

**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 PRISZM INCOME FUND, PRISZM CANADIAN OPERATING TRUST,
PRISZM INC. AND KIT FINANCE INC.

(the "Applicants")

**BOOK OF AUTHORITIES OF THE APPLICANTS
(Motion Returnable May 30, 2011 Re:
Approval of the Soul Agreement, Approval of the Sales Process and Canaccord
Genuity Engagement Letter, and Amendment of the KERPs)**

Dated: May 26, 2011

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

Ashley John Taylor LSUC#: 39932E
Tel: (416) 869-5236
Maria Konyukhova LSUC#: 52880V
Tel: (416) 869-5230
Kathryn Esaw LSUC#: 58264F
Tel: (416) 869-6820
Fax: (416) 947-0866

Lawyers for the Applicants

TO: **ATTACHED SERVICE LIST**

**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 PRISZM INCOME FUND, PRISZM CANADIAN OPERATING TRUST,
PRISZM INC. AND KIT FINANCE INC.

(the "Applicants")

**SERVICE LIST
APPROVAL OF SOUL AGREEMENT, SALES PROCESS AND KERP
AMENDMENTS**

GENERAL	
PRISZM LP, PRISZM INC., PRISZM CANADIAN OPERATING TRUST, PRISZM INCOME FUND AND KIT FINANCE INC. 101 Exchange Avenue Vaughan, ON L4K 5R6 Applicants	Deborah Papernick Tel: (416) 739-2983 Fax: (416) 650-9751 Email: deborah.papernick@priszm.com
STIKEMAN ELLIOTT LLP 5300 Commerce Court West 199 Bay Street Toronto, ON M5L 1B9 Lawyers for the Applicants	Ashley J. Taylor Tel: (416) 869-5236 Fax: (416) 947-0866 Email: ataylor@stikeman.com Maria Konyukhova Tel: (416) 869-5230 Email: mkonyukhova@stikeman.com Kathryn Esaw Tel: (416) 869-6820 Email: kesaw@stikeman.com

<p>FTI CONSULTING CANADA INC. TD Waterhouse Tower 79 Wellington St., Suite 2010 Toronto, ON M5K 1G8</p> <p>Monitor</p>	<p>Nigel D. Meakin Tel: (416) 649-8065 Fax: (416) 649-8101 Email: nigel.meakin@fticonsulting.com</p> <p>Toni Vanderlaan Tel: (416) 649-8075 Email: toni.vanderlaan@fticonsulting.com</p>
<p>OSLER, HOSKIN & HARCOURT LLP First Canadian Place 100 King St. West, Suite 6100 Toronto, ON M5X 1B8</p> <p>Lawyers for the Monitor</p>	<p>Marc Wasserman Tel: (416) 862-4908 Fax: (416) 862-6666 Email: mwasserman@osler.com</p> <p>Jeremy Dacks Tel: (416) 862-4923 Email: jdacks@osler.com</p>
<p>YUM! RESTAURANTS INTERNATIONAL (CANADA) COMPANY 101 Exchange Avenue Vaughan, ON L4K 5R6</p>	<p>Sabir Sami Email: sabir.sami@yum.com</p>
<p>WOOLGAR, VANWIECHEN, KETCHESON & DUCOFFE LLP Barristers and Solicitors 70 The Esplanade, Suite 401 Toronto, ON M5E 1R2</p> <p>Lawyers for Yum! Restaurants International (Canada) Company</p>	<p>Christopher Cosgriffe Tel: (416) 867-9036 Fax: (416) 867-1434 Email: ccosgriffe@woolvan.com</p>
<p>PRUDENTIAL INVESTMENT MANAGEMENT INC. 100 Mulberry Street Newark, NJ 07102</p>	<p>Paul Procyk Tel: (973) 802-8107 Fax: (888) 889-3832 Email: paul.procyk@prudential.com</p>
<p>GOWLINGS LLP Barristers and Solicitors 1 First Canadian Place 100 King Street West, Suite 1600 Toronto, ON M5X 1G5</p> <p>Lawyers for Prudential Investment Management Inc.</p>	<p>Patrick Shea Tel: (416) 369-7399 Fax: (416) 862-7661 Email: patrick.shea@gowlings.com</p>

<p>BINGHAM McCUTCHEN LLP One State Street Hartford, CT 06103-3178</p> <p>Lawyers for Prudential Investment Management Inc.</p>	<p>Scott Falk Tel: (860) 240-2763 Fax: (860) 240-2587 Email: scott.falk@bingham.com</p>
<p>RSM RICHTER 200 King Street West, Suite 1100 Toronto, ON M5H 3T4</p> <p>Financial advisor for Prudential Investment Management Inc.</p>	<p>Robert Kofman Tel: (416) 932-6228 Fax: (416) 932-6200 Email: bkofman@rsmrichter.com</p>
<p>BLAKE, CASSELS & GRAYDON LLP 2800 Commerce Court West 199 Bay Street Toronto, ON M5L 1A9</p> <p>Lawyers for the Former Independent Trustees and Directors of the Applicants</p>	<p>Susan Grundy Tel: (416) 863-2572 Fax: (416) 863-2653 Email: susan.grundy@blakes.com</p> <p>Pamela Huff Tel: (416) 863-2958 Email: pamela.huff@blakes.com</p> <p>David Toswell Tel: (416) 863-4246 Email: david.toswell@blakes.com</p>
<p>MINDEN GROSS LLP 145 King Street West, Suite 2200 Toronto, ON M5H 4G2</p> <p>Lawyers for 2279549 Ontario Inc. and Deborah Papernick</p>	<p>David T. Ullmann Tel: (416) 369-4148 Fax: (416) 864-9223 Email: dullmann@mindengross.com</p>
<p>BENNETT JONES LLP 3400 One First Canadian Place P.O. Box 130 Toronto, ON M5X 1A4</p> <p>Conflict Lawyers for Applicants</p>	<p>Mark Laugesen Tel: (416) 777-4802 Fax: (416) 863-1716 Email: laugesenm@bennettjones.com</p> <p>Gavin Finlayson Tel: (416) 777-5762 Email: finlaysong@bennettjones.com</p>

<p>AIRD & BERLIS LLP Brookfield Place, 181 Bay Street Suite 1800, Box 754 Toronto, ON M5J 2T9</p> <p>Lawyers for Scott's Real Estate Investment Trust, SR Operating Trust, Scott's Real Estate Limited Partnership, Scott's Trustee Corp. and Scott's GP Trust</p>	<p>Steven L. Graff Tel: (416) 865-7726 Fax: (416) 863-1515 Email: sgraff@airdberlis.com</p> <p>Ian Aversa Tel: (416) 865-3082 Email: iaversa@airdberlis.com</p>
<p>SOUL RESTAURANTS CANADA INC. c/o Gardiner Roberts LLP 40 King Street West, Suite 3100 Toronto, ON M5H 3Y2</p>	<p>Aly Janmohamed</p>
<p>GARDINER ROBERTS LLP Scotia Plaza 40 King Street West, Suite 3100 Toronto, ON M5H 3Y2</p> <p>Lawyers for Soul Restaurants Canada Inc.</p>	<p>Jonathan Wigley Tel: (416) 865-6655 Fax: (416) 865-6636 Email: jwigley@gardiner-roberts.com</p> <p>Arlene O'Neill Tel: (416) 865-6640 Email: aoneill@gardiner-roberts.com</p>
<p>MCCARTHY TÉTRAULT LLP 1000 De La Gauchetière Street West Bureau 2500 Montréal, QC H3B 0A2</p> <p>Toronto Dominion Bank Tower 66 Wellington Street West, Suite 5300 Toronto, ON M5K 1E6</p> <p>Lawyers for Olymel</p>	<p>Alain Tardif Tel: (514) 397-4274 Fax: (514) 875-6246 Email: atardif@mccarthy.ca</p> <p>Kevin McElcheran Tel: (416) 601-7730 Fax: (416) 868-0673 Email: kmcelcheran@mccarthy.ca</p>

<p>MCCARTHY TÉTRAULT LLP Toronto Dominion Bank Tower 66 Wellington Street West, Suite 5300 Toronto, ON M5K 1E6</p> <p>Lawyers for Pepsi-Cola Canada Ltd.</p>	<p>F. Paul Morrison Tel: (416) 601-7887 Fax: (416) 868-0673 Email: pmorriso@mccarthy.ca</p> <p>Heather L. Meredith Tel: (416) 601-8342 Email: hmeredith@mccarthy.ca</p>
<p>LENCZNER SLAGHT ROYCE SMITH GRIFFIN LLP 130 Adelaide Street West, Suite 2600 Toronto, ON M5H 3P5</p> <p>Lawyers for Sysco Canada</p>	<p>Peter Osborne Tel: (416) 865-3094 Fax: (416) 865-9010 Email: posborne@litigate.com</p>
<p>TORYS LLP TD Centre 79 Wellington Street West, Suite 3000 Toronto, ON M5K 1N2</p> <p>Lawyers for The Cadillac Fairview Corporation Limited</p>	<p>David Bish Tel: (416) 865-7353 Fax: (416) 865-7380 Email: dbish@torys.com</p>
<p>MILLER THOMSON LLP Scotia Plaza 40 King Street West, Suite 5800 Toronto, ON M5H 3S1</p> <p>Lawyers for Metro-Richelieu Inc.</p>	<p>Arthi Sambasivan Tel: (416) 595-8636 Fax: (416) 595-8695 Email: asambasivan@millertomson.com</p>
<p>DAOUST VUKOVICH LLP 20 Queen Street West, Suite 3000 Toronto, ON M5H 3R3</p> <p>Lawyers for Canadian Property Holdings Inc.</p>	<p>Gasper Galati Tel: (416) 598-7050 Email: ggalati@dv-law.com</p> <p>Ken Pimentel Tel: (416) 597-9306 Fax: (416) 597-8897 Email: kpimentel@dv-law.com</p>

<p>MCLEAN & KERR LLP 130 Adelaide Street West, Suite 2800 Toronto, ON M5H 3P5</p> <p>Lawyers for 20 VIC Management Inc.; Ivanhoe Cambridge Inc.; Morguard Investments Limited; Retrocom Mid-Market REIT; Primaris Retail Real Estate Investment Trust; Oxford Properties Group Inc.</p>	<p>Walter Stevenson Tel: (416) 369-6602 Fax: (416) 366-8571 Email: wstevenson@mcleankerr.com</p> <p>Linda Galessiere Tel: (416) 369-6609 Email: lgalessiere@mcleankerr.com</p>
<p>SUNRISE POULTRY PROCESSORS LTD. 13542 73-A Avenue Surrey, B.C. V3W 1C9</p>	<p>Scott Cummings Tel: (604) 596-9505 Fax: (604) 596-6966 Email: scummings@sunrisepoultry.bc.ca</p> <p>Doreen Kerr Tel: (604) 596-9505 ext. 3314 Email: dkerr@sunrisepoultry.bc.ca</p>
<p>CIBC MELLON TRUST COMPANY 320 Bay Street, 11th Floor P.O. Box 1 Toronto, ON M5H 4A6</p> <p>Subordinated Debenture Trustee</p>	<p>Moran Chiu Tel: (416) 933-8526 Email: Moran.Chiu@BNYMellon.com</p>
<p>SMARTCENTRES MANAGEMENT INC. 700 Applewood Crescent, Suite 100 Vaughan, ON L4K 5X3</p> <p>Agent for Calloway REIT</p>	<p>Jeffrey A. Winick Tel: (905) 760-6200 ext. 7665 Fax: (905) 760-6220 Email: jwinick@smartcentres.com</p>
<p>LANDLORDS</p>	
<p>562592 ONTARIO LIMITED 576 Danforth Avenue, Apartment B Toronto, ON M4K 1R1</p> <p>With a copy to: 105 Elvaston Drive Toronto, ON M4A 1N7 Attention: Tom Bountris</p>	

706 QUEENSTON ROAD LIMITED c/o The Effort Trust Company 242 Main Street East Hamilton, ON L8N 1H5	
AVONI INC. 76 The Bridle Path Toronto, ON M3B 2B1	
B.P.Y.A 219 HOLDINGS LTD. 8211 Ackroyd Road, Suite 200 Richmond, B.C. V6X 3K8	
CALLAHAN CONSTRUCTION COMPANY LTD. 1626 Richter Street, Suite 218 Kelowna, B.C. V1Y 2M3	
CAMBRIDGE SHOPPING CENTRES LIMITED 95 Wellington Street West, Suite 300 Toronto, ON M5J 2R2	
CHUNG & JAO HOLDINGS INC. c/o Connium Management Inc. 80 Acadia Avenue, Unit 106 Markham, ON L3R 9V1	
CONTROLEX CORPORATION c/o Mer Bleue Plaza Inc. 223 Colonade Road South, Suite 100 Ottawa, ON K2E 7K3	
DEVONSHIRE MALL LIMITED 95 Wellington Street West, Suite 300 Toronto, ON M5J 2R2	
DUFFERIN MALL INC. c/o Primaris Management Inc. 900 Dufferin Street, Suite 217 Toronto, ON M6H 4B1	

<p>DUFFERIN MALL INC. c/o Primaris Management Inc. 130 Adelaide Street West, Suite 1100 Toronto, ON M5H 3P5</p>	
<p>EUCLID SECURITIES LIMITED c/o The Becker Milk Company Limited 393 Eglinton Avenue East, 2nd Floor Toronto, ON M4P 1M6</p>	
<p>FAIRMALL LEASEHOLDS INC. 20 Queen Street West Toronto, ON M5H 3R4</p>	
<p>FIRST CAPITAL (MEADOWVALE) CORPORATION c/o FCB Property Mgmt Services LP 6777 Meadowvale Town Centre Circle Mississauga, ON L5N 2R5</p>	
<p>FLEETWOOD CENTER INVESTMENTS c/o Yenik Realty Ltd. 2695 Granville Street, Suite 502 Vancouver, B.C. V6H 3H4</p>	
<p>GALLOP PROPERTIES LTD. c/o The Properties Group Management Ltd. 236 Metcalfe Street Ottawa, ON K2P 1R3</p>	
<p>GAPPER-DUNCAN INC. 2060 Lakeshore Road Sarnia, ON N7X 1G7</p>	
<p>INVESTRADE SECURITY CORPORATION 415 Rue St. Gabriel, Unit 103 Montreal, QC H2Y 3A1</p>	
<p>J.S.M. CORPORATION (ONTARIO) LTD. 620 St. Jacques, Suite 200 Montréal, QC H3C 1C7</p>	

<p>LETHBRIDGE DEVELOPMENTS LTD. 3625 Dufferin Street, Suite 105 Downsview, ON M3K 1Z2</p>	
<p>OMRC (OMERS REALTY MANAGEMENT CORPORATION) c/o Oxford Properties Group 100 City Centre Drive Mississauga, ON L5B 2C9</p>	
<p>ONTREA INC. 20 Queen Street West, 5th Floor Toronto, ON M5H 3R4</p>	
<p>PARTNERSHIP PROPERTY & DONVIEW MANAGEMENT LTD. IN TRUST 1252 Lawrence Avenue East, Suite 218 Don Mills, ON M3A 1C3</p>	
<p>PINETREE VILLAGE HOLDINGS INC. c/o CREIT Management (B.C.) Limited 1185 W. Georgia Street, Suite 1040 Vancouver, B.C. V6E 4E6</p>	
<p>REIDING PROJECTS LTD. 33rd Avenue, Suite 13815 Surrey, B.C. V4P 2B4</p>	
<p>RIO CAN REAL ESTATE INVESTMENT TRUST 499 Main Street South, Suite 56 Brampton, ON L6Y 1N7</p>	
<p>ROUTLEYS HOLDINGS (1967) LIMITED c/o Robert McKay 428 Haig Street Espanola, ON P5E 1B7</p>	

<p>SCARBOROUGH T.C. HOLDINGS INC. c/o OPGI Management Limited Partnership 300 Borough Drive, Suite 26 Scarborough, ON M1P 4P5</p>	
<p>SCOTT'S REAL ESTATE LIMITED PARTNERSHIP Canada Trust Tower, BCE Place 161 Bay Street, Suite 2300 Toronto, ON M5J 2S1</p>	
<p>T.E.C. LEASEHOLDS LIMITED 20 Queen Street West Toronto, ON M3R 3R4</p>	
<p>TALMONT INVESTMENTS INC. 4576 Yonge Street, Suite 406 P.O. Box 19 Toronto, ON M2N 6N4</p>	
<p>TALMONT INVESTMENTS INC. c/o Studio Property Consultants Ltd. 4576 Yonge Street, Suite 406 P.O. Box 19 Toronto, ON M2N 6N4</p>	
<p>THE BANK OF NOVA SCOTIA c/o CB Richard Ellis Management Services 40 King Street West P.O. Box 1 Toronto, ON M5H 3Y2</p>	
<p>THE NORFINCH GROUP INC. 50 West Beaver Creek Rd., Unit B Richmond Hill, ON L4B 1G5</p>	
<p>VAUGHAN PROMENADE SHOPPING CENTRE INC. c/o Cadillac Fairview Corp. Ltd. 20 Queen Street West Toronto, ON M5H 3R4</p>	

VIKING RIDEAU CORPORATION 50 Rideau Street, Suite 300 Ottawa, ON K1N 9J7	
WBLG INVESTMENTS INC. c/o Baulke Augitis Stahr LLP P.O. Box 100 150 Hurontario Street Collingwood, ON L9Y 3Z4	
WESTWOOD-DALEWOOD LIMITED c/o TBG 2 St. Clair Avenue West, Suite 901 Toronto, ON M4V 1L5	
YORKDALE SHOPPING CENTRE HOLDINGS INC. c/o OMERS Realty Mgt Corp. 1 Yorkdale Road, Suite 500 Toronto, ON M6A 3A1	
PPSA CREDITORS	
COMPUTERSHARE TRUST COMPANY OF CANADA 100 University Avenue, 8 th Floor Toronto, ON M5J 2Y1	
ARI FINANCIAL SERVICES 1270 Central Parkway West, Suite 600 Mississauga, ON L5C 4P4	
IBM CANADA INC. 3600 Steeles Avenue East Markham, ON L3R 9Z7	
LIFTCAPITAL CORP. 300 The East Mall, Suite 401 Toronto, ON M9B 6B7	
CIT FINANCIAL LTD. 5035 South Service Drive Burlington, ON L7R 4C8	

UNIONS	
CAW-CANADA 205 Placer Court Toronto, ON M2H 3H9 Lawyers for National Automobile, Aerospace, Transportation and General Workers Union of Canada (CAW-Canada)	Barry E. Wadsworth Tel: (416) 495-3776 Fax: (416) 495-3786 Email: barry.wadsworth@caw.ca
SYNDICAT DES MÉTALLOS 5000 boul. des Gradins, bureau 280 Québec, QC G2J 1N3	Pascal Loignon Tel: (418) 628-8222 Email: ploignon@metallos.ca Guy Gendron Tel: (418) 623-7789 Fax: (418) 628-8515 Email: guyg@mua9400.com
GOVERNMENT AGENCIES	
DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE ONTARIO REGIONAL OFFICE The Exchange Tower 130 King Street West, Suite 3400 Toronto, ON M5X 1K6 Attorney General of Canada	Diane Winters Tel: (416) 973-3172 Fax: (416) 973-0809 Email: diane.winters@justice.gc.ca
CANADA REVENUE AGENCY 555 MacKenzie Avenue Ottawa, ON K1A 0L5	
CANADA REVENUE AGENCY GST Interim Processing Centre (GST/HST) 333 Laurier Avenue West Ottawa, ON K1A 1J8	
MONSIEUR LE MINISTRE MINISTÈRE DU REVENU Centre de perception fiscale 3800, rue de Marly Québec City, QC G1X 4A5	

MINISTÈRE DE LA JUSTICE DU QUÉBEC 1200, route de l'Église, 6e étage Québec City, QC G1V 4M1	
MINISTRY OF REVENUE (ONTARIO) 33 King Street West Oshawa, ON L1H 8H5	
MINISTRY OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL (ONTARIO) McMurtry-Scott Building 720 Bay Street, 11th Floor Toronto, ON M7A 2S9	
MINISTRY OF FINANCE (B.C.) P.O. Box 9417, Stn Prov Govt Victoria, B.C. V8W 9V1	
MINISTRY OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL (BRITISH COLUMBIA) Legal Services Branch 1301-865 Hornby Street Vancouver, BC V6Z 2G3	

INDEX

**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 PRISZM INCOME FUND, PRISZM CANADIAN OPERATING TRUST,
PRISZM INC. AND KIT FINANCE INC.

(the "Applicants")

I N D E X

TAB	CASE NAME
1.	<i>Re Nortel Networks Corp.</i> (2009), 55 C.B.R. (5th) 229 (Ont. S.C.J.)
2.	<i>Re Consumers Packaging Inc.</i> , (2001), 27 C.B.R. (4th) 197 (Ont. C.A.)
3.	<i>Re Canwest Publishing Inc.</i> , (2010) 68 C.B.R. (5th) 233 (Ont. S.C.J.)
4.	<i>Re White Birch Paper Holding Co.</i> 2010 QCCS 4915
5.	<i>Re Canwest Global Communications Corp.</i> [2009] O.J. No. 4788 (S.C.J.)
6.	<i>Re Metcalfe & Mansfield Alternative Investments II Corp.</i> (2008), 92 O.R. (3d) 513 (C.A.)
7.	<i>Re Nortel Networks Corp.</i> (2010), 63 C.B.R. (5th) 44 (Ont. S.C.J.)
8.	<i>Re Canadian Red Cross Society</i> (1998), 5 C.B.R. (4th) 299 (Ont. Gen. Div.)
9.	<i>Re Brainhunter Inc.</i> , (2009), 62 C.B.R. (5th) 41

TAB 1

Case Name:
Nortel Networks Corp. (Re)

**RE:IN THE MATTER OF the Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act,
R.S.C. 1985, c. C-36, as amended
AND IN THE MATTER OF a Plan of Compromise or Arrangement of
Nortel Networks Corporation, Nortel Networks Limited, Nortel
Networks Global Corporation, Nortel Networks International
Corporation and Nortel Networks Technology Corporation,
Applicants
APPLICATION UNDER the Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act,
R.S.C. 1985, c. C-36, as amended**

[2009] O.J. No. 3169

55 C.B.R. (5th) 229

2009 CarswellOnt 4467

Court File No. 09-CL-7950

Ontario Superior Court of Justice
Commercial List

G.B. Morawetz J.

Heard: June 29, 2009.
Judgment: June 29, 2009.
Released: July 23, 2009.

(59 paras.)

Bankruptcy and insolvency law -- Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act (CCAA) matters -- Application of Act -- Debtor company -- Motion by applicants for approval of bidding procedure and Sale Agreement allowed -- Applicants had been granted CCAA protection and were involved in insolvency procedures in four other countries -- Bidding procedures set deadline for entry and involved auction -- Sale Agreement was for some of applicants' business units -- Neither proposal involved formal plan of compromise with creditors or vote, but CCAA was flexible and could be broadly interpreted to ensure objective of preserving business was met -- Proposal was warranted, beneficial and there was no viable alternative.

Motion by the applicants for the approval of their proposed bidding process and Sale Agreement. The applicants had been granted CCAA protection and were involved in insolvency proceedings in four other countries. The Monitor approved of the proposal. The bidding process set a deadline for bids and involved an auction. The Sale Agreement was for some of the applicants' business units. The applicants argued the proposal was the best way to preserve jobs and company value. The purchaser was to assume both assets and liabilities. There was no formal plan for compromise with creditors or vote planned.

HELD: Motion allowed. The CCAA was flexible and could be broadly interpreted to ensure that its objectives of preserving the business were achieved. The proposal was warranted and beneficial and there was no viable alternative. A sealing order was also made with respect to Appendix B, which contained commercially sensitive documents.

Statutes, Regulations and Rules Cited:

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

Counsel:

Derrick Tay and Jennifer Stam, for Nortel Networks Corporation, et al.

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

J. Carfagnini and J. Pasquariello, for Ernst & Young Inc., Monitor.

M. Starnino, for the Superintendent of Financial Services and Administrator of PBGF.

S. Philpott, for the Former Employees.

K. Zych, for Noteholders.

Pamela Huff and Craig Thorburn, for MatlinPatterson Global Advisors LLC, MatlinPatterson Global Opportunities Partners III L.P. and Matlin Patterson Opportunities Partners (Cayman) III L.P.

David Ward, for UK Pension Protection Fund.

Leanne Williams, for Flextronics Inc.

Alex MacFarlane, for the Official Committee of Unsecured Creditors.

Arthur O. Jacques and Tom McRae, for Felske and Sylvain (de facto Continuing Employees' Committee).

Robin B. Schwill and Matthew P. Gottlieb, for Nortel Networks UK Limited.

A. Kauffman, for Export Development Canada.

D. Ullman, for Verizon Communications Inc.

G. Benchetrit, for IBM.

ENDORSEMENT

G.B. MORAWETZ J.:--

INTRODUCTION

1 On June 29, 2009, I granted the motion of the Applicants and approved the bidding procedures (the "Bidding Procedures") described in the affidavit of Mr. Riedel sworn June 23, 2009 (the "Riedel Affidavit") and the Fourteenth Report of Ernst & Young, Inc., in its capacity as Monitor (the "Monitor") (the "Fourteenth Report"). The order was granted immediately after His Honour Judge Gross of the United States Bankruptcy Court for the District of Delaware (the "U.S. Court") approved the Bidding Procedures in the Chapter 11 proceedings.

2 I also approved the Asset Sale Agreement dated as of June 19, 2009 (the "Sale Agreement") among Nokia Siemens Networks B.V. ("Nokia Siemens Networks" or the "Purchaser"), as buyer, and Nortel Networks Corporation ("NNC"), Nortel Networks Limited ("NNL"), Nortel Networks, Inc. ("NNI") and certain of their affiliates, as vendors (collectively the "Sellers") in the form attached as Appendix "A" to the Fourteenth Report and I also approved and accepted the Sale Agreement for the purposes of conducting the "stalking horse" bidding process in accordance with the Bidding Procedures including, the Break-Up Fee and the Expense Reimbursement (as both terms are defined in the Sale Agreement).

3 An order was also granted sealing confidential Appendix "B" to the Fourteenth Report containing the schedules and exhibits to the Sale Agreement pending further order of this court.

4 The following are my reasons for granting these orders.

5 The hearing on June 29, 2009 (the "Joint Hearing") was conducted by way of video conference with a similar motion being heard by the U.S. Court. His Honor Judge Gross presided over the hearing in the U.S. Court. The Joint Hearing was conducted in accordance with the provisions of the Cross-Border Protocol, which had previously been approved by both the U.S. Court and this court.

6 The Sale Agreement relates to the Code Division Multiple Access ("CDMA") business Long-Term Evolution ("LTE") Access assets.

7 The Sale Agreement is not insignificant. The Monitor reports that revenues from CDMA comprised over 21% of Nortel's 2008 revenue. The CDMA business employs approximately 3,100 people (approximately 500 in Canada) and the LTE business employs approximately 1,000 people (approximately 500 in Canada). The purchase price under the Sale Agreement is \$650 million.

BACKGROUND

8 The Applicants were granted CCAA protection on January 14, 2009. Insolvency proceedings have also been commenced in the United States, the United Kingdom, Israel and France.

9 At the time the proceedings were commenced, Nortel's business operated through 143 subsidiaries, with approximately 30,000 employees globally. As of January 2009, Nortel employed approximately 6,000 people in Canada alone.

10 The stated purpose of Nortel's filing under the CCAA was to stabilize the Nortel business to maximize the chances of preserving all or a portion of the enterprise. The Monitor reported that a

thorough strategic review of the company's assets and operations would have to be undertaken in consultation with various stakeholder groups.

11 In April 2009, the Monitor updated the court and noted that various restructuring alternatives were being considered.

12 On June 19, 2009, Nortel announced that it had entered into the Sale Agreement with respect to its assets in its CMDA business and LTE Access assets (collectively, the "Business") and that it was pursuing the sale of its other business units. Mr. Riedel in his affidavit states that Nortel has spent many months considering various restructuring alternatives before determining in its business judgment to pursue "going concern" sales for Nortel's various business units.

13 In deciding to pursue specific sales processes, Mr. Riedel also stated that Nortel's management considered:

- (a) the impact of the filings on Nortel's various businesses, including deterioration in sales; and
- (b) the best way to maximize the value of its operations, to preserve jobs and to continue businesses in Canada and the U.S.

14 Mr. Riedel notes that while the Business possesses significant value, Nortel was faced with the reality that:

- (a) the Business operates in a highly competitive environment;
- (b) full value cannot be realized by continuing to operate the Business through a restructuring; and
- (c) in the absence of continued investment, the long-term viability of the Business would be put into jeopardy.

15 Mr. Riedel concluded that the proposed process for the sale of the Business pursuant to an auction process provided the best way to preserve the Business as a going concern and to maximize value and preserve the jobs of Nortel employees.

16 In addition to the assets covered by the Sale Agreement, certain liabilities are to be assumed by the Purchaser. This issue is covered in a comprehensive manner at paragraph 34 of the Fourteenth Report. Certain liabilities to employees are included on this list. The assumption of these liabilities is consistent with the provisions of the Sale Agreement that requires the Purchaser to extend written offers of employment to at least 2,500 employees in the Business.

17 The Monitor also reports that given that certain of the U.S. Debtors are parties to the Sale Agreement and given the desire to maximize value for the benefit of stakeholders, Nortel determined and it has agreed with the Purchaser that the Sale Agreement is subject to higher or better offers being obtained pursuant to a sale process under s. 363 of the U.S. Bankruptcy Code and that the Sale Agreement shall serve as a "stalking horse" bid pursuant to that process.

18 The Bidding Procedures provide that all bids must be received by the Seller by no later than July 21, 2009 and that the Sellers will conduct an auction of the purchased assets on July 24, 2009. It is anticipated that Nortel will ultimately seek a final sales order from the U.S. Court on or about July 28, 2009 and an approval and vesting order from this court in respect of the Sale Agreement and purchased assets on or about July 30, 2009.

19 The Monitor recognizes the expeditious nature of the sale process but the Monitor has been advised that given the nature of the Business and the consolidation occurring in the global market, there are likely to be a limited number of parties interested in acquiring the Business.

20 The Monitor also reports that Nortel has consulted with, among others, the Official Committee of Unsecured Creditors (the "UCC") and the bondholder group regarding the Bidding Procedures and is of the view that both are supportive of the timing of this sale process. (It is noted that the UCC did file a limited objection to the motion relating to certain aspects of the Bidding Procedures.)

21 Given the sale efforts made to date by Nortel, the Monitor supports the sale process outlined in the Fourteenth Report and more particularly described in the Bidding Procedures.

22 Objections to the motion were filed in the U.S. Court and this court by MatlinPatterson Global Advisors LLC, MatlinPatterson Global Opportunities Partners III L.P. and Matlin Patterson Opportunities Partners (Cayman) III L.P. (collectively, "MatlinPatterson") as well the UCC.

23 The objections were considered in the hearing before Judge Gross and, with certain limited exceptions, the objections were overruled.

ISSUES AND DISCUSSION

24 The threshold issue being raised on this motion by the Applicants is whether the CCAA affords this court the jurisdiction to approve a sales process in the absence of a formal plan of compromise or arrangement and a creditor vote. If the question is answered in the affirmative, the secondary issue is whether this sale should authorize the Applicants to sell the Business.

25 The Applicants submit that it is well established in the jurisprudence that this court has the jurisdiction under the CCAA to approve the sales process and that the requested order should be granted in these circumstances.

26 Counsel to the Applicants submitted a detailed factum which covered both issues.

27 Counsel to the Applicants submits that one of the purposes of the CCAA is to preserve the going concern value of debtors companies and that the court's jurisdiction extends to authorizing sale of the debtor's business, even in the absence of a plan or creditor vote.

28 The CCAA is a flexible statute and it is particularly useful in complex insolvency cases in which the court is required to balance numerous constituents and a myriad of interests.

29 The CCAA has been described as "skeletal in nature". It has also been described as a "sketch, an outline, a supporting framework for the resolution of corporate insolvencies in the public interest". *ATB Financial v. Metcalfe & Mansfield Alternative Investments II Corp.* (2008), 45 C.B.R. (5th) 163 (Ont. C.A.), at paras. 44, 61, leave to appeal refused, [2008] S.C.C.A. No. 337. ("ATB Financial").

30 The jurisprudence has identified as sources of the court's discretionary jurisdiction, *inter alia*:

- (a) the power of the court to impose terms and conditions on the granting of a stay under s. 11(4) of the CCAA;
- (b) the specific provision of s. 11(4) of the CCAA which provides that the court may make an order "on such terms as it may impose"; and

- (c) the inherent jurisdiction of the court to "fill in the gaps" of the CCAA in order to give effect to its objects. *Re Canadian Red Cross Society* (1998), 5 C.B.R. (4th) 299 (Ont. Gen. Div.) at para. 43; *Re PSINet Ltd.* (2001), 28 C.B.R. (4th) 95 (Ont. S.C.J.) at para. 5, *ATB Financial, supra*, at paras. 43-52.

31 However, counsel to the Applicants acknowledges that the discretionary authority of the court under s. 11 must be informed by the purpose of the CCAA.

Its exercise must be guided by the scheme and object of the Act and by the legal principles that govern corporate law issues. *Re Stelco Inc.* (2005), 9 C.B.R. (5th) 135 (Ont. C.A.) at para. 44.

32 In support of the court's jurisdiction to grant the order sought in this case, counsel to the Applicants submits that Nortel seeks to invoke the "overarching policy" of the CCAA, namely, to preserve the going concern. *Re Residential Warranty Co. of Canada Inc.* (2006), 21 C.B.R. (5th) 57 (Alta. Q.B.) at para. 78.

33 Counsel to the Applicants further submits that CCAA courts have repeatedly noted that the purpose of the CCAA is to preserve the benefit of a going concern business for all stakeholders, or "the whole economic community":

The purpose of the CCAA is to facilitate arrangements that might avoid liquidation of the company and allow it to continue in business to the benefit of the whole economic community, including the shareholders, the creditors (both secured and unsecured) and the employees. *Citibank Canada v. Chase Manhattan Bank of Canada* (1991), 5 C.B.R. (3rd) 165 (Ont. Gen. Div.) at para. 29. *Re Consumers Packaging Inc.* (2001) 27 C.B.R. (4th) 197 (Ont. C.A.) at para. 5.

34 Counsel to the Applicants further submits that the CCAA should be given a broad and liberal interpretation to facilitate its underlying purpose, including the preservation of the going concern for the benefit of all stakeholders and further that it should not matter whether the business continues as a going concern under the debtor's stewardship or under new ownership, for as long as the business continues as a going concern, a primary goal of the CCAA will be met.

35 Counsel to the Applicants makes reference to a number of cases where courts in Ontario, in appropriate cases, have exercised their jurisdiction to approve a sale of assets, even in the absence of a plan of arrangement being tendered to stakeholders for a vote. In doing so, counsel to the Applicants submits that the courts have repeatedly recognized that they have jurisdiction under the CCAA to approve asset sales in the absence of a plan of arrangement, where such sale is in the best interests of stakeholders generally. *Re Canadian Red Cross Society, supra*, *Re PSINet, supra*, *Re Consumers Packaging, supra*, *Re Stelco Inc.* (2004), 6 C.B.R. (5th) 316 (Ont. S.C.J.) at para. 1, *Re Tiger Brand Knitting Co.* (2005) 9 C.B.R. (5th) 315, *Re Caterpillar Financial Services Ltd. v. Hardrock Paving Co.* (2008), 45 C.B.R. (5th) 87 and *Re Lehndorff General Partner Ltd.* (1993), 17 C.B.R. (3rd) 24 (Ont. Gen. Div.).

36 In *Re Consumers Packaging, supra*, the Court of Appeal for Ontario specifically held that a sale of a business as a going concern during a CCAA proceeding is consistent with the purposes of the CCAA:

The sale of Consumers' Canadian glass operations as a going concern pursuant to the Owens-Illinois bid allows the preservation of Consumers' business (albeit under new ownership), and is therefore consistent with the purposes of the CCAA.

... we cannot refrain from commenting that Farley J.'s decision to approve the Owens-Illinois bid is consistent with previous decisions in Ontario and elsewhere that have emphasized the broad remedial purpose of flexibility of the CCAA and have approved the sale and disposition of assets during CCAA proceedings prior to a formal plan being tendered. *Re Consumers Packaging, supra, at paras. 5, 9.*

37 Similarly, in *Re Canadian Red Cross Society, supra*, Blair J. (as he then was) expressly affirmed the court's jurisdiction to approve a sale of assets in the course of a CCAA proceeding before a plan of arrangement had been approved by creditors. *Re Canadian Red Cross Society, supra, at paras. 43, 45.*

38 Similarly, in *PSINet Limited, supra*, the court approved a going concern sale in a CCAA proceeding where no plan was presented to creditors and a substantial portion of the debtor's Canadian assets were to be sold. Farley J. noted as follows:

[If the sale was not approved,] there would be a liquidation scenario ensuing which would realize far less than this going concern sale (which appears to me to have involved a transparent process with appropriate exposure designed to maximize the proceeds), thus impacting upon the rest of the creditors, especially as to the unsecured, together with the material enlarging of the unsecured claims by the disruption claims of approximately 8,600 customers (who will be materially disadvantaged by an interrupted transition) plus the job losses for approximately 200 employees. *Re PSINet Limited, supra, at para. 3.*

39 In *Re Stelco Inc., supra*, in 2004, Farley J. again addressed the issue of the feasibility of selling the operations as a going concern:

I would observe that usually it is the creditor side which wishes to terminate CCAA proceedings and that when the creditors threaten to take action, there is a realization that a liquidation scenario will not only have a negative effect upon a CCAA applicant, but also upon its workforce. Hence, the CCAA may be employed to provide stability during a period of necessary financial and operational restructuring - and if a restructuring of the "old company" is not feasible, then there is the exploration of the feasibility of the sale of the operations/enterprise as a going concern (with continued employment) in whole or in part. *Re Stelco Inc, supra, at para. 1.*

40 I accept these submissions as being general statements of the law in Ontario. The value of equity in an insolvent debtor is dubious, at best, and, in my view, it follows that the determining factor should not be whether the business continues under the debtor's stewardship or under a structure that recognizes a new equity structure. An equally important factor to consider is whether the case can be made to continue the business as a going concern.

41 Counsel to the Applicants also referred to decisions from the courts in Quebec, Manitoba and Alberta which have similarly recognized the court's jurisdiction to approve a sale of assets during the course of a CCAA proceeding. *Re Boutique San Francisco Inc.* (2004), 7 C.B.R. (5th) 189 (Quebec S. C.), *Re Winnipeg Motor Express Inc.* (2008), 49 C.B.R. (5th) 302 (Man. Q.B.) at paras. 41, 44, and *Re Calpine Canada Energy Limited* (2007), 35 C.B.R. (5th) 1, (Alta. Q.B.) at para. 75.

42 Counsel to the Applicants also directed the court's attention to a recent decision of the British Columbia Court of Appeal which questioned whether the court should authorize the sale of substantially all of the debtor's assets where the debtor's plan "will simply propose that the net proceeds from the sale ... be distributed to its creditors". In *Cliffs Over Maple Bay Investments Ltd. v. Fisgard Capital Corp.* (2008), 46 C.B.R. (5th) 7 (B.C.C.A.) ("*Cliffs Over Maple Bay*"), the court was faced with a debtor who had no active business but who nonetheless sought to stave off its secured creditor indefinitely. The case did not involve any type of sale transaction but the Court of Appeal questioned whether a court should authorize the sale under the CCAA without requiring the matter to be voted upon by creditors.

43 In addressing this matter, it appears to me that the British Columbia Court of Appeal focussed on whether the court should grant the requested relief and not on the question of whether a CCAA court has the jurisdiction to grant the requested relief.

44 I do not disagree with the decision in *Cliffs Over Maple Bay*. However, it involved a situation where the debtor had no active business and did not have the support of its stakeholders. That is not the case with these Applicants.

45 The *Cliffs Over Maple Bay* decision has recently been the subject of further comment by the British Columbia Court of Appeal in *Asset Engineering L.P. v. Forest and Marine Financial Limited Partnership*, 2009 BCCA 319.

46 At paragraphs 24-26 of the *Forest and Marine* decision, Newbury J.A. stated:

24. In *Cliffs Over Maple Bay*, the debtor company was a real estate developer whose one project had failed. The company had been dormant for some time. It applied for CCAA protection but described its proposal for restructuring in vague terms that amounted essentially to a plan to "secure sufficient funds" to complete the stalled project (Para. 34). This court, per Tysoe J.A., ruled that although the Act can apply to single-project companies, its purposes are unlikely to be engaged in such instances, since mortgage priorities are fully straight forward and there will be little incentive for senior secured creditors to compromise their interests (Para. 36). Further, the Court stated, the granting of 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" ... 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". That purpose has been described in *Meridian Developments Inc. v. Toronto Dominion Bank* (1984) 11 D.L.R. (4th) 576 (Alta. Q.B.):

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 pro-

posed arrangement which will enable the company to remain in operation for what is, hopefully, the future benefit of both the company and its creditors. [at 580]

25. The Court was not satisfied in *Cliffs Over Maple Bay* that the "restructuring" contemplated by the debtor would do anything other than distribute the net proceeds from the sale, winding up or liquidation of its business. The debtor had no intention of proposing a plan of arrangement, and its business would not continue following the execution of its proposal - thus it could not be said the purposes of the statute would be engaged ...
26. In my view, however, the case at bar is quite different from *Cliffs Over Maple Bay*. Here, the main debtor, the Partnership, is at the centre of a complicated corporate group and carries on an active financing business that it hopes to save notwithstanding the current economic cycle. (The business itself which fills a "niche" in the market, has been carried on in one form or another since 1983.) The CCAA is appropriate for situations such as this where it is unknown whether the "restructuring" will ultimately take the form of a refinancing or will involve a reorganization of the corporate entity or entities and a true compromise of the rights of one or more parties. The "fundamental purpose" of the Act - to preserve the *status quo* while the debtor prepares a plan that will enable it to remain in business to the benefit of all concerned - will be furthered by granting a stay so that the means contemplated by the Act - a compromise or arrangement - can be developed, negotiated and voted on if necessary ...

47 It seems to me that the foregoing views expressed in *Forest and Marine* are not inconsistent with the views previously expressed by the courts in Ontario. The CCAA is intended to be flexible and must be given a broad and liberal interpretation to achieve its objectives and a sale by the debtor which preserves its business as a going concern is, in my view, consistent with those objectives.

48 I therefore conclude that the court does have the jurisdiction to authorize a sale under the CCAA in the absence of a plan.

49 I now turn to a consideration of whether it is appropriate, in this case, to approve this sales process. Counsel to the Applicants submits that the court should consider the following factors in determining whether to authorize a sale under the CCAA in the absence of a plan:

- (a) is a sale transaction warranted at this time?
- (b) will the sale benefit the whole "economic community"?
- (c) do any of the debtors' creditors have a *bona fide* reason to object to a sale of the business?
- (d) is there a better viable alternative?

I accept this submission.

50 It is the position of the Applicants that Nortel's proposed sale of the Business should be approved as this decision is to the benefit of stakeholders and no creditor is prejudiced. Further, counsel submits that in the absence of a sale, the prospects for the Business are a loss of competitiveness, a loss of value and a loss of jobs.

51 Counsel to the Applicants summarized the facts in support of the argument that the Sale Transaction should be approved, namely:

- (a) Nortel has been working diligently for many months on a plan to reorganize its business;
- (b) in the exercise of its business judgment, Nortel has concluded that it cannot continue to operate the Business successfully within the CCAA framework;
- (c) unless a sale is undertaken at this time, the long-term viability of the Business will be in jeopardy;
- (d) the Sale Agreement continues the Business as a going concern, will save at least 2,500 jobs and constitutes the best and most valuable proposal for the Business;
- (e) the auction process will serve to ensure Nortel receives the highest possible value for the Business;
- (f) the sale of the Business at this time is in the best interests of Nortel and its stakeholders; and
- (g) the value of the Business is likely to decline over time.

52 The objections of MatlinPatterson and the UCC have been considered. I am satisfied that the issues raised in these objections have been addressed in a satisfactory manner by the ruling of Judge Gross and no useful purpose would be served by adding additional comment.

53 Counsel to the Applicants also emphasize that Nortel will return to court to seek approval of the most favourable transaction to emerge from the auction process and will aim to satisfy the elements established by the court for approval as set out in *Royal Bank v. Soundair* (1991), 7 C.B.R. (3rd) 1 (Ont. C.A.) at para. 16.

DISPOSITION

54 The Applicants are part of a complicated corporate group. They carry on an active international business. I have accepted that an important factor to consider in a CCAA process is whether the case can be made to continue the business as a going concern. I am satisfied having considered the factors referenced at [49], as well as the facts summarized at [51], that the Applicants have met this test. I am therefore satisfied that this motion should be granted.

55 Accordingly, I approve the Bidding Procedures as described in the Riedel Affidavit and the Fourteenth Report of the Monitor, which procedures have been approved by the U.S. Court.

56 I am also satisfied that the Sale Agreement should be approved and further that the Sale Agreement be approved and accepted for the purposes of conducting the "stalking horse" bidding process in accordance with the Bidding Procedures including, without limitation the Break-Up Fee and the Expense Reimbursement (as both terms are defined in the Sale Agreement).

57 Further, I have also been satisfied that Appendix B to the Fourteenth Report contains information which is commercially sensitive, the dissemination of which could be detrimental to the stakeholders and, accordingly, I order that this document be sealed, pending further order of the court.

58 In approving the Bidding Procedures, I have also taken into account that the auction will be conducted prior to the sale approval motion. This process is consistent with the practice of this court.

59 Finally, it is the expectation of this court that the Monitor will continue to review ongoing issues in respect of the Bidding Procedures. The Bidding Procedures permit the Applicants to waive certain components of qualified bids without the consent of the UCC, the bondholder group and the Monitor. However, it is the expectation of this court that, if this situation arises, the Applicants will provide advance notice to the Monitor of its intention to do so.

G.B. MORAWETZ J.

cp/e/qllxr/qlpxm/qltl/qlaxw/qlced

TAB 2

Indexed as:
Consumers Packaging 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
Consumers Packaging Inc., Consumers International Inc. and
64489 Canada Inc.**

[2001] O.J. No. 3908

150 O.A.C. 384

27 C.B.R. (4th) 197

12 C.P.C. (5th) 208

108 A.C.W.S. (3d) 765

Docket No. M27743

Ontario Court of Appeal
Toronto, Ontario

McMurtry C.J.O., Finlayson and Austin JJ.A.

Heard: September 27, 2001.

Judgment: October 10, 2001.

(10 paras.)

Bankruptcy -- Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act -- Sale of assets -- Appeals.

Motion by Ardagh PLC for leave to appeal and appeal from a decision that approved a sale of assets of Consumers Packaging Inc. to Owens-Illinois Inc. Consumers filed for protection under the Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act. Consumers was authorized, through an independent restructuring committee and its chief restructuring officer to fix a date upon which interested third parties were to submit firm, fully financed offers to purchase all or any part of its business. Ardagh and Owens participated in the bid process. Owens was the preferred bid since it provided more cash to Consumers' creditors, had the least completion risk, was not conditional on financing, was likely to

close in a reasonable period of time, resulted in the continuation of Consumers' business and retained a vast majority of its employees. Ardagh's restructuring proposal was not backed by financing commitments, required further due diligence by its lenders and offered less by way of recovery to Consumers' creditors. It was the unanimous view of the monitor, the Committee and the Officer that Ardagh's proposal was not viable and would, if pursued, result in its liquidation causing a lower return to creditors, the loss of jobs and cessation of business operations. The judge approved Owens' bid on the basis that it was the only presently viable option better than a liquidation with substantially reduced realization of value.

HELD: Motion for leave to appeal dismissed. Granting leave to appeal would be prejudicial to the prospects of restructuring the business for the benefit of the stakeholders in light of the significant time and financial constraints faced by Consumers and was contrary to the objectives of the Act. The sale of certain of Consumers' assets to Owens allowed the preservation of its business and was consistent with the purposes of the Act.

Statutes, Regulations and Rules Cited:

Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act, R.S.C. 1985, c. C-36, s. 11.7.

Appeal From:

On appeal from the order of Justice James M. Farley dated August 31, 2001.

Counsel:

Peter F.C. Howard, Patrick O'Kelly and Craig Martin, for Ardagh PLC.

Robert S. Harrison and Carole J. Hunter, for the Ad Hoc Noteholders Committee.

Daniel V. MacDonald and Paul G. Macdonald, for Consumers Packaging Inc., Consumers International Inc. and 164489 Canada Inc.

L. Joseph Latham and Elizabeth Moore, for the Toronto-Dominion Bank Syndicate.

Lily I. Harmer, for the United Steelworkers of America.

Marc Lavigne, for Anchor Glass Container Corp.

Dale Denis, for Owens-Illinois, Inc.

Terrence J. O'Sullivan, for KPMG Inc.

The following judgment was delivered by

1 THE COURT:-- Ardagh PLC ("Ardagh"), seeks leave to appeal and if leave is granted appeals the Order of The Honourable Mr. Justice Farley dated August 31, 2001 which approved a sale of certain assets of Consumers Packaging Inc. and Consumers International Inc. and 164489 Canada Inc. (hereinafter collectively "Consumers") to Owens-Illinois, Inc. ("Owens-Illinois").

2 Consumers had filed for protection under the Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act (the "CCAA") on May 23, 2001 and Farley J. made an initial order on that date approving an amendment and forbearance agreement between Consumers and its institutional lenders and arranging interim credit. KPMG Inc. was appointed Monitor under s. 11.7 of the CCAA. On June 18, 2001 Far-

ley J. authorized Consumers through an Independent Restructuring Committee and its Chief Restructuring Officer to fix a date upon which interested third parties were to submit firm, fully financed offers to purchase all or any part of Consumers' business. Both Ardagh and Owens-Illinois participated in the bid process. The Independent Restructuring Committee, the Chief Restructuring Officer and the Monitor agreed on behalf of Consumers that Owens-Illinois was the preferred bid. On the sale approval motion heard August 31, 2001, Farley J. found as a fact that Consumers was "quite sick" and "financially fragile" and that there "exists a material risk that [Consumers] will be destabilized by a withdrawal of funding by the [consortium of lenders] which have been continuously adamant about a September 2001 deadline for pay out."

3 On the evidence before us, the Owens-Illinois bid approved by Farley J. on August 31, 2001 was the result of a fair and open process developed by Consumers and its professional advisors and carried out, after May 23, 2001, under the supervision of the court and with the participation of Ardagh. The Owens-Illinois bid provides more cash to Consumers' creditors than a proposal from Ardagh, has the least completion risk, is not conditional on financing, is likely to close in a reasonable period of time, is made by a credible purchaser (the largest glass bottle manufacturing company in the world) and will result in the continuation of Consumers' Canadian business, the retention of a vast majority of Consumers' 2,400 Canadian employees and the assumption by the purchaser of significant obligations under Consumers' employee pension plan. It is supported by all parties before this court with the exception of Ardagh.

4 The respondents on this motion submit that the restructuring proposals put forward by Ardagh were not backed by financing commitments, required further due diligence by Ardagh and its lenders, could not be completed in a timely way, offered less by way of recovery to Consumers' creditors and were no more than proposals to negotiate. It appears to have been the unanimous view of the Monitor, Consumers' Independent Restructuring Committee and Consumers' Chief Restructuring Officer that Ardagh's proposals were not viable and would, if pursued, result in the liquidation of Consumers, resulting in lower return to creditors, loss of jobs and cessation of business operations. This view was accepted by Farley J. who stated in his endorsement approving the Owens-Illinois bid that it was the "only presently viable option better than a liquidation with substantially reduced realization of value".

5 In our opinion, leave to appeal should not be granted. The authorities are clear that, due to the nature of CCAA proceedings, leave to appeal from orders made in the course of such proceedings should be granted sparingly: see *Algoma Steel Inc. (Re)*, a judgment of the Ontario Court of Appeal, delivered May 25, 2001, [2001] O.J. No. 1943 at p. 3. Leave to appeal should not be granted where, as in the present case, granting leave would be prejudicial to the prospects of restructuring the business for the benefit of the stakeholders as a whole, and hence would be contrary to the spirit and objectives of the CCAA. The sale of Consumers' Canadian glass operations as a going concern pursuant to the Owens-Illinois bid allows the preservation of Consumers' business (albeit under new ownership), and is therefore consistent with the purposes of the CCAA. There is a real and substantial risk that granting leave to appeal in the present case will result in significant prejudice to Consumers and its stakeholders, in light of the significant time and financial constraints currently faced by Consumers. Both Farley J. and KPMG Inc., the court-appointed Monitor in the CCAA proceedings, have concluded that the Owens-Illinois bid represents the only presently viable option available to Consumers, which would be better than a liquidation.

6 The transactions contemplated by the Owens-Illinois bid are expected to close on September 28, 2001. If the Owens-Illinois bid does not close before the end of September, 2001, it is uncertain if, and for how long, Consumers would be able to continue its operations. The financial institutions that are prepared to finance these transactions have appeared before this court and have advised, both before and throughout the CCAA proceedings, that they will not fund the operations of Consumers beyond the end of September, the time at which Consumers' credit requirements seasonally increase on an annual basis. There is no evidence on the record, and certainly none from Ardagh, as to the manner in which the operations of Consumers would be funded until the Ardagh proposal contained in its bid, if successful, could be implemented.

7 Further, despite its protestations to the contrary, it is evident that Ardagh is a disappointed bidder that obtained its security interest in the assets of Consumers in order to participate in their restructuring and obtain a controlling equity position in the restructured entity. There is authority from this court that an unsuccessful bidder has no standing to appeal or to seek leave to appeal. As a general rule, unsuccessful bidders do not have standing to challenge a motion to approve a sale to another bidder (or to appeal from an order approving the sale) because the unsuccessful bidders "have no legal or proprietary right as technically they are not affected by the order": see the statement of Farley J., dealing with a receiver's motion to approve a sale, that is quoted with approval by O'Connor J.A. of this court in *Skyepharmaceutical plc v. Hyal Pharmaceutical Corp.* (2000), 47 O.R. (3d) 234 at 238 (C.A.). O'Connor J.A. went on to say at p. 242:

There is a sound policy reason for restricting, to the extent possible, the involvement of prospective purchasers in sale approval motions. There is often a measure of urgency to complete court approved sales. This case is a good example. When unsuccessful purchasers become involved, there is a potential for greater delay and additional uncertainty. This potential may, in some situations, create commercial leverage in the hands [of] a disappointed would be purchaser which could be counterproductive to the best interests of those for whose benefit the sale is intended.

8 The position of Ardagh is not advanced by the fact that it did not challenge the order of Farley J. of June 18, 2001 which set out the parameters for the bidding. Instead it participated in the bidding process which it now attacks as being ultra vires the CCAA.

9 Finally, while we do not propose to become involved in the merits of the appeal, we cannot refrain from commenting that Farley J.'s decision to approve the Owens-Illinois bid is consistent with previous decisions in Ontario and elsewhere that have emphasized the broad remedial purpose and flexibility of the CCAA and have approved the sale and disposition of assets during CCAA proceedings prior to a formal plan being tendered.

10 Accordingly, leave to appeal is refused with costs.

McMURTRY C.J.O.
FINLAYSON J.A.
AUSTIN J.A.

cp/e/nc/qlrme

TAB 3

Case Name:
Canwest Publishing 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
Canwest Publishing Inc./Publications Canwest Inc., Canwest
Books Inc., and Canwest (Canada) Inc., Applicants**

[2010] O.J. No. 2190

2010 ONSC 2870

68 C.B.R. (5th) 233

2010 CarswellOnt 3509

Court File No. CV-10-8533-00CL

Ontario Superior Court of Justice
Commercial List

S.E. Pepall J.

May 21, 2010.

(19 paras.)

Bankruptcy and insolvency law -- Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act (CCAA) matters -- Compromises and arrangements -- Sanction by court -- Application by limited partners for order authorizing them to enter into asset purchase agreement and related relief allowed -- Through sales and solicitation process, limited partners received offer whereby new limited partnership would acquire assets, assume certain liabilities and offer employment to substantially all employees -- Proposed disposition met statutory requirements, solicitation process was reasonable, sufficient efforts made to attract best possible bid and proposed transaction preferable to bankruptcy -- As senior lenders' CCAA plan was fair and reasonable, statutory requirements complied with, and no available commercial going concern alternatives if sales agreement unable to close, senior lenders' CCAA plan conditionally sanctioned.

Application by limited partners for an order authorizing them to enter into an asset purchase agreement based on a bid from the ad hoc committee of a percentage of senior subordinated noteholders and related relief. The court previously approved a support agreement between the limited partners and administrative agent for the senior lenders and authorized the limited partners to file a senior lenders' plan and commence a sale and investor solicitation process to test the market and obtain an offer that was superior to the terms of the support transaction. The financial advisor commenced the sales and solicitation process and received qualified bids. The ad hoc committee bid was determined to be the superior offer and the monitor recommended that the bid be accepted. The bid contemplated that a holding company would effect a transaction through a new limited partnership which would acquire substantially all of the financial and operating assets of the limited partners, the shares of the newspaper corporation and assume certain liabilities for a purchase price of \$1.1 billion. In addition, the new limited partnership agreed to offer employment to substantially all of the employees of the limited partners and assume the pension liabilities and other benefits of the employees of the limited partners it employed and retirees. The new limited partnership planned to continue to operate all of the businesses of the limited partners in substantially the same manner they currently operated. The bid allowed for the full payout of debts owed by the limited partners to secured lenders and an additional \$150 million for the unsecured creditors.

HELD: Application allowed. The limited partners were authorized to enter into the agreement as the proposed disposition of assets met the statutory and common law requirements, the process through which the agreement was reached was reasonable, sufficient efforts were made to attract the best possible bid and the proposed transaction was preferable to bankruptcy. As the senior lenders' CCAA plan was fair and reasonable, there had been strict compliance with the statutory requirements, and there was no available commercial going concern alternatives if the sales agreement was unable to close, the senior lenders' CCAA plan was conditionally sanctioned.

Statutes, Regulations and Rules Cited:

Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act, R.S.C. 1985, c. C-36, s. 6, s. 6(3), s. 6(5), s. 6(6), s. 11, s. 36

Counsel:

Lyndon Barnes, Alex Cobb and Betsy Putnam, for the Applicant LP Entities.

Mario Forte, for the Special Committee of the Board of Directors.

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

Andrew Kent and Hilary Clarke, for the Administrative Agent of the Senior Secured Lenders Syndicate.

M.P. Gottlieb and J.A. Swartz, for the Ad Hoc Committee of 9.25% Senior Subordinated Noteholders Robert Chadwick and Logan Willis for 7535538 Canada Inc.

Deborah McPhail, for the Superintendent of Financial Services (FSCO).

Thomas McRae, for Certain Canwest Employees.

Endorsement

S.E. PEPALL J.:--

Relief Requested

1 The LP Entities seek an order: (1) authorizing them to enter into an Asset Purchase Agreement based on a bid from the Ad Hoc Committee of 9.25% Senior Subordinated Noteholders ("the AHC Bid"); (2) approving an amended claims procedure; (3) authorizing the LP Entities to resume the claims process; and (4) amending the SISP procedures so that the LP Entities can advance the Ad Hoc Committee transaction (the AHC Transaction") and the Support Transaction concurrently. They also seek an order authorizing them to call a meeting of unsecured creditors to vote on the Ad Hoc Committee Plan on June 10, 2010. Lastly, they seek an order conditionally sanctioning the Senior Lenders' CCAA Plan.

AHC Bid

2 Dealing firstly with approval of the AHC Bid, in my Initial Order of January 8, 2010, I approved the Support Agreement between the LP Entities and the Administrative Agent for the Senior Lenders and authorized the LP Entities to file a Senior Lenders' Plan and to commence a sale and investor solicitation process (the SISP). The objective of the SISP was to test the market and obtain an offer that was superior to the terms of the Support Transaction.

3 On January 11, 2010, the Financial Advisor, RBC Capital Markets, commenced the SISP. Qualified Bids (as that term was defined in the SISP) were received and the Monitor, in consultation with the Financial Advisor and the LP CRA, determined that the AHC Bid was a Superior Cash Offer and that none of the other bids was a Superior Offer as those terms were defined in the SISP.

4 The Monitor recommended that the LP Entities pursue the AHC Transaction and the Special Committee of the Board of Directors accepted that recommendation.

5 The AHC Transaction contemplates that 7535538 Canada Inc. ("Holdco") will effect a transaction through a new limited partnership (Opco LP) in which it will acquire substantially all of the financial and operating assets of the LP Entities and the shares of National Post Inc. and assume certain liabilities including substantially all of the operating liabilities for a purchase price of \$1.1 billion. At closing, Opco LP will offer employment to substantially all of the employees of the LP Entities and will assume all of the pension liabilities and other benefits for employees of the LP Entities who will be employed by Opco LP, as well as for retirees currently covered by registered pension plans or other benefit plans. The materials submitted with the AHC Bid indicated that Opco LP will continue to operate all of the businesses of the LP Entities in substantially the same manner as they are currently operated, with no immediate plans to discontinue operations, sell material assets or make significant changes to current management. The AHC Bid will also allow for a full payout of the debt owed by the LP Entities to the LP Secured Lenders under the LP credit agreement and the Hedging Creditors and provides an additional \$150 million in value which will be available for the unsecured creditors of the LP Entities.

6 The purchase price will consist of an amount in cash that is equal to the sum of the Senior Secured Claims Amount (as defined in the AHC Asset Purchase Agreement), a promissory note of \$150 million (to be exchanged for up to 45% of the common shares of Holdco) and the assumption of certain liabilities of the LP Entities.

7 The Ad Hoc Committee has indicated that Holdco has received commitments for \$950 million of funded debt and equity financing to finance the AHC Bid. This includes \$700 million of new senior funded debt to be raised by Opco LP and \$250 million of mezzanine debt and equity to be raised including from the current members of the Ad Hoc Committee.

8 Certain liabilities are excluded including pre-filing liabilities and restructuring period claims, certain employee related liabilities and intercompany liabilities between and among the LP Entities and the CMI Entities. Effective as of the closing date, Opco LP will offer employment to all full-time and part-time employees of the LP Entities on substantially similar terms as their then existing employment (or the terms set out in their collective agreement, as applicable), subject to the option, exercisable on or before May 30, 2010, to not offer employment to up to 10% of the non-unionized part-time or temporary employees employed by the LP Entities.

9 The AHC Bid contemplates that the transaction will be implemented pursuant to a plan of compromise or arrangement between the LP Entities and certain unsecured creditors (the "AHC Plan"). In brief, the AHC Plan would provide that Opco LP would acquire substantially all of the assets of the LP Entities. The Senior Lenders would be unaffected creditors and would be paid in full. Unsecured creditors with proven claims of \$1,000 or less would receive cash. The balance of the consideration would be satisfied by an unsecured demand note of \$150 million less the amounts paid to the \$1,000 unsecured creditors. Ultimately, affected unsecured creditors with proven claims would receive shares in Holdco and Holdco would apply for the listing of its common shares on the Toronto Stock Exchange.

10 The Monitor recommended that the AHC Asset Purchase Agreement based on the AHC Bid be authorized. Certain factors were particularly relevant to the Monitor in making its recommendation:

- the Senior Lenders will received 100 cents on the dollar;
- the AHC Transaction will preserve substantially all of the business of the LP Entities to the benefit of the LP Entities' suppliers and the millions of people who rely on the LP Entities' publications each day;
- the AHC Transaction preserves the employment of substantially all of the current employees and largely protects the interests of former employees and retirees;
- the AHC Bid contemplates that the transaction will be implemented through a Plan under which \$150 million in cash or shares will be available for distribution to unsecured creditors;
- unlike the Support Transaction, there is no option not to assume certain pension or employee benefits obligations.

11 The Monitor, the LP CRA and the Financial Advisor considered closing risks associated with the AHC Bid and concluded that the Bid was credible, reasonably certain and financially viable. The LP Entities agreed with that assessment. All appearing either supported the AHC Transaction or were unopposed.

12 Clearly the SISP was successful and in my view, the LP Entities should be authorized to enter the Ad Hoc Committee Asset Purchase Agreement as requested.

13 The proposed disposition of assets meets the section 36 CCAA criteria and those set forth in the *Royal Bank of Canada v. Soundair Corp.*¹ decision. Indeed, to a large degree, the criteria overlap. The process was reasonable and the Monitor was content with it. Sufficient efforts were made to attract the best possible bid; the SISP was widely publicized; ample time was given to prepare offers; and there was integrity and no unfairness in the process. The Monitor was intimately involved in supervising the SISP and also made the Superior Cash Offer recommendation. The Monitor had previously advised the Court that in its opinion, the Support Transaction was preferable to a bankruptcy. The logical extension of that conclusion is that the AHC Transaction is as well. The LP Entities' Senior Lenders were either consulted and/or had the right to approve the various steps in the SISP. The effect of the proposed sale on other interested parties is very positive. Amongst other things, it provides for a going concern outcome and significant recoveries for both the secured and unsecured creditors. The consideration to be received is reasonable and fair. The Financial Advisor and the Monitor were both of the opinion that the SISP was a thorough canvassing of the market. The AHC Transaction was the highest offer received and delivers considerably more value than the Support Transaction which was in essence a "stalking horse" offer made by the single largest creditor constituency. The remaining subsequent provisions of section 36 of the CCAA are either inapplicable or have been complied with. In conclusion the AHC Transaction ought to be and is approved.

Claims Procedure Order and Meeting Order

14 Turning to the Claims Procedure Order, as a result of the foregoing, the scope of the claims process needs to be expanded. Claims that have been filed will move to adjudication and resolution and in addition, the scope of the process needs to be expanded so as to ensure that as many creditors as possible have an opportunity to participate in the meeting to consider the Ad Hoc Committee Plan and to participate in distributions. Dates and timing also have to be adjusted. In these circumstances the requested Claims Procedure Order should be approved. Additionally, the Meeting Order required to convene a meeting of unsecured creditors on June 10, 2010 to vote on the Ad Hoc Committee Plan is granted.

SISP Amendment

15 It is proposed that the LP Entities will work diligently to implement the AHC Transaction while concurrently pursuing such steps as are required to effect the Support Transaction. The SISP procedures must be amended. The AHC Transaction which is to be effected through the Ad Hoc Committee Plan cannot be completed within the sixty days contemplated by the SISP. On consent of the Monitor, the LP Administrative Agent, the Ad Hoc Committee and the LP Entities, the SISP is amended to extend the date for closing of the AHC Transaction and to permit the proposed dual track procedure. The proposed amendments to the SISP are clearly warranted as a practical matter and so as to procure the best available going concern outcome for the LP Entities and their stakeholders. Paragraph 102 of the Initial Order contains a comeback clause which provides that interested parties may move to amend the Initial Order on notice. This would include a motion to amend the SISP which is effectively incorporated into the Initial Order by reference. The Applicants submit that I have broad general jurisdiction under section 11 of the CCAA to make such amendments. In my view, it is unnecessary to decide that issue as the affected parties are consenting to the proposed amendments.

Dual Track and Sanction of Senior Lenders' CCAA Plan

16 In my view, it is prudent for the LP Entities to simultaneously advance the AHC Transaction and the Support Transaction. To that end, the LP Entities seek approval of a conditional sanction order. They ask for conditional authorization to enter into the Acquisition and Assumption Agreement pursuant to a Credit Acquisition Sanction, Approval and Vesting Order.

17 The Senior Lenders' meeting was held January 27, 2010 and 97.5% in number and 88.7% in value of the Senior Lenders holding Proven Principal Claims who were present and voting voted in favour of the Senior Lenders' Plan. This was well in excess of the required majorities.

18 The LP Entities are seeking the sanction of the Senior Lenders' CCAA Plan on the basis that its implementation is conditional on the delivery of a Monitor's Certificate. The certificate will not be delivered if the AHC Bid closes. Satisfactory arrangements have been made to address closing timelines as well as access to advisor and management time. Absent the closing of the AHC Transaction, the Senior Lenders' CCAA Plan is fair and reasonable as between the LP Entities and its creditors. If the AHC Transaction is unable to close, I conclude that there are no available commercial going concern alternatives to the Senior Lenders' CCAA Plan. The market was fully canvassed during the SISP; there was ample time to conduct such a canvass; it was professionally supervised; and the AHC Bid was the only Superior Offer as that term was defined in the SISP. For these reasons, I am prepared to find that the Senior Lenders' CCAA Plan is fair and reasonable and may be conditionally sanctioned. I also note that there has been strict compliance with statutory requirements and nothing has been done or purported to have been done which was not authorized by the CCAA. As such, the three part test set forth in the *Re: Canadian Airlines Corp.*² has been met. Additionally, there has been compliance with section 6 of the CCAA. The Crown, employee and pension claims described in section 6 (3),(5), and (6) have been addressed in the Senior Lenders' Plan at sections 5.2, 5.3 and 5.4.

Conclusion

19 In conclusion, it is evident to me that the parties who have been engaged in this CCAA proceeding have worked diligently and cooperatively, rigorously protecting their own interests but at the same time achieving a positive outcome for the LP Entities' stakeholders as a whole. As I indicated in Court, for this they and their professional advisors should be commended. The business of the LP Entities affects many people - creditors, employees, retirees, suppliers, community members and the millions who rely on their publications for their news. This is a good chapter in the LP Entities' CCAA story. Hopefully, it will have a happy ending.

S.E. PEPALL J.

cp/e/qlafr/qljxr/qlana

1 [1991] O.J. 1137.

2 2000 ABQB 442, leave to appeal refused 2000 ABCA 238, affirmed 2001 ABCA 9, leave to appeal to S.C.C. refused July 12, 2001, [2001] S.C.C.A. No. 60.

TAB 4

Case Name:

White Birch Paper Holding Company (Arrangement relatif à)

**IN THE MATTER OF THE PLAN OF ARRANGEMENT AND COMPROMISE OF:
WHITE BIRCH PAPER HOLDING COMPANY**

and

**WHITE BIRCH PAPER COMPANY, STADACONA GENERAL PARTNER INC.,
BLACK SPRUCE PAPER INC., F.F. SOUCY GENERAL PARTNER INC.,
3120772 NOVA SCOTI COMPAPNY, ARRIMAGE DE GROS CACOUNA INC.,
PAPIER MASSON LTÉE, Petitioners**

and

ERNST & YOUNG INC., Monitor

and

**STADACONA LIMITED PARTNERSHIP, F.F. SOUCY LIMITED PARTNERSHIP,
F.F. SOUCY INC. & PARTNERS, LIMITED PARTNERSHIP,
Mises-en-cause**

and

**SERVICE D'IMPARTITION INDUSTRIEL INC., KSH SOLUTIONS INC., BD
WHITE BIRCH INVESTMENT LLC, Intervenant**

and

**SIXTH AVENUE INVESTMENT CO. LLC, DUNE CAPITAL LLC, DUNE
CAPITAL INTERNATIONAL LTD, Opposing parties**

[2010] Q.J. No. 10469

2010 QCCS 4915

2010EXP-3682

J.E. 2010-2002

No.: 500-11-038474-108

**Quebec Superior Court
District of Montreal**

The Honourable Robert Mongeon, J.S.C.

**Heard: September 24, 2010.
Oral Judgment: September 24, 2010.**

Written Judgment: October 15, 2010.

(58 paras.)

Counsel:

No Counsel mentioned.

**REASONS FOR JUDGMENT GIVEN ORALLY ON
SEPTEMBER 24, 2010**

BACKGROUND

- 1 On 24 February 2010, I issued an Initial Order under the CCAA protecting the assets of the Debtors and Mis-en-cause (the WB Group). Ernst & Young was appointed Monitor.
- 2 On the same date, Bear Island Paper Company LLC (Bear Island) filed for protection of Chapter 11 of the US Bankruptcy code before the US Bankruptcy Court for the Eastern District of Virginia.
- 3 On April 28, 2010, the US Bankruptcy Court issued an order approving a Sale and Investor Solicitation Process ("SISP") for the sale of substantially all of the WB Group's assets. I issued a similar order on April 29, 2010. no one objected to the issuance of the April 29, 2010 order. no appeal was lodged in either jurisdiction.
- 4 The SISP caused several third parties to show some interest in the assets of the WG Group and led to the execution of an Asset Sale Agreement (ASA) between the WB Group and BD White Birch Investment LLC ("BDWB"). The ASA is dated August 10, 2010. Under the ASA, BDWB would acquire all of the assets of the Group and would:
 - a) assume from the Sellers and become obligated to pay the Assumed Liabilities (as defined in the ASA);
 - b) pay US\$90 million in cash;
 - c) pay the Reserve Payment Amount (as defined);
 - d) pay all fees and disbursements necessary or incidental for the closing of the transaction; and
 - e) deliver the Wind Down Amount (as defined).the whole for a consideration estimated between \$150 and \$178 million dollars.
- 5 BDWB was to acquire the Assets through a Stalking Horse Bid process. Accordingly, Motions were brought before the US Bankruptcy Court and before this Court for orders approving:
 - a) the ASA
 - b) BDWB as the stalking horse bidder
 - c) The Bidding Procedures

6 On September 1, 2010, the US Bankruptcy Court issued an order approving the foregoing without modifications.

7 On September 10, 2010, I issued an order approving the foregoing with some modifications (mainly reducing the Break-Up Fee and Expense Reimbursement clauses from an aggregate total sought of US\$5 million, down to an aggregate total not to exceed US\$3 million).

8 My order also modified the various key dates of implementation of the above. The date of September 17 was set as the limit to submit a qualified bid under stalking horse bidding procedures, approved by both Courts and the date of September 21st was set as the auction date. Finally, the approval of the outcome of the process was set for September 24, 2010.

9 No appeal was lodged with respect to my decision of September 10, 2010.

10 On September 17, 2010, Sixth Avenue Investment Co. LLC ("Sixth Avenue") submitted a qualified bid.

11 On September 21, 2010, the WB Group and the Monitor commenced the auction for the sale of the assets of the group. The winning bid was the bid of BDWB at US\$236,052,825.00.

12 BDWB's bid consists of:

- i) US\$90 million in cash allocated to the current assets of the WB Group;
- ii) \$4.5 million of cash allocated to the fixed assets;
- iii) \$78 million in the form of a credit bid under the First Lien Credit Agreement allocated to the WB Group's Canadian fixed assets which are collateral to the First Lien Debt affecting the WB Group;
- iv) miscellaneous additional charges to be assumed by the purchaser.

13 Sixth Avenue's bid was equivalent to the BDWB winning bid less US\$500,000.00, that is to say US\$235,552,825.00. The major difference between the two bids being that BDWB used credit bidding to the extent of \$78 million whilst Sixth Avenue offered an additional \$78 million in cash. For a full description of the components of each bid, see the Monitor's Report of September 23, 2010.

14 The Sixth Avenue bidder and the BDWB bidder are both former lenders of the WB Group regrouped in new entities.

15 On April 8, 2005, the WB Group entered into a First Lien Credit Agreement with Credit Suisse AG Cayman Islands and Credit Suisse AG Toronto acting as agents for a number of lenders.

16 As of February 24, 2010, the WB Group was indebted towards the First Lien Lenders under the First Lien Credit Agreement in the approximate amount of \$438 million (including interest). This amount was secured by all of the Sellers' fixed assets. The contemplated sale following the auction includes the WB Group's fixed assets and unencumbered assets.

17 BDWB is comprised of a group of lenders under the First Lien Credit Agreement and hold, in aggregate approximately 65% of the First Lien Debt. They are also "Majority Lenders" under the First Lien Credit Agreement and, as such, are entitled to make certain decisions with respect to the First Lien Debt including the right to use the security under the First Lien Credit Agreement as tool for credit bidding.

18 Sixth Avenue is comprised of a group of First Lien Lenders holding a minority position in the First Lien Debt (approximately 10%). They are not "Majority Lenders" and accordingly, they do not benefit from the same advantages as the BDWB group of First Lien Lenders, with respect to the use of the security on the fixed assets of the WB Group, in a credit bidding process².

19 The bidding process took place in New York on September 21, 2010. Only two bidders were involved: the winning bidder (BDWB) and the losing bidder³ (Sixth Avenue).

20 In its Intervention, BDWB has analysed all of the rather complex mechanics allowing it to use the system of credit bidding as well as developing reasons why Sixth Avenue could not benefit from the same privilege. In addition to certain arguments developed in the reasons which follow, I also accept as my own BDWB's submissions developed in section (e), paragraphs [40] to [53] of its Intervention as well as the arguments brought forward in paragraphs [54] to [60] validating BDWB's specific right to credit bid in the present circumstances.

21 Essentially, BDWB establishes its right to credit bid by referring not only to the September 10 Court Order but also by referring to the debt and security documents themselves, namely the First Lien Credit Agreement, the US First Lien Credit Agreement and under the Canadian Security Agreements whereby the "Majority Lender" may direct the "Agents" to support such credit bid in favour of such "Majority Lenders". Conversely, this position is not available to the "Minority Lenders". This reasoning has not been seriously challenged before me.

22 The Debtors and Mis-en-cause are now asking me to approve the sale of all and/or substantially all the assets of the WB Group to BDWB. The disgruntled bidder asks me to not only dismiss this application but also to declare it the winning bidder or, alternatively, to order a new auction.

23 On September 24, 2010, I delivered oral reasons in support of the Debtors' Motion to approve the sale. Here is a transcript of these reasons.

REASONS (delivered orally on September 24, 2010)

24 I am asked by the Petitioners to approve the sale of substantially all the WB Group's assets following a bid process in the form of a "Stalking Horse" bid process which was not only announced in the originating proceedings in this file, I believe back in early 2010, but more specifically as from May/June 2010 when I was asked to authorise the Sale and Investors Solicitation Process (SISP). The SISP order led to the canvassing of proposed bidders, qualified bidders and the eventual submission of a "Stalking Horse" bidder. In this context, a Motion to approve the "Stalking Horse" Bid process to approve the assets sale agreement and to approve a bidding procedure for the sale of substantially all of the assets of the WB Group was submitted and sanctioned by my decision of September 10, 2010.

25 I note that throughout the implementation of this sale process, all of its various preliminary steps were put in place and approved without any contestation whatsoever by any of the interested stakeholders except for the two construction lien holders KSH⁴ and SIII⁵ who, for very specific reasons, took a strong position towards the process itself (not that much with the bidding process but with the consequences of this process upon their respective claims).

26 The various arguments of KSH and SIII against the entire Stalking Horse bid process have now become moot, considering that both BDWB and Sixth Avenue have agreed to honour the construction liens and to assume the value of same (to be later determined).

27 Today, the Motion of the Debtors is principally contested by a group which was identified as the "Sixth Avenue" bidders and more particularly, identified in paragraph 20 of the Motion now before me. The "Stalking Horse" bidder, of course, is the Black Diamond group identified as "BD White Birch Investment LLC". The Dune Group of companies who are also secured creditors of the WB Group are joining in, supporting the position of Sixth Avenue. Their contestation rests on the argument that the best and highest bid at the auction, which took place in New York on September 21, should not have been identified as the Black Diamond bid. To the contrary, the winning bid should have been, according to the contestants, the "Sixth Avenue" bid which was for a lesser dollar amount (\$500,000.00), for a larger cash amount (approximately \$78,000,000.00 more cash) and for a different allocation of the purchase price.

28 Notwithstanding the foregoing, the Monitor, in its report of August 23, supports the "Black Diamond" winning bid and the Monitor recommends to the Court that the sale of the assets of the WB Group be made on that basis.

29 The main argument of "Sixth Avenue" as averred, sometimes referred to as the "bitter bidder", comes from the fact that the winning bid relied upon the tool of credit bidding to the extent of \$78,000,000.00 in arriving at its total offer of \$236,052,825.00.

30 If I take the comments of "Sixth Avenue", the use of credit bidding was not only a surprise, but a rather bad surprise, in that they did not really expect that this would be the way the "Black Diamond" bid would be ultimately constructed. However, the possibility of reverting to credit bidding was something which was always part of the process. I quote from paragraph 7 of the Motion to Approve the Sale of the Assets, which itself quotes paragraph 24 of the SISP Order, stating that:

"24. Notwithstanding anything herein to the contrary, including without limitation, the bidding requirements herein, the agent under the White Birch DIP Facility (the "DIP Agent") and the agent to the WB Group's first lien term loan lenders (the First Lien Term Agent"), on behalf of the lenders under White Birch DIP Facility and the WB Group's first lien term loan lenders, respectively, shall be deemed Qualified Bidders and any bid submitted by such agent on behalf of the respective lenders in respect of all or a portion of the Assets shall be deemed both Phase 1 Qualified Bids and Phase 2 Qualified Bids. The DIP Agent and First Lien Term Agent, on behalf of the lenders under the White Birch DIP Facility and the WB Group's first lien term loan lenders, respectively, shall be permitted in their sole discretion, to credit bid up to the full amount of any allowed secure claims under the White Birch DIP Facility and the first lien term loan agreement, respectively, to the extent permitted under Section 363(k) of the Bankruptcy Code and other applicable law."

31 The words "and other applicable law" could, in my view, tolerate the inclusion of similar rules of procedure in the province of Quebec.⁶

32 The possibility of reverting to credit bidding was also mentioned in the bidding procedure sanctioned by my decision of September 10, 2010 as follows and I now quote from paragraph 13 of the Debtors' Motion:

13. **Notwithstanding anything herein to the contrary, the applicable agent under the DIP Credit Agreement and the application agent under the First Lien Credit Agreement shall each be entitled to credit bid pursuant to Section 363(k) of the Bankruptcy Code and other applicable law.**

33 I draw from these excerpts that when the "Stalking Horse" bid process was put in place, those bidders able to benefit from a credit bidding situation could very well revert to the use of this lever or tool in order to arrive at a better bid⁷.

34 Furthermore, many comments were made today with respect to the dollar value of a credit bid versus the dollar value of a cash bid. I think that it is appropriate to conclude that if credit bidding is to take place, it goes without saying that the amount of the credit bid should not exceed, but should be allowed to go as high as the face value amount of the credit instrument upon which the credit bidder is allowed to rely. The credit bid should not be limited to the fair market value of the corresponding encumbered assets. It would then be just impossible to function otherwise because it would require an evaluation of such encumbered assets, a difficult, complex and costly exercise.

35 Our Courts have always accepted the dollar value appearing on the face of the instrument as the basis for credit bidding. Rightly or wrongly, this is the situation which prevails.

36 Many arguments were brought forward, for and against the respective position of the two opposing bidders. At the end of the day, it is my considered opinion that the "Black Diamond" winning bid should prevail and the "Sixth Avenue" bid, the bitter bidder, should fail.

37 I have dealt briefly with the process. I don't wish to go through every single step of the process but I reiterate that this process was put in place without any opposition whatsoever. It is not enough to appear before a Court and say: "Well, we've got nothing to say now. We may have something to say later" and then, use this argument to reopen the entire process once the result is known and the result turns out to be not as satisfactory as it may have been expected. In other words, silence sometimes may be equivalent to acquiescence. All stakeholders knew what to expect before walking into the auction room.

38 Once the process is put in place, once the various stakeholders accept the rules, and once the accepted rules call for the possibility of credit bidding, I do not think that, at the end of the day, the fact that credit bidding was used as a tool, may be raised as an argument to set aside a valid bidding and auction process.

39 Today, the process is completed and to allow "Sixth Avenue" to come before the Court and say: "My bid is essentially better than the other bid and Court ratify my bid as the highest and best bid as opposed to the winning bid" is the equivalent to a complete eradication of all proceedings and judgments rendered to this date with respect to the Sale of Assets authorized in this file since May/June 2010 and I am not prepared to accept this as a valid argument. Sixth Avenue should have expected that BDWB would want to revert to credit bidding and should have sought a modification of the bidding procedure in due time.

40 The parties have agreed to go through the bidding process. Once the bidding process is started, then there is no coming back. Or if there is coming back, it is because the process is vitiated by an

illegality or non-compliance of proper procedures and not because a bidder has decided to credit bid in accordance with the bidding procedures previously adopted by the Court.

41 The Court cannot take position today which would have the effect of annihilating the auction which took place last week. The Court has to take the result of this auction and then apply the necessary test to approve or not to approve that result. But this is not what the contestants before me ask me to do. They are asking me to make them win a bid which they have lost.

42 It should be remembered that "Sixth Avenue" agreed to continue to bid even after the credit bidding tool was used in the bidding process during the auction. If that process was improper, then "Sixth Avenue" should have withdrawn or should have addressed the Court for directions but nothing of the sort was done. The process was allowed to continue and it appears evident that it is only because of the end result which is not satisfactory that we now have a contestation of the results.

43 The arguments which were put before me with a view to setting aside the winning bid (leaving aside those under Section 36 of the CCAA to which I will come to a minute) have not convinced me to set it aside. The winning bid certainly satisfies a great number of interested parties in this file, including the winning bidders, including the Monitor and several other creditors.

44 I have adverse representations from two specific groups of creditors who are secured creditors of the White Birch Group prior to the issue of the Initial Order which have, from the beginning, taken strong exceptions to the whole process but nevertheless, they constitute a limited group of stakeholders. I cannot say that they speak for more interests than those of their own. I do not think that these creditors speak necessarily for the mass of unsecured creditors which they allege to be speaking for. I see no benefit to the mass of creditors in accepting their submissions, other than the fact that the Monitor will dispose of US\$500,000.00 less than it will if the winning bid is allowed to stand.

45 I now wish to address the question of Section 36 CCAA.

46 In order to approve the sale, the Court must take into account the provisions of Section 36 CCAA and in my respectful view, these conditions are respected.

47 Section 36 CCAA reads as follows:

36. (1) A debtor company in respect of which an order has been made under this Act may not sell or otherwise dispose of assets outside the ordinary course of business unless authorized to do so by a court. Despite any requirement for shareholder approval, including one under federal or provincial law, the court may authorize the sale or disposition even if shareholder approval was not obtained.

(2) A company that applies to the court for an authorization is to give notice of the application to the secured creditors who are likely to be affected by the proposed sale or disposition.

(3) In deciding whether to grant the authorization, the court is to consider, among other things,

(a) whether the process leading to the proposed sale or disposition was reasonable in the circumstances;

(b) whether the monitor approved the process leading to the proposed sale or disposition;

(c) whether the monitor filed with the court a report stating that in their opinion the sale or disposition would be more beneficial to the creditors than a sale or disposition under a bankruptcy;

(d) the extent to which the creditors were consulted;

(e) the effects of the proposed sale or disposition on the creditors and other interested parties; and

(f) whether the consideration to be received for the assets is reasonable and fair, taking into account their market value.

(4) If the proposed sale or disposition is to a person who is related to the company, the court may, after considering the factors referred to in subsection (3), grant the authorization only if it is satisfied that

(a) good faith efforts were made to sell or otherwise dispose of the assets to persons who are not related to the company; and

(b) the consideration to be received is superior to the consideration that would be received under any other offer made in accordance with the process leading to the proposed sale or disposition.

(5) For the purpose of subsection (4), a person who is related to the company includes

(a) a director or officer of the company;

(b) a person who has or has had, directly or indirectly, control in fact of the company; and

(c) a person who is related to a person described in paragraph (a) or (b).

(6) The court may authorize a sale or disposition free and clear of any security, charge or other restriction and, if it does, it shall also order that other assets of the company or the proceeds of the sale or disposition be subject to a security, charge or other restriction in favour of the creditor whose security, charge or other restriction is to be affected by the order.

(7) The court may grant the authorization only if the court is satisfied that the company can and will make the payments that would have been required under paragraphs 6(4)(a) and (5)(a) if the court had sanctioned the compromise or arrangement.

2005, c. 47, s. 131; 2007, c. 36, s. 78.

(added underlining)

48 The elements which can be found in Section 36 CCAA are, first of all, not limitative and secondly they need not to be all fulfilled in order to grant or not grant an order under this section.

49 The Court has to look at the transaction as a whole and essentially decide whether or not the sale is appropriate, fair and reasonable. In other words, the Court could grant the process for reasons others than those mentioned in Section 36 CCAA or refuse to grant it for reasons which are not mentioned in Section 36 CCAA.

50 Nevertheless, I was given two authorities as to what should guide the Court in similar circumstances, I refer firstly to the comments of Madame Justice Sarah Peppall in *Canwest 2002 CarswellOnt 3509*, and she writes at paragraph 13:

"The proposed disposition of assets meets the Section 36 CCAA criteria and those set forth in the *Royal Bank v. Soundair Corp.* decision. Indeed, to a large degree, the criteria overlap. The process was reasonable as the Monitor was content with it (and this is the case here). Sufficient efforts were made to attract the best possible bid (this was done here through the process, I don't have to review this in detail); the SISP was widely publicized (I am given to understand that, in this present instance, the SISP was publicized enough to generate the interest of many interested bidders and then a smaller group of Qualified Bidders which ended up in the choice of one "Stalking Horse" bidder); ample time was given to prepare offers; and there was integrity and no unfairness in the process. The Monitor was intimately involved in supervising the SISP and also made the Superior Cash Offer recommendation. The Monitor had previously advised the Court that in its opinion, the Support Transaction was preferable to a bankruptcy (this was all done in the present case.) The logical extension of that conclusion is that the AHC Transaction is as well (and, of course, understand that the words "preferable to a bankruptcy" must be added to this last sentence). The effect of the proposed sale on other interested parties is very positive. (It doesn't mean by saying that, that it is positive upon all the creditors and that no creditor will not suffer from the process but given the representations made before me, I have to conclude that the proposed sale is the better solution for the creditors taken as a whole and not taken specifically one by one) Amongst other things, it provides for a going concern outcome and significant recoveries for both the secured and unsecured creditors.

51 Here, we may have an argument that the sale will not provide significant recoveries for unsecured creditors but the question which needs to be asked is the following: "Is it absolutely necessary to provide interest for all classes of creditors in order to approve or to set aside a "Stalking Horse bid process"?"

52 In my respectful view, it is not necessary. It is, of course, always better to expect that it will happen but unfortunately, in any restructuring venture, some creditors do better than others and sometimes, some creditors do very badly. That is quite unfortunate but it is also true in the bankruptcy alternative. In any event, in similar circumstances, the Court must rely upon the final recommendation of the Monitor which, in the present instance, supports the position of the winning bidder.

53 In *Nortel Networks*, Mister Justice Morawetz, in the context of a Motion for the Approval of an Assets Sale Agreement, Vesting Order of approval of an intellectual Property Licence Agreement, etc. basically took a similar position ([2009] O.J. No. 4487, 2009 CarswellOnt 4838, at paragraph 35):

"The duties of the Court in reviewing a proposed sale of assets are as follows:

- 1) It should consider whether sufficient effort has been made to obtain the best price and that the debtor has not acted improvidently;**
- 2) It should consider the interests of all parties;**
- 3) It should consider the efficacy and integrity of the process by which offers have been obtained;**
- 4) and it should consider whether there has been unfairness in the working out of the process."**

54 I agree with this statement and it is my belief that the process applied to the present case meets these criteria.

55 I will make no comment as to the standing of the "bitter bidder". Sixth Avenue may have standing as a stakeholder while it may not have any, as a disgruntled bidder.

56 I am, however, impressed by the comments of my colleague Clément Gascon, j.s.c. in *Abitibi Bowater*, in his decision of May 3rd, 2010 where, in no unclear terms he did not think that as such, a bitter bidder should be allowed a second strike at the proverbial can.

57 There may be other arguments that could need to be addressed in order to give satisfaction to all the arguments provided to me by counsel. Again, this has been a long day, this has been a very important and very interesting debate but at the end of the whole process, I am satisfied that the integrity of the "Stalking Horse" bid process in this file, as it was put forth and as it was conducted, meets the criteria of the case law and the CCAA. I do not think that it would be in the interest of any of the parties before me today to conclude otherwise. If I were to conclude otherwise, I would certainly not be able to grant the suggestion of "Sixth Avenue", to qualify its bid as the winning bid; I

would have to eradicate the entire process and cause a new auction to be held. I am not prepared to do that.

58 I believe that the price which will be paid by the winning bidder is satisfactory given the whole circumstances of this file. The terms and conditions of the winning bid are also acceptable so as a result, I am prepared to grant the Motion. I do not know whether the Order which you would like me to sign is available and I know that some wording was to be reviewed by some of the parties and attorneys in this room. I don't know if this has been done. Has it been done? Are KSH and SIII satisfied or content with the wording?

Attorney:

I believe, Mister Justice, that KSH and SIII have... ..their satisfaction with the wording. I believe also that Dow Jones, who's present,their satisfaction. However, AT&T has communicated that they wish to have some minor adjustments.

The Court:

Are you prepared to deal with this now or do you wish to deal with it during the week-end and submit an Order for signature once you will have ironed out the difficulties, unless there is a major difficulty that will require further hearing?

Attorney:

I think that the second option you suggested is probably the better one. So, we'd be happy to reach an agreement and then submit it to you and we'll recirculate everyone the wording.

The Court:

Very well.

The Motion to Approve the Sale of substantially all of the WB Group assets (no. 87) is **granted**, in accordance with the terms of an Order which will be completed and circulated and which will be submitted to me for signature as of Monday, next at the convenience of the parties;

The Motion of Dow Jones Company Inc. (no. 79) will be continued sine die;

The Amended Contestation of the Motion to Approve the Sale (no. 84) on behalf of "Sixth Avenue" is **dismissed** without costs (I believe that the debate was worth the effort and it will serve no purpose to impose any cost upon the contestant);

Also for the position taken by Dunes, there is no formal Motion before me but Mr. Ferland's position was important to the whole debate but I don't think that costs should be imposed upon his client as well;

The Motion to Stay the Assignment of a Contract from AT&T (no. 86) will be continued sine die;

The Intervention and Memorandum of arguments of BD White Birch Investment LLC is **granted**, without costs.

ROBERT MONGEON, J.S.C.

cp/e/qlspt/qlana/qlcal

1 See my Order of September 10, 2010.

2 For a more comprehensive analysis of the relationship of BDWB members and Sixth Avenue members as lenders under the original First Lien Credit Agreement of April 8, 2005, see paragraphs 15 to 19 of BDWB's Intervention.

3 Sometimes referred to as the "bitter bidder" or "disgruntled bidder" See Re: *Abitibi Bowater* 2010 QCCS 1742 (Gascon J.)

4 KSH Solutions Inc.

5 Service d'Impartition Industriel Inc.

6 The concept of credit bidding is not foreign to Quebec civil law and procedure. See for example articles 689 and 730 of the Quebec code of Civil Procedure which read as follows: **689. The purchase price must be paid within five days, at the expiry of which time interest begins to run. Nevertheless, when the immovable is adjudged to the seizing creditor or any hypothecary creditor who has filed an opposition or whose claim is mentioned in the statement certified by the registrar, he may retain the purchase-money to the extent of the claim until the judgment of distribution is served upon him. 730. A purchaser who has not paid the purchase price must, within ten days after the judgment of homologation is transmitted to him, pay the sheriff the amounts necessary to satisfy the claims which have priority over his own; if he fails to do so, any interested party may demand the resale of the immovable upon him for false bidding. When the purchaser has fulfilled his obligation, the sheriff must give him a certificate that the purchase price has been paid in full. See also Denis Ferland and Benoit Emery, 4ème édition, volume 2 (Éditions Yvon Blais (2003)): "La loi prévoit donc que, lorsque l'immeuble est adjudgé au saisissant ou à un créancier hypothécaire qui a fait opposition, ou dont la créance est portée à l'état certifié par l'officier de la publicité des droits, l'adjudicataire peut retenir le prix, y compris le prix minimum annoncé dans l'avis de vente (art. 670, al. 1, e), 688.1**

C.p.c.), jusqu'à concurrence de sa créance et tant que ne lui a pas été signifié le jugement de distribution prévu à l'article 730 C.p.c. (art. 689, al 2 C.p.c.). Il n'aura alors à payer, dans les cinq jours suivant la signification de ce jugement, que la différence entre le prix d'adjudication et le montant de sa créance pour satisfaire aux créances préférées à la sienne (art. 730, al. 1 C.p.c.). La Cour d'appel a déclaré, à ce sujet, que puisque le deuxième alinéa de l'article 689 C.p.c. est une exception à la règle du paiement lors de la vente par l'adjudicataire du prix minimal d'adjudication (art. 688.1, al. 1 C.p.c.) et à celle du paiement du solde du prix d'adjudication dans les cinq jours suivants (art. 689, al. 1 C.p.c.), il doit être interprété de façon restrictive. Le sens du mot "créance", contenu dans cet article, ne permet alors à l'adjudicataire de retenir que la partie de sa créance qui est colloquée ou susceptible de l'être, tout en tenant compte des priorités établies par la loi." See, finally, *Montreal Trust vs Jori Investment Inc.* (J.E. 80-220 (C.S.)), *Eugène Marcoux Inc. v. Côté* [1990] R.J.Q. 1221 (C.A.).

7 The SISP, the bidding procedure and corresponding orders recognize the principle of credit bidding at the auction and these orders were not the subject of any appeal procedure. See paragraphs 24, 25 and 26 of BDWB's Intervention. As for the right to credit bid in a sale by auction under the CCAA, see Re: *Maax Corporation* (QSC. no. 500-11-033561-081, July 10, 2008, Buffoni J.) See also Re: *Brainhunter* (OSC Commercial List, no. 09-8482-00CL, January 22, 2010).

Case Name:

Canwest Global Communications Corp. (Re)

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

[2009] O.J. No. 4788

Court File No. CV-09-8241-OOCL

Ontario Superior Court of Justice
Commercial List

S.E. Pepall J.

November 12, 2009.

(43 paras.)

Bankruptcy and insolvency law -- Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act (CCAA) matters -- Compromises and arrangements -- Applications -- Sanction by court -- Application by a group of debtor companies for approval of an agreement that would enable them to restructure their business affairs, allowed -- Applicants were under the protection of the Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act -- Agreement was approved because it facilitated the restructuring of the applicants to enable them to become viable and competitive industry participants and it was fair -- Related transaction regarding the transfer of the business and assets of a newspaper that the applicants had an interest in did not require Court approval under s. 36 of the Act because it was an internal corporate reorganization which was in the ordinary course of business -- Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act, R.S.C. 1985, c. C-36, s. 36.

Application by a group of debtor companies and entities for an order approving a Transition and Reorganization Agreement between them and other related parties. The applicants were granted protection under the Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act on October 6, 2009. They were engaged in the newspaper, digital media and television business. The Agreement pertained to the restructuring of the applicants' business affairs. It was an internal reorganization transaction that was designed to realign shared services and assets within the corporate family that the applicants belonged to. The Agreement was entered into after extensive negotiations between the parties who

were affected by it. The Monitor, who was appointed under the Act, concluded that this transaction had several advantages over a liquidation.

HELD: Application allowed. Court approval under s. 36 of the Act was required if a debtor company under the protection of the Act proposed to sell or dispose of assets outside the ordinary course of business. It did not apply to a transaction regarding the transfer of the assets and business of a newspaper that the applicants had an interest in because it was an internal corporate reorganization which was in the ordinary course of business. The Agreement was approved because it facilitated the restructuring of the applicants to enable them to become viable and competitive industry participants and it was fair. It also allowed a substantial number of the businesses operated by the applicants to continue as going concerns. The Agreement did not prejudice the applicants' major creditors. In the absence of the Agreement the newspaper would have to shut down and most of its employees would lose their employment. The stay that was granted under the Act was extended to enable the applicants to continue to work with their various stakeholders on the preparation and filing of a proposed plan of arrangement.

Statutes, Regulations and Rules Cited:

Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act,

Bulk Sales Act, R.S.O. 1990, c. B.14,

Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act, R.S.C. 1985, c. C-36, s. 2(1), s. 2(1), s. 36, s. 36(1), s. 36(4), s. 36(7)

Counsel:

Lyndon Barnes and Jeremy Dacks for the Applicants.

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

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

Benjamin Zarnett for the Ad Hoc Committee of Noteholders.

Peter J. Osborne for Proposed Management Directors of National Post.

Andrew Kent and Hilary Clarke for Bank of Nova Scotia, Agent for Senior Secured Lenders to LP Entities.

Steve Weisz for CIT Business Credit Canada Inc.

Amanda Darroch for Communication Workers of America.

Alena Thouin for Superintendent of Financial Services.

REASONS FOR DECISION

S.E. PEPALL J.:--

Relief Requested

1 The CMI Entities move for an order approving the Transition and Reorganization Agreement by and among Canwest Global Communications Corporation ("Canwest Global"), Canwest Limited Partnership/Canwest Societe en Commandite (the "Limited Partnership"), Canwest Media Inc. ("CMI"), Canwest Publishing Inc./Publications Canwest Inc ("CPI"), Canwest Television Limited Partnership ("CTLP") and The National Post Company/La Publication National Post (the "National Post Company") dated as of October 26, 2009, and which includes the New Shared Services Agreement and the National Post Transition Agreement.

2 In addition they ask for a vesting order with respect to certain assets of the National Post Company and a stay extension order.

3 At the conclusion of oral argument, I granted the order requested with reasons to follow.

Background Facts

(a) Parties

4 The CMI Entities including Canwest Global, CMI, CTLP, the National Post Company, and certain subsidiaries were granted *Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act ("CCAA")* protection on Oct 6, 2009. Certain others including the Limited Partnership and CPI did not seek such protection. The term Canwest will be used to refer to the entire enterprise.

5 The National Post Company is a general partnership with units held by CMI and National Post Holdings Ltd. (a wholly owned subsidiary of CMI). The National Post Company carries on business publishing the National Post newspaper and operating related on line publications.

(b) History

6 To provide some context, it is helpful to briefly review the history of Canwest. In general terms, the Canwest enterprise has two business lines: newspaper and digital media on the one hand and television on the other. Prior to 2005, all of the businesses that were wholly owned by Canwest Global were operated directly or indirectly by CMI using its former name, Canwest Mediaworks Inc. As one unified business, support services were shared. This included such things as executive services, information technology, human resources and accounting and finance.

7 In October, 2005, as part of a planned income trust spin-off, the Limited Partnership was formed to acquire Canwest Global's newspaper publishing and digital media entities as well as certain of the shared services operations. The National Post Company was excluded from this acquisition due to its lack of profitability and unsuitability for inclusion in an income trust. The Limited Partnership entered into a credit agreement with a syndicate of lenders and the Bank of Nova Scotia as administrative agent. The facility was guaranteed by the Limited Partner's general partner, Canwest (Canada) Inc. ("CCI"), and its subsidiaries, CPI and Canwest Books Inc. (CBI") (collectively with the Limited Partnership, the "LP Entities"). The Limited Partnership and its subsidiaries then operated for a couple of years as an income trust.

8 In spite of the income trust spin off, there was still a need for the different entities to continue to share services. CMI and the Limited Partnership entered into various agreements to govern the provision and cost allocation of certain services between them. The following features characterized these arrangements:

- the service provider, be it CMI or the Limited Partnership, would be entitled to reimbursement for all costs and expenses incurred in the provision of services;
- shared expenses would be allocated on a commercially reasonable basis consistent with past practice; and
- neither the reimbursement of costs and expenses nor the payment of fees was intended to result in any material financial gain or loss to the service provider.

9 The multitude of operations that were provided by the LP Entities for the benefit of the National Post Company rendered the latter dependent on both the shared services arrangements and on the operational synergies that developed between the National Post Company and the newspaper and digital operations of the LP Entities.

10 In 2007, following the Federal Government's announcement on the future of income fund distributions, the Limited Partnership effected a going-private transaction of the income trust. Since July, 2007, the Limited Partnership has been a 100% wholly owned indirect subsidiary of Canwest Global. Although repatriated with the rest of the Canwest enterprise in 2007, the LP Entities have separate credit facilities from CMI and continue to participate in the shared services arrangements. In spite of this mutually beneficial interdependence between the LP Entities and the CMI Entities, given the history, there are misalignments of personnel and services.

(c) Restructuring

11 Both the CMI Entities and the LP Entities are pursuing independent but coordinated restructuring and reorganization plans. The former have proceeded with their *CCAA* filing and prepackaged recapitalization transaction and the latter have entered into a forbearance agreement with certain of their senior lenders. Both the recapitalization transaction and the forbearance agreement contemplate a disentanglement and/or a realignment of the shared services arrangements. In addition, the term sheet relating to the CMI recapitalization transaction requires a transfer of the assets and business of the National Post Company to the Limited Partnership.

12 The CMI Entities and the LP Entities have now entered into the Transition and Reorganization Agreement which addresses a restructuring of these inter-entity arrangements. By agreement, it is subject to court approval. The terms were negotiated amongst the CMI Entities, the LP Entities, their financial and legal advisors, their respective chief restructuring advisors, the Ad Hoc Committee of Noteholders, certain of the Limited Partnership's senior lenders and their respective financial and legal advisors.

13 Schedule A to that agreement is the New Shared Services Agreement. It anticipates a cessation or renegotiation of the provision of certain services and the elimination of certain redundancies. It also addresses a realignment of certain employees who are misaligned and, subject to approval of the relevant regulator, a transfer of certain misaligned pension plan participants to pension plans

that are sponsored by the appropriate party. The LP Entities, the CMI Chief Restructuring Advisor and the Monitor have consented to the entering into of the New Shared Services Agreement.

14 Schedule B to the Transition and Reorganization Agreement is the National Post Transition Agreement.

15 The National Post Company has not generated a profit since its inception in 1998 and continues to suffer operating losses. It is projected to suffer a net loss of \$9.3 million in fiscal year ending August 31, 2009 and a net loss of \$0.9 million in September, 2009. For the past seven years these losses have been funded by CMI and as a result, the National Post Company owes CMI approximately \$139.1 million. The members of the Ad Hoc Committee of Noteholders had agreed to the continued funding by CMI of the National Post Company's short-term liquidity needs but advised that they were no longer prepared to do so after October 30, 2009. Absent funding, the National Post, a national newspaper, would shut down and employment would be lost for its 277 non-unionized employees. Three of its employees provide services to the LP Entities and ten of the LP Entities' employees provide services to the National Post Company. The National Post Company maintains a defined benefit pension plan registered under the Ontario Pension Benefits Act. It has a solvency deficiency as of December 31, 2006 of \$1.5 million and a wind up deficiency of \$1.6 million.

16 The National Post Company is also a guarantor of certain of CMI's and Canwest Global's secured and unsecured indebtedness as follows:

Irish Holdco Secured Note -- \$187.3 million

CIT Secured Facility -- \$10.7 million

CMI Senior Unsecured Subordinated Notes -- US\$393.2 million

Irish Holdco Unsecured Note -- \$430.6 million

17 Under the National Post Transition Agreement, the assets and business of the National Post Company will be transferred as a going concern to a new wholly-owned subsidiary of CPI (the "Transferee"). Assets excluded from the transfer include the benefit of all insurance policies, corporate charters, minute books and related materials, and amounts owing to the National Post Company by any of the CMI Entities.

18 The Transferee will assume the following liabilities: accounts payable to the extent they have not been due for more than 90 days; accrued expenses to the extent they have not been due for more than 90 days; deferred revenue; and any amounts due to employees. The Transferee will assume all liabilities and/or obligations (including any unfunded liability) under the National Post pension plan and benefit plans and the obligations of the National Post Company under contracts, licences and permits relating to the business of the National Post Company. Liabilities that are not expressly assumed are excluded from the transfer including the debt of approximately \$139.1 million owed to CMI, all liabilities of the National Post Company in respect of borrowed money including any related party or third party debt (but not including approximately \$1,148,365 owed to the LP Entities) and contingent liabilities relating to existing litigation claims.

19 CPI will cause the Transferee to offer employment to all of the National Post Company's employees on terms and conditions substantially similar to those pursuant to which the employees are currently employed.

20 The Transferee is to pay a portion of the price or cost in cash: (i) \$2 million and 50% of the National Post Company's negative cash flow during the month of October, 2009 (to a maximum of \$1 million), less (ii) a reduction equal to the amount, if any, by which the assumed liabilities estimate as defined in the National Post Transition Agreement exceeds \$6.3 million.

21 The CMI Entities were of the view that an agreement relating to the transfer of the National Post could only occur if it was associated with an agreement relating to shared services. In addition, the CMI Entities state that the transfer of the assets and business of the National Post Company to the Transferee is necessary for the survival of the National Post as a going concern. Furthermore, there are synergies between the National Post Company and the LP Entities and there is also the operational benefit of reintegrating the National Post newspaper with the other newspapers. It cannot operate independently of the services it receives from the Limited Partnership. Similarly, the LP Entities estimate that closure of the National Post would increase the LP Entities' cost burden by approximately \$14 million in the fiscal year ending August 31, 2010.

22 In its Fifth Report to the Court, the Monitor reviewed alternatives to transitioning the business of the National Post Company to the LP Entities. RBC Dominion Securities Inc. who was engaged in December, 2008 to assist in considering and evaluating recapitalization alternatives, received no expressions of interest from parties seeking to acquire the National Post Company. Similarly, the Monitor has not been contacted by anyone interested in acquiring the business even though the need to transfer the business of the National Post Company has been in the public domain since October 6, 2009, the date of the Initial Order. The Ad Hoc Committee of Noteholders will only support the short term liquidity needs until October 30, 2009 and the National Post Company is precluded from borrowing without the Ad Hoc Committee's consent which the latter will not provide. The LP Entities will not advance funds until the transaction closes. Accordingly, failure to transition would likely result in the forced cessation of operations and the commencement of liquidation proceedings. The estimated net recovery from a liquidation range from a negative amount to an amount not materially higher than the transfer price before costs of liquidation. The senior secured creditors of the National Post Company, namely the CIT Facility lenders and Irish Holdco, support the transaction as do the members of the Ad Hoc Committee of Noteholders.

23 The Monitor has concluded that the transaction has the following advantages over a liquidation:

- it facilitates the reorganization and orderly transition and subsequent termination of the shared services arrangements between the CMI Entities and the LP Entities;

- it preserves approximately 277 jobs in an already highly distressed newspaper publishing industry;

- it will help maintain and promote competition in the national daily newspaper market for the benefit of Canadian consumers; and
- the Transferee will assume substantially all of the National Post Company's trade payables (including those owed to various suppliers) and various employment costs associated with the transferred employees.

Issues

24 The issues to consider are whether:

- (a) the transfer of the assets and business of the National Post is subject to the requirements of section 36 of the *CCAA*;
- (b) the Transition and Reorganization Agreement should be approved by the Court; and
- (c) the stay should be extended to January 22, 2010.

Discussion

(a) Section 36 of the *CCAA*

25 Section 36 of the *CCAA* was added as a result of the amendments which came into force on September 18, 2009. Counsel for the CMI Entities and the Monitor outlined their positions on the impact of the recent amendments to the *CCAA* on the motion before me. As no one challenged the order requested, no opposing arguments were made.

26 Court approval is required under section 36 if:

- (a) a debtor company under *CCAA* protection
- (b) proposes to sell or dispose of assets outside the ordinary course of business.

27 Court approval under this section of the Act¹ is only required if those threshold requirements are met. If they are met, the court is provided with a list of non-exclusive factors to consider in determining whether to approve the sale or disposition. Additionally, certain mandatory criteria must be met for court approval of a sale or disposition of assets to a related party. Notice is to be given to secured creditors likely to be affected by the proposed sale or disposition. The court may only grant authorization if satisfied that the company can and will make certain pension and employee related payments.

28 Specifically, section 36 states:

- (1) Restriction on disposition of business assets -- A debtor company in respect of which an order has been made under this Act may not sell or otherwise dispose of assets outside the ordinary course of business unless authorized to do so by a court. Despite any requirement for shareholder approval, including one under federal or provincial law, the court may authorize the sale or disposition even if shareholder approval was not obtained.

- (2) Notice to creditors -- A company that applies to the court for an authorization is to give notice of the application to the secured creditors who are likely to be affected by the proposed sale or disposition.
- (3) Factors to be considered -- In deciding whether to grant the authorization, the court is to consider, among other things,
 - (a) whether the process leading to the proposed sale or disposition was reasonable in the circumstances;
 - (b) whether the monitor approved the process leading to the proposed sale or disposition;
 - (c) whether the monitor filed with the court a report stating that in their opinion the sale or disposition would be more beneficial to the creditors than a sale or disposition under a bankruptcy;
 - (d) the extent to which the creditors were consulted;
 - (e) the effects of the proposed sale or disposition on the creditors and other interested parties; and
 - (f) whether the consideration to be received for the assets is reasonable and fair, taking into account their market value.
- (4) Additional factors -- related persons -- If the proposed sale or disposition is to a person who is related to the company, the court may, after considering the factors referred to in subsection (3), grant the authorization only if it is satisfied that
 - (a) good faith efforts were made to sell or otherwise dispose of the assets to persons who are not related to the company; and
 - (b) the consideration to be received is superior to the consideration that would be received under any other offer made in accordance with the process leading to the proposed sale or disposition.
- (5) Related persons -- For the purpose of subsection (4), a person who is related to the company includes
 - (a) a director or officer of the company;
 - (b) a person who has or has had, directly or indirectly, control in fact of the company; and
 - (c) a person who is related to a person described in paragraph (a) or (b).

- (6) Assets may be disposed of free and clear -- The court may authorize a sale or disposition free and clear of any security, charge or other restriction and, if it does, it shall also order that other assets of the company or the proceeds of the sale or disposition be subject to a security, charge or other restriction in favour of the creditor whose security, charge or other restriction is to be affected by the order.
- (7) Restriction -- employers -- The court may grant the authorization only if the court is satisfied that the company can and will make the payments that would have been required under paragraphs 6(4)(a) and (5)(a) if the court had sanctioned the compromise or arrangement.²

29 While counsel for the CMI Entities states that the provisions of section 36 have been satisfied, he submits that section 36 is inapplicable to the circumstances of the transfer of the assets and business of the National Post Company because the threshold requirements are not met. As such, the approval requirements are not triggered. The Monitor supports this position.

30 In support, counsel for the CMI Entities and for the Monitor firstly submit that section 36(1) makes it clear that the section only applies to a debtor company. The terms "debtor company" and "company" are defined in section 2(1) of the *CCAA* and do not expressly include a partnership. The National Post Company is a general partnership and therefore does not fall within the definition of debtor company. While I acknowledge these facts, I do not accept this argument in the circumstances of this case. Relying on case law and exercising my inherent jurisdiction, I extended the scope of the Initial Order to encompass the National Post Company and the other partnerships such that they were granted a stay and other relief. In my view, it would be inconsistent and artificial to now exclude the business and assets of those partnerships from the ambit of the protections contained in the statute.

31 The CMI Entities' and the Monitor's second argument is that the Transition and Reorganization Agreement represents an internal corporate reorganization that is not subject to the requirements of section 36. Section 36 provides for court approval where a debtor under *CCAA* protection proposes to sell or otherwise dispose of assets "outside the ordinary course of business". This implies, so the argument goes, that a transaction that is in the ordinary course of business is not captured by section 36. The Transition and Reorganization Agreement is an internal corporate reorganization which is in the ordinary course of business and therefore section 36 is not triggered state counsel for the CMI Entities and for the Monitor. Counsel for the Monitor goes on to submit that the subject transaction is but one aspect of a larger transaction. Given the commitments and agreements entered into with the Ad Hoc Committee of Noteholders and the Bank of Nova Scotia as agent for the senior secured lenders to the LP Entities, the transfer cannot be treated as an independent sale divorced from its rightful context. In these circumstances, it is submitted that section 36 is not engaged.

32 The *CCAA* is remedial legislation designed to enable insolvent companies to restructure. As mentioned by me before in this case, the amendments do not detract from this objective. In discussing section 36, the Industry Canada Briefing Book³ on the amendments states that "The reform is intended to provide the debtor company with greater flexibility in dealing with its property while limiting the possibility of abuse."⁴

33 The term "ordinary course of business" is not defined in the *CCAA* or in the *Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act*. As noted by Cullity J. in *Millgate Financial Corp. v. BCED Holdings Ltd.*⁶, authorities that have considered the use of the term in various statutes have not provided an exhaustive definition. As one author observed in a different context, namely the *Bulk Sales Act*⁷, courts have typically taken a common sense approach to the term "ordinary course of business" and have considered the normal business dealings of each particular seller⁸. In *Pacific Mobile Corp.*⁹, the Supreme Court of Canada stated:

It is not wise to attempt to give a comprehensive definition of the term "ordinary course of business" for all transactions. Rather, it is best to consider the circumstances of each case and to take into account the type of business carried on by the debtor and creditor.

We approve of the following passage from Monet J.A.'s reasons, [1982] C.A. 501, discussing the phrase "ordinary course of business" ...

'It is apparent from these authorities, it seems to me, that the concept we are concerned with is an abstract one and that it is the function of the courts to consider the circumstances of each case in order to determine how to characterize a given transaction. This in effect reflects the constant interplay between law and fact.'

34 In arguing that section 36 does not apply to an internal corporate reorganization, the CMI Entities rely on the commentary of Industry Canada as being a useful indicator of legislative intent and descriptive of the abuse the section was designed to prevent. That commentary suggests that section 36(4), which deals with dispositions of assets to a related party, was intended to:

... prevent the possible abuse by "phoenix corporations". Prevalent in small business, particularly in the restaurant industry, phoenix corporations are the result of owners who engage in serial bankruptcies. A person incorporates a business and proceeds to cause it to become bankrupt. The person then purchases the assets of the business at a discount out of the estate and incorporates a "new" business using the assets of the previous business. The owner continues their original business basically unaffected while creditors are left unpaid.¹⁰

35 In my view, not every internal corporate reorganization escapes the purview of section 36. Indeed, a phoenix corporation to one may be an internal corporate reorganization to another. As suggested by the decision in *Pacific Mobile Corp.*¹¹, a court should in each case examine the circumstances of the subject transaction within the context of the business carried on by the debtor.

36 In this case, the business of the National Post Company and the CP Entities are highly integrated and interdependent. The Canwest business structure predated the insolvency of the CMI Entities and reflects in part an anomaly that arose as a result of an income trust structure driven by tax considerations. The Transition and Reorganization Agreement is an internal reorganization transaction that is designed to realign shared services and assets within the Canwest corporate family so as to rationalize the business structure and to better reflect the appropriate business model. Furthermore, the realignment of the shared services and transfer of the assets and business of the National Post Company to the publishing side of the business are steps in the larger reorganization of the relationship between the CMI Entities and the LP Entities. There is no ability to proceed with either

the Shared Services Agreement or the National Post Transition Agreement alone. The Transition and Reorganization Agreement provides a framework for the CMI Entities and the LP Entities to properly restructure their inter-entity arrangements for the benefit of their respective stakeholders. It would be commercially unreasonable to require the CMI Entities to engage in the sort of third party sales process contemplated by section 36(4) and offer the National Post for sale to third parties before permitting them to realign the shared services arrangements. In these circumstances, I am prepared to accept that section 36 is inapplicable.

(b) Transition and Reorganization Agreement

37 As mentioned, the Transition and Reorganization Agreement is by its terms subject to court approval. The court has a broad jurisdiction to approve agreements that facilitate a restructuring: *Re Stelco Inc.*¹² Even though I have accepted that in this case section 36 is inapplicable, court approval should be sought in circumstances where the sale or disposition is to a related person and there is an apprehension that the sale may not be in the ordinary course of business. At that time, the court will confirm or reject the ordinary course of business characterization. If confirmed, at minimum, the court will determine whether the proposed transaction facilitates the restructuring and is fair. If rejected, the court will determine whether the proposed transaction meets the requirements of section 36. Even if the court confirms that the proposed transaction is in the ordinary course of business and therefore outside the ambit of section 36, the provisions of the section may be considered in assessing fairness.

38 I am satisfied that the proposed transaction does facilitate the restructuring and is fair and that the Transition and Reorganization Agreement should be approved. In this regard, amongst other things, I have considered the provisions of section 36. I note the following. The CMI recapitalization transaction which prompted the Transition and Reorganization Agreement is designed to facilitate the restructuring of CMI into a viable and competitive industry participant and to allow a substantial number of the businesses operated by the CMI Entities to continue as going concerns. This preserves value for stakeholders and maintains employment for as many employees of the CMI Entities as possible. The Transition and Reorganization Agreement was entered into after extensive negotiation and consultation between the CMI Entities, the LP Entities, their respective financial and legal advisers and restructuring advisers, the Ad Hoc Committee and the LP senior secured lenders and their respective financial and legal advisers. As such, while not every stakeholder was included, significant interests have been represented and in many instances, given the nature of their interest, have served as proxies for unrepresented stakeholders. As noted in the materials filed by the CMI Entities, the National Post Transition Agreement provides for the transfer of assets and certain liabilities to the publishing side of the Canwest business and the assumption of substantially all of the operating liabilities by the Transferee. Although there is no guarantee that the Transferee will ultimately be able to meet its liabilities as they come due, the liabilities are not stranded in an entity that will have materially fewer assets to satisfy them.

39 There is no prejudice to the major creditors of the CMI Entities. Indeed, the senior secured lender, Irish Holdco., supports the Transition and Reorganization Agreement as does the Ad Hoc Committee and the senior secured lenders of the LP Entities. The Monitor supports the Transition and Reorganization Agreement and has concluded that it is in the best interests of a broad range of stakeholders of the CMI Entities, the National Post Company, including its employees, suppliers and customers, and the LP Entities. Notice of this motion has been given to secured creditors likely to be affected by the order.

40 In the absence of the Transition and Reorganization Agreement, it is likely that the National Post Company would be required to shut down resulting in the consequent loss of employment for most or all the National Post Company's employees. Under the National Post Transition Agreement, all of the National Post Company employees will be offered employment and as noted in the affidavit of the moving parties, the National Post Company's obligations and liabilities under the pension plan will be assumed, subject to necessary approvals.

41 No third party has expressed any interest in acquiring the National Post Company. Indeed, at no time did RBC Dominion Securities Inc. who was assisting in evaluating recapitalization alternatives ever receive any expression of interest from parties seeking to acquire it. Similarly, while the need to transfer the National Post has been in the public domain since at least October 6, 2009, the Monitor has not been contacted by any interested party with respect to acquiring the business of the National Post Company. The Monitor has approved the process leading to the sale and also has conducted a liquidation analysis that caused it to conclude that the proposed disposition is the most beneficial outcome. There has been full consultation with creditors and as noted by the Monitor, the Ad Hoc Committee serves as a good proxy for the unsecured creditor group as a whole. I am satisfied that the consideration is reasonable and fair given the evidence on estimated liquidation value and the fact that there is no other going concern option available.

42 The remaining section 36 factor to consider is section 36(7) which provides that the court should be satisfied that the company can and will make certain pension and employee related payments that would have been required if the court had sanctioned the compromise or arrangement. In oral submissions, counsel for the CMI Entities confirmed that they had met the requirements of section 36. It is agreed that the pension and employee liabilities will be assumed by the Transferee. Although present, the representative of the Superintendent of Financial Services was unopposed to the order requested. If and when a compromise and arrangement is proposed, the Monitor is asked to make the necessary inquiries and report to the court on the status of those payments.

Stay Extension

43 The CMI Entities are continuing to work with their various stakeholders on the preparation and filing of a proposed plan of arrangement and additional time is required. An extension of the stay of proceedings is necessary to provide stability during that time. The cash flow forecast suggests that the CMI Entities have sufficient available cash resources during the requested extension period. The Monitor supports the extension and nobody was opposed. I accept the statements of the CMI Entities and the Monitor that the CMI Entities have acted, and are continuing to act, in good faith and with due diligence. In my view it is appropriate to extend the stay to January 22, 2010 as requested.

S.E. PEPALL J.

cp/e/qlrxg/qljxr/qlced/qlaxw

1 Court approval may nonetheless be required by virtue of the terms of the Initial or other court order or at the request of a stakeholder.

2 The reference to paragraph 6(4)a should presumably be 6(6)a.

3 Industry Canada "Bill C-55: Clause by Clause Analysis-Bill Clause No. 131-CCAA Section 36".

4 Ibid.

5 *R.S.C. 1985, c. C-36 as amended.*

6 (2003), 47 C.B.R. (4th) 278 at para. 52.

7 R.S.O. 1990, c. B.14, as amended.

8 D.J. Miller "Remedies under the Bulk Sales Act: (Necessary, or a Nuisance?)", Ontario Bar Association, October, 2007.

9 [1985] 1 S.C.R. 290.

10 *Supra*, note 3.

11 *Supra*, note 9.

12 (2005), 15 C.B.R. (5th) 288 (Ont. C.A.).

TAB 6

Metcalf & Mansfield Alternative Investments II Corp. (Re)

92 O.R. (3d) 513

Court of Appeal for Ontario,

Laskin, Cronk and Blair JJ.A.

August 18, 2008

Debtor and creditor -- Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act -- Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act permitting inclusion of third-party releases in plan of compromise or arrangement to be sanctioned by court where those releases are reasonably connected to proposed restructuring -- Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act, R.S.C. 1985, c. C-36.

In response to a liquidity crisis which threatened the Canadian market in Asset Backed Commercial Paper ("ABCP"), a creditor-initiated Plan of Compromise and Arrangement was crafted. The Plan called for the release of third parties from any liability associated with ABCP, including, with certain narrow exceptions, liability for claims relating to fraud. The "double majority" required by s. 6 of the Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act ("CCAA") approved the Plan. The respondents sought court approval of the Plan under s. 6 of the CCAA. The application judge made the following findings: (a) the parties to be released were necessary and essential to the restructuring; (b) the claims to be released were rationally related to the purpose of the Plan and necessary for it; (c) the Plan could not succeed without the releases; (d) the parties who were to have claims against them released were contributing in a tangible and realistic way to the Plan; and (e) the Plan would benefit not only the debtor companies but creditor noteholders generally. The application judge sanctioned the Plan. The appellants were holders of ABCP notes who opposed the Plan. On appeal, they argued that the CCAA does not permit a release of claims against third parties and that the releases constitute an unconstitutional confiscation of private property that is within the exclusive domain of the provinces under s. 92 of the Constitution Act, 1867.

Held, the appeal should be dismissed.

On a proper interpretation, the CCAA permits the inclusion of third-party releases in a plan of compromise or arrangement to be sanctioned by the court where those releases are reasonably connected to the proposed restructuring. That conclusion is supported by (a) the open-ended, flexible character of the CCAA itself; (b) the broad nature of the term "compromise or arrangement" as used in the CCAA; and (c) the express statutory effect of the "double majority" vote and court sanction which render the plan binding on all creditors, including those unwilling to accept certain portions of it. The first of these signals a flexible approach to the application of the CCAA in new and evolving situations, an active judicial role in its application and interpretation, and a liberal approach to inter-

pretation. The second provides the entrée to negotiations between the parties [page514] affected in the restructuring and furnishes them with the ability to apply the broad scope of their ingenuity to fashioning the proposal. The latter afford necessary protection to unwilling creditors who may be deprived of certain of their civil and property rights as a result of the process.

While the principle that legislation must not be construed so as to interfere with or prejudice established contractual or proprietary rights -- including the right to bring an action -- in the absence of a clear indication of legislative intention to that effect is an important one, Parliament's intention to clothe the court with authority to consider and sanction a plan that contains third-party releases is expressed with sufficient clarity in the "compromise or arrangement" language of the CCAA coupled with the statutory voting and sanctioning mechanism making the provisions of the plan binding on all creditors. This is not a situation of impermissible "gap-filling" in the case of legislation severely affecting property rights; it is a question of finding meaning in the language of the Act itself.

Interpreting the CCAA as permitting the inclusion of third-party releases in a plan of compromise or arrangement is not unconstitutional under the division-of-powers doctrine and does not contravene the rules of public order pursuant to the Civil Code of Quebec. The CCAA is valid federal legislation under the federal insolvency power, and the power to sanction a plan of compromise or arrangement that contains third-party releases is embedded in the wording of the CCAA. The fact that this may interfere with a claimant's right to pursue a civil action or trump Quebec rules of public order is constitutionally immaterial. To the extent that the provisions of the CCAA are inconsistent with provincial legislation, the federal legislation is paramount.

The application judge's findings of fact were supported by the evidence. His conclusion that the benefits of the Plan to the creditors as a whole and to the debtor companies outweighed the negative aspects of compelling the unwilling appellants to execute the releases was reasonable.

Cases referred to

Steinberg Inc. c. Michaud, [1993] J.Q. no 1076, 42 C.B.R. (5th) 1, 1993 CarswellQue 229, 1993 CarswellQue 2055, [1993] R.J.Q. 1684, J.E. 93-1227, 55 Q.A.C. 297, 55 Q.A.C. 298, 41 A.C.W.S. (3d) 317 (C.A.), not folld

Canadian Airlines Corp. (Re), [2000] A.J. No. 771, 2000 ABQB 442, [2000] 10 W.W.R. 269, 84 Alta. L.R. (3d) 9, 265 A.R. 201, 9 B.L.R. (3d) 41, 20 C.B.R. (4th) 1, 98 A.C.W.S. (3d) 334 (Q.B.); NBD Bank, Canada v. Dofasco Inc. (1999), 46 O.R. (3d) 514, [1999] O.J. No. 4749, 181 D.L.R. (4th) 37, 127 O.A.C. 338, 1 B.L.R. (3d) 1, 15 C.B.R. (4th) 67, 47 C.C.L.T. (2d) 213, 93 A.C.W.S. (3d) 391 (C.A.); Pacific Coastal Airlines Ltd. v. Air Canada, [2001] B.C.J. No. 2580, 2001 BCSC 1721, 19 B.L.R. (3d) 286, 110 A.C.W.S. (3d) 259 (S.C.); Stelco Inc. (Re) (2005), 78 O.R. (3d) 241, [2005] O.J. No. 4883, 261 D.L.R. (4th) 368, 204 O.A.C. 205, 11 B.L.R. (4th) 185, 15 C.B.R. (5th) 307, 144 A.C.W.S. (3d) 15 (C.A.); Stelco Inc. (Re), [2005] O.J. No. 4814, 15 C.B.R. (5th) 297, 143 A.C.W.S. (3d) 623 (S.C.J.); Stelco Inc. (Re), [2006] O.J. No. 1996, 210 O.A.C. 129, 21 C.B.R. (5th) 157, 148 A.C.W.S. (3d) 193 (C.A.); consd

Other cases referred to

Air Canada (Re), [2004] O.J. No. 1909, [2004] O.T.C. 1169, 2 C.B.R. (5th) 4, 130 A.C.W.S. (3d) 899 (S.C.J.); Anvil Range Mining Corp. (Re) (1998), 7 C.B.R. (4th) 51 (Ont. Gen. Div.); Bell ExpressVu Ltd. Partnership v. Rex, [2002] 2 S.C.R. 559, [2002] S.C.J. No. 43, 2002 SCC 42, 212

D.L.R. (4th) 1, 287 N.R. 248, [2002] 5 W.W.R. 1, J.E. 2002-775, 166 B.C.A.C. 1, 100 B.C.L.R. (3d) 1, 18 C.P.R. (4th) 289, 93 C.R.R. (2d) 189, 113 A.C.W.S. (3d) 52, REJB 2002-30904; [page515] Canadian Red Cross Society (Re), [1998] O.J. No. 3306, 72 O.T.C. 99, 5 C.B.R. (4th) 299, 81 A.C.W.S. (3d) 932 (Gen. Div.); Chef Ready Foods Ltd. v. Hongkong Bank of Canada, [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 (C.A.); Cineplex Odeon Corp. (Re) (2001), 24 C.B.R. (4th) 201 (Ont. C.A.); Country Style Food Services (Re), [2002] O.J. No. 1377, 158 O.A.C. 30, 112 A.C.W.S. (3d) 1009 (C.A.); Dans l'affaire de la proposition de: Le Royal Penfield inc. et Groupe Thibault Van Houtte et Associés ltée, [2003] J.Q. no 9223, [2003] R.J.Q. 2157, J.E. 2003-1566, 44 C.B.R. (4th) 302, [2003] G.S.T.C. 195 (C.S.); Dylex Ltd. (Re), [1995] O.J. No. 595, 31 C.B.R. (3d) 106, 54 A.C.W.S. (3d) 504 (Gen. Div.); Elan Corp. v. Comiskey (1990), 1 O.R. (3d) 289, [1990] O.J. No. 2180, 41 O.A.C. 282, 1 C.B.R. (3d) 101, 23 A.C.W.S. (3d) 1192 (C.A.); Employers' Liability Assurance Corp. v. Ideal Petroleum (1959) Ltd., [1978] 1 S.C.R. 230, [1976] S.C.J. No. 114, 75 D.L.R. (3d) 63, 14 N.R. 503, 26 C.B.R. (N.S.) 84, [1977] 1 A.C.W.S. 562; Fotini's Restaurant Corp. v. White Spot Ltd., [1998] B.C.J. No. 598, 38 B.L.R. (2d) 251, 78 A.C.W.S. (3d) 256 (S.C.); Guardian Assurance Co. (Re), [1917] 1 Ch. 431 (C.A.); Muscletech Research and Development Inc. (Re), [2006] O.J. No. 4087, 25 C.B.R. (5th) 231, 152 A.C.W.S. (3d) 16 (S.C.J.); Olympia & York Developments Ltd. (Re) (1993), 12 O.R. (3d) 500, [1993] O.J. No. 545, 17 C.B.R. (3d) 1, 38 A.C.W.S. (3d) 1149 (Gen. Div.); Ravelston Corp. (Re), [2007] O.J. No. 1389, 2007 ONCA 268, 31 C.B.R. (5th) 233, 156 A.C.W.S. (3d) 824, 159 A.C.W.S. (3d) 541; Reference re: Constitutional Creditors Arrangement Act (Canada), [1934] S.C.R. 659, [1934] S.C.J. No. 46, [1934] 4 D.L.R. 75, 16 C.B.R. 1; Reference re Timber Regulations, [1935] A.C. 184, [1935] 2 D.L.R. 1, [1935] 1 W.W.R. 607 (P.C.), affg [1933] S.C.R. 616, [1933] S.C.J. No. 53, [1934] 1 D.L.R. 43; Resurgence Asset Management LLC v. Canadian Airlines Corp., [2000] A.J. No. 1028, 2000 ABCA 238, [2000] 10 W.W.R. 314, 84 Alta. L.R. (3d) 52, 266 A.R. 131, 9 B.L.R. (3d) 86, 20 C.B.R. (4th) 46, 99 A.C.W.S. (3d) 533 (C.A.) [Leave to appeal to S.C.C. refused [2001] S.C.C.A. No. 60, 293 A.R. 351]; Rizzo & Rizzo Shoes Ltd. (Re) (1998), 36 O.R. (3d) 418, [1998] 1 S.C.R. 27, [1998] S.C.J. No. 2, 154 D.L.R. (4th) 193, 221 N.R. 241, J.E. 98-201, 106 O.A.C. 1, 50 C.B.R. (3d) 163, 33 C.C.E.L. (2d) 173, 98 CLLC Â210-006; Royal Bank of Canada v. Larue, [1928] A.C. 187 (J.C.P.C.); Skydome Corp. v. Ontario, [1998] O.J. No. 6548, 16 C.B.R. (4th) 125 (Gen. Div.); Society of Composers, Authors and Music Publishers of Canada v. Armitage (2000), 50 O.R. (3d) 688, [2000] O.J. No. 3993, 137 O.A.C. 74, 20 C.B.R. (4th) 160, 100 A.C.W.S. (3d) 530 (C.A.); T&N Ltd. and Others (No. 3) (Re), [2006] E.W.H.C. 1447, [2007] 1 All E.R. 851, [2007] 1 B.C.L.C. 563, [2006] B.P.I.R. 1283, [2006] Lloyd's Rep. I.R. 817 (Ch.)

Statutes referred to

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

Business Corporations Act, R.S.O. 1990, c. B.16, s. 182

Canada Business Corporations Act, R.S.C. 1985, c. C-44, s. 192 [as am.]

Civil Code of Québec, C.c.Q.

Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act, R.S.C. 1985, c. C-36, ss. 4, 5.1 [as am.], 6 [as am.]

Companies Act 1985 (U.K.), 1985, c. 6, s. 425

Constitution Act, 1867 (U.K.), 30 & 31 Victoria, c. 3, s. 92, (13), (21)

Winding-up and Restructuring Act, R.S.C. 1985, c. W-11

Authorities referred to

Dickerson, Reed, *The Interpretation and Application of Statutes* (Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1975) [page516]

Houlden, L.W., and C.H. Morawetz, *Bankruptcy and Insolvency Law of Canada*, 3rd ed., looseleaf (Scarborough, Ont.: Carswell, 1992)

Driedger, E.A., *Construction of Statutes*, 2nd ed. (Toronto: Butterworths, 1983)

Smith, Gavin, and Rachel Platts, eds., *Halsbury's Laws of England*, 4th ed. reissue, vol. 44(1) (London, U.K.: Butterworths, 1995)

Jackson, Georgina R., and Janis P. Sarra, "Selecting the Judicial Tool to get the Job Done: An Examination of Statutory Interpretation, Discretionary Power and Inherent Jurisdiction in Insolvency Matters" in Sarra, Janis P., ed., *Annual Review of Insolvency Law, 2007* (Vancouver: Carswell, 2007)

Driedger, E.A., and R. Sullivan, *Sullivan and Driedger on the Construction of Statutes*, 4th ed. (Markham, Ont.: Butterworths, 2002)

House of Commons Debates (Hansard), (20 April 1933) at 4091 (Hon. C.H. Cahan)

APPEAL from the sanction order of C.L. Campbell J., [2008] O.J. No. 2265, 43 C.B.R. (5th) 269 (S.C.J.) under the Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act.

See Schedule "C" -- Counsel for list of counsel.

The judgment of the court was delivered by

BLAIR J.A.: --

A. Introduction

[1] In August 2007, a liquidity crisis suddenly threatened the Canadian market in Asset Backed Commercial Paper ("ABCP"). The crisis was triggered by a loss of confidence amongst investors stemming from the news of widespread defaults on U.S. sub-prime mortgages. The loss of confidence placed the Canadian financial market at risk generally and was reflective of an economic volatility worldwide.

[2] By agreement amongst the major Canadian participants, the \$32 billion Canadian market in third-party ABCP was frozen on August 13, 2007, pending an attempt to resolve the crisis through a restructuring of that market. The Pan-Canadian Investors Committee, chaired by Purdy Crawford, C.C., Q.C., was formed and ultimately put forward the creditor-initiated Plan of Compromise and Arrangement that forms the subject-matter of these proceedings. The Plan was sanctioned by Colin L. Campbell J. on June 5, 2008.

[3] Certain creditors who opposed the Plan seek leave to appeal and, if leave is granted, appeal from that decision. They raise an important point regarding the permissible scope of a restructuring under the Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act, R.S.C. 1985, c. C-36 as amended ("CCAA"): can the court sanction a Plan that calls for creditors to provide releases to third parties who are themselves solvent and not creditors of the debtor company? They also argue that, if the answer to this question is yes, the [page517] application judge erred in holding that this Plan, with its particular releases (which bar some claims even in fraud), was fair and reasonable and therefore in sanctioning it under the CCAA.

Leave to appeal

[4] Because of the particular circumstances and urgency of these proceedings, the court agreed to collapse an oral hearing for leave to appeal with the hearing of the appeal itself. At the outset of argument, we encouraged counsel to combine their submissions on both matters.

[5] The proposed appeal raises issues of considerable importance to restructuring proceedings under the CCAA Canada-wide. There are serious and arguable grounds of appeal and -- given the expedited timetable -- the appeal will not unduly delay the progress of the proceedings. I am satisfied that the criteria for granting leave to appeal in CCAA proceedings, set out in such cases as *Cineplex Odeon Corp. (Re)* (2001), 24 C.B.R. (4th) 201 (Ont. C.A.) and *Re Country Style Food Services*, [2002] O.J. No. 1377, 158 O.A.C. 30 (C.A.) are met. I would grant leave to appeal.

Appeal

[6] For the reasons that follow, however, I would dismiss the appeal.

B. Facts

The parties

[7] The appellants are holders of ABCP Notes who oppose the Plan. They do so principally on the basis that it requires them to grant releases to third-party financial institutions against whom they say they have claims for relief arising out of their purchase of ABCP Notes. Amongst them are an airline, a tour operator, a mining company, a wireless provider, a pharmaceuticals retailer and several holding companies and energy companies.

[8] Each of the appellants has large sums invested in ABCP -- in some cases, hundreds of millions of dollars. Nonetheless, the collective holdings of the appellants -- slightly over \$1 billion -- represent only a small fraction of the more than \$32 billion of ABCP involved in the restructuring.

[9] The lead respondent is the Pan-Canadian Investors Committee which was responsible for the creation and negotiation of the Plan on behalf of the creditors. Other respondents include various major international financial institutions, the five largest Canadian banks, several trust companies and some smaller holders of ABCP product. They participated in the market in a number of different ways. [page518]

The ABCP market

[10] Asset Backed Commercial Paper is a sophisticated and hitherto well-accepted financial instrument. It is primarily a form of short-term investment -- usually 30 to 90 days -- typically with a low-interest yield only slightly better than that available through other short-term paper from a government or bank. It is said to be "asset backed" because the cash that is used to purchase an ABCP

Note is converted into a portfolio of financial assets or other asset interests that in turn provide security for the repayment of the notes.

[11] ABCP was often presented by those selling it as a safe investment, somewhat like a guaranteed investment certificate.

[12] The Canadian market for ABCP is significant and administratively complex. As of August 2007, investors had placed over \$116 billion in Canadian ABCP. Investors range from individual pensioners to large institutional bodies. On the selling and distribution end, numerous players are involved, including chartered banks, investment houses and other financial institutions. Some of these players participated in multiple ways. The Plan in this proceeding relates to approximately \$32 billion of non-bank sponsored ABCP, the restructuring of which is considered essential to the preservation of the Canadian ABCP market.

[13] As I understand it, prior to August 2007, when it was frozen, the ABCP market worked as follows.

[14] Various corporations (the "Sponsors") would arrange for entities they control ("Conduits") to make ABCP Notes available to be sold to investors through "Dealers" (banks and other investment dealers). Typically, ABCP was issued by series and sometimes by classes within a series.

[15] The cash from the purchase of the ABCP Notes was used to purchase assets which were held by trustees of the Conduits ("Issuer Trustees") and which stood as security for repayment of the notes. Financial institutions that sold or provided the Conduits with the assets that secured the ABCP are known as "Asset Providers". To help ensure that investors would be able to redeem their notes, "Liquidity Providers" agreed to provide funds that could be drawn upon to meet the demands of maturing ABCP Notes in certain circumstances. Most Asset Providers were also Liquidity Providers. Many of these banks and financial institutions were also holders of ABCP Notes ("Noteholders"). The Asset and Liquidity Providers held first charges on the assets.

[16] When the market was working well, cash from the purchase of new ABCP Notes was also used to pay off maturing ABCP [page519] Notes; alternatively, Noteholders simply rolled their maturing notes over into new ones. As I will explain, however, there was a potential underlying predicament with this scheme.

The liquidity crisis

[17] The types of assets and asset interests acquired to "back" the ABCP Notes are varied and complex. They were generally long-term assets such as residential mortgages, credit card receivables, auto loans, cash collateralized debt obligations and derivative investments such as credit default swaps. Their particular characteristics do not matter for the purpose of this appeal, but they shared a common feature that proved to be the Achilles heel of the ABCP market: because of their long-term nature, there was an inherent timing mismatch between the cash they generated and the cash needed to repay maturing ABCP Notes.

[18] When uncertainty began to spread through the ABCP marketplace in the summer of 2007, investors stopped buying the ABCP product and existing Noteholders ceased to roll over their maturing notes. There was no cash to redeem those notes. Although calls were made on the Liquidity Providers for payment, most of the Liquidity Providers declined to fund the redemption of the notes, arguing that the conditions for liquidity funding had not been met in the circumstances. Hence the "liquidity crisis" in the ABCP market.

[19] The crisis was fuelled largely by a lack of transparency in the ABCP scheme. Investors could not tell what assets were backing their notes -- partly because the ABCP Notes were often sold before or at the same time as the assets backing them were acquired; partly because of the sheer complexity of certain of the underlying assets; and partly because of assertions of confidentiality by those involved with the assets. As fears arising from the spreading U.S. sub-prime mortgage crisis mushroomed, investors became increasingly concerned that their ABCP Notes may be supported by those crumbling assets. For the reasons outlined above, however, they were unable to redeem their maturing ABCP Notes.

The Montreal Protocol

[20] The liquidity crisis could have triggered a wholesale liquidation of the assets, at depressed prices. But it did not. During the week of August 13, 2007, the ABCP market in Canada froze -- the result of a standstill arrangement orchestrated on the heels of the crisis by numerous market participants, including Asset Providers, Liquidity Providers, Noteholders and other financial industry representatives. Under the standstill agreement -- known as the Montreal Protocol -- the parties committed [page520] to restructuring the ABCP market with a view, as much as possible, to preserving the value of the assets and of the notes.

[21] The work of implementing the restructuring fell to the Pan-Canadian Investors Committee, an applicant in the proceeding and respondent in the appeal. The Committee is composed of 17 financial and investment institutions, including chartered banks, credit unions, a pension board, a Crown corporation and a university board of governors. All 17 members are themselves Noteholders; three of them also participated in the ABCP market in other capacities as well. Between them, they hold about two-thirds of the \$32 billion of ABCP sought to be restructured in these proceedings.

[22] Mr. Crawford was named the Committee's chair. He thus had a unique vantage point on the work of the Committee and the restructuring process as a whole. His lengthy affidavit strongly informed the application judge's understanding of the factual context, and our own. He was not cross-examined and his evidence is unchallenged.

[23] Beginning in September 2007, the Committee worked to craft a plan that would preserve the value of the notes and assets, satisfy the various stakeholders to the extent possible and restore confidence in an important segment of the Canadian financial marketplace. In March 2008, it and the other applicants sought CCAA protection for the ABCP debtors and the approval of a Plan that had been pre-negotiated with some, but not all, of those affected by the misfortunes in the Canadian ABCP market.

The Plan

(a) Plan overview

[24] Although the ABCP market involves many different players and kinds of assets, each with their own challenges, the committee opted for a single plan. In Mr. Crawford's words, "all of the ABCP suffers from common problems that are best addressed by a common solution". The Plan the Committee developed is highly complex and involves many parties. In its essence, the Plan would convert the Noteholders' paper -- which has been frozen and therefore effectively worthless for many months -- into new, long-term notes that would trade freely, but with a discounted face value. The hope is that a strong secondary market for the notes will emerge in the long run.

[25] The Plan aims to improve transparency by providing investors with detailed information about the assets supporting their ABCP Notes. It also addresses the timing mismatch between the notes and the assets by adjusting the maturity provisions and interest rates on the new notes. Further, the Plan [page521] adjusts some of the underlying credit default swap contracts by increasing the thresholds for default triggering events; in this way, the likelihood of a forced liquidation flowing from the credit default swap holder's prior security is reduced and, in turn, the risk for ABCP investors is decreased.

[26] Under the Plan, the vast majority of the assets underlying ABCP would be pooled into two master asset vehicles (MAV1 and MAV2). The pooling is designed to increase the collateral available and thus make the notes more secure.

[27] The Plan does not apply to investors holding less than \$1 million of notes. However, certain Dealers have agreed to buy the ABCP of those of their customers holding less than the \$1 million threshold, and to extend financial assistance to these customers. Principal among these Dealers are National Bank and Canaccord, two of the respondent financial institutions the appellants most object to releasing. The application judge found that these developments appeared to be designed to secure votes in favour of the Plan by various Noteholders and were apparently successful in doing so. If the Plan is approved, they also provide considerable relief to the many small investors who find themselves unwittingly caught in the ABDP collapse.

(b) The releases

[28] This appeal focuses on one specific aspect of the Plan: the comprehensive series of releases of third parties provided for in art. 10.

[29] The Plan calls for the release of Canadian banks, Dealers, Noteholders, Asset Providers, Issuer Trustees, Liquidity Providers and other market participants -- in Mr. Crawford's words, "virtually all participants in the Canadian ABCP market" -- from any liability associated with ABCP, with the exception of certain narrow claims relating to fraud. For instance, under the Plan as approved, creditors will have to give up their claims against the Dealers who sold them their ABCP Notes, including challenges to the way the Dealers characterized the ABCP and provided (or did not provide) information about the ABCP. The claims against the proposed defendants are mainly in tort: negligence, misrepresentation, negligent misrepresentation, failure to act prudently as a dealer/advisor, acting in conflict of interest and in a few cases fraud or potential fraud. There are also allegations of breach of fiduciary duty and claims for other equitable relief.

[30] The application judge found that, in general, the claims for damages include the face value of the Notes, plus interest and additional penalties and damages.

[31] The releases, in effect, are part of a quid pro quo. Generally speaking, they are designed to compensate various participants in [page522] the market for the contributions they would make to the restructuring. Those contributions under the Plan include the requirements that:

- (a) Asset Providers assume an increased risk in their credit default swap contracts, disclose certain proprietary information in relation to the assets and provide below-cost financing for margin funding facilities that are designed to make the notes more secure;

- (b) Sponsors -- who in addition have co-operated with the Investors' Committee throughout the process, including by sharing certain proprietary information -- give up their existing contracts;
- (c) the Canadian banks provide below-cost financing for the margin funding facility; and
- (d) other parties make other contributions under the Plan.

[32] According to Mr. Crawford's affidavit, the releases are part of the Plan "because certain key participants, whose participation is vital to the restructuring, have made comprehensive releases a condition for their participation".

The CCAA proceedings to date

[33] On March 17, 2008, the applicants sought and obtained an Initial Order under the CCAA staying any proceedings relating to the ABCP crisis and providing for a meeting of the Noteholders to vote on the proposed Plan. The meeting was held on April 25. The vote was overwhelmingly in support of the Plan -- 96 per cent of the Noteholders voted in favour. At the instance of certain Noteholders, and as requested by the application judge (who has supervised the proceedings from the outset), the monitor broke down the voting results according to those Noteholders who had worked on or with the Investors' Committee to develop the Plan and those Noteholders who had not. Re-calculated on this basis the results remained firmly in favour of the proposed Plan -- 99 per cent of those connected with the development of the Plan voted positively, as did 80 per cent of those Noteholders who had not been involved in its formulation.

[34] The vote thus provided the Plan with the "double majority" approval -- a majority of creditors representing two-thirds in value of the claims -- required under s. 6 of the CCAA.

[35] Following the successful vote, the applicants sought court approval of the Plan under s. 6. Hearings were held on May 12 [page523] and 13. On May 16, the application judge issued a brief endorsement in which he concluded that he did not have sufficient facts to decide whether all the releases proposed in the Plan were authorized by the CCAA. While the application judge was prepared to approve the releases of negligence claims, he was not prepared at that point to sanction the release of fraud claims. Noting the urgency of the situation and the serious consequences that would result from the Plan's failure, the application judge nevertheless directed the parties back to the bargaining table to try to work out a claims process for addressing legitimate claims of fraud.

[36] The result of this renegotiation was a "fraud carve-out" -- an amendment to the Plan excluding certain fraud claims from the Plan's releases. The carve-out did not encompass all possible claims of fraud, however. It was limited in three key respects. First, it applied only to claims against ABCP Dealers. Secondly, it applied only to cases involving an express fraudulent misrepresentation made with the intention to induce purchase and in circumstances where the person making the representation knew it to be false. Thirdly, the carve-out limited available damages to the value of the notes, minus any funds distributed as part of the Plan. The appellants argue vigorously that such a limited release respecting fraud claims is unacceptable and should not have been sanctioned by the application judge.

[37] A second sanction hearing -- this time involving the amended Plan (with the fraud carve-out) -- was held on June 3, 2008. Two days later, Campbell J. released his reasons for decision, approving and sanctioning the Plan on the basis both that he had jurisdiction to sanction a Plan calling for

third-party releases and that the Plan including the third-party releases in question here was fair and reasonable.

[38] The appellants attack both of these determinations.

C. Law and Analysis

[39] There are two principal questions for determination on this appeal:

- (1) As a matter of law, may a CCAA plan contain a release of claims against anyone other than the debtor company or its directors?
- (2) If the answer to that question is yes, did the application judge err in the exercise of his discretion to sanction the Plan as fair and reasonable given the nature of the releases called for under it? [page524]

- (1) Legal authority for the releases

[40] The standard of review on this first issue -- whether, as a matter of law, a CCAA plan may contain third-party releases -- is correctness.

[41] The appellants submit that a court has no jurisdiction or legal authority under the CCAA to sanction a plan that imposes an obligation on creditors to give releases to third parties other than the directors of the debtor company.¹ The requirement that objecting creditors release claims against third parties is illegal, they contend, because:

- (a) on a proper interpretation, the CCAA does not permit such releases;
- (b) the court is not entitled to "fill in the gaps" in the CCAA or rely upon its inherent jurisdiction to create such authority because to do so would be contrary to the principle that Parliament did not intend to interfere with private property rights or rights of action in the absence of clear statutory language to that effect;
- (c) the releases constitute an unconstitutional confiscation of private property that is within the exclusive domain of the provinces under s. 92 of the Constitution Act, 1867;
- (d) the releases are invalid under Quebec rules of public order; and because
- (e) the prevailing jurisprudence supports these conclusions.

[42] I would not give effect to any of these submissions.

Interpretation, "gap filling" and inherent jurisdiction

[43] On a proper interpretation, in my view, the CCAA permits the inclusion of third-party releases in a plan of compromise or arrangement to be sanctioned by the court where those releases are reasonably connected to the proposed restructuring. I am led to this conclusion by a combination of (a) the open-ended, flexible character of the CCAA itself, (b) the broad nature of the term "compromise or arrangement" as used in the Act, and (c) the express statutory effect of the "double-majority" vote and court sanction which render the plan binding on all creditors, including [page525] those unwilling to accept certain portions of it. The first of these signals a flexible approach to the application of the Act in new and evolving situations, an active judicial role in its application and interpretation, and a liberal approach to that interpretation. The second provides the entrée to negotiations between the parties affected in the restructuring and furnishes them with the

ability to apply the broad scope of their ingenuity in fashioning the proposal. The latter afford necessary protection to unwilling creditors who may be deprived of certain of their civil and property rights as a result of the process.

[44] The CCAA is skeletal in nature. It does not contain a comprehensive code that lays out all that is permitted or barred. Judges must therefore play a role in fleshing out the details of the statutory scheme. The scope of the Act and the powers of the court under it are not limitless. It is beyond controversy, however, that the CCAA is remedial legislation to be liberally construed in accordance with the modern purposive approach to statutory interpretation. It is designed to be a flexible instrument and it is that very flexibility which gives the Act its efficacy: *Canadian Red Cross Society (Re)*, [1998] O.J. No. 3306, 5 C.B.R. (4th) 299 (Gen. Div.). As Farley J. noted in *Dylex Ltd. (Re)*, [1995] O.J. No. 595, 31 C.B.R. (3d) 106 (Gen. Div.), at p. 111 C.B.R., "[t]he history of CCAA law has been an evolution of judicial interpretation".

[45] Much has been said, however, about the "evolution of judicial interpretation" and there is some controversy over both the source and scope of that authority. Is the source of the court's authority statutory, discerned solely through application of the principles of statutory interpretation, for example? Or does it rest in the court's ability to "fill in the gaps" in legislation? Or in the court's inherent jurisdiction?

[46] These issues have recently been canvassed by the Honourable Georgina R. Jackson and Dr. Janis Sarra in their publication "Selecting the Judicial Tool to get the Job Done: An Examination of Statutory Interpretation, Discretionary Power and Inherent Jurisdiction in Insolvency Matters",² and there was considerable argument on these issues before the application judge and before us. While I generally agree with the authors' suggestion that the courts should adopt a hierarchical approach in their resort to these interpretive tools -- statutory interpretation, gap-filling, discretion and inherent jurisdiction [page526] -- it is not necessary, in my view, to go beyond the general principles of statutory interpretation to resolve the issues on this appeal. Because I am satisfied that it is implicit in the language of the CCAA itself that the court has authority to sanction plans incorporating third-party releases that are reasonably related to the proposed restructuring, there is no "gap-filling" to be done and no need to fall back on inherent jurisdiction. In this respect, I take a somewhat different approach than the application judge did.

[47] The Supreme Court of Canada has affirmed generally -- and in the insolvency context particularly -- that remedial statutes are to be interpreted liberally and in accordance with Professor Driedger's modern principle of statutory interpretation. Driedger advocated that "the words of an Act are to be read in their entire context and in their grammatical and ordinary sense harmoniously with the scheme of the Act, the object of the Act, and the intention of Parliament": *Rizzo & Rizzo Shoes Ltd. (Re)* (1998), 36 O.R. (3d) 418, [1998] 1 S.C.R. 27, [1998] S.C.J. No. 2, at para. 21, quoting E.A. Driedger, *Construction of Statutes*, 2nd ed. (Toronto: Butterworths, 1983); *Bell ExpressVu Ltd. Partnership v. Rex*, [2002] 2 S.C.R. 559, [2002] S.C.J. No. 43, at para. 26.

[48] More broadly, I believe that the proper approach to the judicial interpretation and application of statutes -- particularly those like the CCAA that are skeletal in nature -- is succinctly and accurately summarized by Jackson and Sarra in their recent article, *supra*, at p. 56:

The exercise of a statutory authority requires the statute to be construed. The plain meaning or textualist approach has given way to a search for the object and goals of the statute and the intentionalist approach. This latter approach makes use of the purposive

approach and the mischief rule, including its codification under interpretation statutes that every enactment is deemed remedial, and is to be given such fair, large and liberal construction and interpretation as best ensures the attainment of its objects. This latter approach advocates reading the statute as a whole and being mindful of Driedger's "one principle", that the words of the Act are to be read in their entire context, in their grammatical and ordinary sense harmoniously with the scheme of the Act, the object of the Act, and the intention of Parliament. It is important that courts first interpret the statute before them and exercise their authority pursuant to the statute, before reaching for other tools in the judicial toolbox. Statutory interpretation using the principles articulated above leaves room for gap-filling in the common law provinces and a consideration of purpose in Québec as a manifestation of the judge's overall task of statutory interpretation. Finally, the jurisprudence in relation to statutory interpretation demonstrates the fluidity inherent in the judge's task in seeking the objects of the statute and the intention of the legislature.

[49] I adopt these principles. [page527]

[50] The remedial purpose of the CCAA -- as its title affirms -- is to facilitate compromises or arrangements between an insolvent debtor company and its creditors. In *Chef Ready Foods Ltd. v. Hongkong Bank of Canada*, [1990] B.C.J. No. 2384, 4 C.B.R. (3d) 311 (C.A.), at p. 318 C.B.R., Gibbs J.A. summarized very concisely the purpose, object and scheme of the 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.

[51] The CCAA was enacted in 1933 and was necessary -- as the then secretary of state noted in introducing the Bill on First Reading-- "because of the prevailing commercial and industrial depression" and the need to alleviate the effects of business bankruptcies in that context: see the statement of the Hon. C.H. Cahan, Secretary of State, House of Commons Debates (Hansard) (April 20, 1933) at 4091. One of the greatest effects of that Depression was what Gibbs J.A. described as "the social evil of devastating levels of unemployment". Since then, courts have recognized that the Act has a broader dimension than simply the direct relations between the debtor company and its creditors and that this broader public dimension must be weighed in the balance together with the interests of those most directly affected: see, for example, *Elan Corp. v. Comiskey* (1990), 1 O.R. (3d) 289, [1990] O.J. No. 2180 (C.A.), per Doherty J.A. in dissent; *Skydome Corp. v. Ontario*, [1998] O.J. No. 6548, 16 C.B.R. (4th) 125 (Gen. Div.); *Anvil Range Mining Corp. (Re)* (1998), 7 C.B.R. (4th) 51 (Ont. Gen. Div.).

[52] In this respect, I agree with the following statement of Doherty J.A. in *Elan*, supra, at pp. 306-307 O.R.:

[T]he Act was designed to serve a "broad constituency of investors, creditors and employees".³ Because of that "broad constituency" the court must, when considering applications brought under the Act, have regard not only to the individuals

and organizations directly affected by the application, but also to the wider public interest.

(Emphasis added)

Application of the principles of interpretation

[53] An interpretation of the CCAA that recognizes its broader socio-economic purposes and objects is apt in this case. As the [page528] application judge pointed out, the restructuring underpins the financial viability of the Canadian ABCP market itself.

[54] The appellants argue that the application judge erred in taking this approach and in treating the Plan and the proceedings as an attempt to restructure a financial market (the ABCP market) rather than simply the affairs between the debtor corporations who caused the ABCP Notes to be issued and their creditors. The Act is designed, they say, only to effect reorganizations between a corporate debtor and its creditors and not to attempt to restructure entire marketplaces.

[55] This perspective is flawed in at least two respects, however, in my opinion. First, it reflects a view of the purpose and objects of the CCAA that is too narrow. Secondly, it overlooks the reality of the ABCP marketplace and the context of the restructuring in question here. It may be true that, in their capacity as ABCP Dealers, the releasee financial institutions are "third-parties" to the restructuring in the sense that they are not creditors of the debtor corporations. However, in their capacities as Asset Providers and Liquidity Providers, they are not only creditors but they are prior secured creditors to the Noteholders. Furthermore -- as the application judge found -- in these latter capacities they are making significant contributions to the restructuring by "foregoing immediate rights to assets and . . . providing real and tangible input for the preservation and enhancement of the Notes" (para. 76). In this context, therefore, the application judge's remark, at para. 50, that the restructuring "involves the commitment and participation of all parties" in the ABCP market makes sense, as do his earlier comments, at paras. 48-49:

Given the nature of the ABCP market and all of its participants, it is more appropriate to consider all Noteholders as claimants and the object of the Plan to restore liquidity to the assets being the Notes themselves. The restoration of the liquidity of the market necessitates the participation (including more tangible contribution by many) of all Noteholders.

In these circumstances, it is unduly technical to classify the Issuer Trustees as debtors and the claims of the Noteholders as between themselves and others as being those of third party creditors, although I recognize that the restructuring structure of the CCAA requires the corporations as the vehicles for restructuring.

(Emphasis added)

[56] The application judge did observe that "[t]he insolvency is of the ABCP market itself, the restructuring is that of the market for such paper . . ." (para. 50). He did so, however, to point out the uniqueness of the Plan before him and its industry-wide significance and not to suggest that he need have no regard to the provisions of the CCAA permitting a restructuring as between debtor [page529] and creditors. His focus was on the effect of the restructuring, a perfectly permissible perspective given the broad purpose and objects of the Act. This is apparent from his later refer-

ences. For example, in balancing the arguments against approving releases that might include aspects of fraud, he responded that "what is at issue is a liquidity crisis that affects the ABCP market in Canada" (para. 125). In addition, in his reasoning on the fair-and-reasonable issue, he stated, at para. 142: "Apart from the Plan itself, there is a need to restore confidence in the financial system in Canada and this Plan is a legitimate use of the CCAA to accomplish that goal".

[57] I agree. I see no error on the part of the application judge in approaching the fairness assessment or the interpretation issue with these considerations in mind. They provide the context in which the purpose, objects and scheme of the CCAA are to be considered.

The statutory wording

[58] Keeping in mind the interpretive principles outlined above, I turn now to a consideration of the provisions of the CCAA. Where in the words of the statute is the court clothed with authority to approve a plan incorporating a requirement for third-party releases? As summarized earlier, the answer to that question, in my view, is to be found in:

- (a) the skeletal nature of the CCAA;
- (b) Parliament's reliance upon the broad notions of "compromise" and "arrangement" to establish the framework within which the parties may work to put forward a restructuring plan; and in
- (c) the creation of the statutory mechanism binding all creditors in classes to the compromise or arrangement once it has surpassed the high "double majority" voting threshold and obtained court sanction as "fair and reasonable".

Therein lies the expression of Parliament's intention to permit the parties to negotiate and vote on, and the court to sanction, third-party releases relating to a restructuring.

[59] Sections 4 and 6 of the CCAA state:

4. Where a compromise or an arrangement is proposed between a debtor company and its unsecured creditors or any class of them, the court may, on the application in a summary way of the company, of any such creditor or of the trustee in bankruptcy or liquidator of the company, order a meeting of the creditors or class of creditors, and, if the court so determines, of the shareholders of the company, to be summoned in such manner as the court directs. [page530]

.....

6. Where a majority in number representing two-thirds in value of the creditors, or class of creditors, as the case may be, present and voting either in person or by proxy at the meeting or meetings thereof respectively held pursuant to sections 4 and 5, or either of those sections, agree to any compromise or arrangement either as proposed or as altered or modified at the meeting or meetings, the compromise or arrangement may be sanctioned by the court, and if so sanctioned is binding

- (a) on all the creditors or the class of creditors, as the case may be, and on any trustee for any such class of creditors, whether secured or unsecured, as the case may be, and on the company; and
- (b) in the case of a company that has made an authorized assignment or against which a bankruptcy order has been made under the Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act or is in the course of being wound up under the Winding-up and Restructuring Act, on the trustee in bankruptcy or liquidator and contributories of the company.

Compromise or arrangement

[60] While there may be little practical distinction between "compromise" and "arrangement" in many respects, the two are not necessarily the same. "Arrangement" is broader than "compromise" and would appear to include any scheme for reorganizing the affairs of the debtor: L.W. Houlden and C.H. Morawetz, *Bankruptcy and Insolvency Law of Canada*, looseleaf, 3rd ed., vol. 4 (Scarborough, Ont.: Carswell, 1992) at 10A-12.2, N10. It has been said to be "a very wide and indefinite [word]": Reference re Timber Regulations, [1935] A.C. 184, [1935] 2 D.L.R. 1 (P.C.), at p. 197 A.C., affg [1933] S.C.R. 616, [1933] S.C.J. No. 53. See also Guardian Assurance Co. (Re), [1917] 1 Ch. 431 (C.A.), at pp. 448, 450 Ch.; T&N Ltd. and Others (No. 3) (Re), [2007] 1 All E.R. 851, [2006] E.W.H.C. 1447 (Ch.).

[61] The CCAA is a sketch, an outline, a supporting framework for the resolution of corporate insolvencies in the public interest. Parliament wisely avoided attempting to anticipate the myriad of business deals that could evolve from the fertile and creative minds of negotiators restructuring their financial affairs. It left the shape and details of those deals to be worked out within the framework of the comprehensive and flexible concepts of a "compromise" and "arrangement". I see no reason why a release in favour of a third party, negotiated as part of a package between a debtor and creditor and reasonably relating to the proposed restructuring cannot fall within that framework.

[62] A proposal under the Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act, R.S.C. 1985, c. B-3 (the "BIA") is a contract: *Employers' Liability Assurance Corp. v. Ideal Petroleum (1959) Ltd.*, [1978] 1 S.C.R. 230, [1976] S.C.J. No. 114, at p. 239 S.C.R.; [page531] *Society of Composers, Authors and Music Publishers of Canada v. Armitage (2000)*, 50 O.R. (3d) 688, [2000] O.J. No. 3993 (C.A.), at para. 11. In my view, a compromise or arrangement under the CCAA is directly analogous to a proposal for these purposes and, therefore, is to be treated as a contract between the debtor and its creditors. Consequently, parties are entitled to put anything into such a plan that could lawfully be incorporated into any contract. See *Air Canada (Re)*, [2004] O.J. No. 1909, 2 C.B.R. (5th) 4 (S.C.J.), at para. 6; *Olympia & York Developments Ltd. (Re) (1993)*, 12 O.R. (3d) 500, [1993] O.J. No. 545 (Gen. Div.), at p. 518 O.R.

[63] There is nothing to prevent a debtor and a creditor from including in a contract between them a term providing that the creditor release a third party. The term is binding as between the debtor and creditor. In the CCAA context, therefore, a plan of compromise or arrangement may propose that creditors agree to compromise claims against the debtor and to release third parties, just as any debtor and creditor might agree to such a term in a contract between them. Once the statutory mechanism regarding voter approval and court sanctioning has been complied with, the plan -- including the provision for releases -- becomes binding on all creditors (including the dissenting minority).

[64] T&N Ltd. and Others (Re), *supra*, is instructive in this regard. It is a rare example of a court focusing on and examining the meaning and breadth of the term "arrangement". T&N and its associated companies were engaged in the manufacture, distribution and sale of asbestos-containing products. They became the subject of many claims by former employees, who had been exposed to asbestos dust in the course of their employment, and their dependents. The T&N companies applied for protection under s. 425 of the U.K. Companies Act 1985, a provision virtually identical to the scheme of the CCAA -- including the concepts of compromise or arrangement.⁴

[65] T&N carried employers' liability insurance. However, the employers' liability insurers (the "EL insurers") denied coverage. This issue was litigated and ultimately resolved through the establishment of a multi-million pound fund against which the employees and their dependants (the EL claimants) would assert their claims. In return, T&N's former employees and dependants (the EL claimants) agreed to forego any further claims against the EL insurers. This settlement was incorporated into the plan of [page532] compromise and arrangement between the T&N companies and the EL claimants that was voted on and put forward for court sanction.

[66] Certain creditors argued that the court could not sanction the plan because it did not constitute a "compromise or arrangement" between T&N and the EL claimants since it did not purport to affect rights as between them but only the EL claimants' rights against the EL insurers. The court rejected this argument. Richards J. adopted previous jurisprudence -- cited earlier in these reasons -- to the effect that the word "arrangement" has a very broad meaning and that, while both a compromise and an arrangement involve some "give and take", an arrangement need not involve a compromise or be confined to a case of dispute or difficulty (paras. 46-51). He referred to what would be the equivalent of a solvent arrangement under Canadian corporate legislation as an example.⁵ Finally, he pointed out that the compromised rights of the EL claimants against the EL insurers were not unconnected with the EL claimants' rights against the T&N companies; the scheme of arrangement involving the EL insurers was "an integral part of a single proposal affecting all the parties" (para. 52). He concluded his reasoning with these observations (para. 53):

In my judgment it is not a necessary element of an arrangement for the purposes of s 425 of the 1985 Act that it should alter the rights existing between the company and the creditors or members with whom it is made. No doubt in most cases it will alter those rights. But, provided that the context and content of the scheme are such as properly to constitute an arrangement between the company and the members or creditors concerned, it will fall within s 425. It is ... neither necessary nor desirable to attempt a definition of arrangement. The legislature has not done so. To insist on an alteration of rights, or a termination of rights as in the case of schemes to effect takeovers or mergers, is to impose a restriction which is neither warranted by the statutory language nor justified by the courts' approach over many years to give the term its widest meaning. Nor is an arrangement necessarily outside the section, because its effect is to alter the rights of creditors against another party or because such alteration could be achieved by a scheme of arrangement with that party.

(Emphasis added)

[67] I find Richard J.'s analysis helpful and persuasive. In effect, the claimants in T&N were being asked to release their claims against the EL insurers in exchange for a call on the fund. Here, the appellants are being required to release their claims against certain financial third parties in ex-

change for what is anticipated to be an improved position for all ABCP Noteholders, stemming from the contributions the financial [page533] third parties are making to the ABCP restructuring. The situations are quite comparable.

The binding mechanism

[68] Parliament's reliance on the expansive terms "compromise" or "arrangement" does not stand alone, however. Effective insolvency restructurings would not be possible without a statutory mechanism to bind an unwilling minority of creditors. Unanimity is frequently impossible in such situations. But the minority must be protected too. Parliament's solution to this quandary was to permit a wide range of proposals to be negotiated and put forward (the compromise or arrangement) and to bind all creditors by class to the terms of the plan, but to do so only where the proposal can gain the support of the requisite "double majority" of votes⁶ and obtain the sanction of the court on the basis that it is fair and reasonable. In this way, the scheme of the CCAA supports the intention of Parliament to encourage a wide variety of solutions to corporate insolvencies without unjustifiably overriding the rights of dissenting creditors.

The required nexus

[69] In keeping with this scheme and purpose, I do not suggest that any and all releases between creditors of the debtor company seeking to restructure and third parties may be made the subject of a compromise or arrangement between the debtor and its creditors. Nor do I think the fact that the releases may be "necessary" in the sense that the third parties or the debtor may refuse to proceed without them, of itself, advances the argument in favour of finding jurisdiction (although it may well be relevant in terms of the fairness and reasonableness analysis).

[70] The release of the claim in question must be justified as part of the compromise or arrangement between the debtor and its creditors. In short, there must be a reasonable connection between the third-party claim being compromised in the plan and the restructuring achieved by the plan to warrant inclusion of the third-party release in the plan. This nexus exists here, in my view.

[71] In the course of his reasons, the application judge made the following findings, all of which are amply supported on the record:

- (a) The parties to be released are necessary and essential to the restructuring of the debtor; [page534]
- (b) the claims to be released are rationally related to the purpose of the Plan and necessary for it;
- (c) the Plan cannot succeed without the releases;
- (d) the parties who are to have claims against them released are contributing in a tangible and realistic way to the Plan; and
- (e) the Plan will benefit not only the debtor companies but creditor Noteholders generally.

[72] Here, then -- as was the case in T&N -- there is a close connection between the claims being released and the restructuring proposal. The tort claims arise out of the sale and distribution of the ABCP Notes and their collapse in value, as do the contractual claims of the creditors against the debtor companies. The purpose of the restructuring is to stabilize and shore up the value of those notes in the long run. The third parties being released are making separate contributions to enable those results to materialize. Those contributions are identified earlier, at para. 31 of these reasons.

The application judge found that the claims being released are not independent of or unrelated to the claims that the Noteholders have against the debtor companies; they are closely connected to the value of the ABCP Notes and are required for the Plan to succeed. At paras. 76-77, he said:

I do not consider that the Plan in this case involves a change in relationship among creditors "that does not directly involve the Company." Those who support the Plan and are to be released are "directly involved in the Company" in the sense that many are foregoing immediate rights to assets and are providing real and tangible input for the preservation and enhancement of the Notes. It would be unduly restrictive to suggest that the moving parties' claims against released parties do not involve the Company, since the claims are directly related to the value of the Notes. The value of the Notes is in this case the value of the Company.

This Plan, as it deals with releases, doesn't change the relationship of the creditors apart from involving the Company and its Notes.

[73] I am satisfied that the wording of the CCAA -- construed in light of the purpose, objects and scheme of the Act and in accordance with the modern principles of statutory interpretation -- supports the court's jurisdiction and authority to sanction the Plan proposed here, including the contested third-party releases contained in it.

The jurisprudence

[74] Third-party releases have become a frequent feature in Canadian restructurings since the decision of the Alberta Court of Queen's [page535] Bench in *Canadian Airlines Corp. (Re)*, [2000] A.J. No. 771, 265 A.R. 201 (Q.B.), leave to appeal refused by *Resurgence Asset Management LLC v. Canadian Airlines Corp.*, [2000] A.J. No. 1028, 266 A.R. 131 (C.A.), and [2001] S.C.C.A. No. 60, 293 A.R. 351. In *Muscletech Research and Development Inc. (Re)*, [2006] O.J. No. 4087, 25 C.B.R. (5th) 231 (S.C.J.), Justice Ground remarked (para. 8):

[It] is not uncommon in CCAA proceedings, in the context of a plan of compromise and arrangement, to compromise claims against the Applicants and other parties against whom such claims or related claims are made.

[75] We were referred to at least a dozen court-approved CCAA plans from across the country that included broad third-party releases. With the exception of *Canadian Airlines (Re)*, however, the releases in those restructurings -- including *Muscletech* -- were not opposed. The appellants argue that those cases are wrongly decided because the court simply does not have the authority to approve such releases.

[76] In *Canadian Airlines (Re)* the releases in question were opposed, however. Paperny J. (as she then was) concluded the court had jurisdiction to approve them and her decision is said to be the wellspring of the trend towards third-party releases referred to above. Based on the foregoing analysis, I agree with her conclusion although for reasons that differ from those cited by her.

[77] Justice Paperny began her analysis of the release issue with the observation, at para. 87, that "[p]rior to 1997, the CCAA did not provide for compromises of claims against anyone other than the petitioning company". It will be apparent from the analysis in these reasons that I do not accept

that premise, notwithstanding the decision of the Quebec Court of Appeal in *Michaud v. Steinberg*,⁷ of which her comment may have been reflective. Paperny J.'s reference to 1997 was a reference to the amendments of that year adding s. 5.1 to the CCAA, which provides for limited releases in favour of directors. Given the limited scope of s. 5.1, Justice Paperny was thus faced with the argument -- dealt with later in these reasons -- that Parliament must not have intended to extend the authority to approve third-party releases beyond the scope of this section. She chose to address this contention by concluding that, although the amendments "[did] not authorize a release of claims against third parties other than directors, [they did] not prohibit such releases either" (para. 92). [page536]

[78] Respectfully, I would not adopt the interpretive principle that the CCAA permits releases because it does not expressly prohibit them. Rather, as I explain in these reasons, I believe the open-ended CCAA permits third-party releases that are reasonably related to the restructuring at issue because they are encompassed in the comprehensive terms "compromise" and "arrangement" and because of the double-voting majority and court-sanctioning statutory mechanism that makes them binding on unwilling creditors.

[79] The appellants rely on a number of authorities, which they submit support the proposition that the CCAA may not be used to compromise claims as between anyone other than the debtor company and its creditors. Principal amongst these are *Michaud v. Steinberg*, *supra*; *NBD Bank, Canada v. Dofasco Inc.* (1999), 46 O.R. (3d) 514, [1999] O.J. No. 4749 (C.A.); *Pacific Coastal Airlines Ltd. v. Air Canada*, [2001] B.C.J. No. 2580, 19 B.L.R. (3d) 286 (S.C.); and *Stelco Inc. (Re)* (2005), 78 O.R. (3d) 241, [2005] O.J. No. 4883 (C.A.) ("*Stelco I*"). I do not think these cases assist the appellants, however. With the exception of *Steinberg*, they do not involve third-party claims that were reasonably connected to the restructuring. As I shall explain, it is my opinion that *Steinberg* does not express a correct view of the law, and I decline to follow it.

[80] In *Pacific Coastal Airlines*, Tysoe J. made the following comment, at para. 24:

[The purpose of the CCAA proceeding] is not to deal with disputes between a creditor of a company and a third party, even if the company was also involved in the subject matter of the dispute. While issues between the debtor company and non-creditors are sometimes dealt with in CCAA proceedings, it is not a proper use of a CCAA proceeding to determine disputes between parties other than the debtor company.

[81] This statement must be understood in its context, however. *Pacific Coastal Airlines* had been a regional carrier for Canadian Airlines prior to the CCAA reorganization of the latter in 2000. In the action in question, it was seeking to assert separate tort claims against Air Canada for contractual interference and inducing breach of contract in relation to certain rights it had to the use of Canadian's flight designator code prior to the CCAA proceeding. Air Canada sought to have the action dismissed on grounds of *res judicata* or issue estoppel because of the CCAA proceeding. Tysoe J. rejected the argument.

[82] The facts in *Pacific Coastal* are not analogous to the circumstances of this case, however. There is no suggestion that a resolution of *Pacific Coastal's* separate tort claim against Air Canada was in any way connected to the Canadian Airlines restructuring, even though Canadian -- at a contractual level -- may have had some involvement with the particular dispute. [page537] Here, however, the disputes that are the subject matter of the impugned releases are not simply "disputes be-

tween parties other than the debtor company". They are closely connected to the disputes being resolved between the debtor companies and their creditors and to the restructuring itself.

[83] Nor is the decision of this court in the NBD Bank case dispositive. It arose out of the financial collapse of Algoma Steel, a wholly owned subsidiary of Dofasco. The bank had advanced funds to Algoma allegedly on the strength of misrepresentations by Algoma's Vice-President, James Melville. The plan of compromise and arrangement that was sanctioned by Farley J. in the Algoma CCAA restructuring contained a clause releasing Algoma from all claims creditors "may have had against Algoma or its directors, officers, employees and advisors". Mr. Melville was found liable for negligent misrepresentation in a subsequent action by the bank. On appeal, he argued that since the bank was barred from suing Algoma for misrepresentation by its officers, permitting it to pursue the same cause of action against him personally would subvert the CCAA process -- in short, he was personally protected by the CCAA release.

[84] Rosenberg J.A., writing for this court, rejected this argument. The appellants here rely particularly upon his following observations, at paras. 53-54:

In my view, the appellant has not demonstrated that allowing the respondent to pursue its claim against him would undermine or subvert the purposes of the Act. As this court noted in *Elan Corp. v. Comiskey* (1990), 1 O.R. (3d) 289 at p. 297, . . . the CCAA is remedial legislation "intended to provide a structured environment for the negotiation of compromises between a debtor company and its creditors for the benefit of both". It is a means of avoiding a liquidation that may yield little for the creditors, especially unsecured creditors like the respondent, and the debtor company shareholders. However, the appellant has not shown that allowing a creditor to continue an action against an officer for negligent misrepresentation would erode the effectiveness of the Act.

In fact, to refuse on policy grounds to impose liability on an officer of the corporation for negligent misrepresentation would contradict the policy of Parliament as demonstrated in recent amendments to the CCAA and the Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act, R.S.C. 1985, c. B-3. Those Acts now contemplate that an arrangement or proposal may include a term for compromise of certain types of claims against directors of the company except claims that "are based on allegations of misrepresentations made by directors". L.W. Houlden and C.H. Morawetz, the editors of *The 2000 Annotated Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act* (Toronto: Carswell, 1999) at p. 192 are of the view that the policy behind the provision is to encourage directors of an insolvent corporation to remain in office so that the affairs of the corporation can be reorganized. I can see no similar policy interest in barring an action against an officer of the company who, prior to the insolvency, has misrepresented the financial affairs of the corporation to its creditors. It may be necessary to permit the compromise of claims against the debtor corporation, otherwise it may [page538] not be possible to successfully reorganize the corporation. The same considerations do not apply to individual officers. Rather, it would seem to me that it would be contrary to good policy to immunize officers from the consequences of their negligent statements which might otherwise be made in anticipation of being forgiven under a subsequent corporate proposal or arrangement.

(Footnote omitted)

[85] Once again, this statement must be assessed in context. Whether Justice Farley had the authority in the earlier Algoma CCAA proceedings to sanction a plan that included third-party releases was not under consideration at all. What the court was determining in NBD Bank was whether the release extended by its terms to protect a third party. In fact, on its face, it does not appear to do so. Justice Rosenberg concluded only that not allowing Mr. Melville to rely upon the release did not subvert the purpose of the CCAA. As the application judge here observed, "there is little factual similarity in NBD to the facts now before the Court" (para. 71). Contrary to the facts of this case, in NBD Bank the creditors had not agreed to grant a release to officers; they had not voted on such a release and the court had not assessed the fairness and reasonableness of such a release as a term of a complex arrangement involving significant contributions by the beneficiaries of the release -- as is the situation here. Thus, NBD Bank is of little assistance in determining whether the court has authority to sanction a plan that calls for third-party releases.

[86] The appellants also rely upon the decision of this court in *Stelco I*. There, the court was dealing with the scope of the CCAA in connection with a dispute over what were called the "Turnover Payments". Under an inter-creditor agreement, one group of creditors had subordinated their rights to another group and agreed to hold in trust and "turn over" any proceeds received from Stelco until the senior group was paid in full. On a disputed classification motion, the Subordinated Debt Holders argued that they should be in a separate class from the Senior Debt Holders. Farley J. refused to make such an order in the court below, stating:

[Sections] 4, 5 and 6 [of the CCAA] talk of compromises or arrangements between a company and its creditors. There is no mention of this extending by statute to encompass a change of relationship among the creditors vis-à-vis the creditors themselves and not directly involving the company.

(Citations omitted; emphasis added)

See *Stelco Inc. (Re)*, [2005] O.J. No. 4814, 15 C.B.R. (5th) 297 (S.C.J.), at para. 7.

[87] This court upheld that decision. The legal relationship between each group of creditors and Stelco was the same, albeit there were inter-creditor differences, and creditors were to be classified in accordance with their legal rights. In addition, the [page539] need for timely classification and voting decisions in the CCAA process militated against enmeshing the classification process in the vagaries of inter-corporate disputes. In short, the issues before the court were quite different from those raised on this appeal.

[88] Indeed, the *Stelco* plan, as sanctioned, included third-party releases (albeit uncontested ones). This court subsequently dealt with the same inter-creditor agreement on an appeal where the Subordinated Debt Holders argued that the inter-creditor subordination provisions were beyond the reach of the CCAA and, therefore, that they were entitled to a separate civil action to determine their rights under the agreement: *Stelco Inc. (Re)*, [2006] O.J. No. 1996, 21 C.B.R. (5th) 157 (C.A.) ("*Stelco II*"). The court rejected that argument and held that where the creditors' rights amongst themselves were sufficiently related to the debtor and its plan, they were properly brought within the scope of the CCAA plan. The court said (para. 11):

In [*Stelco I*] -- the classification case -- the court observed that it is not a proper use of a CCAA proceeding to determine disputes between parties other than the debtor company . . . [H]owever, the present case is not simply an inter-creditor dispute that does

not involve the debtor company; it is a dispute that is inextricably connected to the restructuring process.

(Emphasis added)

[89] The approach I would take to the disposition of this appeal is consistent with that view. As I have noted, the third-party releases here are very closely connected to the ABCP restructuring process.

[90] Some of the appellants -- particularly those represented by Mr. Woods -- rely heavily upon the decision of the Quebec Court of Appeal in *Michaud v. Steinberg*, supra. They say that it is determinative of the release issue. In *Steinberg*, the court held that the CCAA, as worded at the time, did not permit the release of directors of the debtor corporation and that third-party releases were not within the purview of the Act. Deschamps J.A. (as she then was) said (paras. 42, 54 and 58 -- English translation):

Even if one can understand the extreme pressure weighing on the creditors and the respondent at the time of the sanctioning, a plan of arrangement is not the appropriate forum to settle disputes other than the claims that are the subject of the arrangement. In other words, one cannot, under the pretext of an absence of formal directives in the Act, transform an arrangement into a potpourri.

.....

The Act offers the respondent a way to arrive at a compromise with its creditors. It does not go so far as to offer an umbrella to all the persons within its orbit by permitting them to shelter themselves from any recourse.

..... [page540]

The [CCAA] and the case law clearly do not permit extending the application of an arrangement to persons other than the respondent and its creditors and, consequently, the plan should not have been sanctioned as is [that is, including the releases of the directors].

[91] Justices Vallerand and Delisle, in separate judgments, agreed. Justice Vallerand summarized his view of the consequences of extending the scope of the CCAA to third-party releases in this fashion (para. 7):

In short, the Act will have become the Companies' and Their Officers and Employees Creditors Arrangement Act -- an awful mess -- and likely not attain its purpose, which is to enable the company to survive in the face of its creditors and through their will, and not in the face of the creditors of its officers. This is why I feel, just like my colleague, that such a clause is contrary to the Act's mode of operation, contrary to its purposes and, for this reason, is to be banned.

[92] Justice Delisle, on the other hand, appears to have rejected the releases because of their broad nature -- they released directors from all claims, including those that were altogether unrelated to their corporate duties with the debtor company -- rather than because of a lack of authority

to sanction under the Act. Indeed, he seems to have recognized the wide range of circumstances that could be included within the term "compromise or arrangement". He is the only one who addressed that term. At para., 90 he said:

The CCAA is drafted in general terms. It does not specify, among other things, what must be understood by "compromise or arrangement". However, it may be inferred from the purpose of this [A]ct that these terms encompass all that should enable the person who has recourse to it to fully dispose of his debts, both those that exist on the date when he has recourse to the statute and those contingent on the insolvency in which he finds himself . . .

(Emphasis added)

[93] The decision of the court did not reflect a view that the terms of a compromise or arrangement should "encompass all that should enable the person who has recourse to [the Act] to dispose of his debts ... and those contingent on the insolvency in which he finds himself", however. On occasion, such an outlook might embrace third parties other than the debtor and its creditors in order to make the arrangement work. Nor would it be surprising that, in such circumstances, the third parties might seek the protection of releases, or that the debtor might do so on their behalf. Thus, the perspective adopted by the majority in Steinberg, in my view, is too narrow, having regard to the language, purpose and objects of the CCAA and the intention of Parliament. They made no attempt to consider and explain why a compromise or arrangement could not include third-party releases. In addition, the decision [page541] appears to have been based, at least partly, on a rejection of the use of contract-law concepts in analyzing the Act -- an approach inconsistent with the jurisprudence referred to above.

[94] Finally, the majority in Steinberg seems to have proceeded on the basis that the CCAA cannot interfere with civil or property rights under Quebec law. Mr. Woods advanced this argument before this court in his factum, but did not press it in oral argument. Indeed, he conceded that if the Act encompasses the authority to sanction a plan containing third-party releases -- as I have concluded it does -- the provisions of the CCAA, as valid federal insolvency legislation, are paramount over provincial legislation. I shall return to the constitutional issues raised by the appellants later in these reasons.

[95] Accordingly, to the extent Steinberg stands for the proposition that the court does not have authority under the CCAA to sanction a plan that incorporates third-party releases, I do not believe it to be a correct statement of the law and I respectfully decline to follow it. The modern approach to interpretation of the Act in accordance with its nature and purpose militates against a narrow interpretation and towards one that facilitates and encourages compromises and arrangements. Had the majority in Steinberg considered the broad nature of the terms "compromise" and "arrangement" and the jurisprudence I have referred to above, they might well have come to a different conclusion.

The 1997 amendments

[96] Steinberg led to amendments to the CCAA, however. In 1997, s. 5.1 was added, dealing specifically with releases pertaining to directors of the debtor company. It states:

5.1(1) A compromise or arrangement made in respect of a debtor company may include in its terms provision for the compromise of claims against directors of the com-

pany that arose before the commencement of proceedings under this Act and that relate to the obligations of the company where the directors are by law liable in their capacity as directors for the payment of such obligations.

Exception

(2) A provision for the compromise of claims against directors may not include claims that

- (a) relate to contractual rights of one or more creditors; or
- (b) are based on allegations of misrepresentations made by directors to creditors or of wrongful or oppressive conduct by directors.

Powers of court

(3) The court may declare that a claim against directors shall not be compromised if it is satisfied that the compromise would not be fair and reasonable in the circumstances. [page542]

Resignation or removal of directors

(4) Where all of the directors have resigned or have been removed by the shareholders without replacement, any person who manages or supervises the management of the business and affairs of the debtor company shall be deemed to be a director for the purposes of this section.

[97] Perhaps the appellants' strongest argument is that these amendments confirm a prior lack of authority in the court to sanction a plan including third-party releases. If the power existed, why would Parliament feel it necessary to add an amendment specifically permitting such releases (subject to the exceptions indicated) in favour of directors? *Expressio unius est exclusio alterius*, is the Latin maxim sometimes relied on to articulate the principle of interpretation implied in that question: to express or include one thing implies the exclusion of the other.

[98] The maxim is not helpful in these circumstances, however. The reality is that there may be another explanation why Parliament acted as it did. As one commentator has noted:⁸

Far from being a rule, [the maxim *expressio unius*] is not even lexicographically accurate, because it is simply not true, generally, that the mere express conferral of a right or privilege in one kind of situation implies the denial of the equivalent right or privilege in other kinds. Sometimes it does and sometimes it does not, and whether it does or does not depends on the particular circumstances of context. Without contextual support, therefore there is not even a mild presumption here. Accordingly, the maxim is at best a description, after the fact, of what the court has discovered from context.

[99] As I have said, the 1997 amendments to the CCAA providing for releases in favour of directors of debtor companies in limited circumstances were a response to the decision of the Quebec

Court of Appeal in Steinberg. A similar amendment was made with respect to proposals in the BIA at the same time. The rationale behind these amendments was to encourage directors of an insolvent company to remain in office during a restructuring rather than resign. The assumption was that by remaining in office the directors would provide some stability while the affairs of the company were being reorganized: see Houlden and Morawetz, vol. 1, *supra*, at 2-144, E11A; Dans l'affaire de la proposition de: Le Royal Penfield inc. et Groupe Thibault Van Houtte et Associés ltée), [2003] J.Q. no. 9223, [2003] R.J.Q. 2157 (C.S.), at paras. 44-46.

[100] Parliament thus had a particular focus and a particular purpose in enacting the 1997 amendments to the CCAA and the [page543] BIA. While there is some merit in the appellants' argument on this point, at the end of the day I do not accept that Parliament intended to signal by its enactment of s. 5.1 that it was depriving the court of authority to sanction plans of compromise or arrangement in all circumstances where they incorporate third-party releases in favour of anyone other than the debtor's directors. For the reasons articulated above, I am satisfied that the court does have the authority to do so. Whether it sanctions the plan is a matter for the fairness hearing.

The deprivation of proprietary rights

[101] Mr. Shapray very effectively led the appellants' argument that legislation must not be construed so as to interfere with or prejudice established contractual or proprietary rights -- including the right to bring an action -- in the absence of a clear indication of legislative intention to that effect: Halsbury's Laws of England, 4th ed. reissue, vol. 44(1) (London: Butterworths, 1995) at paras. 1438, 1464 and 1467; Driedger, 2nd ed., *supra*, at 183; E.A. Driedger and Ruth Sullivan, Sullivan and Driedger on the Construction of Statutes, 4th ed., (Markham, Ont.: Butterworths, 2002) at 399. I accept the importance of this principle. For the reasons I have explained, however, I am satisfied that Parliament's intention to clothe the court with authority to consider and sanction a plan that contains third-party releases is expressed with sufficient clarity in the "compromise or arrangement" language of the CCAA coupled with the statutory voting and sanctioning mechanism making the provisions of the plan binding on all creditors. This is not a situation of impermissible "gap-filling" in the case of legislation severely affecting property rights; it is a question of finding meaning in the language of the Act itself. I would therefore not give effect to the appellants' submissions in this regard.

The division of powers and paramountcy

[102] Mr. Woods and Mr. Sternberg submit that extending the reach of the CCAA process to the compromise of claims as between solvent creditors of the debtor company and solvent third parties to the proceeding is constitutionally impermissible. They say that under the guise of the federal insolvency power pursuant to s. 91(21) of the Constitution Act, 1867, this approach would improperly affect the rights of civil claimants to assert their causes of action, a provincial matter falling within s. 92(13), and contravene the rules of public order pursuant to the Civil Code of Quebec. [page544]

[103] I do not accept these submissions. It has long been established that the CCAA is valid federal legislation under the federal insolvency power: Reference re: Constitutional Creditors Arrangement Act (Canada), [1934] S.C.R. 659, [1934] S.C.J. No. 46. As the Supreme Court confirmed in that case (p. 661 S.C.R.), citing Viscount Cave L.C. in *Royal Bank of Canada v. Larue*, [1928] A.C. 187 (J.C.P.C.), "the exclusive legislative authority to deal with all matters within the domain of bankruptcy and insolvency is vested in Parliament". Chief Justice Duff elaborated:

Matters normally constituting part of a bankruptcy scheme but not in their essence matters of bankruptcy and insolvency may, of course, from another point of view and in another aspect be dealt with by a provincial legislature; but, when treated as matters pertaining to bankruptcy and insolvency, they clearly fall within the legislative authority of the Dominion.

[104] That is exactly the case here. The power to sanction a plan of compromise or arrangement that contains third-party releases of the type opposed by the appellants is embedded in the wording of the CCAA. The fact that this may interfere with a claimant's right to pursue a civil action -- normally a matter of provincial concern -- or trump Quebec rules of public order is constitutionally immaterial. The CCAA is a valid exercise of federal power. Provided the matter in question falls within the legislation directly or as necessarily incidental to the exercise of that power, the CCAA governs. To the extent that its provisions are inconsistent with provincial legislation, the federal legislation is paramount. Mr. Woods properly conceded this during argument.

Conclusion with respect to legal authority

[105] For all of the foregoing reasons, then, I conclude that the application judge had the jurisdiction and legal authority to sanction the Plan as put forward.

(2) The Plan is "fair and reasonable"

[106] The second major attack on the application judge's decision is that he erred in finding that the Plan is "fair and reasonable" and in sanctioning it on that basis. This attack is centred on the nature of the third-party releases contemplated and, in particular, on the fact that they will permit the release of some claims based in fraud.

[107] Whether a plan of compromise or arrangement is fair and reasonable is a matter of mixed fact and law, and one on which the application judge exercises a large measure of discretion. The standard of review on this issue is therefore one of deference. In [page545] the absence of a demonstrable error, an appellate court will not interfere: see *Ravelston Corp. Ltd. (Re)*, [2007] O.J. No. 1389, 31 C.B.R. (5th) 233 (C.A.).

[108] I would not interfere with the application judge's decision in this regard. While the notion of releases in favour of third parties -- including leading Canadian financial institutions -- that extend to claims of fraud is distasteful, there is no legal impediment to the inclusion of a release for claims based in fraud in a plan of compromise or arrangement. The application judge had been living with and supervising the ABCP restructuring from its outset. He was intimately attuned to its dynamics. In the end, he concluded that the benefits of the Plan to the creditors as a whole, and to the debtor companies, outweighed the negative aspects of compelling the unwilling appellants to execute the releases as finally put forward.

[109] The application judge was concerned about the inclusion of fraud in the contemplated releases and at the May hearing adjourned the final disposition of the sanctioning hearing in an effort to encourage the parties to negotiate a resolution. The result was the "fraud carve-out" referred to earlier in these reasons.

[110] The appellants argue that the fraud carve-out is inadequate because of its narrow scope. It (i) applies only to ABCP Dealers; (ii) limits the type of damages that may be claimed (no punitive damages, for example); (iii) defines "fraud" narrowly, excluding many rights that would be pro-

ected by common law, equity and the Quebec concept of public order; and (iv) limits claims to representations made directly to Noteholders. The appellants submit it is contrary to public policy to sanction a plan containing such a limited restriction on the type of fraud claims that may be pursued against the third parties.

[111] The law does not condone fraud. It is the most serious kind of civil claim. There is, therefore, some force to the appellants' submission. On the other hand, as noted, there is no legal impediment to granting the release of an antecedent claim in fraud, provided the claim is in the contemplation of the parties to the release at the time it is given: *Fotini's Restaurant Corp. v. White Spot Ltd.*, [1998] B.C.J. No. 598, 38 B.L.R. (2d) 251 (S.C.), at paras. 9 and 18. There may be disputes about the scope or extent of what is released, but parties are entitled to settle allegations of fraud in civil proceedings -- the claims here all being untested allegations of fraud -- and to include releases of such claims as part of that settlement.

[112] The application judge was alive to the merits of the appellants' submissions. He was satisfied in the end, however, [page546] that the need "to avoid the potential cascade of litigation that . . . would result if a broader 'carve out' were to be allowed" (para. 113) outweighed the negative aspects of approving releases with the narrower carve-out provision. Implementation of the Plan, in his view, would work to the overall greater benefit of the Noteholders as a whole. I can find no error in principle in the exercise of his discretion in arriving at this decision. It was his call to make.

[113] At para. 71, above, I recited a number of factual findings the application judge made in concluding that approval of the Plan was within his jurisdiction under the CCAA and that it was fair and reasonable. For convenience, I reiterate them here -- with two additional findings -- because they provide an important foundation for his analysis concerning the fairness and reasonableness of the Plan. The application judge found that:

- (a) The parties to be released are necessary and essential to the restructuring of the debtor;
- (b) the claims to be released are rationally related to the purpose of the Plan and necessary for it;
- (c) the Plan cannot succeed without the releases;
- (d) the parties who are to have claims against them released are contributing in a tangible and realistic way to the Plan;
- (e) the Plan will benefit not only the debtor companies but creditor Noteholders generally;
- (f) the voting creditors who have approved the Plan did so with knowledge of the nature and effect of the releases; and that,
- (g) the releases are fair and reasonable and not overly broad or offensive to public policy.

[114] These findings are all supported on the record. Contrary to the submission of some of the appellants, they do not constitute a new and hitherto untried "test" for the sanctioning of a plan under the CCAA. They simply represent findings of fact and inferences on the part of the application judge that underpin his conclusions on jurisdiction and fairness.

[115] The appellants all contend that the obligation to release the third parties from claims in fraud, tort, breach of fiduciary duty, etc. is confiscatory and amounts to a requirement that they -- as individual creditors -- make the equivalent of a greater financial contribution to the Plan. In his

usual lively fashion, [page547] Mr. Sternberg asked us the same rhetorical question he posed to the application judge. As he put it, how could the court countenance the compromise of what in the future might turn out to be fraud perpetrated at the highest levels of Canadian and foreign banks? Several appellants complain that the proposed Plan is unfair to them because they will make very little additional recovery if the Plan goes forward, but will be required to forfeit a cause of action against third-party financial institutions that may yield them significant recovery. Others protest that they are being treated unequally because they are ineligible for relief programs that Liquidity Providers such as Canaccord have made available to other smaller investors.

[116] All of these arguments are persuasive to varying degrees when considered in isolation. The application judge did not have that luxury, however. He was required to consider the circumstances of the restructuring as a whole, including the reality that many of the financial institutions were not only acting as Dealers or brokers of the ABCP Notes (with the impugned releases relating to the financial institutions in these capacities, for the most part) but also as Asset and Liquidity Providers (with the financial institutions making significant contributions to the restructuring in these capacities).

[117] In insolvency restructuring proceedings, almost everyone loses something. To the extent that creditors are required to compromise their claims, it can always be proclaimed that their rights are being unfairly confiscated and that they are being called upon to make the equivalent of a further financial contribution to the compromise or arrangement. Judges have observed on a number of occasions that CCAA proceedings involve "a balancing of prejudices", inasmuch as everyone is adversely affected in some fashion.

[118] Here, the debtor corporations being restructured represent the issuers of the more than \$32 billion in non-bank sponsored ABCP Notes. The proposed compromise and arrangement affects that entire segment of the ABCP market and the financial markets as a whole. In that respect, the application judge was correct in adverting to the importance of the restructuring to the resolution of the ABCP liquidity crisis and to the need to restore confidence in the financial system in Canada. He was required to consider and balance the interests of all Noteholders, not just the interests of the appellants, whose notes represent only about 3 per cent of that total. That is what he did.

[119] The application judge noted, at para. 126, that the Plan represented "a reasonable balance between benefit to all Noteholders and enhanced recovery for those who can make out [page548] specific claims in fraud" within the fraud carve-out provisions of the releases. He also recognized, at para. 134, that:

No Plan of this size and complexity could be expected to satisfy all affected by it. The size of the majority who have approved it is testament to its overall fairness. No plan to address a crisis of this magnitude can work perfect equity among all stakeholders.

[120] In my view, we ought not to interfere with his decision that the Plan is fair and reasonable in all the circumstances.

D. Disposition

[121] For the foregoing reasons, I would grant leave to appeal from the decision of Justice Campbell, but dismiss the appeal.

Appeal dismissed.

SCHEDULE "A" -- CONDUITS

Apollo Trust

Apsley Trust

Aria Trust

Aurora Trust

Comet Trust

Encore Trust

Gemini Trust

Ironstone Trust

MMAI-I Trust

Newshore Canadian Trust

Opus Trust

Planet Trust

Rocket Trust

Selkirk Funding Trust

Silverstone Trust

Slate Trust

Structured Asset Trust

Structured Investment Trust III

Symphony Trust

Whitehall Trust

SCHEDULE "B" -- APPLICANTS

ATB Financial

Caisse de dépôt et placement du Québec

Canaccord Capital Corporation [page549]

Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation

Canada Post Corporation

Credit Union Central Alberta Limited

Credit Union Central of BC

Credit Union Central of Canada
Credit Union Central of Ontario
Credit Union Central of Saskatchewan
Desjardins Group
Magna International Inc.
National Bank of Canada/National Bank Financial
Inc.
NAV Canada
Northwater Capital Management Inc.
Public Sector Pension Investment Board
The Governors of the University of Alberta
SCHEDULE "C" -- COUNSEL

- (1) Benjamin Zarnett and Frederick L. Myers, for the Pan-Canadian Investors Committee
- (2) Aubrey E. Kauffman and Stuart Brotman, for 4446372 Canada Inc. and 6932819 Canada Inc.
- (3) Peter F.C. Howard, and Samaneh Hosseini, for Bank of America N.A.; Citibank N.A.; Citibank Canada, in its capacity as Credit Derivative Swap Counterparty and not in any other capacity; Deutsche Bank AG; HSBC Bank Canada; HSBC Bank USA, National Association; Merrill Lynch International; Merrill Lynch Capital Services, Inc.; Swiss Re Financial Products Corporation; and UBS AG
- (4) Kenneth T. Rosenberg, Lily Harmer, and Max Starnino, for Jura Energy Corporation and Redcorp Ventures Ltd.
- (5) Craig J. Hill and Sam P. Rappos, for the Monitors (ABCP Appeals)
- (6) Jeffrey C. Carhart and Joseph Marin, for Ad Hoc Committee and Pricewaterhouse Coopers Inc., in its capacity as Financial Advisor
- (7) Mario J. Forte, for Caisse de Dépôt et Placement du Québec
- (8) John B. Laskin, for National Bank Financial Inc. and National Bank of Canada [page550]
- (9) Thomas McRae and Arthur O. Jacques, for Ad Hoc Retail Creditors Committee (Brian Hunter, et al.)
- (10) Howard Shapray, Q.C. and Stephen Fitterman for Ivanhoe Mines Ltd.
- (11) Kevin P. McElcheran and Heather L. Meredith for Canadian Banks, BMO, CIBC RBC, Bank of Nova Scotia and T.D. Bank
- (12) Jeffrey S. Leon, for CIBC Mellon Trust Company, Computershare Trust Company of Canada and BNY Trust Company of Canada, as Indenture Trustees
- (13) Usman Sheikh, for Coventree Capital Inc.
- (14) Allan Sternberg and Sam R. Sasso, for Brookfield Asset Management and Partners Ltd. and Hy Bloom Inc. and Cardacian Mortgage Services Inc.
- (15) Neil C. Saxe, for Dominion Bond Rating Service

- (16) James A. Woods, Sébastien Richemont and Marie-Anne Paquette, for Air Transat A.T. Inc., Transat Tours Canada Inc., The Jean Coutu Group (PJC) Inc., Aéroports de Montréal, Aéroports de Montréal Capital Inc., Pomerleau Ontario Inc., Pomerleau Inc., Labopharm Inc., Agence Métropolitaine de Transport (AMT), Giro Inc., Vêtements de sports RGR Inc., 131519 Canada Inc., Tecsys Inc., New Gold Inc. and Jazz Air LP
- (17) Scott A. Turner, for Webtech Wireless Inc., Wynn Capital Corporation Inc., West Energy Ltd., Sabre Energy Ltd., Petrolifera Petroleum Ltd., Vaquero Resources Ltd., and Standard Energy Ltd.
- (18) R. Graham Phoenix, for Metcalfe & Mansfield Alternative Investments II Corp., Metcalfe & Mansfield Alternative Investments III Corp., Metcalfe & Mansfield Alternative Investments V Corp., Metcalfe & Mansfield Alternative Investments XI Corp., Metcalfe & Mansfield Alternative Investments XII Corp., Quanto Financial Corporation and Metcalfe & Mansfield Capital Corp.

Notes

1 Section 5.1 of the CCAA specifically authorizes the granting of releases to directors in certain circumstances.

2 Georgina R. Jackson and Janis P. Sarra, "Selecting the Judicial Tool to get the Job Done: An Examination of Statutory Interpretation, Discretionary Power and Inherent Jurisdiction in Insolvency Matters" in Sarra, ed., *Annual Review of Insolvency Law, 2007* (Vancouver, B.C.: Carswell, 2007).

3 Citing Gibbs J.A. in *Chef Ready Foods*, supra, at pp. 319-20 C.B.R.

4 The legislative debates at the time the CCAA was introduced in Parliament in April 1933 make it clear that the CCAA is patterned after the predecessor provisions of s. 425 of the *Companies Act 1985* (U.K.): see *House of Commons Debates* (Hansard), supra.

5 See *Canada Business Corporations Act*, R.S.C. 1985, c. C-44, s. 192; *Ontario Business Corporations Act*, R.S.O. 1990, c. B.16, s. 182.

6 A majority in number representing two-thirds in value of the creditors (s. 6).

7 Steinberg was originally reported in French: *Steinberg Inc. c. Michaud*, [1993] J.Q. no. 1076, [1993] R.J.Q. 1684 (C.A.). All paragraph references to Steinberg in this judgment are from the unofficial English translation available at 1993 CarswellQue 2055.

8 Reed Dickerson, *The Interpretation and Application of Statutes* (Boston: Little Brown and Company, 1975) at pp. 234-35, cited in Bryan A. Garner, ed., *Black's Law Dictionary*, 8th ed. (West Group, St. Paul, Minn., 2004) at p. 621.

TAB 7

Case Name:
Nortel Networks Corp. (Re)

**IN THE MATTER OF the Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act,
R.S.C. 1985, c. C-36, as amended
AND IN THE MATTER OF a Plan of Compromise or Arrangement of
Nortel Networks Corporation, Nortel Networks Limited, Nortel
Networks Global Corporation, Nortel Networks International
Corporation and Nortel Networks Technology Corporation,
Applicants**

[2010] O.J. No. 1232

2010 ONSC 1708

63 C.B.R. (5th) 44

81 C.C.P.B. 56

2010 CarswellOnt 1754

Court File No. 09-CL-7950

Ontario Superior Court of Justice
Commercial List

G.B. Morawetz J.

Heard: March 3-5, 2010.
Judgment: March 26, 2010.

(106 paras.)

Bankruptcy and insolvency law -- Property of bankrupt -- Pensions and benefits -- Motion by the applicant Nortel corporations for approval of a settlement agreement dismissed -- The settlement agreement contained a clause that stating that no party was precluded from arguing the applicability of any amendment to the Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act that changed the priority of claims -- The clause was not fair and reasonable -- The clause resulted in an agreement that did not provide certainty and did not provide finality of a fundamental priority issue -- Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act, s. 5.1(2).

Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act (CCAA) matters -- Compromises and arrangements -- Sanction by court -- Motion by the applicant Nortel corporations for approval of a settlement agreement dismissed -- The settlement agreement contained a clause that stating that no party was precluded from arguing the applicability of any amendment to the Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act that changed the priority of claims -- The clause was not fair and reasonable -- The clause resulted in an agreement that did not provide certainty and did not provide finality of a fundamental priority issue -- Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act, s. 5.1(2).

Motion by the applicant Nortel corporations for approval of a settlement agreement. The settlement agreement provided for the termination of pension payments and the termination of benefits paid through Nortel's Health and Welfare Trust (HWT). The applicants were granted a stay of proceedings on January 14, 2009, pursuant to the Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act, but had continued to provide the HWT benefits and had continued contributions and special payments to the pension plans. The opposing long-term disability employees opposed the settlement agreement, principally as a result of the inclusion of a release of Nortel and its successors, advisors, directors and officers, from all future claims regarding the pension plans and the HWT in the absence of fraud. The Official Committee of Unsecured Creditors of Nortel Networks Inc. ("UCC"), and the informal Nortel Noteholder Group (the "Noteholders") opposed Clause H.2 of the settlement agreement. Clause H.2 stated that no party was precluded from arguing the applicability of any amendment to the Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act that changed the priority of claims. The Monitor supported the Settlement Agreement, submitting that it was necessary to allow the Applicants to wind down operations and to develop a plan of arrangement. The CAW and Board of Directors of Nortel also supported the settlement agreement.

HELD: Motion dismissed. Cause H.2 was not fair and reasonable. Clause H.2 resulted in an agreement that did not provide certainty and did not provide finality of a fundamental priority issue. The third party releases were necessary and connected to a resolution of the claims against the applicants, benefited creditors generally and were not overly broad or offensive to public policy.

Statutes, Regulations and Rules Cited:

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

Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act, R.S.C. 1985, c. C-36, s. 5.1(2)

Counsel:

Derrick Tay, Jennifer Stam and Suzanne Wood, for the Applicants.

Lyndon Barnes and Adam Hirsh, for the Nortel Directors.

Benjamin Zarnett, Gale Rubenstein, C. Armstrong and Melaney Wagner, for Ernst & Young Inc., Monitor.

Arthur O. Jacques, for the Nortel Canada Current Employees.

Deborah McPhail, for the Superintendent of Financial Services (non-PBGF).

Mark Zigler and Susan Philpott, for the Former and Long-Term Disability Employees.

Ken Rosenberg and M. Starnino, for the Superintendent of Financial Services in its capacity as Administrator of the Pension Benefit Guarantee Fund.

S. Richard Orzy and Richard B. Swan, for the Informal Nortel Noteholder Group.

Alex MacFarlane and Mark Dunsmuir, for the Unsecured Creditors' Committee of Nortel Networks Inc.

Leanne Williams, for Flextronics Inc.

Barry Wadsworth, for the CAW-Canada.

Pamela Huff, for the Northern Trust Company, Canada.

Joel P. Rochon and Sakie Tambakos, for the Opposing Former and Long-Term Disability Employees.

Robin B. Schwill, for the Nortel Networks UK Limited (In Administration).

Sorin Gabriel Radulescu, In Person.

Guy Martin, In Person, on behalf of Marie Josee Perrault.

Peter Burns, In Person.

Stan and Barbara Arnelien, In Person.

ENDORSEMENT

G.B. MORAWETZ J.:-

INTRODUCTION

1 On January 14, 2009, Nortel Networks Corporation ("NNC"), Nortel Networks Limited ("NNL"), Nortel Networks Global Corporation, Nortel Networks International Corporation and Nortel Networks Technology Corporation (collectively, the "Applicants") were granted a stay of proceedings pursuant to the *Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act* ("CCAA") and Ernst & Young Inc. was appointed as Monitor.

2 The Applicants have historically operated a number of pension, benefit and other plans (both funded and unfunded) for their employees and pensioners, including:

- (i) Pension benefits through two registered pension plans, the Nortel Networks Limited Managerial and Non-Negotiated Pension Plan and the Nortel Networks Negotiated Pension Plan (the "Pension Plans"); and
- (ii) Medical, dental, life insurance, long-term disability and survivor income and transition benefits paid, except for survivor termination benefits, through Nortel's Health and Welfare Trust (the "HWT").

3 Since the CCAA filing, the Applicants have continued to provide medical, dental and other benefits, through the HWT, to pensioners and employees on long-term disability ("Former and LTD

Employees") and active employees ("HWT Payments") and have continued all current service contributions and special payments to the Pension Plans ("Pension Payments").

4 Pension Payments and HWT Payments made by the Applicants to the Former and LTD Employees while under CCAA protection are largely discretionary. As a result of Nortel's insolvency and the significant reduction in the size of Nortel's operations, the unfortunate reality is that, at some point, cessation of such payments is inevitable. The Applicants have attempted to address this situation by entering into a settlement agreement (the "Settlement Agreement") dated as of February 8, 2010, among the Applicants, the Monitor, the Former Employees' Representatives (on their own behalf and on behalf of the parties they represent), the LTD Representative (on her own behalf and on behalf of the parties she represents), Representative Settlement Counsel and the CAW-Canada (the "Settlement Parties").

5 The Applicants have brought this motion for approval of the Settlement Agreement. From the standpoint of the Applicants, the purpose of the Settlement Agreement is to provide for a smooth transition for the termination of Pension Payments and HWT Payments. The Applicants take the position that the Settlement Agreement represents the best efforts of the Settlement Parties to negotiate an agreement and is consistent with the spirit and purpose of the CCAA.

6 The essential terms of the Settlement Agreement are as follows:

- (a) until December 31, 2010, medical, dental and life insurance benefits will be funded on a pay-as-you-go basis to the Former and LTD Employees;
- (b) until December 31, 2010, LTD Employees and those entitled to receive survivor income benefits will receive income benefits on a pay-as-you-go basis;
- (c) the Applicants will continue to make current service payments and special payments to the Pension Plans in the same manner as they have been doing over the course of the proceedings under the CCAA, through to March 31, 2010, in the aggregate amount of \$2,216,254 per month and that thereafter and through to September 30, 2010, the Applicants shall make only current service payments to the Pension Plans, in the aggregate amount of \$379,837 per month;
- (d) any allowable pension claims, in these or subsequent proceedings, concerning any Nortel Worldwide Entity, including the Applicants, shall rank *pari passu* with ordinary, unsecured creditors of Nortel, and no part of any such HWT claims shall rank as a preferential or priority claim or shall be the subject of a constructive trust or trust of any nature or kind;
- (e) proofs of claim asserting priority already filed by any of the Settlement Parties, or the Superintendent on behalf of the Pension Benefits Guarantee Fund are disallowed in regard to the claim for priority;
- (f) any allowable HWT claims made in these or subsequent proceedings shall rank *pari passu* with ordinary unsecured creditors of Nortel;
- (g) the Settlement Agreement does not extinguish the claims of the Former and LTD Employees;
- (h) Nortel and, *inter alia*, its successors, advisors, directors and officers, are released from all future claims regarding Pension Plans and the HWT, provided that nothing in the release shall release a director of the Applicants

from any matter referred to in subsection 5.1(2) of the CCAA or with respect to fraud on the part of any Releasee, with respect to that Releasee only;

- (i) upon the expiry of all appeals and rights of appeal in respect thereof, Representative Settlement Counsel will withdraw their application for leave to appeal the decision of the Court of Appeal, dated November 26, 2009, to the Supreme Court of Canada on a with prejudice basis;¹
- (j) a CCAA plan of arrangement in the Nortel proceedings will not be proposed or approved if that plan does not treat the Pension and HWT claimants *pari passu* to the other ordinary, unsecured creditors ("Clause H.1"); and
- (k) if there is a subsequent amendment to the *Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act* ("BIA") that "changes the current, relative priorities of the claims against Nortel, no party is precluded by this Settlement Agreement from arguing the applicability" of that amendment to the claims ceded in this Agreement ("Clause H.2").

7 The Settlement Agreement does *not* relate to a distribution of the HWT as the Settlement Parties have agreed to work towards developing a Court-approved distribution of the HWT corpus in 2010.

8 The Applicants' motion is supported by the Settlement Parties and by the Board of Directors of Nortel.

9 The Official Committee of Unsecured Creditors of Nortel Networks Inc. ("UCC"), the informal Nortel Noteholder Group (the "Noteholders"), and a group of 37 LTD Employees (the "Opposing LTD Employees") oppose the Settlement Agreement.

10 The UCC and Noteholders oppose the Settlement Agreement, principally as a result of the inclusion of Clause H.2.

11 The Opposing LTD Employees oppose the Settlement Agreement, principally as a result of the inclusion of the third party releases referenced in [6h] above.

THE FACTS

A. Status of Nortel's Restructuring

12 Although it was originally hoped that the Applicants would be able to restructure their business, in June 2009 the decision was made to change direction and pursue sales of Nortel's various businesses.

13 In response to Nortel's change in strategic direction and the impending sales, Nortel announced on August 14, 2009 a number of organizational updates and changes including the creation of groups to support transitional services and management during the sales process.

14 Since June 2009, Nortel has closed two major sales and announced a third. As a result of those transactions, approximately 13,000 Nortel employees have been or will be transferred to purchaser companies. That includes approximately 3,500 Canadian employees.

15 Due to the ongoing sales of Nortel's business units and the streamlining of Nortel's operations, it is expected that by the close of 2010, the Applicants' workforce will be reduced to only 475 employees. There is a need to wind-down and rationalize benefits and pension processes.

16 Given Nortel's insolvency, the significant reduction in Nortel's operations and the complexity and size of the Pension Plans, both Nortel and the Monitor believe that the continuation and funding of the Pension Plans and continued funding of medical, dental and other benefits is not a viable option.

B. The Settlement Agreement

17 On February 8, 2010 the Applicants announced that a settlement had been reached on issues related to the Pension Plans, and the HWT and certain employment related issues.

18 Recognizing the importance of providing notice to those who will be impacted by the Settlement Agreement, including the Former Employees, the LTD Employees, unionized employees, continuing employees and the provincial pension plan regulators ("Affected Parties"), Nortel brought a motion to this Court seeking the approval of an extensive notice and opposition process.

19 On February 9, 2010, this Court approved the notice program for the announcement and disclosure of the Settlement (the "Notice Order").

20 As more fully described in the Monitor's Thirty-Sixth, Thirty-Ninth and Thirty-Ninth Supplementary Reports, the Settlement Parties have taken a number of steps to notify the Affected Parties about the Settlement.

21 In addition to the Settlement Agreement, the Applicants, the Monitor and the Superintendent, in his capacity as administrator of the Pension Benefits Guarantee Fund, entered into a letter agreement on February 8, 2010, with respect to certain matters pertaining to the Pension Plans (the "Letter Agreement").

22 The Letter Agreement provides that the Superintendent will not oppose an order approving the Settlement Agreement ("Settlement Approval Order"). Additionally, the Monitor and the Applicants will take steps to complete an orderly transfer of the Pension Plans to a new administrator to be appointed by the Superintendent effective October 1, 2010. Finally, the Superintendent will not oppose any employee incentive program that the Monitor deems reasonable and necessary or the creation of a trust with respect to claims or potential claims against persons who accept directorships of a Nortel Worldwide Entity in order to facilitate the restructuring.

POSITIONS OF THE PARTIES ON THE SETTLEMENT AGREEMENT

The Applicants

23 The Applicants take the position that the Settlement is fair and reasonable and balances the interests of the parties and other affected constituencies equitably. In this regard, counsel submits that the Settlement:

- (a) eliminates uncertainty about the continuation and termination of benefits to pensioners, LTD Employees and survivors, thereby reducing hardship and disruption;

- (b) eliminates the risk of costly and protracted litigation regarding Pension Claims and HWT Claims, leading to reduced costs, uncertainty and potential disruption to the development of a Plan;
- (c) prevents disruption in the transition of benefits for current employees;
- (d) provides early payments to terminated employees in respect of their termination and severance claims where such employees would otherwise have had to wait for the completion of a claims process and distribution out of the estates;
- (e) assists with the commitment and retention of remaining employees essential to complete the Applicants' restructuring; and
- (f) does not eliminate Pension Claims or HWT Claims against the Applicants, but maintains their quantum and validity as ordinary and unsecured claims.

24 Alternatively, absent the approval of the Settlement Agreement, counsel to the Applicants submits that the Applicants are not required to honour such benefits or make such payments and such benefits could cease immediately. This would cause undue hardship to beneficiaries and increased uncertainty for the Applicants and other stakeholders.

25 The Applicants state that a central objective in the Settlement Agreement is to allow the Former and LTD Employees to transition to other sources of support.

26 In the absence of the approval of the Settlement Agreement or some other agreement, a cessation of benefits will occur on March 31, 2010 which would have an immediate negative impact on Former and LTD Employees. The Applicants submit that extending payments to the end of 2010 is the best available option to allow recipients to order their affairs.

27 Counsel to the Applicants submits that the Settlement Agreement brings Nortel closer to finalizing a plan of arrangement, which is consistent with the spirit and purpose of the CCAA. The Settlement Agreement resolves uncertainties associated with the outstanding Former and LTD Employee claims. The Settlement Agreement balances certainty with clarity, removing litigation risk over priority of claims, which properly balances the interests of the parties, including both creditors and debtors.

28 Regarding the priority of claims going forward, the Applicants submit that because a deemed trust, such as the HWT, is not enforceable in bankruptcy, the Former and LTD Employees are by default *pari passu* with other unsecured creditors.

29 In response to the Noteholders' concern that bankruptcy prior to October 2010 would create pension liabilities on the estate, the Applicants committed that they would not voluntarily enter into bankruptcy proceedings prior to October 2010. Further, counsel to the Applicants submits the court determines whether a bankruptcy order should be made if involuntary proceedings are commenced.

30 Further, counsel to the Applicants submits that the court has the jurisdiction to release third parties under a Settlement Agreement where the releases (1) are connected to a resolution of the debtor's claims, (2) will benefit creditors generally and (3) are not overly broad or offensive to public policy. See *Re Metcalfe & Mansfield Alternative Investments II Corp.* (2008), 92 O.R. (3d) 513 (C.A.), [*Metcalfe*] at para. 71, leave to appeal refused, [2008] S.C.C.A. No. 337 and *Re Grace* [2008] O.J. No. 4208 (S.C.J.) [*Grace 2008*] at para. 40.

31 The Applicants submit that a settlement of the type put forward should be approved if it is consistent with the spirit and purpose of the CCAA and is fair and reasonable in all the circumstances. Elements of fairness and reasonableness include balancing the interests of parties, including any objecting creditor or creditors, equitably (although not necessarily equally); and ensuring that the agreement is beneficial to the debtor and its stakeholders generally, as per *Re Air Canada*, [2003] O.J. No. 5319 (S.C.J.) [*Air Canada*]. The Applicants assert that this test is met.

The Monitor

32 The Monitor supports the Settlement Agreement, submitting that it is necessary to allow the Applicants to wind down operations and to develop a plan of arrangement. The Monitor submits that the Settlement Agreement provides certainty, and does so with input from employee stakeholders. These stakeholders are represented by Employee Representatives as mandated by the court and these Employee Representatives were given the authority to approve such settlements on behalf of their constituents.

33 The Monitor submits that Clause H.2 was bargained for, and that the employees did give up rights in order to have that clause in the Settlement Agreement; particularly, it asserts that Clause H.1 is the counterpoint to Clause H.2. In this regard, the Settlement Agreement is fair and reasonable.

34 The Monitor asserts that the court may either (1) approve the Settlement Agreement, (2) not approve the Settlement Agreement, or (3) not approve the Settlement Agreement but provide practical comments on the applicability of Clause H.2.

Former and LTD Employees

35 The Former Employees' Representatives' constituents number an estimated 19,458 people. The LTD Employees number an estimated 350 people between the LTD Employee's Representative and the CAW-Canada, less the 37 people in the Opposing LTD Employee group.

36 Representative Counsel to the Former and LTD Employees acknowledges that Nortel is insolvent, and that much uncertainty and risk comes from insolvency. They urge that the Settlement Agreement be considered within the scope of this reality. The alternative to the Settlement Agreement is costly litigation and significant uncertainty.

37 Representative Counsel submits that the Settlement Agreement is fair and reasonable for all creditors, but especially the represented employees. Counsel notes that employees under Nortel are unique creditors under these proceedings, as they are not sophisticated creditors and their personal welfare depends on receiving distributions from Nortel. The Former and LTD Employees assert that this is the best agreement they could have negotiated.

38 Representative Counsel submits that bargaining away of the right to litigate against directors and officers of the corporation, as well as the trustee of the HWT, are examples of the concessions that have been made. They also point to the giving up of the right to make priority claims upon distribution of Nortel's estate and the HWT, although the claim itself is not extinguished. In exchange, the Former and LTD Employees will receive guaranteed coverage until the end of 2010. The Former and LTD Employees submit that having money in hand today is better than uncertainty going forward, and that, on balance, this Settlement Agreement is fair and reasonable.

39 In response to allegations that third party releases unacceptably compromise employees' rights, Representative Counsel accepts that this was a concession, but submits that it was satisfac-

tory because the claims given up are risky, costly and very uncertain. The releases do not go beyond s. 5.1(2) of the CCAA, which disallows releases relating to misrepresentations and wrongful or oppressive conduct by directors. Releases as to deemed trust claims are also very uncertain and were acceptably given up in exchange for other considerations.

40 The Former and LTD Employees submit that the inclusion of Clause H.2 was essential to their approval of the Settlement Agreement. They characterize Clause H.2 as a no prejudice clause to protect the employees by not releasing any future potential benefit. Removing Clause H.2 from the Settlement Agreement would be not the approval of an agreement, but rather the creation of an entirely new Settlement Agreement. Counsel submits that without Clause H.2, the Former and LTD Employees would not be signatories.

CAW

41 The CAW supports the Settlement Agreement. It characterizes the agreement as Nortel's recognition that it has a moral and legal obligation to its employees, whose rights are limited by the laws in this country. The Settlement Agreement temporarily alleviates the stress and uncertainty its constituents feel over the winding up of their benefits and is satisfied with this result.

42 The CAW notes that some members feel they were not properly apprised of the facts, but all available information has been disclosed, and the concessions made by the employee groups were not made lightly.

Board of Directors

43 The Board of Directors of Nortel supports the Settlement Agreement on the basis that it is a practical resolution with compromises on both sides.

Opposing LTD Employees

44 Mr. Rochon appeared as counsel for the Opposing LTD Employees, notwithstanding that these individuals did not opt out of having Representative Counsel or were represented by the CAW. The submissions of the Opposing LTD Employees were compelling and the court extends its appreciation to Mr. Rochon and his team in co-ordinating the representatives of this group.

45 The Opposing LTD Employees put forward the position that the cessation of their benefits will lead to extreme hardship. Counsel submits that the Settlement Agreement conflicts with the spirit and purpose of the CCAA because the LTD Employees are giving up legal rights in relation to a \$100 million shortfall of benefits. They urge the court to consider the unique circumstances of the LTD Employees as they are the people hardest hit by the cessation of benefits.

46 The Opposing LTD Employees assert that the HWT is a true trust, and submit that breaches of that trust create liabilities and that the claim should not be released. Specifically, they point to a \$37 million shortfall in the HWT that they should be able to pursue.

47 Regarding the third party releases, the Opposing LTD Employees assert that Nortel is attempting to avoid the distraction of third party litigation, rather than look out for the best interests of the Former and LTD Employees. The Opposing LTD Employees urge the court not to release the only individuals the Former and LTD Employees can hold accountable for any breaches of trust. Counsel submits that Nortel has a common law duty to fund the HWT, which the Former and LTD Employees should be allowed to pursue.

48 Counsel asserts that allowing these releases (a) is not necessary and essential to the restructuring of the debtor, (b) does not relate to the insolvency process, (c) is not required for the success of the Settlement Agreement, (d) does not meet the requirement that each party contribute to the plan in a material way and (e) is overly broad and therefore not fair and reasonable.

49 Finally, the Opposing LTD Employees oppose the *pari passu* treatment they will be subjected to under the Settlement Agreement, as they have a true trust which should grant them priority in the distribution process. Counsel was not able to provide legal authority for such a submission.

50 A number of Opposing LTD Employees made in person submissions. They do not share the view that Nortel will act in their best interests, nor do they feel that the Employee Representatives or Representative Counsel have acted in their best interests. They shared feelings of uncertainty, helplessness and despair. There is affidavit evidence that certain individuals will be unable to support themselves once their benefits run out, and they will not have time to order their affairs. They expressed frustration and disappointment in the CCAA process.

UCC

51 The UCC was appointed as the representative for creditors in the U.S. Chapter 11 proceedings. It represents creditors who have significant claims against the Applicants. The UCC opposes the motion, based on the inclusion of Clause H.2, but otherwise the UCC supports the Settlement Agreement.

52 Clause H.2, the UCC submits, removes the essential element of finality that a settlement agreement is supposed to include. The UCC characterizes Clause H.2 as a take back provision; if activated, the Former and LTD Employees have compromised nothing, to the detriment of other unsecured creditors. A reservation of rights removes the finality of the Settlement Agreement.

53 The UCC claims it, not Nortel, bears the risk of Clause H.2. As the largest unsecured creditor, counsel submits that a future change to the BIA could subsume the UCC's claim to the Former and LTD Employees and the UCC could end up with nothing at all, depending on Nortel's asset sales.

Noteholders

54 The Noteholders are significant creditors of the Applicants. The Noteholders oppose the settlement because of Clause H.2, for substantially the same reasons as the UCC.

55 Counsel to the Noteholders submits that the inclusion of H.2 is prejudicial to the non-employee unsecured creditors, including the Noteholders. Counsel submits that the effect of the Settlement Agreement is to elevate the Former and LTD Employees, providing them a payout of \$57 million over nine months while everyone else continues to wait, and preserves their rights in the event the laws are amended in future. Counsel to the Noteholders submits that the Noteholders forego millions of dollars while remaining exposed to future claims.

56 The Noteholders assert that a proper settlement agreement must have two elements: a real compromise, and resolution of the matters in contention. In this case, counsel submits that there is no resolution because there is no finality in that Clause H.2 creates ambiguity about the future. The very object of a Settlement Agreement, assert the Noteholders, is to avoid litigation by withdrawing claims, which this agreement does not do.

Superintendent

57 The Superintendent does not oppose the relief sought, but this position is based on the form of the Settlement Agreement that is before the Court.

Northern Trust

58 Northern Trust, the trustee of the pension plans and HWT, takes no position on the Settlement Agreement as it takes instructions from Nortel. Northern Trust indicates that an oversight left its name off the third party release and asks for an amendment to include it as a party released by the Settlement Agreement.

LAW AND ANALYSIS

A. Representation and Notice Were Proper

59 It is well settled that the Former Employees' Representatives and the LTD Representative (collectively, the "Settlement Employee Representatives") and Representative Counsel have the authority to represent the Former Employees and the LTD Beneficiaries for purposes of entering into the Settlement Agreement on their behalf: *see Grace 2008, supra* at para. 32.

60 The court appointed the Settlement Employee Representatives and the Representative Settlement Counsel. These appointment orders have not been varied or appealed. Unionized employees continue to be represented by the CAW. The Orders appointing the Settlement Employee Representatives expressly gave them authority to represent their constituencies "for the purpose of settling or compromising claims" in these Proceedings. Former Employees and LTD Employees were given the right to opt out of their representation by Representative Settlement Counsel. After provision of notice, only one former employee and one active employee exercised the opt-out right.

B. Effect of the Settlement Approval Order

61 In addition to the binding effect of the Settlement Agreement, many additional parties will be bound and affected by the Settlement Approval Order. Counsel to the Applicants submits that the binding nature of the Settlement Approval Order on all affected parties is a crucial element to the Settlement itself. In order to ensure all Affected Parties had notice, the Applicants obtained court approval of their proposed notice program.

62 Even absent such extensive noticing, virtually all employees of the Applicants are represented in these proceedings. In addition to the representative authority of the Settlement Employee Representatives and Representative Counsel as noted above, Orders were made authorizing a Nortel Canada Continuing Employees' Representative and Nortel Canada Continuing Employees' Representative Counsel to represent the interests of continuing employees on this motion.

63 I previously indicated that "the overriding objective of appointing representative counsel for employees is to ensure that the employees have representation in the CCAA process": *Re Nortel Networks Corp.*, [2009] O.J. No. 2529 at para. 16. I am satisfied that this objective has been achieved.

64 The Record establishes that the Monitor has undertaken a comprehensive notice process which has included such notice to not only the Former Employees, the LTD Employees, the unionized employees and the continuing employees but also the provincial pension regulators and has given the opportunity for any affected person to file Notices of Appearance and appear before this court on this motion.

65 I am satisfied that the notice process was properly implemented by the Monitor.

66 I am satisfied that Representative Counsel has represented their constituents' interests in accordance with their mandate, specifically, in connection with the negotiation of the Settlement Agreement and the draft Settlement Approval Order and appearance on this Motion. There have been intense discussions, correspondence and negotiations among Representative Counsel, the Monitor, the Applicants, the Superintendent, counsel to the Board of the Applicants, the Noteholder Group and the Committee with a view to developing a comprehensive settlement. NCCE's Representative Counsel have been apprised of the settlement discussions and served with notice of this Motion. Representatives have held Webinar sessions and published press releases to inform their constituents about the Settlement Agreement and this Motion.

C. Jurisdiction to Approve the Settlement Agreement

67 The CCAA is a flexible statute that is skeletal in nature. It has been described as a "sketch, an outline, a supporting framework for the resolution of corporate insolvencies in the public interest". *Re Nortel*, [2009] O.J. No. 3169 (S.C.J.) at paras. 28-29, citing *Metcalf*, *supra*, at paras. 44 and 61.

68 Three sources for the court's authority to approve pre-plan agreements have been recognized:

- (a) the power of the court to impose terms and conditions on the granting of a stay under s. 11(4) of the CCAA;
- (b) the power of the court to make an order "on such terms as it may impose" pursuant to s. 11(4) of the CCAA; and
- (c) the inherent jurisdiction of the court to "fill in the gaps" of the CCAA in order to give effect to its objects: see *Re Nortel*, [2009] O.J. No. 3169 (S.C.J.) at para. 30, citing *Re Canadian Red Cross Society*, [1998] O.J. No. 3306 (Gen. Div.) [*Canadian Red Cross*] at para. 43; *Metcalf*, *supra* at para. 44.

69 In *Re Stelco Inc.*, (2005), 78 O.R. (3d) 254 (C.A.), the Ontario Court of Appeal considered the court's jurisdiction under the CCAA to approve agreements, determining at para. 14 that it is not limited to preserving the *status quo*. Further, agreements made prior to the finalization of a plan or compromise are valid orders for the court to approve: *Grace 2008*, *supra* at para. 34.

70 In these proceedings, this court has confirmed its jurisdiction to approve major transactions, including settlement agreements, during the stay period defined in the Initial Order and prior to the proposal of any plan of compromise or arrangement: see, for example, *Re Nortel*, [2009] O.J. No. 5582 (S.C.J.); *Re Nortel* [2009] O.J. 5582 (S.C.J.) and *Re Nortel*, 2010 ONSC 1096 (S.C.J.).

71 I am satisfied that this court has jurisdiction to approve transactions, including settlements, in the course of overseeing proceedings during a CCAA stay period and prior to any plan of arrangement being proposed to creditors: see *Re Calpine Canada Energy Ltd.*, [2007] A.J. No. 917 (C.A.) [*Calpine*] at para. 23, affirming [2007] A.J. No. 923 (Q.B.); *Canadian Red Cross*, *supra*; *Air Canada*, *supra*; *Grace 2008*, *supra*, and *Re Grace Canada* [2010] O.J. No. 62 (S.C.J.) [*Grace 2010*], leave to appeal to the C.A. refused February 19, 2010; *Re Nortel*, 2010 ONSC 1096 (S.C.J.).

D. Should the Settlement Agreement Be Approved?

72 Having been satisfied that this court has the jurisdiction to approve the Settlement Agreement, I must consider whether the Settlement Agreement *should* be approved.

73 A Settlement Agreement can be approved if it is consistent with the spirit and purpose of the CCAA and is fair and reasonable in all circumstances. What makes a settlement agreement fair and reasonable is its balancing of the interests of all parties; its equitable treatment of the parties, including creditors who are not signatories to a settlement agreement; and its benefit to the Applicant and its stakeholders generally.

i) Spirit and Purpose

74 The CCAA is a flexible instrument; part of its purpose is to allow debtors to balance the conflicting interests of stakeholders. The Former and LTD Employees are significant creditors and have a unique interest in the settlement of their claims. This Settlement Agreement brings these creditors closer to ultimate settlement while accommodating their special circumstances. It is consistent with the spirit and purpose of the CCAA.

ii) Balancing of Parties' Interests

75 There is no doubt that the Settlement Agreement is comprehensive and that it has support from a number of constituents when considered in its totality.

76 There is, however, opposition from certain constituents on two aspects of the proposed Settlement Agreement: (1) the Opposing LTD Employees take exception to the inclusion of the third party releases; (2) the UCC and Noteholder Groups take exception to the inclusion of Clause H.2.

Third Party Releases

77 Representative Counsel, after examining documentation pertaining to the Pension Plans and HWT, advised the Former Employees' Representatives and Disabled Employees' Representative that claims against directors of Nortel for failing to properly fund the Pension Plans were unlikely to succeed. Further, Representative Counsel advised that claims against directors or others named in the Third Party Releases to fund the Pension Plans were risky and could take years to resolve, perhaps unsuccessfully. This assisted the Former Employees' Representatives and the Disabled Employees' Representative in agreeing to the Third Party Releases.

78 The conclusions reached and the recommendations made by both the Monitor and Representative Counsel are consistent. They have been arrived at after considerable study of the issues and, in my view, it is appropriate to give significant weight to their positions.

79 In *Grace 2008, supra*, and *Grace 2010, supra*, I indicated that a Settlement Agreement entered into with Representative Counsel that contains third party releases is fair and reasonable where the releases are necessary and connected to a resolution of claims against the debtor, will benefit creditors generally and are not overly broad or offensive to public policy.

80 In this particular case, I am satisfied that the releases are necessary and connected to a resolution of claims against the Applicants.

81 The releases benefit creditors generally as they reduces the risk of litigation against the Applicants and their directors, protect the Applicants against potential contribution claims and indemnity claims by certain parties, including directors, officers and the HWT Trustee; and reduce the risk of delay caused by potentially complex litigation and associated depletion of assets to fund potentially significant litigation costs.

82 Further, in my view, the releases are not overly broad or offensive to public policy. The claims being released specifically relate to the subject matter of the Settlement Agreement. The parties granting the release receive consideration in the form of both immediate compensation and the maintenance of their rights in respect to the distribution of claims.

Clause H.2

83 The second aspect of the Settlement Agreement that is opposed is the provision known as Clause H.2. Clause H.2 provides that, in the event of a bankruptcy of the Applicants, and notwithstanding any provision of the Settlement Agreement, if there are any amendments to the BIA that change the current, relative priorities of the claims against the Applicants, no party is precluded from arguing the applicability or non-applicability of any such amendment in relation to any such claim.

84 The Noteholders and UCC assert that Clause H.2 causes the Settlement Agreement to not be a "settlement" in the true and proper sense of that term due to a lack of certainty and finality. They emphasize that Clause H.2 has the effect of undercutting the essential compromises of the Settlement Agreement in imposing an unfair risk on the non-employee creditors of NNL, including NNI, after substantial consideration has been paid to the employees.

85 This position is, in my view, well founded. The inclusion of the Clause H.2 creates, rather than eliminates, uncertainty. It creates the potential for a fundamental alteration of the Settlement Agreement.

86 The effect of the Settlement Agreement is to give the Former and LTD Employees preferred treatment for certain claims, notwithstanding that priority is not provided for in the statute nor has it been recognized in case law. In exchange for this enhanced treatment, the Former Employees and LTD Beneficiaries have made certain concessions.

87 The Former and LTD Employees recognize that substantially all of these concessions could be clawed back through Clause H.2. Specifically, they acknowledge that future Pension and HWT Claims will rank *pari passu* with the claims of other ordinary unsecured creditors, but then go on to say that should the BIA be amended, they may assert once again a priority claim.

88 Clause H.2 results in an agreement that does not provide certainty and does not provide finality of a fundamental priority issue.

89 The Settlement Parties, as well as the Noteholders and the UCC, recognize that there are benefits associated with resolving a number of employee-related issues, but the practical effect of Clause H.2 is that the issue is not fully resolved. In my view, Clause H.2 is somewhat inequitable from the standpoint of the other unsecured creditors of the Applicants. If the creditors are to be bound by the Settlement Agreement, they are entitled to know, with certainty and finality, the effect of the Settlement Agreement.

90 It is not, in my view, reasonable to require creditors to, in effect, make concessions in favour of the Former and LTD Employees today, and be subject to the uncertainty of unknown legislation in the future.

91 One of the fundamental purposes of the CCAA is to facilitate a process for a compromise of debt. A compromise needs certainty and finality. Clause H.2 does not accomplish this objective. The inclusion of Clause H.2 does not recognize that at some point settlement negotiations cease and parties bound by the settlement have to accept the outcome. A comprehensive settlement of claims

in the magnitude and complexity contemplated by the Settlement Agreement should not provide an opportunity to re-trade the deal after the fact.

92 The Settlement Agreement should be fair and reasonable in all the circumstances. It should balance the interests of the Settlement Parties and other affected constituencies equitably and should be beneficial to the Applicants and their stakeholders generally.

93 It seems to me that Clause H.2 fails to recognize the interests of the other creditors of the Applicants. These creditors have claims that rank equally with the claims of the Former Employees and LTD Employees. Each have unsecured claims against the Applicants. The Settlement Agreement provides for a transfer of funds to the benefit of the Former Employees and LTD Employees at the expense of the remaining creditors. The establishment of the Payments Charge crystallized this agreed upon preference, but Clause H.2 has the effect of not providing any certainty of outcome to the remaining creditors.

94 I do not consider Clause H.2 to be fair and reasonable in the circumstances.

95 In light of this conclusion, the Settlement Agreement cannot be approved in its current form.

96 Counsel to the Noteholder Group also made submissions that three other provisions of the Settlement Agreement were unreasonable and unfair, namely:

- (i) ongoing exposure to potential liability for pension claims if a bankruptcy order is made before October 1, 2010;
- (ii) provisions allowing payments made to employees to be credited against employees' claims made, rather than from future distributions or not to be credited at all; and
- (iii) lack of clarity as to whether the proposed order is binding on the Superintendent in all of his capacities under the *Pension Benefits Act* and other applicable law, and not merely in his capacity as Administrator on behalf of the Pension Benefits Guarantee Fund.

97 The third concern was resolved at the hearing with the acknowledgement by counsel to the Superintendent that the proposed order would be binding on the Superintendent in all of his capacities.

98 With respect to the concern regarding the potential liability for pension claims if a bankruptcy order is made prior to October 1, 2010, counsel for the Applicants undertook that the Applicants would not take any steps to file a voluntary assignment into bankruptcy prior to October 1, 2010. Although such acknowledgment does not bind creditors from commencing involuntary bankruptcy proceedings during this time period, the granting of any bankruptcy order is preceded by a court hearing. The Noteholders would be in a position to make submissions on this point, if so advised. This concern of the Noteholders is not one that would cause me to conclude that the Settlement Agreement was unreasonable and unfair.

99 Finally, the Noteholder Group raised concerns with respect to the provision which would allow payments made to employees to be credited against employees' claims made, rather than from future distributions, or not to be credited at all. I do not view this provision as being unreasonable and unfair. Rather, it is a term of the Settlement Agreement that has been negotiated by the Settle-

ment Parties. I do note that the proposed treatment with respect to any payments does provide certainty and finality and, in my view, represents a reasonable compromise in the circumstances.

DISPOSITION

100 I recognize that the proposed Settlement Agreement was arrived at after hard-fought and lengthy negotiations. There are many positive aspects of the Settlement Agreement. I have no doubt that the parties to the Settlement Agreement consider that it represents the best agreement achievable under the circumstances. However, it is my conclusion that the inclusion of Clause H.2 results in a flawed agreement that cannot be approved.

101 I am mindful of the submission of counsel to the Former and LTD Employees that if the Settlement Agreement were approved, with Clause H.2 excluded, this would substantively alter the Settlement Agreement and would, in effect, be a creation of a settlement and not the approval of one.

102 In addition, counsel to the Superintendent indicated that the approval of the Superintendent was limited to the proposed Settlement Agreement and would not constitute approval of any altered agreement.

103 In *Grace 2008, supra*, I commented that a line-by-line analysis was inappropriate and that approval of a settlement agreement was to be undertaken in its entirety or not at all, at para. 74. A similar position was taken by the New Brunswick Court of Queen's Bench in *Wandlyn Inns Limited (Re)* (1992), 15 C.B.R. (3d) 316. I see no reason or basis to deviate from this position.

104 Accordingly, the motion is dismissed.

105 In view of the timing of the release of this decision and the functional funding deadline of March 31, 2010, the court will make every effort to accommodate the parties if further directions are required.

106 Finally, I would like to express my appreciation to all counsel and in person parties for the quality of written and oral submissions.

G.B. MORAWETZ J.

cp/e/qlrxg/qlpxm/qlaxw/qlced/qljyw

¹ On March 25, 2010, the Supreme Court of Canada released the following: *Donald Sproule et al. v. Nortel Networks Corporation et al.* (Ont.) (Civil) (By Leave) (33491) (The motions for directions and to expedite the application for leave to appeal are dismissed. The application for leave to appeal is dismissed with no order as to costs./La requête en vue d'obtenir des directives et la requête visant à accélérer la procédure de demande d'autorisation d'appel sont rejetées. La demande d'autorisation d'appel est rejetée; aucune ordonnance n'est rendue concernant les dépens.): <http://scc.lexum.umontreal.ca/en/news_release/2010/10-03-25.3 a/10-03-25.3a.html>

TAB 8

Indexed as:

Canadian Red Cross Society (Re)

**IN THE MATTER OF the Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act,
R.S.C. 1985 c. C-36
AND IN THE MATTER OF a Plan of Compromise or Arrangement of
the Canadian Red Cross Society/La Société Canadienne De La
Croix-Rouge
AND IN THE MATTER OF the Canadian Red Cross Society/ La
Société Canadienne De La Croix-Rouge**

[1998] O.J. No. 3306

72 O.T.C. 99

5 C.B.R. (4th) 299

1998 CarswellOnt 3346

81 A.C.W.S. (3d) 932

Commercial List File No. 98-CL-002970

Ontario Court of Justice (General Division)

Blair J.

August 19, 1998.

(28 pp.)

[Ed. note: Supplementary reasons released August 19, 1998. See [1998] O.J. No. 3307. Further supplementary reasons also released August 19, 1998. See [1998] O.J. No. 3513.]

Counsel:

B. Zarnett, B. Empey and J. Latham, for the Canadian Red Cross.

E.B. Leonard, S.J. Page and D.S. Ward, for the Provinces except Que. and for the Canadian Blood Services.

Jeffrey Carhart, for the Héma-Québec and for the Government of Québec.

Marlene Thomas and John Spencer, for the Attorney General of Canada.

Pierre R. Lavigne and Frank Bennett, for the Quebec '86-90 Hepatitis C Claimants.
Pamela Huff and Bonnie Tough, for the 1986-1990 Haemophiliac Hepatitis C Claimants.
Harvin Pitch and Kenneth Arenson, for the 1986-1990 Hepatitis C Class Action Claimants.
Aubrey Kaufman and David Harvey, for the Pre 86/Post 90 Hepatitis C Class Action Claimants.
Bruce Lemer, for the B.C. 1986-90 Class Action.
Donna Ring, for the HIV Claimants.
David A. Klein, for the B.C. Pre-86/Post-90 Hepatitis C Claimants.
David Thompson, agent for the Quebec Pre-86/Post 90 Hepatitis C Claimants.
Michael Kainer, for the Service Employees International Union.
I.V.B. Nordheimer, for the Bayer Corporation.
R.N. Robertson, Q.C. and S.E. Seigel, for the T.D. Bank.
James H. Smellie, for the Canadian Blood Agency.
W.V. Sasso, for the Province of British Columbia.
Justin R. Fogarty, for the Raytheon Engineers.
Nancy Spies, for the Central Hospital et al (Co-D).
M. Thomson, for the various physicians.
C.H. Freeman, for the Blood Trac Systems.

BLAIR J. (endorsement):--

Background and Genesis of the Proceedings

1 The Canadian Red Cross Society/La Société Canadienne de la Croix Rouge has sought and obtained the insolvency protection and supervision of the Court under the Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act ("CCAA"). It has done so with a view to putting forward a Plan to compromise its obligations to creditors and also as part of a national process in which responsibility for the Canadian blood supply is to be transferred from the Red Cross to two new agencies which are to form a new national blood authority to take control of the Canadian Blood Program.

2 The Red Cross finds itself in this predicament primarily as a result of some \$8 billion of tort claims being asserted against it (and others, including governments and hospitals) by a large number of people who have suffered tragic harm from diseases contacted as a result of a blood contamination problem that has haunted the Canadian blood system since at least the early 1980's. Following upon the revelations forthcoming from the wide-ranging and seminal Krever Commission Inquiry on the Blood System in Canada, and the concern about the safety of that system - and indeed alarm - in the general population as a result of those revelations, the federal, provincial and territorial governments decided to transfer responsibility for the Canadian Blood Supply to a new national authority. This new national authority consists of two agencies, the Canadian Blood Service and Héma-Québec.

The Motions

3 The primary matters for consideration in these Reasons deal with a Motion by the Red Cross for approval of the sale and transfer of its blood supply assets and operations to the two agencies and a cross-Motion on behalf of one of the Groups of Transfusion Claimants for an order dismissing that Motion and directing the holding of a meeting of creditors to consider a counter-proposal which

would see the Red Cross continue to operate the blood system for a period of time and attempt to generate sufficient revenues on a fee-for-blood-service basis to create a compensation fund for victims.

4 There are other Motions as well, dealing with such things as the appointment of additional Representative Counsel and their funding, and with certain procedural matters pertaining generally to the CCAA proceedings. I will return to these less central motions at the end of these Reasons.

Operation of the Canadian Blood System and Evolution of the Acquisition Agreement

5 Transfer of responsibility for the operation of the Canadian blood supply system to a new authority will mark the first time that responsibility for a nationally co-ordinated blood system has not been in the hands of the Canadian Red Cross. Its first blood donor clinic was held in January, 1940 - when a national approach to the provision of a blood supply was first developed. Since 1977, the Red Cross has operated the Blood Program furnishing the Canadian health system with a variety of blood and blood products, with funding from the provincial and territorial governments. In 1981, the Canadian Blood Committee, composed of representatives of the governments, was created to oversee the Blood Program on behalf of the Governments. In 1991 this Committee was replaced by the Canadian Blood Agency - whose members are the Ministers of Health for the provinces and territories - as funder and co-ordinator of the Blood Program. The Canadian Blood Agency, together with the federal government's regulatory agency known as BBR (The Bureau of Biologics and Radiopharmaceuticals) and the Red Cross, are the principal components of the organizational structure of the current Blood Supply System.

6 In the contemplated new regime, The Canadian Blood Service has been designated as the vehicle by which the Governments in Canada will deliver to Canadians (in all provinces and territories except Quebec) a new fully integrated and accountable Blood Supply System. Quebec has established Héma-Québec as its own blood service within its own health care system, but subject to federal standards and regulations. The two agencies have agreed to work together, and are working in a co-ordinated fashion, to ensure all Canadians have access to safe, secure and adequate supplies of blood, blood products and their alternatives. The scheduled date for the transfer of the Canadian blood supply operations from the Red Cross to the new agencies was originally September 1, 1998. Following the adjournment of these proceedings on July 31st to today's date, the closing has been postponed. It is presently contemplated to take place shortly after September 18, 1998 if the transaction is approved by the Court.

7 The assets owned and controlled by the Red Cross are important to the continued viability of the blood supply operations, and to the seamless transfer of those operations in the interests of public health and safety. They also have value. In fact, they are the source of the principal value in the Red Cross's assets which might be available to satisfy the claims of creditors. Their sale was therefore seen by those involved in attempting to structure a resolution to all of these political, social and personal problems, as providing the main opportunity to develop a pool of funds to go towards satisfying the Red Cross's obligations regarding the claims of what are generally referred to in these proceedings as the "Transfusion Claimants". It appears, though, that the Transfusion Claimants did not have much, if any, involvement in the structuring of the proposed resolution.

8 Everyone recognizes, I think, that the projected pool of funds will not be sufficient to satisfy such claims in full, but it is thought - by the Red Cross and the Governments, in any event - that the proceeds of sale from the transfer of the Society's blood supply assets represent the best hope of

maximizing the return on the Society's assets and thus of maximizing the funds available from it to meet its obligations to the Transfusion Claimants.

9 This umbrella approach - namely, that the blood supply operations must be transferred to a new authority, but that the proceeds generated from that transfer should provide the pool of funds from which the Transfusion Claimants can, and should, be satisfied, so that the Red Cross may avoid bankruptcy and continue its other humanitarian operations - is what led to the marriage of these CCAA proceedings and the transfer of responsibility for the Blood System. The Acquisition Agreement which has been carefully and hotly negotiated over the past 9 months, and the sale from the Red Cross to the new agencies is - at the insistence of the Governments - subject to the approval of the Court, and they are as well conditional upon the Red Cross making an application to restructure pursuant to the CCAA.

10 The Initial Order was made in these proceedings under the CCAA on July 20th.

The Sale and Transfer Transaction

11 The Acquisition Agreement provides for the transfer of the operation of the Blood Program from the Red Cross to the Canadian Blood Service and Héma-Québec, together with employees, donor and patient records and assets relating to the operation of the Program on September 1, 1998. Court approval of the Agreement, together with certain orders to ensure the transfer of clear title to the Purchasers, are conditions of closing.

12 The sale is expected to generate about \$169 million in all, before various deductions. That sum is comprised of a purchase price for the blood supply assets of \$132.9 million plus an estimated \$36 million to be paid for inventory. Significant portions of these funds are to be held in escrow pending the resolution of different issues; but, in the end, after payment of the balance of the outstanding indebtedness to the T-D Bank (which has advanced a secured line of credit to fund the transfer and re-structuring) and the payment of certain creditors, it is anticipated that a pool of funds amounting to between \$70 million and \$100 million may be available to be applied against the Transfusion Claims.

13 In substance, the new agencies are to acquire all fixed assets, inventory, equipment, contracts and leases associated with the Red Cross Blood Program, including intellectual property, information systems, data, software, licences, operating procedures and the very important donor and patient records. There is no doubt that the sale represents the transfer of the bulk of the significant and valuable assets of the Red Cross.

14 A vesting order is sought as part of the relief to be granted. Such an order, if made, will have the effect of extinguishing realty encumbrances against and security interest in those assets. I am satisfied for these purposes that appropriate notification has been given to registered encumbrancers and other security interest holders to permit such an order to be made. I am also satisfied, for purposes of notification warranting a vesting order, that adequate notification of a direct and public nature has been given to all of those who may have a claim against the assets. The CCAA proceedings themselves, and the general nature of the Plan to be advanced by the Red Cross - including the prior sale of the blood supply assets - has received wide coverage in the media. Specific notification has been published in principal newspapers across the country. A document room containing relevant information regarding the proposed transaction, and relevant financial information, was set up in Toronto and most, if not all, claimants have taken advantage of access to that room. Richter & Partners were appointed by the Court to provide independent financial advice to the Transfusion Claim-

ants, and they have done so. Accordingly, I am satisfied in terms of notification and service that the proper foundation for the granting of the Order sought has been laid.

15 What is proposed, to satisfy the need to protect encumbrancers and holders of personal security interests is,

- a) that generally speaking, prior registered interests and encumbrances against the Red Cross's lands and buildings will not be affected - i.e., the transfer and sale will take place subject to those interests, or they will be paid off on closing; and,
- b) that registered personal property interests will either be assumed by the Purchasers or paid off from the proceeds of closing in accordance with their legal entitlement.

Whether the Purchase Price is Fair and Reasonable

16 The central question for determination on this Motion is whether the proposed Purchase Price for the Red Cross's blood supply related assets is fair and reasonable in the circumstances, and a price that is as close to the maximum as is reasonably likely to be obtained for such assets. If the answer to this question is "Yes", then there can be little quarrel - it seems to me - with the conversion of those assets into cash and their replacement with that cash as the asset source available to satisfy the claims of creditors, including the Transfusion Claimants. It matters not to creditors and Claimants whether the source of their recovery is a pool of cash or a pool of real/personal/intangible assets. Indeed, it may well be advantageous to have the assets already crystallised into a cash fund, readily available and earning interest. What is important is that the value of that recovery pool is as high as possible.

17 On behalf of the 1986-1990 Québec Hepatitis C Claimants Mr. Lavigne and Mr. Bennett argue, however, that the purchase price is not high enough. Mr. Lavigne has put forward a counter-proposal which he submits will enhance the value of the Red Cross's blood supply assets by giving greater play to the value of its exclusive licence to be the national supplier of blood, and which will accordingly result in a much greater return for Claimants. This proposal has been referred to as the "Lavigne Proposal" or the "No-Fault Plan of Arrangement". I shall return to it shortly; but first I propose to deal with the submissions of the Red Cross and of those who support its Motion for approval, that the proposed price is fair and reasonable. Those parties include the Governments, the proposed Purchasers - the Canadian Blood Service and Héma-Québec - and several (but not all) of the other Transfusion Claimant Groups.

18 As I have indicated, the gross purchase price under the Acquisition Agreement is \$132.9 million, plus an additional amount to be paid for inventory on closing which will generate a total purchase price of approximately \$169 million. Out of that amount, the Bank indebtedness is to be paid and the claims of certain other creditors defrayed. It is estimated that a fund of between \$70 million and \$100 million will be available to constitute the trust fund to be set aside to satisfy Transfusion Claims.

19 This price is based upon a Valuation prepared jointly by Deloitte & Touche (financial advisor to the Governments) and Ernst & Young (financial advisor to the Red Cross and the present Monitor appointed under the Initial CCAA Order). These two financial advisors retained and relied upon independent appraisal experts to appraise the realty (Royal LePage), the machinery and equipment

and intangible assets (American Appraisal Canada Inc.) and the laboratories (Pellemon Inc.). The experience, expertise and qualifications of these various experts to conduct such appraisals cannot be questioned. At the same time, it must be acknowledged that neither Deloitte & Touche nor Ernst & Young are completely "independent" in this exercise, given the source of their retainers. It was at least partly for this reason that the Court was open to the suggestion that Richter & Partners be appointed to advise the 1986-1990 Ontario Class Action Claimants (and through them to provide independent advice and information to the other groups of Transfusion Claimants). The evidence and submissions indicate that Richter & Partners have met with the Monitor and with representatives of Deloitte & Touche, and that all enquiries have been responded to.

20 Richter & Partners were appointed at the instance of the 1986-1990 Ontario Hepatitis C Claimants Richter & Partners, with a mandate to share their information and recommendations with the other Groups of Transfusion Claimants. Mr. Pitch advises on behalf of that Group that as a result of their due diligence enquiries his clients are prepared to agree to the approval of the Acquisition Agreement, and, indeed urge that it be approved quickly. A significant number of the other Transfusion Claimant groups but by no means all - have taken similar positions, although subject in some cases to certain caveats, none of which pertain to the adequacy of the purchase price. On behalf of the 1986-1990 Hemophiliac Claimants, for instance, Ms. Huff does not oppose the transfer approval, although she raises certain concerns about certain terms of the Acquisition Agreement which may impinge upon the amount of monies that will be available to Claimants on closing, and she would like to see these issues addressed in any Order, if approval is granted. Mr. Lemer, on behalf of the British Columbia 1986-1990 Hepatitis C Class Action Claimants, takes the same position as Ms. Huff, but advises that his clients' further due diligence has satisfied them that the price is fair and reasonable. While Mr. Kaufman, on behalf of Pre 86/Post 90 Hepatitis C Claimants, advances a number of jurisdictional arguments against approval, his clients do not otherwise oppose the transfer (but they would like certain caveats applied) and they do not question the price which has been negotiated for the Red Cross's blood supply assets. Mr. Kainer for the Service Employees Union (which represents approximately 1,000 Red Cross employees) also supports the Red Cross Motion, as does, very eloquently, Ms. Donna Ring who is counsel for Ms. Janet Connors and other secondarily infected spouses and children with HIV.

21 Thus, there is broad support amongst a large segment of the Transfusion Claimants for approval of the sale and transfer of the blood supply assets as proposed.

22 Some of these supporting Claimants, at least, have relied upon the due diligence information received through Richter & Partners, in assessing their rights and determining what position to take. This independent source of due diligence therefore provides some comfort as to the adequacy of the purchase price. It does not necessarily carry the day, however, if the Lavigne Proposal offers a solution that may reasonably practically generate a higher value for the blood supply assets in particular and the Red Cross assets in general. I turn to that Proposal now.

The Lavigne Proposal

23 Mr. Lavigne is Representative Counsel for the 1986-1990 Québec Hepatitis C Claimants. His cross-motion asks for various types of relief, including for the purposes of the main Motion,

- a) an order dismissing the Red Cross motion for court approval of the sale of the blood supply assets;

- b) an order directing the Monitor to review the feasibility of the Lavigne Proposal's plan of arrangement (the "No-Fault Plan of Arrangement") which has now been filed with the Court of behalf of his group of "creditors"; and,
- c) an order scheduling a meeting of creditors within 6 weeks of the end of this month for the purpose of voting on the No-Fault Plan of Arrangement.

24 This cross-motion is supported by a group of British Columbia Pre 86/Post 90 Hepatitis C Claimants who are formally represented at the moment by Mr. Kaufman but for whom Mr. Klein now seeks to be appointed Representative Counsel. It is also supported by Mr. Lauzon who seeks to be appointed Representative Counsel for a group of Québec Pre 86/Post 90 Hepatitis C Claimants. I shall return to these "Representation" Motions at the end of these Reasons. Suffice it to say at this stage that counsel strongly endorsed the Lavigne Proposal.

25 The Lavigne Proposal can be summarized in essence in the following four principals, namely:

1. Court approval of a no-fault plan of compensation for all Transfusion Claimants, known or unknown;
2. Immediate termination by the Court of the Master Agreement presently governing the relationship between the Red Cross and the Canadian Blood Agency, and the funding of the former, which Agreement requires a one year notice period for termination;
3. Payment in full of the claims of all creditors of the Red Cross; and,
4. No disruption of the Canadian Blood Supply.

26 The key assumptions and premises underlying these notions are,

- * that the Red Cross has a form of monopoly in the sense that it is the only blood supplier licensed by Government in Canada to supply blood to hospitals;
- * that, accordingly, this license has "value", which has not been recognized in the Valuation prepared by Deloitte & Touche and by Ernst & Young, and which can be exploited and enhanced by the Red Cross continuing to operate the Blood Supply and charging hospitals directly on a fully funded cost recovery basis for its blood services;
- * that Government will not remove this monopoly from the Red Cross for fear of disrupting the Blood Supply in Canada;
- * that the Red Cross would be able to charge hospitals sufficient amounts not only to cover its costs of operation (without any public funding such as that now coming from the Canadian Blood Agency under the Master Agreement), but also to pay all of its creditors and to establish a fund which would allow for compensation over time to all of the Transfusion Claimants; and, finally,
- * that the no-fault proposal is simply an introduction of the Krever Commission recommendations for a scheme of no-fault compensation for all transfusion claimants, for the funding of the blood supply program through direct cost recovery from hospitals, and for the inclusion of a component for a compensation fund in the fee for service delivery charge.

27 In his careful argument in support of his proposal Mr. Lavigne was more inclined to couch his rationale for the No-Fault Plan in political terms rather than in terms of the potential value created by the Red Cross monopoly licence and arising from the prospect of utilizing that monopoly licence to raise revenue on a fee-for-blood-service basis, thus leading - arguably - to an enhanced "value" of the blood supply operations and assets. He seemed to me to be suggesting, in essence, that because there are significant Transfusion Claims outstanding against the Red Cross, Government as the indirect purchaser of the assets should recognize this and incorporate into the purchase price an element reflecting the value of those claims. It was submitted that because the Red Cross has (or, at least, will have had) a monopoly licence regarding the supply of blood products in Canada, and because it could charge a fee-for-blood-service to hospitals for those services and products, and because other regimes in other countries employ such a fee for service system and build in an insurance or compensation element for claims, and because the Red Cross might be able to recover such an element in the regime he proposes for it, then the purchase price must reflect the value of those outstanding claims in some fashion. I am not able to understand, in market terms, however, why the value of a debtor's assets is necessarily reflective in any way of the value of the claims against those assets. In fact, it is the stuff of the everyday insolvency world that exactly the opposite is the case. In my view, the argument is more appropriately put - for the purposes of the commercial and restructuring considerations which are what govern the Court's decisions in these types of CCAA proceedings - on the basis of the potential increase in value from the revenue generating capacity of the monopoly licence itself. In fairness, that is the way in which Mr. Lavigne's Proposal is developed and justified in the written materials filed.

28 After careful consideration of it, however, I have concluded that the Lavigne Proposal cannot withstand scrutiny, in the context of these present proceedings.

29 Farley Cohen - a forensic principal in the expert forensic investigative and accounting firm of Linquist Avery Macdonald Baskerville Company - has testified that in his opinion the Red Cross operating licence "provides the potential opportunity and ability for the Red Cross to satisfy its current and future liabilities as discussed below". Mr. Cohen then proceeds in his affidavit to set out the basis and underlying assumptions for that opinion in the following paragraphs, which I quote in their entirety:

1. In my opinion, if the Red Cross can continue as a sole and exclusive operator of the Blood Supply Program and can amend its funding arrangements to provide for full cost recovery, including the cost of proven claims of Transfusion Claimants, and whereby the Red Cross would charge hospitals directly for the Blood Safety Program, then there is a substantial value to the Red Cross to satisfy all the claims against it.
2. In my opinion, such value to the Red Cross is not reflected in the Joint Valuation Report.
3. My opinion is based on the following assumptions: (i) the Federal Government, while having the power to issue additional licences to other Blood System operators, would not do so in the interest of public safety; (ii) the Red Cross can terminate the current funding arrangement pursuant to the terms of the Master Agreement; and (iii) the cost of blood charged to the hospitals would not be cost-prohibitive compared to alternative blood suppliers. (highlighting in original)

30 On his cross-examination, Mr. Cohen acknowledged that he did not know whether his assumptions could come true or not. That difficulty, it seems to me, is an indicia of the central weakness in the Lavigne Proposal. The reality of the present situation is that all 13 Governments in Canada have determined unequivocally that the Red Cross will no longer be responsible for or involved in the operation of the national blood supply in this country. That is the evidentiary bedrock underlying these proceedings. If that is the case, there is simply no realistic likelihood that any of the assumptions made by Mr. Cohen will occur. His opinion is only as sound as the assumptions on which it is based.

31 Like all counsel - even those for the Transfusion Claimants who do not support his position - I commend Mr. Lavigne for his ingenuity and for his sincerity and perseverance in pursuing his clients' general goals in relation to the blood supply program. However, after giving it careful consideration as I have said, I have come to the conclusion that the Lavigne Proposal - whatever commendation it may deserve in other contexts - does not offer a workable or practical alternative solution in the context of these CCAA proceedings. I question whether it can even be said to constitute a "Plan of Compromise and Arrangement" within the meaning of the CCAA, because it is not something which either the debtor (the Red Cross) or the creditors (the Transfusion Claimants amongst them) have control over to make happen. It is, in reality, a political and social solution which must be effected by Governments. It is not something which can be imposed by the Court in the context of a restructuring. Without deciding that issue, however, I am satisfied that the Proposal is not one which in the circumstances warrants the Court in exercising its discretion under sections 4 and 5 of the CCAA to call a meeting of creditors to vote on it.

32 Mr. Justice Krever recommended that the Red Cross not continue in the operation of the Blood Supply System and, while he did recommend the introduction of a no-fault scheme to compensate all blood victims, it was not a scheme that would be centred around the continued involvement of the Red Cross. It was a government established statutory no-fault scheme. He said (Final Report, Vol. 3, p. 1045):

The provinces and territories of Canada should devise statutory no-fault schemes that compensate all blood-injured persons promptly and adequately, so they do not suffer impoverishment or illness without treatment. I therefore recommend that, without delay, the provinces and territories devise statutory no-fault schemes for compensating persons who suffer serious adverse consequences as a result of the administration of blood components or blood products.

33 Governments - which are required to make difficult choices - have chosen, for their own particular reasons, not to go down this particular socio-political road. While this may continue to be a very live issue in the social and political arena, it is not one which, as I have said, is a solution that can be imposed by the Court in proceedings such as these.

34 I am satisfied, as well, that the Lavigne Proposal ought not to impede the present process on the basis that it is unworkable and impractical, in the present circumstances, and given the determined political decision to transfer the blood supply from the Red Cross to the new agencies, might possibly result in a disruption of the supply and raise concerns for the safety of the public if that were the case. The reasons why this is so, from an evidentiary perspective, are well articulated in the affidavit of the Secretary General of the Canadian Red Cross, Pierre Duplessis, in his affidavit sworn on August 17, 1998. I accept that evidence and the reasons articulated therein. In substance

Dr. Duplessis states that the assumptions underlying the Lavigne Proposal are "unrealistic, impractical and unachievable for the Red Cross in the current environment" because,

- a) the political and factual reality is that Governments have clearly decided - following the recommendation of Mr. Justice Krever - that the Red Cross will not continue to be involved in the National Blood Program, and at least with respect to Quebec have indicated that they are prepared to resort to their powers of expropriation if necessary to effect a transfer;
- b) the delays and confusion which would result from a postponement to test the Lavigne Proposal could have detrimental effects on the blood system itself and on employees, hospitals, and other health care providers involved in it;
- c) the Master Agreement between the Red Cross and the Canadian Blood Agency, under which the Society currently obtains its funding, cannot be cancelled except on one year's notice, and even if it could there would be great risks in denuding the Red Cross of all of its existing funding in exchange for the prospect of replacing that funding with fee for service revenues; and,
- d) it is very unlikely that over 900 hospitals across Canada - which have hitherto not paid for their blood supply, which have no budgets contemplating that they will do so, and which are underfunded in event will be able to pay sufficient sums to enable the Red Cross not only to cover its operating costs and to pay current bills, but also to repay the present Bank indebtedness of approximately \$35 million in full, and to repay existing unsecured creditors in full, and to generate a compensation fund that will pay existing Transfusion Claimants (it is suggested) in full for their \$8 billion in claims.

35 Dr. Duplessis summarizes the risks inherent in further delays in the following passages from paragraph 17 of his affidavit sworn on August 17, 1998:

The Lavigne Proposal that the purchase price could be renegotiated to a higher price because of Red Cross' ability to operate on the terms the Lavigne Proposal envisions is not realistic, because Red Cross does not have the ability to operate on those terms. Accordingly, there is no reason to expect that CBS and H-Q would pay a higher amount than they have already agreed to pay under the Acquisition Agreement. Indeed, there is a serious risk that delays or attempts to renegotiate would result in lower amounts being paid. Delaying approval of the Acquisition Agreement to permit an experiment with the Lavigne Proposal exposes Red Cross and its stakeholders, including all Transfusion Claimants, to the following risks:

- (a) continued losses in operating the National Blood Program which will reduce the amounts ultimately available to all stakeholders;
- (b) Red Cross' ability to continue to operate its other activities being jeopardized;

- (c) the Bank refusing to continue to support even the current level of funding and demanding repayment, thereby jeopardizing Red Cross and all of Red Cross' activities including the National Blood Program;
- (d) CBS and H-Q becoming unprepared to complete an acquisition on the same financial terms given, among other things, the costs which they will incur in adjusting for later transfer dates, raising the risks of expropriation or some other, less favourable taking of Red Cross' assets, or the Governments simply proceeding to set up the means to operate the National Blood Program without paying the Red Cross for its assets.

36 These conclusions, and the evidentiary base underlying them, are in my view irrefutable in the context of these proceedings.

37 Those supporting the Lavigne Proposal argued vigorously that approval of the proposed sale transaction in advance of a creditors' vote on the Red Cross Plan of Arrangement (which has not yet been filed) would strip the Lavigne Proposal of its underpinnings and, accordingly, would deprive those "creditor" Transfusion Claimants from their statutory right under the Act to put forward a Plan and to have a vote on their proposed Plan. In my opinion, however, Mr. Zarnett's response to that submission is the correct one in law. Sections 4 and 5 of the CCAA do not give the creditors a right to a meeting or a right to put forward a Plan and to insist on that Plan being put to a vote; they have a right to request the Court to order a meeting, and the Court will do so if it is in the best interests of the debtor company and the stakeholders to do so. In this case I accept the submission that the Court ought not to order a meeting for consideration of the Lavigne Proposal because the reality is that the Proposal is unworkable and unrealistic in the circumstances and I see nothing to be gained by the creditors being called to consider it. In addition, as I have pointed out earlier in these Reasons, a large number of the creditors and of the Transfusion Claimants oppose such a development. The existence of a statutory provision permitting creditors to apply for an order for the calling of a meeting does not detract from the Court's power to approve a sale of assets, assuming that the Court otherwise has that power in the circumstances.

38 The only alternative to the sale and transfer, on the one hand, and the Lavigne Proposal, on the other hand, is a liquidation scenario for the Red Cross, and a cessation of its operations altogether. This is not in the interests of anyone, if it can reasonably be avoided. The opinion of the valuation experts is that on a liquidation basis, rather than on a "going concern" basis, as is contemplated in the sale transaction, the value of the Red Cross blood supply operations and assets varies between the mid - \$30 million and about \$74 million. This is quite considerable less than the \$169 million (+/-) which will be generated by the sale transaction.

39 Having rejected the Lavigne Proposal in this context, it follows from what I have earlier said that I conclude the purchase price under the Acquisition Agreement is fair and reasonable, and a price that is as close to the maximum as is reasonably likely to be obtained for the assets.

Jurisdiction Issue

40 The issue of whether the Court has jurisdiction to make an order approving the sale of substantial assets of the debtor company before a Plan has been put forward and placed before the creditors for approval, has been raised by Mr. Bennett. I turn now to a consideration of that question.

41 Mr. Bennett argues that the Court does not have the jurisdiction under the CCAA to make an order approving the sale of substantial assets by the Applicant Company before a Plan has even been filed and the creditors have had an opportunity to consider and vote on it. He submits that section 11 of the Act permits the Court to extend to a debtor the protection of the Court pending a restructuring attempt but only in the form of a stay of proceedings against the debtor or in the form of an order restraining or prohibiting new proceedings. There is no jurisdiction to approve a sale of assets in advance he submits, or otherwise than in the context of the sanctioning of a Plan already approved by the creditors.

42 While Mr. Kaufman does not take the same approach to a jurisdictional argument, he submits nonetheless that although he does not oppose the transfer and approval of the sale, the Court cannot grant its approval at this stage if it involves "sanitizing" the transaction. By this, as I understand it, he means that the Court can "permit" the sale to go through - and presumably the purchase price to be paid - but that it cannot shield the assets conveyed from claims that may subsequently arise - such as fraudulent preference claims or oppression remedy claims in relation to the transaction. Apart from the fact that there is no evidence of the existence of any such claims, it seems to me that the argument is not one of "jurisdiction" but rather one of "appropriateness". The submission is that the assets should not be freed up from further claims until at least the Red Cross has filed its Plan and the creditors have had a chance to vote on it. In other words, the approval of the sale transaction and the transfer of the blood supply assets and operations should have been made a part and parcel of the Plan of Arrangement put forward by the debtor, and the question of whether or not it is appropriate and supportable in that context debated and fought out on the voting floor, and not separately before-the-fact. These sentiments were echoed by Mr. Klein and by Mr. Thompson as well. In my view, however, the assets either have to be sold free and clear of claims against them - for a fair and reasonable price - or not sold. A purchaser cannot be expected to pay the fair and reasonable purchase price but at the same time leave it open for the assets purchased to be later attacked and, perhaps, taken back. In the context of the transfer of the Canadian blood supply operations, the prospect of such a claw back of assets sold, at a later time, has very troubling implications for the integrity and safety of that system. I do not think, firstly, that the argument is a jurisdictional one, and secondly, that it can prevail in any event.

43 I cannot accept the submission that the Court has no jurisdiction to make the order sought. The source of the authority is twofold: it is to be found in the power of the Court to impose terms and conditions on the granting of a stay under section 11; and it may be grounded upon the inherent jurisdiction of the Court, not to make orders which contradict a statute, but to "fill in the gaps in legislation so as to give effect to the objects of the CCAA, including the survival program of a debtor until it can present a plan": *Re Dylex Limited and Others*, (1995), 31 C.B.R. (3d) 106, per Farley J., at p. 110.

44 As Mr. Zarnett pointed out, paragraph 20 of the Initial Order granted in these proceedings on July 20, 1998, makes it a condition of the protection and stay given to the Red Cross that it not be permitted to sale or dispose of assets valued at more than \$1 million without the approval of the Court. Clearly this is a condition which the Court has the jurisdiction to impose under section 11 of the Act. It is a necessary conjunction to such a condition that the debtor be entitled to come back to the Court and seek approval of a sale of such assets, if it can show it is in the best interests of the Company and its creditors as a whole that such approval be given. That is what it has done.

45 It is very common in CCAA restructurings for the Court to approve the sale and disposition of assets during the process and before the Plan if formally tendered and voted upon. There are many examples where this has occurred, the recent Eaton's restructuring being only one of them. The CCAA is designed to be a flexible instrument, and it is that very flexibility which gives it its efficacy. As Farley J. said in *Dylex*, supra (p. 111), "the history of CCAA law has been an evolution of judicial interpretation". It is not infrequently that judges are told, by those opposing a particular initiative at a particular time, that if they make a particular order that is requested it will be the first time in Canadian jurisprudence (sometimes in global jurisprudence, depending upon the level of the rhetoric) that such an order has made! Nonetheless, the orders are made, if the circumstances are appropriate and the orders can be made within the framework and in the spirit of the CCAA legislation. Mr. Justice Farley has well summarized this approach in the following passage from his decision in *Re Lehndorff General Partner* (1993), 17 C.B.R. (3d) 24, at p. 31, which I adopt:

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)

46 In the spirit of that approach, and having regard to the circumstances of this case, I am satisfied not only that the Court has the jurisdiction to make the approval and related orders sought, but also that it should do so. There is no realistic alternative to the sale and transfer that is proposed, and the alternative is a liquidation/bankruptcy scenario which, on the evidence would yield an average of about 44% of the purchase price which the two agencies will pay. To forego that purchase price - supported as it is by reliable expert evidence - would in the circumstances be folly, not only for the ordinary creditors but also for the Transfusion Claimants, in my view.

47 While the authorities as to exactly what considerations a court should have in mind in approving a transaction such as this are scarce, I agree with Mr. Zarnett that an appropriate analogy may be found in cases dealing with the approval of a sale by a court-appointed receiver. In those circumstances, as the Ontario Court of Appeal has indicated in *Royal Bank v. Soundair Corp.* (1991), 7 C.B.R. (3d) 1, at p. 6 the Court's duties are,

- (i) to consider whether the receiver has made a sufficient effort to get the best price and has not acted improvidently;
- (ii) to consider the interests of the parties;
- (iii) to consider the efficacy and integrity of the process by which offers are obtained; and,
- (iv) to consider whether there has been unfairness in the working out of the process.

48 I am satisfied on all such counts in the circumstances of this case.

49 Some argument was directed towards the matter of an order under the Bulk Sales Act. Because of the nature and extent of the Red Cross assets being disposed of, the provisions of that Act must either be complied with, or an exemption from compliance obtained under s. 3 thereof. The circumstances warrant the granting of such an exemption in my view. While there were submissions about whether or not the sale would impair the Society's ability to pay its creditors in full, I do not believe that the sale will impair that ability. In fact, it may well enhance it. Even if one accepts the argument that the emphasis should be placed upon the language regarding payment "in full" rather than on "impair", the case qualifies for an exemption. It is conceded that the Transfusion claimants do not qualify as "creditors" as that term is defined under the Bulk Sales Act; and if the claims of the Transfusion Claimants are removed from the equation, it seems evident that other creditors could be paid from the proceeds in full.

Conclusion and Treatment of Other Motions

50 I conclude that the Red Cross is entitled to the relief it seeks at this stage, and orders will go accordingly. In the end, I come to these conclusions having regard in particular to the public interest imperative which requires a Canadian Blood Supply with integrity and a seamless, effective and relatively early transfer of blood supply operations to the new agencies; having regard to the interests in the Red Cross in being able to put forward a Plan that may enable it to avoid bankruptcy and be able to continue on with its non-blood supply humanitarian efforts; and having regard to the interests of the Transfusion Claimants in seeing the value of the blood supply assets maximized.

51 Accordingly an order is granted - subject to the caveat following - approving the sale and authorizing and approving the transactions contemplated in the Acquisition Agreement, granting a vesting order, and declaring that the Bulk Sales Act does not apply to the sale, together with the other related relief claimed in paragraphs (a) through (g) of the Red Cross's Notice of Motion herein. The caveat is that the final terms and settlement of the Order are to be negotiated and approved by the Court before the Order is issued. If the parties cannot agree on the manner in which the "Agreement Content" issues raised by Ms. Huff and Mr. Kaufman in their joint memorandum of comments submitted in argument yesterday, I will hear submissions to resolve those issues.

Other Motions

52 The Motions by Mr. Klein and by W. Lauzon to be appointed Representative Counsel for the British Columbia and Quebec Pre86/Post 90 Hepatitis C Claimants, respectively, are granted. It is true that Mr. Klein had earlier authorized Mr. Kaufman to accept the appointment on behalf of his

British Columbia group of clients, but nonetheless it may be - because of differing settlement proposals emanating to differing groups in differing Provinces - that there are differences in interests between these groups, as well as differences in perspectives in the Canadian way. As I commented earlier, in making the original order appointing Representative Counsel, the Court endeavours to conduct a process which is both fair and perceived to be fair. Having regard to the nature of the claims, the circumstances in which the injuries and diseases inflicting the Transfusion Claimants have been sustained, and the place in Canadian Society at the moment for those concerns, it seems to me that those particular claimants, in those particular Provinces, are entitled if they wish to have their views put forward by those counsel who are already and normally representing them in their respective class proceedings.

53 I accept the concerns expressed by Mr. Zarnett on behalf of the Red Cross, and by Mr. Robertson on behalf of the Bank, about the impact of funding on the Society's cash flow and position. In my earlier endorsement dealing with the appointment of Representative Counsel and funding, I alluded to the fact that if additional funding was required to defray these costs those in a position to provide such funding may have to do so. The reference, of course, was to the Governments and the Purchasers. It is the quite legitimate but nonetheless operative concerns of the Governments to ensure the effective and safe transfer of the blood supply operations to the new agencies which are driving much of what is happening here. Since the previous judicial hint was not responded to, I propose to make it a specific term and condition of the approval Order that the Purchasers, or the Governments, establish a fund - not to exceed \$2,000,000 at the present time without further order - to pay the professional costs incurred by Representative Counsel and by Richter & Partners.

54 The other Motions which were pending at the outset of yesterday's Hearing are adjourned to another date to be fixed by the Commercial List Registrar.

55 Orders are to go in accordance with the foregoing.

BLAIR J.

qp/s/aaa/mjb/qlmjb/qlvls

TAB 9

Case Name:
Brainhunter 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
Brainhunter Inc., Brainhunter Canada Inc., Brainhunter
(Ottawa) Inc., Protec Employment Services Ltd., Treklogic
Inc., Applicants**

[2009] O.J. No. 5578

62 C.B.R. (5th) 41

2009 CarswellOnt 8207

Court File No. 09-8482-00CL

Ontario Superior Court of Justice
Commercial List

G.B. Morawetz J.

Heard: December 11, 2009.
Judgment: December 18, 2009.

(25 paras.)

Bankruptcy and insolvency law -- Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act (CCAA) matters -- Compromises and arrangements -- Motion by the debtors for an extension of the stay period, approval of the bid process and approval of the stalking horse plan of arrangement allowed -- Proposed purchaser under the stalking horse was an insider and a related party -- Applicants proposed to sell business as a going concern -- A sales transaction was warranted at this time and that the sale would be of benefit to the economic community -- No creditor opposed sale.

Motion by the debtors for an extension of the stay period, approval of the bid process and approval of the stalking horse plan of arrangement. The applicants submitted that, absent the certainty that the applicants' business would continue as a going concern which was created by the stalking horse plan and the bid process, substantial damage would result to the applicants' business due to the potential loss of clients, contractors and employees. The proposed purchaser under the stalking horse

was an insider and a related party. A Special Committee, the advisors, the key creditor groups and the Monitor all supported the applicants' process.

HELD: Motion allowed. The bid process and the stalking horse were approved. There was a distinction between the approval of the sales process and the approval of a sale. The applicants established that a sales transaction was warranted at this time and that the sale would be of benefit to the economic community. No better alternative had been put forward. In addition, no creditor had come forward to object to a sale of the business. It was not appropriate or necessary for the court to substitute its business judgment for that of the applicants. The applicants were acting in good faith and with due diligence and the circumstances made the granting of an extension appropriate.

Statutes, Regulations and Rules Cited:

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

Counsel:

Jay Swartz and Jim Bunting, for the Applicants.

G. Moffat, for Deloitte & Touche Inc., Monitor.

Joseph Bellissimo, for Roynat Capital Inc.

Peter J. Osborne, for R. N. Singh and Purchaser.

Edmond Lamek, for the Toronto-Dominion Bank.

D. Dowdall, for Noteholders.

D. Ullmann, for Procom Consultants Group Inc.

ENDORSEMENT

1 G.B. MORAWETZ J.:-- At the conclusion of the hearing on December 11, 2009, I granted the motion with reasons to follow. These are the reasons.

2 The Applicants brought this motion for an extension of the Stay Period, approval of the Bid Process and approval of the Stalking Horse APA between TalentPoint Inc., 2223945 Ontario Ltd., 2223947 Ontario Ltd., and 2223956 Ontario Ltd., as purchasers (collectively, the "Purchasers") and each of the Applicants, as vendors.

3 The affidavit of Mr. Jewitt and the Report of the Monitor dated December 1, 2009 provide a detailed summary of the events that lead to the bringing of this motion.

4 The Monitor recommends that the motion be granted.

5 The motion is also supported by TD Bank, Roynat, and the Noteholders. These parties have the significant economic interest in the Applicants.

6 Counsel on behalf of Mr. Singh and the proposed Purchasers also supports the motion.

7 Opposition has been voiced by counsel on behalf of Procom Consultants Group Inc., a business competitor to the Applicants and a party that has expressed interest in possibly bidding for the assets of the Applicants.

8 The Bid Process, which provides for an auction process, and the proposed Stalking Horse APA have been considered by Breakwall, the independent Special Committee of the Board and the Monitor.

9 Counsel to the Applicants submitted that, absent the certainty that the Applicants' business will continue as a going concern which is created by the Stalking Horse APA and the Bid Process, substantial damage would result to the Applicants' business due to the potential loss of clients, contractors and employees.

10 The Monitor agrees with this assessment. The Monitor has also indicated that it is of the view that the Bid Process is a fair and open process and the best method to either identify the Stalking Horse APA as the highest and best bid for the Applicants' assets or to produce an offer for the Applicants' assets that is superior to the Stalking Horse APA.

11 It is acknowledged that the proposed purchaser under the Stalking Horse APA is an insider and a related party. The Monitor is aware of the complications that arise by having an insider being a bidder. The Monitor has indicated that it is of the view that any competing bids can be evaluated and compared with the Stalking Horse APA, even though the bids may not be based on a standard template.

12 Counsel on behalf of Procom takes issue with the \$700,000 break fee which has been provided for in the Stalking Horse APA. He submits that it is neither fair nor necessary to have a break fee. Counsel submits that the break fee will have a chilling effect on the sales process as it will require his client to in effect outbid Mr. Singh's group by in excess of \$700,000 before its bid could be considered. The break fee is approximately 2.5% of the total consideration.

13 The use of a stalking horse bid process has become quite popular in recent CCAA filings. In *Re Nortel Networks Corp.* [2009] O.J. No. 3169, I approved a stalking horse sale process and set out four factors (the "Nortel Criteria") the court should consider in the exercise of its general statutory discretion to determine whether to authorize a sale process:

- (a) Is a sale transaction warranted at this time?
- (b) Will the sale benefit the whole "economic community"?
- (c) Do any of the debtors' creditors have a *bona fide* reason to object to a sale of the business?
- (d) Is there a better viable alternative?

14 The Nortel decision predates the recent amendments to the CCAA. This application was filed December 2, 2009 which post-dates the amendments.

15 Section 36 of the CCAA expressly permits the sale of substantially all of the debtors' assets in the absence of a plan. It also sets out certain factors to be considered on such a sale. However, the amendments do not directly assess the factors a court should consider when deciding to approve a sale process.

16 Counsel to the Applicants submitted that a distinction should be drawn between the approval of a sales process and the approval of an actual sale in that the Nortel Criteria is engaged when con-

sidering whether to approve a sales process, while s. 36 of the CCAA is engaged when determining whether to approve a sale. Counsel also submitted that s. 36 should also be considered indirectly when applying the Nortel Criteria.

17 I agree with these submissions. There is a distinction between the approval of the sales process and the approval of a sale. Issues can arise after approval of a sales process and prior to the approval of a sale that requires a review in the context of s. 36 of the CCAA. For example, it is only on a sale approval motion that the court can consider whether there has been any unfairness in the working out of the sales process.

18 In this case, the Special Committee, the advisors, the key creditor groups and the Monitor all expressed support for the Applicants' process.

19 In my view, the Applicants have established that a sales transaction is warranted at this time and that the sale will be of benefit to the "economic community". I am also satisfied that no better alternative has been put forward. In addition, no creditor has come forward to object to a sale of the business.

20 With respect to the possibility that the break fee may deter other bidders, this is a business point that has been considered by the Applicants, its advisors and key creditor groups. At 2.5% of the amount of the bid, the break fee is consistent with break fees that have been approved by this court in other proceedings. The record makes it clear that the break fee issue has been considered and, in the exercise of their business judgment, the Special Committee unanimously recommended to the Board and the Board unanimously approved the break fee. In the circumstances of this case, it is not appropriate or necessary for the court to substitute its business judgment for that of the Applicants.

21 For the foregoing reasons, I am satisfied that the Bid Process and the Stalking Horse APA be approved.

22 For greater certainty, a bid will not be disqualified as a Qualified Bid (or a bidder as a Qualified Bidder) for the reason that the bid does not contemplate the bidder offering employment to all or substantially all of the employees of the Applicants or assuming liabilities to employees on terms comparable to those set out in s. 5.6 of the Stalking Horse Bid. However, this may be considered as a factor in comparing the relative value of competing bids.

23 The Applicants also seek an extension of the Stay Period to coincide with the timelines in the Bid Process. The timelines call for the transaction to close in either February or March, 2010 depending on whether there is a plan of arrangement proposed.

24 Having reviewed the record and heard submissions, I am satisfied that the Applicants have acted, and are acting, in good faith and with due diligence and that circumstances exist that make the granting of an extension appropriate. Accordingly, the Stay Period is extended to February 8, 2010.

25 An order shall issue to give effect to the foregoing.

G.B. MORAWETZ J.

cp/e/qlrxg/qljxr/qlaxw/qlcas

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 PRISZM INCOME FUND, PRISZM CANADIAN OPERATING TRUST, PRISZM INC. AND KIT FINANCE INC.

Court File No: CV-11-9159-00CL

**ONTARIO
SUPERIOR COURT OF JUSTICE -
COMMERCIAL LIST**

Proceeding commenced at Toronto

**BOOK OF AUTHORITIES
OF THE APPLICANT
(RETURNABLE MAY 30, 2011)**

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

Ashley John Taylor LSUC#: 39932E
Tel: (416) 869-5236

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

Kathryn Esaw LSUC#: 58264F
Tel: (416) 869-5230
Fax: (416) 947-0866

Lawyers for the Applicants