree with the comment of Newbury J.A. in *Clear Creek Contracting Ltd. v. Skeena Cellulose Inc.*, [2003] B.C.J. No. 1335, 43 C.B.R. (4th) 187 (C.A.), at para. 46, that:

> ... the court is not exercising a power that arises from its nature as a superior court of law, but is exercising the discretion given to it by the CCAA. ... This is the discretion, given by s. 11, to stay proceedings against the debtor corporation and the discretion, given by s. 6, to approve a plan which appears to be reasonable and fair, to be in accord with the requirements and objects of the statute, and to make possible the continuation of the corporation as a viable entity. It is these considerations the courts have been concerned with in the cases discussed above[2] at the end of the document], rather than the integrity of their own process.

[37] As Jacob observes, in his article "The Inherent Jurisdiction of the Court", supra, at p. 25:

> The inherent jurisdiction of the court is a concept which must be distinguished from the exercise of judicial discretion. These two concepts resemble each other, particularly in their operation, and they often appear to overlap, and are therefore sometimes confused the one with the other. There is nevertheless a vital juridical distinction between jurisdiction and discretion, which must always be observed.

[38] I do not mean to suggest that inherent jurisdiction can never apply in a CCAA context. The court retains the ability to control its own process, should the need arise. There is a distinction, however -- difficult as it may be to draw -- between the court's process with respect to the restructuring, on the one hand, and the course of action involving the negotiations and corporate actions accompanying them, which are the company's process, on the other hand. The court simply supervises the latter [page19]

process through its ability to stay, restrain or prohibit proceedings against the company during the plan negotiation period "on such terms as it may impose"[3] at the end of the document]. Hence the better view is that a judge is generally exercising the court's statutory discretion under s. 11 of the Act when supervising a CCAA proceeding. The order in this case could not be founded on inherent jurisdiction because it is designed to supervise the company's process, not the court's process.

37 As to the exercise of the jurisdiction given by s. 11, the Court in *Stelco* said the following at paragraphs 43 and 44:

> [43] Mr. Leon and Mr. Swan argue that matters relating to the removal of directors do not fall within the court's discretion under s. 11 because they fall outside of the parameters of the court's role in the restructuring process, in contrast to the company's role in the restructuring process. The court's role is defined by the "on such terms as may be imposed" jurisdiction under subparas. 11(3)(a) -- (c) and 11 (4)(a) -- (c) of the CCAA to stay, or restrain, or prohibit proceedings against the company during the "breathing space" period for negotiations and a plan. ...
>
> [44] What the court does under s. 11 is to establish the boundaries of the playing field and act as a referee in the process. The company's role in the restructuring, and that of its stakeholders, is to work out a plan or compromise that a sufficient percentage of creditors will accept and the court will approve and sanction. The corporate activities that take place in the course of the workout are governed by the legislation and legal principles that normally apply to such activities. In the course of acting as referee, the court has great leeway, as Farley J. observed in Lehndorff, supra, at para. 5, "to make order[s] so as to effectively maintain the status quo in respect of an insolvent company while it attempts to gain the approval of its creditors for the proposed compromise or arrangement which will be to the benefit of both the company and its creditors". But the s. 11 discretion is not open-ended and unfettered. Its exercise must be guided by the scheme and object of the Act and by the legal principles that govern corporate law issues. Moreover, the court is not entitled to usurp the role of the directors and management in conducting what are in substance the company's restructuring efforts.

38 The Court in *Stelco* went on to determine that it was not for the Court under s. 11 to usurp the role of the directors and management in conducting the restructuring efforts and found that there was no authority in s. 11 of the CCAA for the Court to interfere with the composition of a board of directors.

In the course of that analysis the Court stated as follows at paragraph 48:

> [48] There is therefore a statutory scheme under the CBCA (and similar provincial corporate legislation) providing for the election, appointment and removal of directors. Where another applicable statute confers jurisdiction with respect to a matter, a broad and undefined discretion provided in one statute cannot be used to supplant or override the other applicable statute. There is no legislative "gap" to fill. See Baxter Student *Housing Ltd. v. College Housing Cooperative Ltd., supra*, at p. 480 S.C.R.; *Royal Oak Mines Inc. (Re), supra*; and *Richtree Inc. (Re), supra.*

39 It appears to me that in making the analysis set out in the above paragraphs and coming to the conclusion that it reached, the Court was addressing the need to ensure that the "terms" imposed by the Court under its s. 11 powers to do so are terms that are properly related to the jurisdiction given under s. 11 to the Court to grant stays and the purpose of that jurisdiction under the CCAA. In that regard, the Court did not consider that intervening in the composition of the internal management of the company contrary to the applicable laws in that regard was proper. This conclusion is perhaps best understood in the context of the earlier discussion in the decision of the nature of the jurisdiction of the Court under s. 11. In particular, the Court emphasized the role of the Court as a supervisory one which is exercised through its ability "to stay, restrain or prohibit proceedings against the company during the plan negotiation period" on such terms as the Court may impose (paragraph 38). It is not apparent how an order removing directors would be inherently or functionally related to the Court's role to provide a protection against legal proceedings which are potentially adverse to the facilitation of "the continuation of the corporation as a viable entity" (paragraph 36, in the quoted passage from the *Skeena* decision).

40 On this basis, the limitation expressed by the Court in *Re Stelco* is not to be understood as restricting the jurisdiction of the Court to make orders which carry out that protective function.

41 Similarly, but in a quite different fact situation, Lax J. of this Court, in her decision in *Richtree Inc. (Re)* (2005), 74 O.R.(3d) 174 dismissed a motion to exempt the applicant company from certain filing requirements with regulatory authorities: see paragraphs 13 to 18 of the decision. In paragraph 18 of the decision, Lax J. said that the order that was sought

had nothing to do with the restructuring process of the applicant company.

42 In view of the reasoning and the decisions in the above cases considered, the Court has a jurisdiction under the CCAA which, in the words of the decision in *Re Sulphur Corp. of Canada Ltd., supra*, at paragraph 37, "can be used to override an express provincial statutory provision" where that would contribute to carrying out the protective function of the CCAA as reflected particularly in the provisions of s. 11 of the CCAA.

43 This analysis is developed further with regard to the special payments in the part of the text below that deals with the issue relating to paragraph 6 of the Initial Order.

The Context of the Initial Order and the CRO Order

44 On July 19, 2007, the Court issued the Initial Order authorizing, *inter alia*, Automotive to obtain and borrow under a credit facility (the "DIP Facility") from Chrysler as DIP Lender in order to finance certain expenditures contemplated by the cash flows that are approved by the DIP Lender and filed with the Court.

45 The Initial Order provided that the DIP Facility was to be on the terms and subject to the conditions set forth in the DIP Term Sheet and Commitment Letter between Automotive and the DIP Lender dated as of July 18, 2007 (the "Commitment Letter"), filed with the Court.

46 The Commitment Letter provides:

> The Borrower covenants as follows:
>
> > The Borrower shall not, without the Lender's prior written consent, make any material disbursement unless it is contemplated in the Initial cash flow, attached as Schedule "A" to this DIP Term Sheet and Commitment Letter (the "Initial Cash Flow") or any rolling cash flow approved by the Lender (collectively "Cash Flow Projections") and, for greater certainty, the Borrower shall not issue any cheques or make any disbursements until such point in time as the Lender has approved the same and confirmed sufficient funding of the same in accordance with the terms hereof[.]

47 The Initial Order also stated that rights of the DIP Lender under the Commitment Letter shall not be impaired in any way in Automotive's CCAA proceedings or by any provincial or federal statutes and that the DIP Lender shall not have any liability to any person whatsoever resulting from the breach by Automotive of any agreement caused by Automotive entering into the Commitment Letter.

48 The Initial Order provided that the DIP Lender was entitled to the benefit of the DIP Lender's Charge on all of the property of Automotive (except certain tax refunds).

49 The Affidavit of John Boken, dated July 19, 2007, sworn on behalf of Automotive and filed with the Court in connection with the application for the Initial Order (the "Boken Affidavit") stated the following at paragraph 46 with respect to the pension plans of Automotive:

> [Automotive] intends to continue to pay current service costs with respect to benefits accruing from the date of filing. The DIP Loan (as defined below), does not provide for the funding of any special payments.

50 In addition, the initial cash flow approved by Chrysler and filed with the Court on the application for the Initial Order clearly stated that special payments would not be made and that such payments were not included in the cash flow projections.

51 Automotive brought a motion to the Court on July 30, 2007 for, inter alia, an Order confirming the terms of the DIP Facility (the "DIP Approval Motion"). The DIP Approval Motion was made on notice to, among others, the USW and the Superintendent. The Boken Affidavit was again served in connection with the DIP Approval Motion. As noted above, the Boken Affidavit unequivocally indicated that special payments would not be made and were not permitted by the DIP Facility.

52 In addition, the Monitor filed its First Report with the Court at the return of the DIP Approval Motion and specifically

noted that Automotive could not make any payments that were not in the cash flow forecast and that special pension payments were not provided for in the forecast. That point was reiterated in the notes to the cash flow forecast.

53 On July 30, 2007, the Court issued an Order confirming the terms of the DIP Facility (the "DIP Approval Order"). The DIP Approval Order provided:

> 3. THIS COURT ORDERS that the DIP Facility provided by DCC to the Applicant in the amount of Cdn.$13.6 million on the terms and subject to the conditions contained in the DIP Term Sheet and Commitment Letter between the Applicant and DCC dated as of July 18, 2007, all as set forth in the Initial Order, is hereby confirmed and approved.

54 Based on the First Report of the Monitor and the submissions of all counsel Justice Stinson granted the requested relief and approved the DIP Loan "on the terms and subject to the conditions contained in the DIP Term Sheet and Commitment Letter between the Applicant and the DIP Lender dated as of July 18, 2007, all as set forth in the Initial Order". As noted in Justice Stinson's endorsement in respect of the DIP Approval Order, Mr. Bailey on behalf of FSCO and Mr. Starnino on behalf of the USW requested that the Court "record their respective clients' reservation of rights in relation to the pension fund payments and other matters referenced in paragraphs 6(a), 11(b) and (d) of paragraph 26 of the [Initial] Order". Although the CAW did not attend the hearing on July 30, it did receive notice of Automotive's CCAA proceedings on July 23, 2007.

55 No party objected to the approval of the DIP Loan, or the terms and conditions set forth therein. No party appealed Justice Stinson's July 30 order approving the DIP Loan. The appeal period expired on August 20, 2007.

56 The DIP Approval Order was not opposed by the USW or the Superintendent, although they did appear at the DIP Approval Motion.

57 Automotive brought a motion to the Court on August 23, 2007 for an Order, inter alia, extending the stay of proceedings and increasing the amount of an amended DIP Facility. The motion was made on notice to the Unions and the Superintendent. The revised Cash Flow approved by Chrysler and filed with the Court (as a Schedule to the Monitor's Second Report) clearly stated that special payments would not be made and that such payments were not included in the cash flow projections.

58 On August 23, 2007, the Court issued an Order (the "August 23 Order") approving the Amended DIP Term Sheet and Commitment letter dated August 21, 2007 (the "Amended Commitment Letter"). The Amended Commitment Letter provides that Automotive shall not, without the DIP Lender's prior written consent, make any material disbursement unless it is contemplated in the cash flows approved by the DIP Lender. The Unions and the Superintendent did not oppose the August 23 Order, and they did not seek leave to appeal it.

59 The Boken Affidavit filed in support of the Initial Application indicated that:

> (a) Automotive had no other realistic source of DIP funding to continue operations;
> (b) the DIP Loan was the only basis on which funding was available to keep the potential for the preservation of some of the plants as going concerns; and
> (c) the DIP Loan was being provided as a component of a complex multi-party agreement that represented a compromise of the rights of Chrysler, Automotive and the U.S. Debtors, which agreement was approved by the US Bankruptcy Court.

60 By Order of Justice Pepall dated September 11, 2007, Axis Consulting Group and Allan Rutman was appointed Chief Restructuring Officer ("CRO") of Automotive (the "CRO Order"). Paragraph 4 of that CRO Order states:

> THIS COURT ORDERS that the CRO shall not incur any liability or obligation as a result of the fulfilment of its duties, save and except for any liability or obligation arising from the gross negligence or wilful misconduct of the CRO, and no action or other proceedings may be commenced against the CRO relating to its appointment or its conduct as CRO except with the prior leave of this Court obtained on at least seven (7) days' notice to Automotive and the CRO and provided further that any liability of the CRO hereunder shall not in any event exceed the quantum of the fees and disbursements paid to or incurred by the CRO in connection therewith. This last limitation on liability will be effective up until and including Sept. 20, 2007 and thereafter as ordered by the judge hearing the motion on Sept. 20, 2007.

61 The last sentence in paragraph 4 of the CRO Order was added by Justice Pepall in response to submissions by counsel that the issue of protections for the CRO were to be further addressed on this motion by the USW.

The Issues

Paragraph 4

62 The USW states its concern that the provision in paragraph 4 that allows the Applicant to retain further Assistants could be interpreted to allow hiring "in a manner inconsistent with the terms of the Collective Agreement, contrary to applicable labour legislation" (USW Factum, paragraph 43). How in particular that might come about is not explained. It is not suggested that the Applicant has acted or intends to act in such a manner.

63 Paragraph 4 does not provide that such hirings may be made in the manner that is the cause of concern. No basis was submitted for considering that such a result is implicit in paragraph 4.

64 Paragraph 4 is, as it is stated, consistent with the protective function of s. 11 because it effectively restrains proceedings that might otherwise be brought against the Applicant for making further hirings. It is conceivable in principle that hirings might be made in a way that would raise issues of the kind raised in *Re Richtree Inc., supra.* In such circumstances, having regard to the approach taken by the Court in *Richtree*, the aggrieved parties would apparently be able to seeks appropriate relief from the Court as part of administrative or supervisory jurisdiction in respect of orders made by the Court under the CCAA. That would be an appropriate context in which to address the question of whether there is a conflict between the Collective Agreement and/or the LRA on the one hand and the CCAA and/or the Initial Order on the other. In the present circumstances, it is unnecessary to address the matter and there is no fact situation before the Court to allow it to be addressed properly.

Paragraph 6

65 The objection taken to the phrase "but not required" in paragraph 6 is that Automotive regards the phrase as staying its obligations to pay various kinds of post-filing employee compensation, including in particular special payments to the pension plan.

66 Under the DIP Approval Order, the Court approved the DIP Facility on the terms and subject to the conditions contained in the DIP Term Sheet and Commitment Letter dated July 18, 2007. As noted, the Commitment Letter precludes Automotive from making distributions not contemplated in approved cash flows and the cash flow filed with the Court stated that special payments under the pension plans would not be made. These features link the DIP Approval Order to the paragraph 6 provision in the Initial Order that the specified kinds of payments are not required to be made. That is to say, the Initial Order and the DIP Approval Order are an integrated arrangement. The rationale given for this arrangement in the records is that Automotive will not be in a position to carry on business and will not have available funds without the DIP Facility and the terms on which the DIP Lender is prepared to commit to the DIP Facility are as stated.

67 Automotive states in its factum that it has continued to pay all wages and vacation pay during the course of this CCAA proceeding and intends to continue such payments and that the DIP Loan will, subject to certain conditions, provide advances to facilitate payment of statutory severance obligations.

68 The Initial Cash Flow provides for certain operating disbursements in respect of "Payroll, Payroll Taxes, Benefits, Severance, Other". The associated note states:

> The Forecast [Initial Cash Flow] assumes that payments are made for medical and health benefits and current service pension payments will be made while a plant is operating and then cease on the end of production date. The Forecast does not provide for the payment of any special pension payments as it is assumed these will be stayed in a CCAA filing.

69 The Court has approved the DIP Facility and, subject to this motion, the Initial Order. It is obvious that the DIP Facility and the Initial Order are integrally related. In consequence, if Automotive were to fail to use the funds available under the DIP Facility for the purposes that have been indicated for those funds in these CCAA proceedings, that would be a matter that might properly found a motion to the Court for relief. So the phrase "but not required" in paragraph 6 does not given Automotive a carte blanche to withhold contemplated payments, contrary to a suggestion that was made against the paragraph in the course of the hearing.

70 On the other hand, it is clear that the effect of the terms of the DIP Approval and paragraph 6 of the Initial Order is that Automotive, under the Order, is "not required" to make the special payments under its Pension Plans that would otherwise be required.

71 The requirement for the making of such special payments is a statutory requirement. The special payments are provided for in the pension benefits regime under the PBA and the related regulations, as set out in the relevant provisions excerpted above.

Jurisdiction under the CCAA re the Special Payments

72 The USW and the CAW submitted that the obligation under the pension benefits statutory regime to make special payments is an obligation under their respective collective agreements with Automotive. Those agreements require Automotive to maintain pension plans for members having certain specific features, principally relating to the amount of the pension to be earned and paid for the period of employment served by the employee. It was not shown that any provisions in the collective agreements do expressly require Automotive to comply with the statutory regime as to special payments. Rather, the submission seemed to be that because Automotive has an obligation under the Collective Agreement to maintain the pension plan and also has a statutory obligation in respect of pension plans it maintains to make certain special payments, that the contractual obligation impliedly includes the statutory obligations and therefore, any relief from the statutory obligation also constitutes relief from the contractual obligation under the Collective Agreement. Whenever it is argued, as here, that a term should be implied in a contract, the necessary question is why that is so and in this case, no answer is evident from the submissions. The implication was perhaps that it is self-evident but that may be debatable. The pension plan provisions in the collective agreements are addressed to the pension benefits that the plan is required to make available to the members and not to how that is to be done. On this basis, it would seem to be a stretch to say that just because a pension plan is required to conform to the statutory regime, the company sponsoring the plan has impliedly agreed with the bargaining agent to do so. This would suggest that all that the company has agreed to do in the Collective Agreement is to maintain a plan that provides for the benefits contracted for in the collective bargain.

73 However, that analysis may be unduly technical for purposes of the issues on this motion. The commitment of Automotive in its collective agreement to maintain pension plans would given rise to a reasonable expectation that it would keep those plans in good standing in accordance with applicable regulatory requirements designed to ensure that the plans will be able to meet their payment obligations. Moreover, at least one of the pension plans contains a provision which requires the making of all payments required by the applicable statutes. So the better approach is probably to regard the maintenance of the special payments as effectively contemplated by the collective agreements.

74 Even so, this consideration would be relevant to the issue of the jurisdiction of the Court to make the impugned order only if this relationship to the collective agreements gives rise to jurisdictional considerations that are different from those that arise by reasons of the payments being required pursuant to the PBA.

75 As observed by the Supreme Court of Canada in its decision in *Health Services and Support-Facilities Subsector Bargaining Association v. British Columbia*, [2007] S.C.J. No. 27, 2007 SCC 27 at paragraph 86, collective bargaining is a fundamental aspect of Canadian society, which has emerged as the most significant collective activity through which the freedom of association protected by s. 2(d) of the Charter is expressed in the labour context. Recognizing that workers have the right to bargain collectively reaffirms the values of dignity, personal autonomy, equality and democracy.

76 This fundamental process of collective bargaining is entrenched in the laws of Ontario by the LRA, which provides a comprehensive scheme for employment relations. Among other things, that statute directs that:

(a) there shall only be one collective agreement in force between a trade union and an employer;
(b) the trade union that is a party to the collective agreement is recognized as the exclusive bargaining agent of the employees in the bargaining unit defined therein;
(c) the collective agreement is binding upon the employer and the employees;
(d) the collective agreement shall not be terminated by the parties before it ceases to operate in accordance with its provisions or the statute without the consent of the Labour Board on the joint application of the parties;
(e) a provision of a collective agreement may only be revised on the mutual consent of the parties;
(f) no employer and no person acting on behalf of an employer shall interfere with the representation of employees by a trade union; and,
(g) no employer shall, so long as a trade union continues to be entitled to represent the employees in a bargaining unit, bargain with or enter into a collective agreement with any person on behalf

> of or purporting, designed or intended to be binding upon the employees in the bargaining unit or any of them.

77 Based on these elements of the LRA, it appears that the employees cannot legally terminate their employment under their collective agreement before "it ceases to operate in accordance with its provisions or the LRA without consent of the O.L.R.B. on the joint application of the parties". The USW submits that therefore, the employees cannot legally terminate their services. However, whether this is so would depend first on whether the making of the Initial Order or its terms would allow the Collective Agreement to be terminated. No submissions were made that assist on this point.

78 Secondly, since the LRA provides that the Collective Agreement could be terminated with the consent of the Board, there is a question whether that consent could be obtained - a matter that was not canvassed in the submissions.

79 The above considerations relating to the LRA do not suggest that the relationship of the PBA requirements for special payments to the collective agreements should be considered to give those requirements any jurisdictional status for the issues in this case that would go beyond the implications that arise from the fact of those requirements being imposed pursuant to statute.

80 This result is not altered by the Court's recognition that collective bargaining is a fundamental aspect of Canadian society involving the exercise of the freedom of association protected by s. 2(d) of the *Charter*. It was not suggested that the Initial Order constitutes a breach of the *Charter* rights of the employees.

81 The Moving Parties rely upon the decision of Farley J. in *United Air Lines, Inc. (Re)* (2005), 45 C.C.P.B. 151 (Ont. S.C.J. [Commercial List]) as authority for the proposition that a CCAA debtor must in all circumstances continue to make special payments post-filing. *United Air Lines* involved a motion brought by UAL for an order authorizing it to cease making contributions to its Canadian pension plans. UAL applied for protection from its creditors pursuant to section 18.6 of the CCAA, whereby it sought recognition of a Chapter 11 proceeding in the United States. UAL had filed for bankruptcy protection in the United States in December 2002 and filed under section 18.6 of the CCAA in 2003. The motion was not brought until February 2005.

82 UAL was a large U.S. corporation that was attempting to restructure. It had an international workforce, including a small Canadian workforce. In its motion, it was seeking authority to cease making all contributions to its Canadian pension plans even though it continued to meet its pension funding commitments in all countries other than the United States and Canada. UAL's U.S. employees and retirees had the benefit of the protections provided by the Pension Benefits Guarantee Corporation, while the Canadian employees, as the beneficiaries of a federally regulated scheme, did not. UAL had not presented any evidence of its inability to make the pension payments.

83 After reviewing all of the facts, Farley J. summarized as follows at paragraph 7:

> As discussed above, the relative size of the Canadian problems *vis-a-vis* the U.S.A. problems is rather insignificant. It would not seem on the evidence before me that payment of funding obligations would in any way cause any particular stress or strain on the U.S. restructuring - given their relatively insignificant amounts in question. UAL had no qualms about making such payments in the other countries internationally. Additionally there is the issue of the U.S. situation having the benefit of the Pension Benefits Guarantee Corp. (as to which UAL would have paid premiums) but there being no such safety net in Canada on the federal level (and thus no previous premium obligation on UAL).

84 *United Air Lines* does not appear to stand for the proposition that all pension contributions, including special payments, must in all cases be paid by a CCAA debtor absent an agreement with its unions and FSCO. On the contrary, Farley J.'s decision states in paragraph 8 that it was made "on the basis of fairness and equity" after a consideration of the facts and circumstances existing in that case.

85 Based on the decision of the Court of appeal for Quebec in *Syndicat national de l'amiante d'Asbestos inc. et al. v. Jeffrey Mine Inc.*, [2003] Q.J. No. 264, there is a reason to consider that the "not required" clause does not purport to abrogate the pension plan obligations. It authorizes the company not to make payments on account of its obligations during the currency of the Initial Order. Unpaid obligations would constitute debts of the company to be dealt with at the termination of its protection under the CCAA: see *Jeffrey Mine* paragraphs 60 to 62.

86 It was submitted that the text of the *Jeffrey Mine* decision at paragraph 57 shows that in that case there was no suspension of the special payments obligation in respect of the employees who continued to work in the post-filing period. The phrase in paragraph 57 that is relied on in this regard is that the monitor was authorized to suspend pension contributions

"except for employees whose services are retained by the monitor". This phrase is stated in the text to be a translation. The text of the original version of the initial order in *Jeffrey Mine* is set out at paragraph 9 of the decision. Paragraph [22] of the order authorizes the monitor to suspend "contributions to pension plans made by employees other than those kept by the monitor". At paragraphs 10 and 11 of the decision, the text makes clear that, in respect of the pension plan, the monitor advised that the payments that would continue to be paid were the current service payments, which are described as monthly remuneration to the employees to be paid to them by being paid to the plan. Nothing is said there about making any other payments to the plan. Paragraphs 68 and 70 express the Court's rejection of paragraph 16 of the Court's Order of November 29, 2006 which exempted the monitor from the collective agreements. However, paragraphs 54 and 55 of the decision deal with the suspension by the Court of payments to offset actuarial liability, which would seem to be payments in the nature of the special payments that are in issue in the present case. At paragraph 55 the Court gave its opinion that it was within the power of the Superior Court to suspend those payments. The Court of Appeal may have been making a distinction between the powers of the monitor and the Court.

87 Based on the analysis set out earlier in these reasons, even if it is correct to view the "not required" provision as abrogating provisions of pension plan statutory law, the Court has the jurisdiction under the CCAA to make an order under the CCAA which conflicts with, and overrides, provincial legislation. There is no apparent reason why this principle would not apply to an order made under the CCAA which conflicts with the PBA.

88 Reference was made to s. 11.3(a) of the CCAA, which provides that no order made under s. 11 is to have the effect of prohibiting a person from requiring payment for services provided after the order is made. The Applicant is paying the wages and the current service obligations under the pension plans of the employees who continue to be employed. The special payments do not relate exclusively to the continuing employees. It is not shown (and does not seem to be submitted) that the amounts that might be required under the special payments arise from or are in connection with the current service obligations to the plan (assuming those obligations are paid in due course). The most that can be said on the basis of the material now before the Court is that the fact that Automotive continues to operate with employment services being provided by Plan members may occasion some change in the amounts that were due and the payments that were required to be made as at the time of the CCAA filing, but what that amount might be and how, if at all, it could be attributed materially to the continuing service as opposed to other factors such as plan asset valuation is impossible to determine.

89 Accordingly, this point does not alter the conclusion that the Court has the jurisdiction to approve the "not required" clause, notwithstanding its effect in respect of the special payments.

Exercise of the Statutory Discretion under the CCAA

90 There is a separate question raised whether it is a proper exercise of the discretion of the court for it to approve the provision in question. That question must be addressed in the context discussed above.

91 The evidence before this Court is that Automotive is incapable of making the special payments. Automotive does not have the funds necessary to make the special payments. As at July 19, 2007, Automotive had no cash of its own. In the five-week period from July 19, 2007 to August 25, 2007, Automotive had negative cash flow from operations of approximately $5 million. It is forecast that in the four-week period from August 26, 2007 until September 22, 2007 Automotive will have negative cash flow of approximately an additional $12 million. Since filing, Automotive has been wholly dependent on the DIP Loan to fund all disbursements.

92 Two other important considerations are evident in the present case. First, for the reasons given above, the effective suspension of special payments is a feature of the integrated arrangement which was made available by Chrysler as the DIP Lender and which was the arrangement which enabled the company to continue in operation. So there was and is a very good reason for the Court to approve that arrangement.

93 Secondly, the moving parties each had a full opportunity to object to the approval of the DIP Facility and none of them did so, even though it was clear from the terms of the DIP Facility and the terms of the Initial Order that they are an integrated arrangement. Instead of objecting to the DIP Facility, they have allowed it to be approved and have objected only to the related provisions of the Initial Order. In proceeding this way, it appears they have avoided facing the question whether if they opposed the DIP Approval Order for the reasons they now advance in respect of the special payments, the DIP Lender might have resisted their demands at the first moment, to the detriment of the continuing employment of members, and they now seek to raise the issue now that the DIP lender is in place and has been advancing funds, in circumstances where the only practical consequence could be to raise the question which would have appropriately been raised at the earlier stage.

94 Chrysler submitted that this conduct is a collateral attack on the DIP Approval Order and should not be countenanced by the Court.

95 The Initial Order was approved on July 19, 2007 with a provision in paragraph 3 providing for a further hearing on July 30, 2007 (the "Comeback Date") at which time the Initial Order could be supplemented or otherwise varied. On July 30, 2007 the Court ordered the approval of the DIP Facility. It ordered an extension of the Stay Period to August 24, 2007.

96 The Court did not make any order to supplement or vary the Initial Order in any other respects. Neither did it make any order to the contrary. Nor does it appear from the recitals in the DIP Approval Order that the Court was asked on that motion to deal with the Initial Order in other respects. Stinson J., in his endorsement of July 30, 2007 approving the issuance of the DIP Approval Order, recorded the requests on behalf of the Superintendent and the USW that he record their respective clients' reservation of rights in relation to the pension fund payment and other matters referenced in paragraphs 6(a), 11(b) and (d) and paragraph 26 of the Initial Order. Since this reservation was recorded at the same time as the DIP Approval Order was granted and without any order being granted at that time to deal with any variations to the Initial Order, this raises a question of whether it is fair to regard the motion now before the Court as a collateral attack on the DIP Approval Order.

97 It is important that, in the Initial Order at paragraph 34, the DIP Facility was ordered to be on the terms and conditions in the DIP Term Sheet and Commitment Letter dated as of July 18, 2007 which was approved in that paragraph subject to a further hearing on the Comeback Date. Covenant No. 1 in the DIP Term Sheet and Commitment Letter provides that the Borrower shall not without the Lender's prior written consent make any material disbursement unless it is contemplated in the initial cash flow or any subsequent cash flow approved by the Lender.

98 As noted earlier, on the motion to approve the Initial Order the Court had affidavit information from Automotive that the DIP Loan does not provide for the funding of any special payments, along with a copy of the cash flow which states that no provision is made for the payment of any special pension payments.

99 So, based on the above analysis, the Court, in the Initial Order, by reason of paragraph 34 (as to which no reservation of a right to object has been made or is now asserted), has ordered that the DIP Loan is not to be applied to special payments except with the consent of the DIP Lender.

100 The Superintendent seeks an order requiring the Applicant to pay the Special Payments. For the reasons given above, such an order would constitute a collateral attack on DIP Approval because the evidence is that the Applicant has no funds available to it other than the DIP Loan. Consequently, the order the Superintendent requests would effectively order the Applicant to use the DIP Loan for a purpose which, pursuant to paragraph 34 of the Initial Order, is not permitted.

101 Chrysler's agreement to act as DIP lender is based on the fact that the Applicant's supply is required to maintain Chrysler's own just-in-time vehicle manufacturing operations. The Superintendent submits that if Chrysler has concluded that it requires the output derived from the labour of the employees, then it is only fair and equitable that Chrysler bears the cost, in terms of remuneration to the employees including special payments to the Pension Plans, of that labour.

102 In the decision in *Ivaco Inc. (Re)* (2005), 47 C.C.P.B. 62 at paragraph 4 (Ont. S.C.J. [Commercial List]) (affirmed (2006) 275 D.L.R. (4th) 132 (Ont. C.A.), leave to appeal granted [2006] S.C.C.A. No. 490) at the first instance, Farley J. characterized the nature of special payments, stating that "notwithstanding that past service contributions could be characterized as functionally a pre-filing obligation, legally the obligation pursuant to the applicable pension legislation is a fresh' obligation".

103 The amount of the outstanding special payments in the present case appears to have been determined prior to the Initial Order based on information relating to the pre-filing period. It is not apparent that the continuation of the operations of the Applicant in the post-filing period has given rise to an increase in the amount of the special payments from the amount that would otherwise have been applicable by reason of the pre-filing experience. Consequently, it seems tendentious to characterize the outstanding special payments as the costs of operating in the post-filing period.

104 The Superintendent objects that the approach that has been taken by the Applicant in the present case has been done without the requisite negotiation with the Superintendent and the pension plan stakeholders. In the decision in *United Airlines, Inc., supra*, Farley J. cited the example of a case where the company obtained specific relief from the requirement to make special payments although current service costs were made. The Court, however, concluded that such an arrangement "is not a given right' of the company" and is to be achieved "on a consensual basis after negotiation" with the pension plan stakeholders.

105 If there had been an objection to paragraph 34 of the Initial Order, that might well have occasioned negotiations of this kind, but there was no such objection. As noted, if there had been, each side could have assessed its own interests *vis-à-vis* the position of the other and the extent to which it would take the risk of insisting on its position or instead seek a

compromise. Instead, what has happened is that the DIP Facility has proceeded without objection and the DIP Lender has changed its position on the basis of the Court orders given to date and now, after it has done so, an effort is made to put it in a position where it has no choice but to increase its funding or risk the loss of the continuing operations. This might yield a negotiation but it would be a lopsided one by reason of the DIP Lender already having provided funding in accordance with the Court orders.

106 The USW contends that its submissions in respect of paragraph 6 of the Initial Order are not in conflict with paragraph 34 because they do not seek an order that the DIP Lender provide the funds that Automotive would require to make the special payments or that Automotive make the payments, but only that it not be ordered that Automotive is not required to make those payments.

107 Since the material before the Court is to the effect that Automotive had and has no funds and has no expectation of having funds available which could be used to make the special payments, other than the monies available under the DIP Facility, if the Court were now to countenance and make the amendment to paragraph 6 which the moving party seeks, the necessary practical consequence of that amendment would be to allow pressure to be put on the DIP Lender to increase its funding commitment to Automotive and consent to Automotive making the special payments, because Automotive would otherwise be potentially vulnerable to proceedings to force it to meet its payment obligations and there would inevitably be concerns about the consequences that could flow from default on its part. That situation would be contrary to the expectations which both Automotive and the DIP Lender would reasonably have been entitled to hold in respect of the Initial Order. It might well be different if the moving party had instead sought an order that the "not required" clause in paragraph 6 should be subject to a proviso that it would not apply to the extent that payment of such amounts could be funded out of monies other than from the DIP Facility. There is no alternative request for such a proviso, perhaps because no one expects it would be of any use.

108 So what remains is a request that the Court, in the exercise of its discretion under s. 11, should make an order that would be contrary to the reasonable expectations of the Applicant and the DIP Lender based on the steps already taken and the orders already granted under the CCAA in this proceeding. That would be unfair and it would not contribute to the fair application of the CCAA in this case or as a precedent for others.

109 Moreover, the failure of the moving parties to reserve in respect of and then dispute paragraph 34 of the Initial Order has the following unsatisfactory effect. If the moving parties had duly disputed paragraph 34 there would have been an opportunity for the Court to consider what would have been the two opposing positions on whether the DIP terms proposed by the DIP Lender should be accepted. If that question had properly been put in issue, then there would also have been an opportunity for each side to consider whether it would seek to press its position or would compromise for the sake of the respective potential benefits to each side. No such opportunity would exists with the request that is now before the Court. So the request should not be granted.

110 For the reasons given above, there is no fair way at the present time to put the parties on a level playing field for negotiation about the special payments. For the reasons mentioned at other points above, it is desirable to ensure that there is an opportunity for such negotiation in CCAA circumstances, as an important means of achieving the most satisfactory arrangements for all concerned to the extent possible. With these considerations in mind, it is appropriate to take into account that the period of the application of the Initial Order was extended by Court order and will expire on the date set by the last such Order unless further extended. If a motion is made for a further extension of the Initial Order beyond its present expiry date, there would seem to be no basis in the above reasons to object to the legitimacy of interested parties raising an objection to paragraph 6 at that time, provided they are also prepared to object to paragraph 34.

Paragraph 11

111 The objection taken by the USW is that the provisions of s. 11 are open to an interpretation that would permit Automotive to repudiate its collective agreements with the USW's members.

112 Paragraph 11 is stated to be subject to covenants in the Definitive Documents as defined in the Initial Order. (They appear to be certain security documents.) The provision does not state that the right to terminate is subject only to such covenants. No mention is made in paragraph 11 of other obligations to which the Applicant may or may not be subject.

113 The USW seeks to have the rights provided for in clauses (b) and (d) of paragraph 11 made subject to all applicable collective agreements and labour laws. Those rights can only be exercised by agreement with the affected employees or other counterparty or under a plan filed under the CCAA, failing which the matters are to be left to be dealt with in any plan of arrangement filed by the Applicant under the CCAA. Nothing in the provision purports to abrogate any applicable collective agreement or labour laws. No reason was advanced why the authorized bargaining agent could not withhold agreement to any proposed exercise of clause (b) or (d) and if Automotive then sought to deal further with the matter pursuant to the CCAA

there is no apparent reason why the matter could not be pursued against Automotive in court under the CCAA.

114 Reference is made to the discussion set out earlier with respect to the provision in paragraph 4 relating to further hirings. The comments made there are, with appropriate changes, applicable with respect to the issue relating to paragraph 11.

Paragraph 26

115 The USW and the CAW object to the part of paragraph 26 which provides that the monitor, by fulfilling its obligations under the Initial Order, shall not be deemed to have taken control of the business or be deemed to have "been or become an employer of any of the Applicant's employees." [The word "employees" does not appear in the text of the Order in certain of the materials, but it is obviously intended.]

116 The USW objects to the provision on the basis that the determination of whether the monitor is an employer is within the exclusive jurisdiction of the O.L.R.B. by reason of s. 69, s. 111 and s. 116 of the LRA. Section 69(2) of that Act provides that a person to whom an employer sells its business becomes the employer (the "successor employer") for the purposes specified in that section until the Board declares otherwise.

117 The Initial Order does not expressly purport to determine the application of s. 69(2) of the LRA, since it does not refer to that Act. The application of paragraph 26 is stated to be limited to the monitor in its limited role under the Initial Order, which leaves the Applicant in possession and control of the business and, therefore, as the employer . This consideration has been regarded as determinative in finding such a provision to be acceptable: see the *Jeffrey Mine* decision at paragraph [76].

118 The discussion in *Re Jeffrey Mine* about a provision of this kind did not address statutory provisions such as s. 69(2) of the LRA.

119 As worded, it is not apparent that paragraph 26 warrants the concern expressed by the USW. It seems reasonable to assume that if the monitor were to take action of a kind that would suggest that the monitor has started to act *de facto* as the employer, in breach of paragraph 26, a motion might be brought before the Court under the CCAA and/or to the Ontario Labour Relations Board and the matter would then be considered in the context of an actual fact situation rather than in the present abstract and ill-defined circumstances. No order to give effect to the objection of the USW and the CAW in respect of this feature of paragraph 26 is appropriate at the present time.

Paragraph 29

120 The USW objects that the immunity, or limitation of liability, provided to the monitor in the first sentence of paragraph 29 is not within the jurisdiction of the Court under the CCAA, or if it is, the granting of this immunity is not a proper exercise of the discretion of the Court. The impugned provision limits liability to gross negligence and willful misconduct.

121 There was no reservation of rights in the endorsement of Stinson J. of July 30, 2007 with respect to this paragraph.

122 The USW cites no authority that has been decided with respect to the CCAA in support of its contention that the limitation of liability is beyond the jurisdiction of the Court under the CCAA. In view of the stay jurisdiction of s. 11 of the CCAA and taking into account the "on such terms" jurisdiction under that section, it might seem that the better view is that the Court does have the jurisdiction to make such an order and that the only issue is whether the grant of limited liability of the kind specified is a proper exercise of the discretion of the Court.

123 The USW submits that other court decisions show that the Court does not have the jurisdiction to grant a limitation of liability to the monitor of the kind set out in paragraph 29.

124 In *GMAC Commercial Credit Corp. - Canada v. T.C.T. Logistics Inc.*, [2006] 2 S.C.R. 123 ("*T.C.T. Logistics*"), the Supreme Court of Canada held that the "boiler plate" immunization of the receiver, though not uncommon in receivership orders, was invalid in the absence of "explicit statutory language" to authorize such an extreme measure:

> Flexibility is required to cure the problems in any particular bankruptcy. But guarding that flexibility with boiler plate immunizations that inoculate against the assertion of rights is beyond the therapeutic reach of the Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act.

...

> As Major J. stated in *Crystalline Investments Ltd. v. Domgroup Ltd.*, 2004 SCC 3 (CanLII), [2004] 1 S.C.R. 60, 2004 SCC 3:
>
> > ... explicit statutory language is required to divest persons of rights they otherwise enjoy at law ... [S]o long as the doctrine of paramountcy is not triggered, federally regulated bankruptcy and insolvency proceedings cannot be used to subvert provincially regulated property and civil rights. [para. 43]

125 The USW also relies on s. 11.8(1) of the CCAA. Indeed, subsection 11.8(1) explicitly exempts a monitor from liability in respect of claims against the company which arise "before or upon the monitor's appointment":

> Notwithstanding anything in any federal or provincial law, where a monitor carries on in that position the business of a debtor company or continues the employment of the company's employees, the monitor is not by reason of that fact personally liable in respect of any claim against the company or related to a requirement imposed on the company to pay an amount where the claim arose before or upon the monitor's appointment.

126 The decision in *T.C.T. Logistics* did not deal with the CCAA. The monitor in that case had been appointed by the Court with a mandate to hire employees and carry on the business, but in the present case the monitor is restricted from hiring any employees and Automotive remains the employer of all of the unionized employees. The statements quoted from the *T.C.T. Logistics* decision are made in the context of a consideration of the issue whether a bankruptcy court judge can determine successor rights issues relating to the LRA. The immunity given in that case was that no action could be taken against the interim receiver without the leave of the Court.

127 Section 11.8(1) deals with the situation where a monitor carries on in that position the business of a debtor company or continues the employment of the company's employees and it provides a blanket immunity against claims which arose before or upon the monitor's appointment. It is understandable that in the situation addressed in the section that the immunity would be limited to such claims and that it would be a blanket immunity in respect of such claims. The existence of s. 11.8(1) does not given rise to any implication as to what kind of limitation of liability would be reasonable in respect of a monitor with the limited powers given in the present case.

128 The specific wording in paragraph 29 of the Initial Order is consistent with the standard limitation of liability protections granted to monitors under the standard-form model CCAA Initial Order, which was authorized and approved by the Commercial List Users' Committee on September 12, 2006.

129 That is, of course, not determinative but it suggest that the clause has received serious favourable consideration from members of the bar in a context unrelated to particular party interests.

130 The monitor submitted in its factum a list of twelve recent CCAA proceedings in which orders have been granted with similar provisions to the limitation of liability in this case. This would seem to suggest that in those cases the clause limiting liability was not disputed or, if it was, the Court found the clause to be acceptable.

131 For these reasons, paragraph 29 is acceptable.

Paragraph 4 of the CRO Order

132 The USW advances the submissions made with respect to jurisdiction as regards the monitor based on *T.C.T. Logistics* against the clause limiting the liability of the CRO.

133 Automotive does not have D&O insurance in place. The protection set out in paragraph 4 of the CRO Order can reasonably be regarded as a fundamental condition of Axis Consulting Group Inc. and Mr. Rutman's agreement to accept and continue as CRO. Automotive would probably be severely restricted in its ability to appoint a capable and experienced Chief Restructuring Officer without the ability to offer a limitation on potential liability.

134 The USW's claim that the Court does not have authority to grant this protection to the CRO is contrary to established practice. These protections are consistent with limitations of liability granted to Chief Restructuring Officers in other CCAA proceedings, and are consistent with the protections granted to Monitors under the standard-form CCAA Initial Order. The

same or similar language was used in paragraph 19 of the Order of July 29, 2004 in the Stelco Inc. CCAA proceedings and in paragraph 3 of the Order of November 28, 2003 in the Ivaco Inc. CCAA proceeding, both granted by Farley J.

135 In *ICR Commercial Real Estate (Regina) Ltd. v. Bricore Land Group Ltd.*, [2007] S.J. No. 154 the Saskatchewan Court of Queen's Bench upheld a similar limitation of liability for the Chief Restructuring Officer of Bricore. In dismissing a motion to lift the stay against the Chief Restructuring Officer, Koch J. stated:

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

136 The Saskatchewan Court of Appeal upheld the decision, [2007] S.J. No. 313.

137 The terms of the limitation of liability given to the CRO are similar to the limitation in the indemnity ordered in paragraph 21 of the Initial Order to be given by the Applicant to the directors and officers of the Applicant. The moving parties have not requested any amendment of that paragraph.

138 It is hard to imagine how a prospective CRO would be prepared to take on the responsibilities of that position in the context of a situation like the present one, fraught as it is with obvious conflicting interests on the part of the different parties involved and a background of action in the work place and litigation in court, without significant protection against liability.

139 Paragraph 4 of the CRO Order appears satisfactory for the above reasons.

Conclusion

140 For the reasons given above, the motions are dismissed.

141 Counsel may make written submissions as to costs if necessary.

J.M. SPENCE J.

cp/e/qlaxs/qlmxt/qlhcs

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 INDALEX LIMITED, INDALEX HOLDINGS (B.C.) LTD., 6326765 CANADA INC. and NOVAR INC.

Court File No: CV-09-8122-00CL

ONTARIO
SUPERIOR COURT OF JUSTICE-
(COMMERCIAL LIST)

Proceeding commenced at Toronto

BOOK OF AUTHORITIES

(Motion for Reinstatement of Supplementary Pension Benefits, returnable July 2, 2009)

KOSKIE MINSKY LLP
20 Queen Street West, Suite 900, Box 52
Toronto, Ontario
M5H 3R3

Andrew J. Hatnay LSUC#: 31885W
Tel: 416-595-2083
Fax: 416-204-2872
Email: ahatnay@kmlaw.ca
Demetrios Yiokaris LSUC#: 45852L
Tel: 416-595-2130
Fax: 416-204-2810
Email: dyiokaris@kmlaw.ca
Andrea McKinnon LSUC#: 55900A
Tel: 416-595-2150
Fax: 416-204-2874
Email: amckinnon@kmlaw.ca

Lawyers for Keith Carruthers, Leon Kozierok, Bertram McBride, Max Degen, Eugene D'Iorio, Richard Smith, Robert Leckie and Neil Fraser (the "SERP Group")