

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF BRITISH COLUMBIA

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

**IN THE MATTER OF ARDENTON CAPITAL CORPORATION AND ARDENTON CAPITAL
BRIDGING INC.**

PETITIONERS

**JOINT BOOK OF AUTHORITIES
OF THE PETITIONERS AND THE MONITOR**

(Second Amended and Restated Initial Order / Committee Order / Claims Procedure Order)

Prepared by:

MLT Aikins LLP

2600 - 1066 West Hastings Street
Vancouver, BC V6E 3X1

Attention: William E. J. Skelly

Telephone: (604) 608-4597

wskelly@mltaikins.com

Aird & Berlis LLP

181 Bay Street, #1800

Toronto, ON M5J 2T9

Attention: Kyle Plunkett

Tel No. (416) 230-2560

kplunkett@airdberlis.com

Co-Counsel for the Petitioners, Ardenton Capital Corporation and Ardenton Capital Bridging Inc.

DLA Piper (Canada) LLP

666 Burrard Street, Suite 2800

Vancouver, BC V6C 2Z7

Attention: Colin Brousson

Telephone: (604) 643-6400

colin.brousson@dlapiper.com

Counsel for the Monitor: KSV Advisory

KSV Advisory Inc.

150 King Street West, Suite 2308

Toronto, ON M5H 1J9

Attention: Bobby Kofman

Tel No. (647) 282-6228

bkofman@ksvadvisory.com

Attention: Noah Goldstein

Tel No. (416) 844-4842

ngoldstein@ksvadvisory.com

Date of Hearing: March 31, 2021 to be heard at 9:00 a.m.

Place: Via Telephone Conference (Vancouver Law Courts)

Call-in Telephone No. 604-608-4575 / participant code 594-2718

Vancouver Law Courts

Before the Honourable Mr. Justice Macintosh

Time Estimate: 1 hour

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF BRITISH COLUMBIA

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

AND

**IN THE MATTER OF ARDENTON CAPITAL CORPORATION AND ARDENTON
CAPITAL BRIDGING INC.**

PETITIONERS

PETITIONERS' BOOK OF AUTHORITIES INDEX

TAB NO.	CASE LAW
1.	<i>Canwest Global Communications Corp., Re</i> , 2009 CarswellOnt 6184
2.	<i>JTI-Macdonald Corp., Re</i> , 2019 ONSC 1625
3.	<i>Timminco Ltd., Re</i> , 2012 ONSC 506
	STATUTE
4.	<i>Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act</i> , R.S.C. 1985, c. C-36, sections 11.2(1), 11.2(2), 11.2(4), and 11.52

MONITOR'S BOOK OF AUTHORITIES INDEX

TAB NO.	CASE LAW
5.	<i>Canwest Publishing Inc., Re</i> . 2010 ONSC 1328
6.	<i>Bul River Mineral Corporation, Re</i> , 2014 BCSC 1732
7.	<i>ScoZinc Ltd., Re</i> , 2009 NSSC 136
8.	<i>Timminco Limited, Re</i> , 2014 ONSC 3393
9.	<i>Sierra Club of Canada (Minister of Finance)</i> , 2002 SCC 41

2009 CarswellOnt 6184
Ontario Superior Court of Justice [Commercial List]

Canwest Global Communications Corp., Re

2009 CarswellOnt 6184, [2009] O.J. No. 4286, 181 A.C.W.S. (3d) 853, 59 C.B.R. (5th) 72

**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"

Pepall J.

Judgment: October 13, 2009

Docket: CV-09-8241-OOCL

Counsel: Lyndon Barnes, Edward Sellers, Jeremy Dacks for Applicants
Alan Merskey for Special Committee of the Board of Directors
David Byers, Maria Konyukhova for Proposed Monitor, FTI Consulting Canada Inc.
Benjamin Zarnett, Robert Chadwick for Ad Hoc Committee of Noteholders
Edmond Lamek for Asper Family
Peter H. Griffin, Peter J. Osborne for Management Directors, Royal Bank of Canada
Hilary Clarke for Bank of Nova Scotia
Steve Weisz for CIT Business Credit Canada Inc.

Subject: Insolvency

Headnote

Bankruptcy and insolvency --- Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act — Arrangements — Miscellaneous

Debtor companies experienced financial problems due to deteriorating economic environment in Canada — Debtor companies took steps to improve cash flow and to strengthen their balance sheets — Economic conditions did not improve nor did financial circumstances of debtor companies — They experienced significant tightening of credit from critical suppliers and trade creditors, reduction of advertising commitments, demands for reduced credit terms by newsprint and printing suppliers, and restrictions on or cancellation of credit cards for certain employees — Application was brought for relief pursuant to Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act — Application granted — Proposed monitor was appointed — Companies qualified as debtor companies under Act — Debtor companies were in default of their obligations — Required statement of projected cash-flow and other financial documents required under s. 11(2) were filed — Stay of proceedings was granted to create stability and allow debtor companies to pursue their restructuring — Partnerships in application carried on operations that were integral and closely interrelated to business of debtor companies — It was just and convenient to grant relief requested with respect to partnerships — Debtor-in-possession financing was approved — Administration charge was granted — Debtor companies' request for authorization to pay pre-filing amounts owed to critical suppliers was granted — Directors' and officers' charge was granted — Key employee retention plans were approved — Extension of time for calling of annual general meeting was granted.

APPLICATION for relief pursuant to *Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act*.

Pepall J.:

1 Canwest Global Communications Corp. ("Canwest Global"), its principal operating subsidiary, Canwest Media Inc. ("CMI"), and the other applicants listed on Schedule "A" of the Notice of Application apply for relief pursuant to the *Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act*.¹ The applicants also seek to have the stay of proceedings and other provisions extend

to the following partnerships: Canwest Television Limited Partnership ("CTLP"), Fox Sports World Canada Partnership and The National Post Company/La Publication National Post ("The National Post Company"). The businesses operated by the applicants and the aforementioned partnerships include (i) Canwest's free-to-air television broadcast business (ie. the Global Television Network stations); (ii) certain subscription-based specialty television channels that are wholly owned and operated by CTLP; and (iii) the National Post.

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

3 No one appearing opposed the relief requested.

Background Facts

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

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

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

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

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

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

10 In February, 2009, CMI breached certain of the financial covenants in its secured credit facility. It subsequently received waivers of the borrowing conditions on six occasions. On March 15, 2009, it failed to make an interest payment of US\$30.4 million due on 8% senior subordinated notes. CMI entered into negotiations with an ad hoc committee of the 8% senior subordinated noteholders holding approximately 72% of the notes (the "Ad Hoc Committee"). An agreement was reached wherein CMI and its subsidiary CTLP agreed to issue US\$105 million in 12% secured notes to members of the Ad Hoc Committee. At the same time, CMI entered into an agreement with CIT Business Credit Canada Inc. ("CIT") in which CIT

agreed to provide a senior secured revolving asset based loan facility of up to \$75 million. CMI used the funds generated for operations and to repay amounts owing on the senior credit facility with a syndicate of lenders of which the Bank of Nova Scotia was the administrative agent. These funds were also used to settle related swap obligations.

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

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

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

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

15 Consents from a majority of the 8% senior subordinated noteholders were necessary to allow the sale of the Ten Holdings shares. A Use of Cash Collateral and Consent Agreement was entered into by CMI, CMIH, certain consenting noteholders and others wherein CMIH was allowed to lend the proceeds of sale to CMI.

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

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

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

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

20 CMI has agreed to maintain not more than \$2.5 million as cash collateral in a deposit account with the Bank of Nova Scotia to secure cash management obligations owed to BNS. BNS holds first ranking security against those funds and no court ordered charge attaches to the funds in the account.

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

Proposed Monitor

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

Proposed Order

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

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

(a) Threshold Issues

25 Firstly, the applicants qualify as debtor companies under the [CCAA](#). Their chief place of business is in Ontario. The applicants are affiliated debtor companies with total claims against them exceeding \$5 million. The CMI Entities are in default of their obligations. CMI does not have the necessary liquidity to make an interest payment in the amount of US\$30.4 million that was due on September 15, 2009 and none of the other CMI Entities who are all guarantors are able to make such a payment either. The assets of the CMI Entities are insufficient to discharge all of the liabilities. The CMI Entities are unable to satisfy their debts as they come due and they are insolvent. They are insolvent both under the *Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act*³ definition and under the more expansive definition of insolvency used in *Stelco Inc., Re*⁴. Absent these [CCAA](#) proceedings, the applicants would lack liquidity and would be unable to continue as going concerns. The CMI Entities have acknowledged their insolvency in the affidavit filed in support of the application.

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

(b) Stay of Proceedings

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

(b) Partnerships and Foreign Subsidiaries

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

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

30 Certain applicants are foreign subsidiaries of CMI. Each is a guarantor under the 8% senior subordinated notes, the CIT credit agreement (and therefore the DIP facility), the intercompany notes and is party to the support agreement and the Use of Cash Collateral and Consent Agreement. If the stay of proceedings was not extended to these entities, creditors could seek to enforce their guarantees. I am persuaded that the foreign subsidiary applicants as that term is defined in the affidavit filed are debtor companies within the meaning of [section 2 of the CCAA](#) and that I have jurisdiction and ought to grant the order requested as it relates to them. In this regard, I note that they are insolvent and each holds assets in Ontario in that they each maintain funds on deposit at the Bank of Nova Scotia in Toronto. See in this regard *Cadillac Fairview Inc., Re*⁸ and *Global Light Telecommunications Inc., Re*⁹

(C) DIP Financing

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

- (1) On application by a debtor company and on notice to the secured creditors who are likely to be affected by the security or charge, a court may make an order declaring that all or part of the company's property is subject to a security or charge — in an amount that the court considers appropriate — in favour of a person specified in the order who agrees to lend to the company an amount approved by the court as being required by the company, having regard to its cash-flow statement. The security or charge may not secure an obligation that exists before the order is made.
- (2) The court may order that the security or charge rank in priority over the claim of any secured creditor of the company.
- (3) The court may order that the security or charge rank in priority over any security or charge arising from a previous order made under subsection (1) only with the consent of the person in whose favour the previous order was made.
- (4) In deciding whether to make an order, the court is to consider, among other things,
 - (a) the period during which the company is expected to be subject to proceedings under this Act;
 - (b) how the company's business and financial affairs are to be managed during the proceedings;
 - (c) whether the company's management has the confidence of its major creditors;
 - (d) whether the loan would enhance the prospects of a viable compromise or arrangement being made in respect of the company;
 - (e) the nature and value of the company's property;
 - (f) whether any creditor would be materially prejudiced as a result of the security or charge; and
 - (g) the monitor's report referred to in [paragraph 23\(1\)\(b\)](#), if any.

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

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

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

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

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

(d) Administration Charge

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

(1) On notice to the secured creditors who are likely to be affected by the security or charge, the court may make an order declaring that all or part of the property of a debtor company is subject to a security or charge — in an amount that the court considers appropriate — in respect of the fees and expenses of

(a) the monitor, including the fees and expenses of any financial, legal or other experts engaged by the monitor in the performance of the monitor's duties;

(b) any financial, legal or other experts engaged by the company for the purpose of proceedings under this Act; and

(c) any financial, legal or other experts engaged by any other interested person if the court is satisfied that the security or charge is necessary for their effective participation in proceedings under this Act.

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

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

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

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

(e) Critical Suppliers

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

- (1) On application by a debtor company and on notice to the secured creditors who are likely to be affected by the security or charge, the court may make an order declaring a person to be a critical supplier to the company if the court is satisfied that the person is a supplier of goods or services to the company and that the goods or services that are supplied are critical to the company's continued operation.
- (2) If the court declares a person to be a critical supplier, the court may make an order requiring the person to supply any goods or services specified by the court to the company on any terms and conditions that are consistent with the supply relationship or that the court considers appropriate.
- (3) If the court makes an order under subsection (2), the court shall, in the order, declare that all or part of the property of the company is subject to a security or charge in favour of the person declared to be a critical supplier, in an amount equal to the value of the goods or services supplied under the terms of the order.
- (4) The court may order that the security or charge rank in priority over the claim of any secured creditor of the company.

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

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

(f) Directors' and Officers' Charge

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

45 Again, the recent amendments to the [CCAA](#) allow for such a charge. Section 11.51 provides that:

(1) On application by a debtor company and on notice to the secured creditors who are likely to be affected by the security or charge, the court may make an order declaring that all or part of the property of the company is subject to a security or charge — in an amount that the court considers appropriate — in favour of any director or officer of the company to indemnify the director or officer against obligations and liabilities that they may incur as a director or officer of the company

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

(3) The court may not make the order if in its opinion the company could obtain adequate indemnification insurance for the director or officer at a reasonable cost.

(4) The court shall make an order declaring that the security or charge does not apply in respect of a specific obligation or liability incurred by a director or officer if in its opinion the obligation or liability was incurred as a result of the director's or officer's gross negligence or wilful misconduct or, in Quebec, the director's or officer's gross or intentional fault.

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

47 The proposed Monitor reports that the amount of \$20 million was estimated taking into consideration the existing D&O insurance and the potential liabilities which may attach including certain employee related and tax related obligations. The amount was negotiated with the DIP lender and the Ad Hoc Committee. The order proposed speaks of indemnification relating to the failure of any of the CMI Entities, after the date of the order, to make certain payments. It also excludes gross negligence and wilful misconduct. The D&O insurance provides for \$30 million in coverage and \$10 million in excess coverage for a total of \$40 million. It will expire in a matter of weeks and Canwest Global has been unable to obtain additional or replacement coverage. I am advised that it also extends to others in the Canwest enterprise and not just to the CMI Entities. The directors and senior management are described as highly experienced, fully functional and qualified. The directors have indicated that they cannot continue in the restructuring effort unless the order includes the requested directors' charge.

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

(g) Key Employee Retention Plans

49 Approval of a KERP and a KERP charge are matters of discretion. In this case, the CMI Entities have developed KERPs that are designed to facilitate and encourage the continued participation of certain of the CMI Entities' senior executives and other key employees who are required to guide the CMI Entities through a successful restructuring with a view to preserving enterprise value. There are 20 KERP participants all of whom are described by the applicants as being critical to the successful restructuring of the CMI Entities. Details of the KERPs are outlined in the materials and the proposed Monitor's report. A charge of \$5.9 million is requested. The three Management Directors are seasoned executives with extensive experience in

the broadcasting and publishing industries. They have played critical roles in the restructuring initiatives taken to date. The applicants state that it is probable that they would consider other employment opportunities if the KERPs were not secured by a KERP charge. The other proposed participants are also described as being crucial to the restructuring and it would be extremely difficult to find replacements for them

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

51 The applicants ask that the Confidential Supplement containing unredacted copies of the KERPs that reveal individually identifiable information and compensation information be sealed. Generally speaking, judges are most reluctant to grant sealing orders. An open court and public access are fundamental to our system of justice. Section 137(2) of the *Courts of Justice Act* provides authority to grant a sealing order and the Supreme Court of Canada's decision in *Sierra Club of Canada v. Canada (Minister of Finance)*¹² provides guidance on the appropriate legal principles to be applied. Firstly, the Court must be satisfied that the order is necessary in order to prevent a serious risk to an important interest, including a commercial interest, in the context of litigation because reasonable alternative measures will not prevent the risk. Secondly, the salutary effects of the order should outweigh its deleterious effects including the effects on the right to free expression which includes the public interest in open and accessible court proceedings.

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

Annual Meeting

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

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

Other

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

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

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

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

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

Conclusion

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

Application granted.

Footnotes

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

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

3 [R.S.C. 1985, c. B-3](#), as amended.

4 [\(2004\), 48 C.B.R. \(4th\) 299](#) (Ont. S.C.J. [Commercial List]); leave to appeal refused [2004 CarswellOnt 2936](#) (Ont. C.A.).

5 [\(1993\), 9 B.L.R. \(2d\) 275](#) (Ont. Gen. Div. [Commercial List]).

6 [\[2009\] O.J. No. 349](#) (Ont. S.C.J. [Commercial List]).

7 [\(2006\), 19 C.B.R. \(5th\) 187](#) (Alta. Q.B.).

8 [\(1995\), 30 C.B.R. \(3d\) 29](#) (Ont. Gen. Div. [Commercial List]).

9 [\(2004\), 33 B.C.L.R. \(4th\) 155](#) (B.C. S.C.).

10 [\(2003\), 39 C.B.R. \(4th\) 216](#) (Ont. S.C.J.).

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

12 [\[2002\] 2 S.C.R. 522](#) (S.C.C.).

2019 ONSC 1625
Ontario Superior Court of Justice [Commercial List]

JTI-Macdonald Corp., Re

2019 CarswellOnt 3653, 2019 ONSC 1625, 303 A.C.W.S. (3d) 241, 69 C.B.R. (6th) 285

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

IN THE MATTER OF A PLAN OF COMPROMISE OR
ARRANGEMENT OF JTI-MACDONALD CORP. (Applicant)

Hainey J.

Heard: March 8, 2019

Judgment: March 12, 2019

Docket: CV-19-615862-00CL

Counsel: Robert I. Thornton, Leanne M. Williams, Rachel Bengino, Mitch Grossell, for Applicant
Scott A. Bomhof, Adam M. Slavens, for Respondents, JT Canada LLC, and PWC, in its capacity as Receiver of JTI-MacDonald
TM

Pamela L.J. Huff, Linc A. Rogers, Christopher Burr, for Proposed Monitor, Deloitte Restructuring Inc.

Subject: Insolvency

Headnote

Bankruptcy and insolvency --- Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act — Initial application — Grant of stay — Maintenance of status quo

As result of judgment from Quebec Court of Appeal, debtor and four others were found liable to pay damages of \$13.5 billion — Debtor claimed it did not have sufficient assets to satisfy judgment and that enforcement would lead to its demise, impacting its 500 employees, 1,300 suppliers, 28,000 retailers and 790,000 consumers — Debtor was also defendant in significant number of health care costs recovery actions claiming damages of more than \$500 billion — On basis it wanted opportunity to seek collective solution to all proceedings, for benefit of all stakeholders, debtor brought application for initial order under Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act — Application granted — Given amount of judgment debt and debtor's apparent inability to pay, there was no question debtor was insolvent company to which Act applied — On basis primary purpose of Act was to maintain status quo while debtor consulted with creditors and stakeholders with view to continuing operations for benefit of company, creditors and stakeholders, it was appropriate to grant stay of proceedings — On basis goal was to reach collective solution, including other defendants in tobacco litigation, it was appropriate to extend stay to those non-applicant third parties — Appointment of proposed monitor was approved — Administrative charges in favour of counsel, restructuring officer and monitor and its counsel in amount of \$3 million were authorized — In order to ensure ongoing stability of debtor's business during proceeding, directors' charges in amount of \$4.1 million were authorized — In order to protect directors and officers from personal liability, payment of sales taxes, excise taxes and duties of \$127 million was authorized — Also in order to maintain debtor's business as going concern, payment of various pre-existing and ongoing obligations arising in ordinary course of business, to employees, trade creditors and like, was authorized — Appointment of proposed restructuring officer, on terms set out in engagement letter, was approved — Debtor was entitled to order sealing engagement letter, which contained commercially sensitive information — Debtor was granted permission to continue application for leave to appeal to Supreme Court of Canada.

APPLICATION by debtor for initial order under *Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act*.

Hainey J.:

Background

1 On March 8, 2019 JTI-Macdonald Corp. ("JTIM" or "Applicant") sought an Initial Order pursuant to *The Companies Creditors Arrangement Act* ("CCAA"). I granted the Initial Order and endorsed the record as follows:

I am satisfied that this application should be granted today on the terms of the attached Initial Order. There shall be a sealing order on the terms of para. 59 of the Initial Order. I will provide written reasons for my decision to grant this order in due course. The comeback motion referred to in para. 50 shall be on April 4, 2019 at 10 a.m. in this Court.

2 These are my Reasons.

Facts

3 As a result of a judgment of the Quebec Court of Appeal released on March 1, 2019 in a class proceeding ("Quebec Class Action"), JTIM and two other defendants are liable for damages totaling \$13.5 billion ("Quebec Judgment"). If this judgment is not stayed, its enforcement could destroy the company because JTIM does not have sufficient funds to satisfy the judgment.

4 According to JTIM, enforcement of the Quebec Judgment would destroy the company's value for its 500 employees and 1,300 suppliers. It would also impact approximately 28,000 retailers that sell JTIM's products and 790,000 consumers of its products. Enforcement of the Quebec Judgment would also jeopardize federal and provincial taxes and duties in excess of \$1.3 billion paid annually in connection with JTIM's operations (of which \$500 million per year is paid directly by JTIM and another \$800 million per year is paid by third parties and consumers).

5 JTIM is also a defendant in a number of significant health care costs recovery actions ("HCCR Actions"). The total claims in the HCCR Actions exceed \$500 billion.

6 JTIM wishes to seek a "collective solution" to the Quebec Judgment and the HCCR Actions for the benefit of all of its stakeholders. It is for this reason that it seeks a stay of all proceedings in its application for an Initial Order pursuant to the CCAA.

7 In its application JTIM seeks protection from its creditors and the following additional relief under the CCAA:

- (a) declaring that it is a company to which the CCAA applies;
- (b) granting a stay of proceedings against it, and the Other Defendants in the Pending Litigation, as defined and described in the Notice of Application;
- (c) appointing Deloitte Restructuring Inc. ("Proposed Monitor") as Monitor in these CCAA proceedings;
- (d) granting an Administrative Charge, Directors' Charge and Tax Charge;
- (e) authorizing the Applicant to pay its pre-filing and post-filing obligations in respect of suppliers, trade creditors, taxes, duties, employees (including outstanding and future pension plan contributions, other post-employment benefits and severance packages) and royalty payments and to pay post-filing interest of certain of its secured obligations in the ordinary course of business in order to minimize any disruption of the Applicant's business;
- (f) approving the engagement letter dated April 23, 2018 (the "CRO Engagement Letter") appointing Blue Tree Advisors Inc. as the Applicant's Chief Restructuring Officer ("CRO");
- (g) authorizing it to apply for leave and, if successful, to appeal the Quebec Judgment to the Supreme Court of Canada; and
- (h) sealing Confidential Exhibit "1" of Robert Master's affidavit.

Issues

8 I must decide the following issues:

- (a) Should the Court grant protection to JTIM under the [CCAA](#)?
- (b) Is it appropriate to grant the requested stay of proceedings?
- (c) Should the Proposed Monitor be appointed as Monitor in these proceedings?
- (d) Should the Court grant the requested charges?
- (e) Is it appropriate to allow the payment of certain pre-filing and post-filing amounts?
- (f) Should Blue Tree Advisors be appointed as CRO?
- (g) Should JTIM be authorized to continue its application for leave to appeal of the Quebec Judgment to the Supreme Court of Canada?

Analysis

Should the Court grant protection to JTIM under the CCAA?

9 The [CCAA](#) applies to an insolvent company whose liabilities exceed \$5 million.

10 JTIM is a company incorporated pursuant to the [Canada Business Corporations Act](#).

11 JTIM's liabilities clearly exceed \$5 million. It faces a judgment for \$13.5 billion. According to Robert McMaster, JTIM's Director, Taxation and Treasury, the company does not have sufficient funds to satisfy the Quebec Judgment which is currently payable. Accordingly, JTIM is an insolvent company to which the [CCAA](#) applies.

Is it appropriate to grant the requested stay of proceedings?

12 The Court may grant a stay of proceedings pursuant to [s. 11.02 of the CCAA](#) in respect of a debtor company if it is satisfied that circumstances exist that make the order appropriate. In order to determine whether a stay order is appropriate the Court should consider the purpose behind the [CCAA](#). The primary purpose of the [CCAA](#) is to maintain the *status quo* for a period while the debtor company consults with its creditors and stakeholders with a view to continuing the company's operations for the benefit of the company and its creditors.

13 JTIM cannot pay the amount of the Quebec Judgment. Any steps to enforce the judgment could cause serious harm to JTIM's business to the detriment of all of its stakeholders. In my view, it is appropriate for this reason to grant the requested stay of proceedings in favour of JTIM.

14 JTIM also requests a stay of proceedings in favour of the other defendants in other litigation relating to tobacco claims in which JTIM is a defendant, including the Quebec Class Action and the HCCR Actions. The Court has discretion under [s. 11 of the CCAA](#) to impose a stay of proceedings with respect to non-applicant third parties. In *Tamerlane Ventures Inc., Re*, [2013 ONSC 5461](#) (Ont. S.C.J. [Commercial List]), Newbould J stated as follows at para. 21:

Courts have an inherent jurisdiction to impose stays of proceedings against non-applicant third parties where it is important to the reorganization and restructuring process, where it is just and reasonable to do so.

15 I came to the same conclusion in *Pacific Exploration & Production Corp., Re*, [2016 ONSC 5429](#) (Ont. S.C.J. [Commercial List]), where at para. 26 I set out the following list of factors that courts have considered in deciding whether to extend a stay of proceedings to non-applicant third parties:

- (a) the business and operations of the third party was significantly intertwined and integrated with those of the debtor company;
- (b) extending the stay to the third party would help maintain stability and value during the [CCAA](#) process;
- (c) not extending the stay to the third party would have a negative impact on the debtor company's ability to restructure, potentially jeopardizing the success of the restructuring and the continuance of the debtor company;
- (d) if the debtor company is prevented from concluding a successful restructuring with its creditors, the economic harm would be far-reaching and significant;
- (e) failure of the restructuring would be even more harmful to customers, suppliers, landlords and other counterparties whose rights would otherwise be stayed under the third party stay;
- (f) if the restructuring proceedings are successful, the debtor company will continue to operate for the benefit of all of its stakeholders, and its stakeholders will retain all of its remedies in the event of future breaches by the debtor company or breaches that are not related to the released claims; and
- (g) the balance of convenience favours extending the stay to the third party.

16 Having considered these factors, I am satisfied that granting the requested stay of proceedings to the other defendants will allow JTIM to attempt to arrive at a collective solution with respect to the Quebec Class Action and the HCCR actions. If these actions continue to proceed against the other defendants but not JTIM there could be significant economic harm for all of JTIM's stakeholders.

17 Accordingly, I have concluded that the balance of convenience favours exercising my discretion under the [CCAA](#) to grant a stay of proceedings to the other defendants.

Should the Proposed Monitor be appointed as the Monitor?

18 I am satisfied that Deloitte Restructuring Inc. ("Deloitte") should be appointed the Monitor in these proceedings pursuant to [s. 11.7 of the CCAA](#). Deloitte regularly acts as the Monitor in [CCAA](#) proceedings and it is not subject to any of the restrictions set out in [s. 11.7\(2\) of the CCAA](#).

Should the requested charges be granted?

Administrative Charge

19 JTIM requests that I grant an administrative charge in favour of JTIM's counsel, the CRO, the Monitor and its legal counsel in the amount of \$3 million.

20 The Court has jurisdiction to grant an administrative charge pursuant to [s. 11.52 of the CCAA](#). In *Canwest Publishing Inc./ Publications Canwest Inc., Re*, [2012 ONSC 633](#) (Ont. S.C.J. [Commercial List]), Pepall J. set out the following list of factors the Court should consider when granting an administrative charge:

- (a) the size and the complexity of the business being restructured;
- (b) the proposed role of the beneficiaries of the charge;
- (c) whether there is an unwarranted duplication of roles
- (d) whether the quantum of the proposed charge appears to be fair and reasonable;
- (e) the position of the secured creditors likely to be affected by the charge; and

(f) the position of the monitor.

21 Having considered these factors, I am satisfied that the requested administration charge should be granted for the following reasons:

(a) JTIM's restructuring will require extensive involvement by the professional advisors who are subject to the administrative charge;

(b) the professionals subject to the administration charge have contributed, and will continue to contribute, to the restructuring of JTIM;

(c) there is no unwarranted duplication of roles so that the professional fees associated with these proceedings will be minimized;

(d) the administrative charge will rank in priority to the directors' charge and the tax charge. The only secured creditors that will be affected by the administrative charge are JTIM's parent companies and certain other secured related party suppliers, each of which support the granting of the administrative charge; and

(e) the Proposed Monitor believes that the amount of the administration charge is reasonable

Directors' Charge

22 I am satisfied that the directors' charge should be approved to ensure the ongoing stability of JTIM's business during the [CCAA](#) proceedings. The directors and officers have a great deal of institutional knowledge and experience and JTIM requires their continued management of its business. To ensure that the officers and directors remain with JTIM during the [CCAA](#) proceedings they require the protection of the directors' charge. The proposed charge of \$4.1 million will only be available to the extent that the directors' and officers' insurance is not available if a claim is made against them. The Proposed Monitor is of the view that the directors' charge is reasonable and appropriate.

Tax Charge

23 JTIM is also seeking a third-ranking super-priority charge in the amount of \$127 million in favour of the Canadian federal, provincial and territorial authorities that are entitled to receive payments and collect money from JTIM with respect to sales taxes and excise taxes and duties. I am satisfied that this tax charge should be granted so that JTIM's directors and officers do not become personally liable for these taxes. Further, the Proposed Monitor is of the view that the tax charge is reasonable and appropriate.

Is it appropriate to allow the payment of certain pre-filing and post-filing amounts?

24 In *Cinram International Inc., Re*, [2012 ONSC 3767](#) (Ont. S.C.J. [Commercial List]) Morawetz J. (as he then was) concluded at Para. 68 that the court should consider the following factors in deciding whether to authorize the payment of pre-filing obligations:

(a) whether the goods and services were integral to the business of the applicants;

(b) the debtors' need for the uninterrupted supply of the goods or services;

(c) the Monitor's support and willingness to work with the applicants to ensure that payments to suppliers in respect of pre-filing liabilities were appropriate; and

(d) the effect on the debtors' ongoing operations and ability to restructure if they were unable to make pre-filing payments to their critical suppliers.

25 JTIM's business is expected to remain cash-flow positive during these CCAA proceedings so that it will have sufficient cash to meet its pre-filing and post-filing obligations. JTIM's operations depend on timely and continuous supply from its suppliers. Maintaining its operations as a going concern is in the best interests of all of JTIM's stakeholders. The Proposed Monitor supports JTIM's intentions to pay its employees, trade creditors, royalty payments, interest, payments, previous obligations and other disbursements in the ordinary course of its business. I agree and adopt the Proposed Monitor's reasons for supporting these pre-filing and post-filing payments as set out at paras. 65-72 of the Report of the Proposed Monitor dated March 8, 2019.

Should Blue Tree Advisors be appointed as CRO?

26 According to JTIM, it requires the proposed Chief Restructuring Officer, William Aziz, to successfully complete its contemplated restructuring plan. Mr. Aziz has the experience and necessary skills to oversee and assist JTIM with its complex negotiations during the CCAA proceedings. With the assistance of the CRO, JTIM's management can focus on the company's operations which should maximize value for its stakeholders.

27 I am satisfied that Mr. Aziz should be appointed as CRO pursuant to the terms of the CRO Engagement Letter which the Monitor supports.

28 JTIM requests an order sealing the unredacted copy of the CRO Engagement Letter. Section 137(2) of the *Courts of Justice Act* gives the Court jurisdiction to order that a document filed in a civil proceeding be treated as confidential, sealed and not form part of the public record.

29 The CRO Engagement Letter sets out the commercial terms of the CRO's engagement. This is commercially sensitive information. In my view JTIM's request for a sealing order meets the test set out in the Supreme Court of Canada's decision in *Sierra Club of Canada v. Canada (Minister of Finance)*, 2002 SCC 41 (S.C.C.) because it will protect a commercial interest and the salutary effects of sealing the CRO's Engagement Letter outweighs any deleterious effects since this is the type of information that a private company outside of a CCAA proceeding would treat as confidential.

Should JTIM be authorized to continue its appeal to the Supreme Court of Canada?

30 At para. 75 of its Factum, JTIM submits as follows:

75. In this case, the Applicant is cash flow positive and has successful business operations. Its insolvency is primarily due to the QCA Judgment. The Applicant wishes to exercise its right to appeal the QCA Judgment, while staying enforcement thereof and while considering its options for a viable solution for the benefit of all of its stakeholders.

31 In my view, based on this submission it is reasonable to permit JTIM to continue its leave to appeal application to the Supreme Court of Canada.

Conclusion

32 For the reasons set out above the Application is granted.

Application granted.

Most Negative Treatment: Check subsequent history and related treatments.

2012 ONSC 506

Ontario Superior Court of Justice [Commercial List]

Timminco Ltd., Re

2012 CarswellOnt 1263, 2012 ONSC 506, [2012] O.J. No.
472, 217 A.C.W.S. (3d) 12, 85 C.B.R. (5th) 169, 95 C.C.P.B. 48

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

In the Matter of a Plan of Compromise or Arrangement of
Timminco Limited and Bécancour Silicon Inc. (Applicants)

Morawetz J.

Heard: January 12, 2012

Judgment: February 2, 2012

Docket: CV-12-9539-00CL

Counsel: A.J. Taylor, M. Konyukhova, K. Esaw, for Applicants
D.W. Ellickson, for Communications, Energy and Paperworkers' Union of Canada
C. Sinclair, for United Steelworkers' Union
K. Peters, for AMG Advance Metallurgical Group NV
M. Bailey, for Superintendent of Financial Services (Ontario)
S. Weisz, for FTI Consulting Canada Inc.
A. Kauffman, for Investissement Quebec

Subject: Insolvency; Corporate and Commercial; Civil Practice and Procedure; Labour; Employment; Public

Headnote

Bankruptcy and insolvency --- Priorities of claims — Preferred claims — Costs and expenses of administrators — Priority over other claims

Super priority of administration charge — Insolvent companies sponsored three pension plans — All pension plans had deficiencies, and terminated plan required increased special payments — Insolvent companies obtained relief under Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act (CCAA), including administration charge and directors' and officers' charge (D&O charge) — Insolvent companies did not have funds to make contributions to plans other than normal cost contributions — Insolvent companies brought motion for order suspending obligations to make special payments to pension plans, and granting super priority to two charges — Motion granted — It was necessary and appropriate to grant super priority to administrative charge and D&O charge — Absence of court-ordered super priority charge would frustrate objectives of CCAA — Without assistance of advisors, and in void caused by lack of governance structure, companies would be unable to proceed with restructuring and likely result would be bankruptcy — It was unlikely that advisors would participate in proceedings, and it was neither reasonable nor realistic to expect advisors to participate, unless administration charge was granted to secure their fees and disbursements — Role of advisors was critical to efforts to restructure insolvent companies — Employees were not prejudiced by requested relief since alternative was bankruptcy, which would not be better result for stakeholders.

Bankruptcy and insolvency --- Priorities of claims — Restricted and postponed claims — Officers, directors, and stockholders Super priority of directors' and officers' charge — Insolvent companies sponsored three pension plans — All pension plans had deficiencies, and terminated plan required increased special payments — Insolvent companies obtained relief under Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act (CCAA), including administration charge and directors' and officers' charge (D&O charge) — Insolvent companies did not have funds to make contributions to plans other than normal cost contributions — Insolvent

companies brought motion for order suspending obligations to make special payments to pension plans, and granting super priority to two charges — Motion granted — It was necessary and appropriate to grant super priority to administrative charge and D&O charge — Absence of court-ordered super priority charge would frustrate objectives of CCAA — Without assistance of advisors, and in void caused by lack of governance structure, companies would be unable to proceed with restructuring and likely result would be bankruptcy — Directors and officers would be unlikely to continue their service without D&O charge — It was neither reasonable nor realistic to expect directors and officers to continue without requested protection — Employees were not prejudiced by requested relief since alternative was bankruptcy, which would not be better result for stakeholders.

Pensions --- Payment of pension — Bankruptcy or insolvency of employer — Registered plans

Suspension of special payments — Insolvent companies sponsored three pension plans — All pension plans had deficiencies, and terminated plan required increased special payments — Insolvent companies obtained relief under Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act (CCAA), including administration charge and directors' and officers' charge (D&O charge) — Insolvent companies did not have funds to make contributions to plans other than normal cost contributions — Insolvent companies brought motion for order suspending obligations to make special payments to pension plans, and granting super priority to two charges — Motion granted — It was necessary and appropriate to grant super priority to administrative charge and D&O charge — It was necessary and appropriate to suspend companies' obligations to make pension contributions, in order to allow companies to restructure or sell business as going concern — Companies had insufficient liquidity to make special payments to plans at this time — Employees were not prejudiced by requested relief since likely outcome should proceedings fail was bankruptcy — There was no priority for special payments in bankruptcy — Application of provincial pensions legislation would frustrate insolvent companies' ability to restructure and avoid bankruptcy — Requiring companies to make special payments would deprive them of sufficient funds to continue operating, which was what CCAA was intended to avoid.

Pensions --- Administration of pension plans — Valuation and funding of plans — Funding arrangements

Suspension of special payments — Insolvent companies sponsored three pension plans — All pension plans had deficiencies, and terminated plan required increased special payments — Insolvent companies obtained relief under Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act (CCAA), including administration charge and directors' and officers' charge (D&O charge) — Insolvent companies did not have funds to make contributions to plans other than normal cost contributions — Insolvent companies brought motion for order suspending obligations to make special payments to pension plans, and granting super priority to two charges — Motion granted — It was necessary and appropriate to grant super priority to administrative charge and D&O charge — It was necessary and appropriate to suspend companies' obligations to make pension contributions, in order to allow companies to restructure or sell business as going concern — Companies had insufficient liquidity to make special payments to plans at this time — Employees were not prejudiced by requested relief since likely outcome should proceedings fail was bankruptcy — There was no priority for special payments in bankruptcy — Application of provincial pensions legislation would frustrate insolvent companies' ability to restructure and avoid bankruptcy — Requiring companies to make special payments would deprive them of sufficient funds to continue operating, which was what CCAA was intended to avoid.

Bankruptcy and insolvency --- Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act — General principles — Application of Act — Miscellaneous

Relationship between Act and provincial pensions acts — Insolvent companies sponsored three pension plans — All pension plans had deficiencies, and terminated plan required increased special payments — Insolvent companies obtained relief under Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act (CCAA), including administration charge and directors' and officers' charge (D&O charge) — Insolvent companies did not have funds to make contributions to plans other than normal cost contributions — Insolvent companies brought motion for order suspending obligations to make special payments to pension plans, and granting super priority to two charges — Motion granted — It was necessary and appropriate to grant super priority to administrative charge and D&O charge — It was necessary and appropriate to suspend companies' obligations to make pension contributions, in order to allow companies to restructure or sell business as going concern — Application of provincial pension legislation would frustrate insolvent companies' ability to restructure and avoid bankruptcy — Order requiring company to make special payments in accordance with provincial legislation would frustrate rehabilitative purpose of CCAA if such order would have effect of forcing company into bankruptcy — It was necessary to invoke doctrine of paramountcy such that provisions of CCAA overrode those of provincial pension legislation.

Bankruptcy and insolvency --- Bankruptcy and insolvency jurisdiction — Constitutional jurisdiction of Federal government and provinces — Paramountcy of Federal legislation

Insolvent companies sponsored three pension plans — All pension plans had deficiencies, and terminated plan required increased special payments — Insolvent companies obtained relief under Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act (CCAA), including administration charge and directors' and officers' charge (D&O charge) — Insolvent companies did not have funds to make contributions to plans other than normal cost contributions — Insolvent companies brought motion for order suspending obligations to make special payments to pension plans, and granting super priority to two charges — Motion granted — It was necessary and appropriate to grant super priority to administrative charge and D&O charge — It was necessary and appropriate to suspend companies' obligations to make pension contributions, in order to allow companies to restructure or sell business as going concern — Application of provincial pension legislation would frustrate insolvent companies' ability to restructure and avoid bankruptcy, contrary to purpose of CCAA — It was necessary to invoke doctrine of paramountcy such that provisions of CCAA overrode those of provincial pension legislation — Doctrine of paramountcy was properly invoked.

Bankruptcy and insolvency --- Priorities of claims — Preferred claims — Wages and salaries of employees — Entitlement to preferred status

Key Employee Retention Plans — Insolvent companies obtained relief under Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act (CCAA) — Insolvent companies' board of directors approved key employee retention plans (KERPs) in order to keep employees who were considered critical to successful proceedings under CCAA because they were experienced employees who played central roles in restructuring initiatives — Insolvent companies brought motion for order approving KERPs, and sealing confidential supplement to monitor's report — Motion granted — KERPs were approved — It was necessary that KERPs' participants be incentivized to remain in current positions during restructuring process — Continued participation of these employees would assist company in its objectives — Replacement of these employees if they left would not provide any substantial economic benefits to company — Confidential supplement to monitor's report, which contained copies of unredacted KERPs, was sealed pursuant to R. 151 of Federal Courts Rules.

Business associations --- Legal proceedings involving business associations — Practice and procedure in proceedings involving corporations — Confidentiality or sealing orders

Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act (CCAA) — Supplement to monitor's report — Insolvent companies obtained relief under CCAA — Insolvent companies' board of directors approved key employee retention plans (KERPs) in order to keep certain employees who were considered critical to successful proceedings under CCAA — Supplement to monitor's report contained copies of unredacted KERPs, which had sensitive personal compensation information — Insolvent companies brought motion for order approving KERPs, and sealing confidential supplement to monitor's report — Motion granted — KERPs were approved — Confidential supplement to monitor's report was sealed pursuant to R. 151 of Federal Courts Rules for period of 45 days — Disclosure of personal information in supplement could compromise commercial interests of companies and cause harm to KERPs' participants — Confidentiality order was necessary to prevent serious risk to companies' and KERPs participants' interests.

Labour and employment law --- Labour law — Collective agreement — Employee benefits — Pensions
Insolvent employer.

MOTION by insolvent companies for order suspending obligations to make special payments to pension plans, granting super priority to two charges, approving key employee retention plans, and sealing confidential supplement to monitor's report.

Morawetz J.:

1 This motion was heard on January 12, 2012. On January 16, 2012, the following endorsement was released:

Motion granted. Reasons will follow. Order to go subject to proviso that the Sealing Order is subject to modification, if necessary, after reasons provided.

2 These are those reasons.

Background

3 On January 3, 2012, Timminco Limited ("Timminco") and Bécancour Silicon Inc. ("BSI") (collectively, the "Timminco Entities") applied for and obtained relief under the *Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act* (the "CCAA").

4 In my endorsement of January 3, 2012, (*Timminco Ltd., Re*, 2012 ONSC 106 (Ont. S.C.J. [Commercial List])), I stated at [11]: "I am satisfied that the record establishes that the Timminco Entities are insolvent and are 'debtor companies' to which the CCAA applies".

5 On the initial motion, the Applicants also requested an "Administration Charge" and a "Directors. and Officers. Charge" ("D&O Charge"), both of which were granted.

6 The Timminco Entities requested that the Administration Charge rank ahead of the existing security interest of Investissement Quebec ("IQ") but behind all other security interests, trusts, liens, charges and encumbrances, claims of secured creditors, statutory or otherwise, including any deemed trust created under the *Ontario Pension Benefit Act* (the "PBA") or the *Quebec Supplemental Pensions Plans Act* (the "QSPPA") (collectively, the "Encumbrances") in favour of any persons that have not been served with this application.

7 IQ had been served and did not object to the Administration Charge and the D&O Charge.

8 At [35] of my endorsement, I noted that the Timminco Entities had indicated their intention to return to court to seek an order granting super priority ranking for both the Administration Charge and the D&O Charge ahead of the Encumbrances.

9 The Timminco Entities now bring this motion for an order:

(a) suspending the Timminco Entities. obligations to make special payments with respect to the pension plans (as defined in the Notice of Motion);

(b) granting super priority to the Administration Charge and the D&O Charge;

(c) approving key employee retention plans (the "KERPs") offered by the Timminco Entities to certain employees deemed critical to a successful restructuring and a charge on the current and future assets, undertakings and properties of the Timminco Entities to secure the Timminco Entities. obligations under the KERPs (the "KERP Charge"); and

(d) sealing the confidential supplement (the "Confidential Supplement") to the First Report of FTI Consulting Canada Inc. (the "Monitor").

10 If granted, the effect of the proposed Court-ordered charges in relation to each other would be:

- first, the Administration Charge to the maximum amount of \$1 million;
- second, the KERP Charge (in the maximum amount of \$269,000); and
- third, the D&O Charge (in the maximum amount of \$400,000).

11 The requested relief was recommended and supported by the Monitor. IQ also supported the requested relief. It was, however, opposed by the Communications, Energy and Paperworkers. Union of Canada ("CEP"). The position put forth by counsel to CEP was supported by counsel for the United Steelworkers. Union ("USW").

12 The motion materials were served on all personal property security registrants in Ontario and in Quebec: the members of the Pension Plan Committees for the Bécancour Union Pension Plan and the Bécancour Non-Union Pension Plan; the Financial Services Commission of Ontario; the Regie de Rentes du Quebec; the United Steel, Paper and Forestry, Rubber, Manufacturing, Energy, Allied Industrial and Service Works International Union; and La Section Locale 184 de Syndicat Canadien des Communications, De L.Energie et du Papier; and various government entities, including Ontario and Quebec environmental agencies and federal and provincial taxing authorities.

13 Counsel to the Applicants identified the issues on the motion as follows:

- (a) Should this court grant increased priority to the Administration Charge and the D&O Charge?
- (b) Should this court grant an order suspending the Timminco Entities. obligations to make the pension contributions with respect to the pension plans?
- (c) Should this court approve the KERPs and grant the KERPs Charge?
- (d) Should this court seal the Confidential Supplement?

14 It was not disputed that the court has the jurisdiction and discretion to order a super priority charge in the context of a CCAA proceeding. However, counsel to CEP submits that this is an extraordinary measure, and that the onus is on the party seeking such an order to satisfy the court that such an order ought to be awarded in the circumstances.

15 The affidavit of Peter A.M. Kalins, sworn January 5, 2012, provides information relating to the request to suspend the payment of certain pension contributions. Paragraphs 14-28 read as follows:

14. The Timminco Entities sponsor the following three pension plans (collectively, the "**Pension Plans**"):

- (a) the Retirement Pension Plan for The Haley Plant Hourly Employees of Timminco Metals, A Division of Timminco Limited (Ontario Registration Number 0589648) (the "**Haley Pension Plan**");
- (b) the Régime de rentes pour les employés non syndiqués de Silicium Bécancour Inc. (Québec Registration Number 26042) (the "**Bécancour Non-Union Pension Plan**"); and
- (c) the Régime de rentes pour les employés syndiqués de Silicium Bécancour Inc. (Québec Registration Number 32063) (the "**Bécancour Union Pension Plan**").

Haley Pension Plan

15. The Haley Pension plan, sponsored and administered by Timminco, applies to former hourly employees at Timminco's magnesium facility in Haley, Ontario.

16. The Haley Pension Plan was terminated effective as of August 1, 2008 and accordingly, no normal cost contributions are payable in connection with the Haley Pension Plan. As required by the Ontario *Pension Benefits Act* (the "**PBA**"), a wind-up valuation in respect of the Haley Pension Plan was filed with the Financial Services Commission of Ontario ("**FSCO**") detailing the plan's funded status as of the wind-up date, and each year thereafter. As of August 1, 2008, the Haley Pension Plan was in a deficit position on a wind-up basis of \$5,606,700. The PBA requires that the wind-up deficit be paid down in equal annual installments payable annually in advance over a period of no more than five years.

17. As of August 1, 2010, the date of the most recently filed valuation report, the Haley Pension Plan had a wind-up deficit of \$3,922,700. Contributions to the Haley Pension Plan are payable annually in advance every August 1. Contributions in respect of the period from August 1, 2008 to July 31, 2011 totalling \$4,712,400 were remitted to the plan. Contributions in respect of the period from August 1, 2011 to July 31, 2012 were estimated to be \$1,598,500 and have not been remitted to the plan.

18. According to preliminary estimates calculated by the Haley Pension Plan's actuaries, despite Timminco having made contributions of approximately \$4,712,400 during the period from August 1, 2008 to July 31, 2011, as of August 1, 2011, the deficit remaining in the Haley Pension Plan is \$3,102,900.

Bécancour Non-Union Pension Plan

19. The Bécancour Non-Union Pension Plan, sponsored by BSI, is an on-going pension plan with both defined benefit ("DB") and defined contribution provisions. The plan has four active members and 32 retired and deferred vested members (including surviving spouses).

20. The most recently filed actuarial valuation of the Bécancour Non-Union Pension Plan performed for funding purposes was performed as of September 30, 2010. As of September 30, 2010, the solvency deficit in the Bécancour Non-Union Pension Plan was \$3,239,600.

21. In 2011, normal cost contributions payable to this plan totaled approximately \$9,525 per month (or 16.8% of payroll). Amortization payments owing to this plan totaled approximately \$41,710 per month. All contributions in respect of the plan were paid when due in accordance with the Québec *Supplemental Pension Plans Act* (the "QSPPA") and regulations.

Bécancour Union Pension Plan

22. The BSI-sponsored Bécancour Union Pension Plan is an on-going DB pension plan with two active members and 98 retired and deferred vested members (including surviving spouses).

23. The most recently filed actuarial valuation performed for funding purposes was performed as of September 30, 2010. As of September 30, 2010, the solvency deficit in the Bécancour Union Pension Plan was \$7,939,500.

24. In 2011, normal cost contributions payable to the plan totaled approximately \$7,083 per month (or 14.7% of payroll). Amortization payments owing to this plan totaled approximately \$95,300 per month. All contributions in respect of the plan were paid when due in accordance with the QSPPA and regulations.

25. BSI unionized employees have the option to transfer their employment to QSLP, under the form of the existing collective bargaining agreement. In the event of such transfer, their pension membership in the Bécancour Union Pension Plan will be transferred to the Quebec Silicon Union Pension Plan (as defined and described in greater detail in the Initial Order Affidavit). Also, in the event that any BSI non-union employees transfer employment to QSLP, their pension membership in the Bécancour Non-Union Pension Plan would be transferred to the Quebec Silicon Non-Union Pension Plan (as defined and described in greater detail in the Initial Order Affidavit). I am advised by Andrea Boctor of Stikeman Elliott LLP, counsel to the Timminco Entities, and do verily believe that if all of the active members of the Bécancour Union Pension Plan and the Bécancour Non-Union Pension Plan transfer their employment to QSLP, the Régie des rentes du Québec would have the authority to order that the plans be wound up.

Pension Plan Deficiencies and the Timminco Entities' CCAA Proceedings

26. The assets of the Pension Plans have been severely impacted by market volatility and decreasing long-term interest rates in recent years, resulting in increased deficiencies in the Pension Plans. As a result, the special payments payable with respect to the Haley Plan also increased. As at 2010, total annual special payments for the final three years of the wind-up of the Haley Pension Plan were \$1,598,500 for 2010, \$1,397,000 for 2011 and \$1,162,000 for 2012, payable in advance annually every August 1. By contrast, in 2011 total annual special payments to the Haley Pension Plan for the remaining two years of the wind-up increased to \$1,728,700 for each of 2011 and 2012.

Suspension of Certain Pension Contributions

27. As is evident from the Cashflow Forecast, the Timminco Entities do not have the funds necessary to make any contributions to the Pension Plans other than (a) contributions in respect of normal cost, (b) contributions to the defined contribution provision of the BSI Non-Union Pension Plan, and (c) employee contributions deducted from pay (together, the "**Normal Cost Contributions**"). Timminco currently owes approximately \$1.6 million in respect of special payments to the Haley Pension Plan. In addition, assuming the Bécancour Non-Union Pension Plan and the Bécancour Union Pension Plan are not terminated, as at January 31, 2012, the Timminco Entities will owe approximately \$140,000 in respect of amortization payments under those plans. If the Timminco Entities are required to make the pension contributions other

than Normal Cost Contributions (the "**Pension Contributions**"), they will not have sufficient funds to continue operating and will be forced to cease operating to the detriment of their stakeholders, including their employees and pensioners.

28. The Timminco Entities intend to make all normal cost contributions when due. However, management of the Timminco Entities does not anticipate an improvement in their cashflows that would permit the making of Pension Contributions with respect to the Pension Plans during these CCAA proceedings.

The Position of CEP and USW

16 Counsel to CEP submits that the super priority charge sought by the Timminco Entities would have the effect of subordinating the rights of, *inter alia*, the pension plans, including the statutory trusts that are created pursuant to the QSPPA. In considering this matter, I have proceeded on the basis that this submission extends to the PBA as well.

17 In order to grant a super priority charge, counsel to CEP, supported by USW, submits that the Timminco Entities must show that the application of provincial legislation "would frustrate the company's ability to restructure and avoid bankruptcy". (See *Indalex Ltd., Re*, 2011 ONCA 265 (Ont. C.A.) at para. 181.)

18 Counsel to CEP takes the position that the evidence provided by the Timminco Entities falls short of showing the necessity of the super priority charge. Presently, counsel contends that the Applicants have not provided any plan for the purpose of restructuring the Timminco Entities and, absent a restructuring proposal, the affected creditors, including the pension plans, have no reason to believe that their interests will be protected through the issuance of the orders being sought.

19 Counsel to CEP takes the position that the Timminco Entities are requesting extraordinary relief without providing the necessary facts to justify same. Counsel further contends that the Timminco Entities must "wear two hats" and act both in their corporate interest and in the best interest of the pension plan and cannot simply ignore their obligations to the pension plans in favour of the corporation. (See *Indalex Ltd., Re*, *supra*, at para. 129.)

20 Counsel to CEP goes on to submit that, where the "two hats" gives rise to a conflict of interest, if a corporation favours its corporate interest rather than its obligations to its fiduciaries, there will be consequences. In *Indalex Ltd., Re*, *supra*, the court found that the corporation seeking CCAA protection had acted in a manner that revealed a conflict with the duties it owed the beneficiaries of pension plans and ordered the corporation to pay the special payments it owed the plans (See *Indalex Ltd., Re*, *supra*, at paras. 140 and 207.)

21 In this case, counsel to CEP submits that, given the lack of evidentiary support for the super priority charge, the risk of conflicting interests and the importance of the Timminco Entities. fiduciary duties to the pension plans, the super priority charge ought not to be granted.

22 Although counsel to CEP acknowledges that the court has the discretion in the context of the CCAA to make orders that override provincial legislation, such discretion must be exercised through a careful weighing of the facts before the court. Only where the applicant proves it is necessary in the context and consistent with the objects of the CCAA may a judge make an order overriding provincial legislation. (See *Indalex Ltd., Re*, *supra*, at paras. 179 and 189.)

23 In the circumstances of this case, counsel to CEP argues that the position of any super priority charge ordered by the court should rank after the pension plans.

24 CEP also takes the position that the Timminco Entities. obligations to the pension plans should not be suspended. Counsel notes that the Timminco Entities have contractual obligations through the collective agreement and pension plan documents to make contributions to the pension plans and, as well, the Timminco Entities owe statutory duties to the beneficiaries of the pension funds pursuant to the QSPPA. Counsel further points out that s. 49 of the QSPPA provides that any contributions and accrued interest not paid into the pension fund are deemed to be held in trust for the employer.

25 In addition, counsel takes the position that the Court of Appeal for Ontario in *Indalex Ltd., Re, supra*, confirmed that, in the context of Ontario legislation, all of the contributions an employee owes a pension fund, including the special payments, are subject to the deemed trust provision of the PBA.

26 In this case, counsel to CEP points out that the special payments the Timminco Entities seek to suspend in the amount of \$95,300 per month to the Bécancour Union Pension Plan, and of \$47,743 to the Silicium Union Pension Plan, are payments that are to be held in trust for the beneficiaries of the pension plans. Thus, they argue that the Timminco Entities have a fiduciary obligation to the beneficiaries of the pension plans to hold the funds in trust. Further, the Timminco Entities' request to suspend the special payments to the Bécancour Union Pension Plan and the Quebec Silicon Union Pension Plan reveals that its interests are in conflict.

27 Counsel also submits that the Timminco Entities have not pointed to a particular reason, other than generalized liquidity problems, as to why they are unable to make special payments to their pension plans.

28 With respect to the KERPs, counsel to CEP acknowledges that the court has the power to approve a KERP, but the court must only do so when it is convinced that it is necessary to make such an order. In this case, counsel contends that the Timminco Entities have not presented any meaningful evidence on the propriety of the proposed KERPs. Counsel notes that the Timminco Entities have not named the KERPs recipients, provided any specific information regarding their involvement with the CCAA proceeding, addressed their replaceability, or set out their individual bonuses. In the circumstances, counsel submits that it would be unfair and inequitable for the court to approve the KERPs requested by the Timminco Entities.

29 Counsel to CEP's final submission is that, in the event the KERPs are approved, they should not be sealed, but rather should be treated in the same manner as other CCAA documents through the Monitor. Alternatively, counsel to CEP submits that a copy of the KERPs should be provided to the Respondent, CEP.

The Position of the Timminco Entities

30 At the time of the initial hearing, the Timminco Entities filed evidence establishing that they were facing severe liquidity issues as a result of, among other things, a low profit margin realized on their silicon metal sales due to a high volume, long-term supply contract at below market prices, a decrease in the demand and market price for solar grade silicon, failure to recoup their capital expenditures incurred in connection with the development of their solar grade operations, and the inability to secure additional funding. The Timminco Entities also face significant pension and environmental remediation legacy costs, and financial costs related to large outstanding debts.

31 I accepted submissions to the effect that without the protection of the CCAA, a shutdown of operations was inevitable, which the Timminco Entities submitted would be extremely detrimental to the Timminco Entities' employees, pensioners, suppliers and customers.

32 As at December 31, 2011, the Timminco Entities' cash balance was approximately \$2.4 million. The 30-day consolidated cash flow forecast filed at the time of the CCAA application projected that the Timminco Entities would have total receipts of approximately \$5.5 million and total operating disbursements of approximately \$7.7 million for net cash outflow of approximately \$2.2 million, leaving an ending cash position as at February 3, 2012 of an estimated \$157,000.

33 The Timminco Entities approached their existing stakeholders and third party lenders in an effort to secure a suitable debtor-in-possession ("DIP") facility. The Timminco Entities' existing stakeholders, Bank of America NA, IQ, and AMG Advance Metallurgical Group NV, have declined to advance any funds to the Timminco Entities at this time. In addition, two thirdparty lenders have apparently refused to enter into negotiations regarding the provision of a DIP Facility.¹

34 The Monitor, in its Second Report, dated January 11, 2012, extended the cash forecast through to February 17, 2012. The Second Report provides explanations for the key variances in actual receipts and disbursements as compared to the January 2, 2012 forecast.

35 There are some timing differences but the Monitor concludes that there are no significant changes in the underlying assumptions in the January 10, 2012 forecast as compared to the January 2, 2012 forecast.

36 The January 10 forecast projects that the ending cash position goes from positive to negative in mid-February.

37 Counsel to the Applicants submits that, based on the latest cash flow forecast, the Timminco Entities currently estimate that additional funding will be required by mid-February in order to avoid an interruption in operations.

38 The Timminco Entities submit that this is an appropriate case in which to grant super priority to the Administration Charge. Counsel submits that each of the proposed beneficiaries will play a critical role in the Timminco Entities restructuring and it is unlikely that the advisors will participate in the CCAA proceedings unless the Administration Charge is granted to secure their fees and disbursements.

39 Statutory Authority to grant such a charge derives from s. 11.52(1) of the CCAA. Subsection 11.52(2) contains the authority to grant super-priority to such a charge:

11.52(1) Court may order security or charge to cover certain costs — On notice to the secured creditors who are likely to be affected by the security or charge, the court may make an order declaring that all or part of the property of a debtor company is subject to a security or charge — in an amount that the court considers appropriate — in respect of the fees and expenses of

(a) the monitor, including the fees and expenses of any financial, legal or other experts engaged by the monitor in the performance of the monitor's duties;

(b) any financial, legal or other experts engaged by the company for the purpose of proceedings under this Act; and

(c) any financial, legal or other experts engaged by any other interested person if the court is satisfied that the security or charge is necessary for their effective participation in proceedings under this Act.

11.52(2) Priority — This court may order that the security or charge rank in priority over the claim of any secured creditor of the company.

40 Counsel also submits that the Timminco Entities require the continued involvement of their directors and officers in order to pursue a successful restructuring of their business and/or finances and, due to the significant personal exposure associated with the Timminco Entities liabilities, it is unlikely that the directors and officers will continue their services with the Timminco Entities unless the D&O Charge is granted.

41 Statutory authority for the granting of a D&O charge on a super priority basis derives from s. 11.51 of the CCAA:

11.51(1) Security or charge relating to director's indemnification — On application by a debtor company and on notice to the secured creditors who are likely to be affected by the security or charge, the court may make an order declaring that all or part of the property of the company is subject to a security or charge — in an amount that the court considers appropriate — in favour of any director or officer of the company to indemnify the director or officer against obligations and liabilities that they may incur as a director or officer of the company after the commencement of proceedings under this Act.

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

(3) Restriction — indemnification insurance — The court may not make the order if in its opinion the company could obtain adequate indemnification insurance for the director or officer at a reasonable cost.

(4) Negligence, misconduct or fault — The court shall make an order declaring that the security or charge does not apply in respect of a specific obligation or liability incurred by a director or officer if in its opinion the obligation or liability was incurred as a result of the director's or officer's gross negligence or wilful misconduct or, in Quebec, the director's or officer's gross or intentional fault.

Analysis

(i) Administration Charge and D&O Charge

42 It seems apparent that the position of the unions. is in direct conflict with the Applicants. positions.

43 The position being put forth by counsel to the CEP and USW is clearly stated and is quite understandable. However, in my view, the position of the CEP and the USW has to be considered in the context of the practical circumstances facing the Timminco Entities. The Timminco Entities are clearly insolvent and do not have sufficient reserves to address the funding requirements of the pension plans.

44 Counsel to the Applicants submits that without the relief requested, the Timminco Entities will be deprived of the services being provided by the beneficiaries of the charges, to the company's detriment. I accept the submissions of counsel to the Applicants that it is unlikely that the advisors will participate in the CCAA proceedings unless the Administration Charge is granted to secure their fees and disbursements. I also accept the evidence of Mr. Kalins that the role of the advisors is critical to the efforts of the Timminco Entities to restructure. To expect that the advisors will take the business risk of participating in these proceedings without the security of the charge is neither reasonable nor realistic.

45 Likewise, I accept the submissions of counsel to the Applicants to the effect that the directors and officers will not continue their service without the D&O Charge. Again, in circumstances such as those facing the Timminco Entities, it is neither reasonable nor realistic to expect directors and officers to continue without the requested form of protection.

46 It logically follows, in my view, that without the assistance of the advisors, and in the anticipated void caused by the lack of a governance structure, the Timminco Entities will be directionless and unable to effectively proceed with any type or form of restructuring under the CCAA.

47 The Applicants argue that the CCAA overrides any conflicting requirements of the QSPPA and the BPA.

48 Counsel submits that the general paramountcy of the CCAA over provincial legislation was confirmed in *ATB Financial v. Metcalfe & Mansfield Alternative Investments II Corp.* (2008), 45 C.B.R. (5th) 163 (Ont. C.A.) at para. 104. In addition, in *Nortel Networks Corp., Re*, the Court of Appeal held that the doctrine of paramountcy applies either where a provincial and a federal statutory position are in conflict and cannot both be complied with, or where complying with the provincial law will have the effect of frustrating the purpose of the federal law and therefore the intent of Parliament. See *Nortel Networks Corp., Re* (2009), 59 C.B.R. (5th) 23 (Ont. C.A.).

49 It has long been stated that the purpose of the CCAA is to facilitate the making of a compromise or arrangement between an insolvent debtor company and its creditors, with the purpose of allowing the business to continue. As the Court of Appeal for Ontario stated in *Stelco Inc., Re* (2005), 75 O.R. (3d) 5 (Ont. C.A.), at para. 36:

In the CCAA context, Parliament has provided a statutory framework to extend protection to a company while it holds its creditors at bay and attempts to negotiate a compromised plan of arrangement that will enable it to emerge and continue as a viable economic entity, thus benefiting society and the company in the long run, along with the company's creditors, shareholders, employees and other stakeholders. The s. 11 discretion is the engine that drives this broad and flexible statutory scheme...

50 Further, as I indicated in *Nortel Networks Corp., Re* (2009), 55 C.B.R. (5th) 229 (Ont. S.C.J. [Commercial List]), this purpose continues to exist regardless of whether a company is actually restructuring or is continuing operations during a sales

process in order to maintain maximum value and achieve the highest price for the benefit of all stakeholders. Based on this reasoning, the fact that Timminco has not provided any plan for restructuring at this time does not change the analysis.

51 The Court of Appeal in *Indalex Ltd., Re* (2011), 75 C.B.R. (5th) 19 (Ont. C.A.) confirmed the CCAA court's ability to override conflicting provisions of provincial statutes where the application of the provincial legislation would frustrate the company's ability to restructure and avoid bankruptcy. The Court stated, *inter alia*, as follows (beginning at paragraph 176):

The CCAA court has the authority to grant a super-priority charge to DIP lenders in CCAA proceedings. I fully accept that the CCAA judge can make an order granting a super-priority charge that has the effect of overriding provincial legislation, including the PBA. ...

...

What of the contention that recognition of the deemed trust will cause DIP lenders to be unwilling to advance funds in CCAA proceedings? It is important to recognize that the conclusion I have reached does not mean that a finding of paramountcy will never be made. That determination must be made on a case by case basis. There may well be situations in which paramountcy is invoked and the record satisfies the CCAA judge that application of the provincial legislation would frustrate the company's ability to restructure and avoid bankruptcy.

52 The Timminco Entities seek approval to suspend Special Payments in order to maintain sufficient liquidity to continue operations for the benefit of all stakeholders, including employees and pensioners. It is clear that based on the January 2 forecast, as modified by the Second Report, the Timminco Entities have insufficient liquidity to make the Special Payments at this time.

53 Counsel to the Timminco Entities submits that where it is necessary to achieve the objective of the CCAA, the court has the jurisdiction to make an order under the CCAA granting, in the present case, super priority over the Encumbrances for the Administration Charge and the D&O Charge, even if such an order conflicts with, or overrides, the QSPPA or the PBA.

54 Further, the Timminco Entities submit that the doctrine of paramountcy is properly invoked in this case and that the court should order that the Administration Charge and the D&O Charge have super priority over the Encumbrances in order to ensure the continued participation of the beneficiaries of these charges in the Timminco Entities. CCAA proceedings.

55 The Timminco Entities also submit that payment of the pension contributions should be suspended. These special (or amortization) payments are required to be made to liquidate a going concern or solvency deficiency in a pension plan as identified in the most recent funding valuation report for the plan that is filed with the applicable pension regulatory authority. The requirement for the employer to make such payments is provided for under applicable provincial pension minimum standards legislation.

56 The courts have characterized special (or amortization) payments as pre-filing obligations which are stayed upon an initial order being granted under the CCAA. (See *AbitibiBowater inc., Re* (2009), 57 C.B.R. (5th) 285 (C.S. Que.); *Collins & Aikman Automotive Canada Inc., Re* (2007), 37 C.B.R. (5th) 282 (Ont. S.C.J.) and *Fraser Papers Inc., Re* (2009), 55 C.B.R. (5th) 217 (Ont. S.C.J. [Commercial List]).

57 I accept the submission of counsel to the Applicants to the effect that courts in Ontario and Quebec have addressed the issue of suspending special (or amortization) payments in the context of a CCAA restructuring and have ordered the suspension of such payments where the failure to stay the obligation would jeopardize the business of the debtor company and the company's ability to restructure.

58 The Timminco Entities also submit that there should be no director or officer liability incurred as a result of a court-ordered suspension of payment of pension contributions. Counsel references *Fraser Papers*, where Pepall J. stated:

Given that I am ordering that the special payments need not be made during the stay period pending further order of the Court, the Applicants and the officers and directors should not have any liability for failure to pay them in that same period.

The latter should be encouraged to remain during the CCAA process so as to govern and assist with the restructuring effort and should be provided with protection without the need to have recourse to the Director's Charge.

59 Importantly, *Fraser Papers* also notes that there is no priority for special payments in bankruptcy. In my view, it follows that the employees and former employees are not prejudiced by the relief requested since the likely outcome should these proceedings fail is bankruptcy, which would not produce a better result for them. Thus, the "two hats" doctrine from *Indalex Ltd., Re, supra*, discussed earlier in these reasons at [20], would not be infringed by the relief requested. Because it would avoid bankruptcy, to the benefit of both the Timminco Entities and beneficiaries of the pension plans, the relief requested would not favour the interests of the corporate entity over its obligations to its fiduciaries.

60 Counsel to the Timminco Entities submits that where it is necessary to achieve the objective of the CCAA, the court has the jurisdiction to make an order under the CCAA suspending the payment of the pension contributions, even if such order conflicts with, or overrides, the QSPPA or the PBA.

61 The evidence has established that the Timminco Entities are in a severe liquidity crisis and, if required to make the pension contributions, will not have sufficient funds to continue operating. The Timminco Entities would then be forced to cease operations to the detriment of their stakeholders, including their employees and pensioners.

62 On the facts before me, I am satisfied that the application of the QSPPA and the PBA would frustrate the Timminco Entities ability to restructure and avoid bankruptcy. Indeed, while the Timminco Entities continue to make Normal Cost Contributions to the pension plans, requiring them to pay what they owe in respect of special and amortization payments for those plans would deprive them of sufficient funds to continue operating, forcing them to cease operations to the detriment of their stakeholders, including their employees and pensioners.

63 In my view, this is exactly the kind of result the CCAA is intended to avoid. Where the facts demonstrate that ordering a company to make special payments in accordance with provincial legislation would have the effect of forcing the company into bankruptcy, it seems to me that to make such an order would frustrate the rehabilitative purpose of the CCAA. In such circumstances, therefore, the doctrine of paramountcy is properly invoked, and an order suspending the requirement to make special payments is appropriate (see *ATB Financial* and *Nortel Networks Corp., Re*).

64 In my view, the circumstances are such that the position put forth by the Timminco Entities must prevail. I am satisfied that bankruptcy is not the answer and that, in order to ensure that the purpose and objective of the CCAA can be fulfilled, it is necessary to invoke the doctrine of paramountcy such that the provisions of the CCAA override those of QSPPA and the PBA.

65 There is a clear inter-relationship between the granting of the Administration Charge, the granting of the D&O Charge and extension of protection for the directors and officers for the company's failure to pay the pension contributions.

66 In my view, in the absence of the court granting the requested super priority and protection, the objectives of the CCAA would be frustrated. It is not reasonable to expect that professionals will take the risk of not being paid for their services, and that directors and officers will remain if placed in a compromised position should the Timminco Entities continue CCAA proceedings without the requested protection. The outcome of the failure to provide these respective groups with the requested protection would, in my view, result in the overwhelming likelihood that the CCAA proceedings would come to an abrupt halt, followed, in all likelihood, by bankruptcy proceedings.

67 If bankruptcy results, the outcome for employees and pensioners is certain. This alternative will not provide a better result for the employees and pensioners. The lack of a desirable alternative to the relief requested only serves to strengthen my view that the objectives of the CCAA would be frustrated if the relief requested was not granted.

68 For these reasons, I have determined that it is both necessary and appropriate to grant super priority to both the Administrative Charge and D&O Charge.

69 I have also concluded that it is both necessary and appropriate to suspend the Timminco Entities' obligations to make pension contributions with respect to the Pension Plans. In my view, this determination is necessary to allow the Timminco Entities to restructure or sell the business as a going concern for the benefit of all stakeholders.

70 I am also satisfied that, in order to encourage the officers and directors to remain during the CCAA proceedings, an order should be granted relieving them from any liability for the Timminco Entities' failure to make pension contributions during the CCAA proceedings. At this point in the restructuring, the participation of its officers and directors is of vital importance to the Timminco Entities.

(ii) The KERPs

71 Turning now to the issue of the employee retention plans (KERPs), the Timminco Entities seek an order approving the KERPs offered to certain employees who are considered critical to successful proceedings under the CCAA.

72 In this case, the KERPs have been approved by the board of directors of Timminco. The record indicates that in the opinion of the Chief Executive Officer and the Special Committee of the Board, all of the KERPs participants are critical to the Timminco Entities' CCAA proceedings as they are experienced employees who have played central roles in the restructuring initiatives taken to date and will play critical roles in the steps taken in the future. The total amount of the KERPs in question is \$269,000. KERPs have been approved in numerous CCAA proceedings where the retention of certain employees has been deemed critical to a successful restructuring. See *Nortel Networks Corp., Re*, [2009] O.J. No. 1044 (Ont. S.C.J. [Commercial List]), *Grant Forest Products Inc., Re* (2009), 57 C.B.R. (5th) 128 (Ont. S.C.J. [Commercial List]), and *Canwest Global Communications Corp., Re* (2009), 59 C.B.R. (5th) 72 (Ont. S.C.J. [Commercial List]).

73 In *Grant Forest Products*, Newbould J. noted that the business judgment of the board of directors of the debtor company and the monitor should rarely be ignored when it comes to approving a KERP charge.

74 The Monitor also supports the approval of the KERPs and, following review of several court-approved retention plans in CCAA proceedings, is satisfied that the KERPs are consistent with the current practice for retention plans in the context of a CCAA proceeding and that the quantum of the proposed payments under the KERPs are reasonable in the circumstances.

75 I accept the submissions of counsel to the Timminco Entities. I am satisfied that it is necessary, in these circumstances, that the KERPs participants be incentivized to remain in their current positions during the CCAA process. In my view, the continued participation of these experienced and necessary employees will assist the company in its objectives during its restructuring process. If these employees were not to remain with the company, it would be necessary to replace them. It is reasonable to conclude that the replacement of such employees would not provide any substantial economic benefits to the company. The KERPs are approved.

76 The Timminco Entities have also requested that the court seal the Confidential Supplement which contains copies of the unredacted KERPs, taking the position that the KERPs contain sensitive personal compensation information and that the disclosure of such information would compromise the commercial interests of the Timminco Entities and harm the KERPs participants. Further, the KERPs participants have a reasonable expectation that their names and salary information will be kept confidential. Counsel relies on *Sierra Club of Canada v. Canada (Minister of Finance)*, [2002] 2 S.C.R. 522 (S.C.C.) at para. 53 where Iacobucci J. adopted the following test to determine when a sealing order should be made:

A confidentiality order under Rule 151 should only be granted when:

- (a) such an order is necessary in order to prevent serious risk to an important interest, including a commercial interest, in the context of litigation because reasonable alternative measures will not prevent the risk; and
- (b) the salutary effects of the confidentiality order, including the effects on the right of civil litigants to a fair trial, outweigh the deleterious effects, including the effects on the right to free expression, which in this context includes the public interest in open and accessible court proceedings.

77 CEP argues that the CCAA process should be open and transparent to the greatest extent possible and that the KERPs should not be sealed but rather should be treated in the same manner as other CCAA documents through the Monitor. In the alternative, counsel to the CEP submits that a copy of the KERPs should be provided to the Respondent, CEP.

78 In my view, at this point in time in the restructuring process, the disclosure of this personal information could compromise the commercial interests of the Timminco Entities and cause harm to the KERP participants. It is both necessary and important for the parties to focus on the restructuring efforts at hand rather than to get, in my view, potentially side-tracked on this issue. In my view, the Confidential Supplement should be and is ordered sealed with the proviso that this issue can be revisited in 45 days.

Disposition

79 In the result, the motion is granted. An order shall issue:

- (a) suspending the Timminco Entities. obligation to make special payments with respect to the pension plans (as defined in the Notice of Motion);
- (b) granting super priority to the Administrative Charge and the D&O Charge;
- (c) approving the KERPs and the grant of the KERP Charge;
- (d) authorizing the sealing of the Confidential Supplement to the First Report of the Monitor.

Motion granted.

Footnotes

- 1 In a subsequent motion relating to approval of a DIP Facility, the Timminco Entities acknowledged they had reached an agreement with a third-party lender with respect to providing DIP financing, subject to court approval. Further argument on this motion will be heard on February 6, 2012.

Canada Federal Statutes
Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act
Part II — Jurisdiction of Courts (ss. 9-18.5)

Most Recently Cited in: *DGDP-BC Holdings Ltd v. Third Eye Capital Corporation*, 2020 ABCA 442, 2020 CarswellAlta 2308, 325 A.C.W.S. (3d) 463, [2021] A.W.L.D. 6 | (Alta. C.A., Dec 4, 2020)

R.S.C. 1985, c. C-36, s. 11.2

S 11.2

Currency

11.2

11.2(1) Interim financing

On application by a debtor company and on notice to the secured creditors who are likely to be affected by the security or charge, a court may make an order declaring that all or part of the company's property is subject to a security or charge — in an amount that the court considers appropriate — in favour of a person specified in the order who agrees to lend to the company an amount approved by the court as being required by the company, having regard to its cash-flow statement. The security or charge may not secure an obligation that exists before the order is made.

11.2(2) Priority — secured creditors

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

11.2(3) Priority — other orders

The court may order that the security or charge rank in priority over any security or charge arising from a previous order made under subsection (1) only with the consent of the person in whose favour the previous order was made.

11.2(4) Factors to be considered

In deciding whether to make an order, the court is to consider, among other things,

- (a) the period during which the company is expected to be subject to proceedings under this Act;
- (b) how the company's business and financial affairs are to be managed during the proceedings;
- (c) whether the company's management has the confidence of its major creditors;
- (d) whether the loan would enhance the prospects of a viable compromise or arrangement being made in respect of the company;
- (e) the nature and value of the company's property;
- (f) whether any creditor would be materially prejudiced as a result of the security or charge; and
- (g) the monitor's report referred to in paragraph 23(1)(b), if any.

11.2(5) Additional factor — initial application

When an application is made under subsection (1) at the same time as an initial application referred to in subsection 11.02(1) or during the period referred to in an order made under that subsection, no order shall be made under subsection (1) unless the

court is also satisfied that the terms of the loan are limited to what is reasonably necessary for the continued operations of the debtor company in the ordinary course of business during that period.

Amendment History

1997, c. 12, s. 124; 2005, c. 47, s. 128; 2007, c. 36, s. 65; 2019, c. 29, s. 138

Currency

Federal English Statutes reflect amendments current to March 3, 2021

Federal English Regulations are current to Gazette Vol. 155:4 (February 17, 2021)

End of Document

Copyright © Thomson Reuters Canada Limited or its licensors (excluding individual court documents). All rights reserved.

Canada Federal Statutes
Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act
Part II — Jurisdiction of Courts (ss. 9-18.5)

Most Recently Cited in: [Laurentian University of Sudbury](#), 2021 ONSC 659, 2021 CarswellOnt 1224 | (Ont. S.C.J., Feb 1, 2021)

R.S.C. 1985, c. C-36, s. 11.52

S 11.52

Currency

11.52

11.52(1) Court may order security or charge to cover certain costs

On notice to the secured creditors who are likely to be affected by the security or charge, the court may make an order declaring that all or part of the property of a debtor company is subject to a security or charge — in an amount that the court considers appropriate — in respect of the fees and expenses of

- (a) the monitor, including the fees and expenses of any financial, legal or other experts engaged by the monitor in the performance of the monitor's duties;
- (b) any financial, legal or other experts engaged by the company for the purpose of proceedings under this Act; and
- (c) any financial, legal or other experts engaged by any other interested person if the court is satisfied that the security or charge is necessary for their effective participation in proceedings under this Act.

11.52(2) Priority

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

Amendment History

2005, c. 47, s. 128; 2007, c. 36, s. 66

Currency

Federal English Statutes reflect amendments current to February 17, 2021

Federal English Regulations are current to Gazette Extra Vol. 155:3 (February 15, 2021)

2010 ONSC 1328
Ontario Superior Court of Justice [Commercial List]
Canwest Publishing Inc. / Publications Canwest Inc., Re

2010 CarswellOnt 1344, 2010 ONSC 1328, [2010] O.J.
No. 943, 185 A.C.W.S. (3d) 865, 65 C.B.R. (5th) 152

**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 PUBLISHING INC. / PUBLICATIONS
CANWEST INC., CANWEST BOOKS INC. AND CANWEST (CANADA) INC.

Pepall J.

Judgment: March 5, 2010

Docket: CV-10-8533-00CL

Counsel: Lyndon Barnes, Alex Cobb for Canwest LP Entities
Maria Konyukhova for Monitor, FTI Consulting Canada Inc.
Hilary Clarke for Bank of Nova Scotia, Administrative Agent for Senior Secured Lenders'
Syndicate
Janice Payne, Thomas McRae for Canwest Salaried Employees and Retirees (CSER) Group
M.A. Church for Communications, Energy and Paperworkers' Union
Anthony F. Dale for CAW-Canada
Deborah McPhail for Financial Services Commission of Ontario

Pepall J.:

Reasons for Decision

Relief Requested

1 Russell Mills, Blair MacKenzie, Rejean Saumure and Les Bale (the "Representatives") seek to be appointed as representatives on behalf of former salaried employees and retirees of Canwest Publishing Inc./Publications Canwest Inc., Canwest Books Inc., Canwest (Canada) and Canwest Limited Partnership and the Canwest Global Canadian Newspaper Entities (collectively the "LP Entities") or any person claiming an interest under or on behalf of such salaried employees or retirees including beneficiaries and surviving spouses ("the Salaried Employees and Retirees").

They also seek an order that Nelligan O'Brien Payne LLP and Shibley Righton LLP be appointed in these proceedings to represent the Salaried Employees and Retirees for all matters relating to claims against the LP Entities and any issues affecting them in the proceedings. Amongst other things, it is proposed that all reasonable legal, actuarial and financial expert and advisory fees be paid by the LP Entities.

2 On February 22, 2010, I granted an order on consent of the LP Entities authorizing the Communications, Energy and Paperworker's Union of Canada ("CEP") to continue to represent its current members and to represent former members of bargaining units represented by the union including pensioners, retirees, deferred vested participants and surviving spouses and dependants employed or formerly employed by the LP Entities. That order only extended to unionized members or former members. The within motion focused on non-unionized former employees and retirees although Ms. Payne for the moving parties indicated that the moving parties would be content to include other non-unionized employees as well. There is no overlap between the order granted to CEP and the order requested by the Salaried Employees and Retirees.

Facts

3 On January 8, 2010 the LP Entities obtained an order pursuant to the *Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act* ("CCAA") staying all proceedings and claims against the LP Entities. The order permits but does not require the LP Entities to make payments to employee and retirement benefit plans.

4 There are approximately 66 employees, 45 of whom were non-unionized, whose employment with the LP Entities terminated prior to the Initial Order but who were still owed termination and severance payments. As of the date of the Initial Order, the LP Entities ceased making those payments to those former employees. As many of these former employees were owed termination payments as part of a salary continuance scheme whereby they would continue to accrue pensionable service during a notice period, after the Initial Order, those former employees stopped accruing pensionable service. The Representatives seek an order authorizing them to act for the 45 individuals and for the aforementioned law firms to be appointed as representative counsel.

5 Additionally, seven retirees and two current employees are (or would be) eligible for a pension benefit from Southam Executive Retirement Arrangements ("SERA"). SERA is a non-registered pension plan used to provide supplemental pension benefits to former executives of the LP Entities and their predecessors. These benefits are in excess of those earned under the Canwest Southam Publications Inc. Retirement Plan which benefits are capped as a result of certain provisions of the *Income Tax Act*. As of the date of the Initial Order, the SERA payments ceased also. This impacts beneficiaries and spouses who are eligible for a joint survivorship option. The aggregate benefit obligation related to SERA is approximately \$14.4 million. The Representatives also seek to act

for these seven retirees and for the aforementioned law firms to be appointed as representative counsel.

6 Since January 8, 2010, the LP Entities have been pursuing the sale and investor solicitation process ("SISP") contemplated by the Initial Order. Throughout the course of the CCAA proceedings, the LP Entities have continued to pay:

- (a) salaries, commissions, bonuses and outstanding employee expenses;
- (b) current services and special payments in respect of the active registered pension plan; and
- (c) post-employment and post-retirement benefits to former employees who were represented by a union when they were employed by the LP Entities.

7 The LP Entities intend to continue to pay these employee related obligations throughout the course of the CCAA proceedings. Pursuant to the Support Agreement with the LP Secured Lenders, AcquireCo. will assume all of the employee related obligations including existing pension plans (other than supplemental pension plans such as SERA), existing post-retirement and post-employment benefit plans and unpaid severance obligations stayed during the CCAA proceeding. This assumption by AcquireCo. is subject to the LP Secured Lenders' right, acting commercially reasonably and after consultation with the operational management of the LP Entities, to exclude certain specified liabilities.

8 All four proposed Representatives have claims against the LP Entities that are representative of the claims that would be advanced by former employees, namely pension benefits and compensation for involuntary terminations. In addition to the claims against the LP Entities, the proposed Representatives may have claims against the directors of the LP Entities that are currently impacted by the CCAA proceedings.

9 No issue is taken with the proposed Representatives nor with the experience and competence of the proposed law firms, namely Nelligan O'Brien Payne LLP and Shibley Righton LLP, both of whom have jointly acted as court appointed representatives for continuing employees in the Nortel Networks Limited case.

10 Funding by the LP Entities in respect of the representation requested would violate the Support Agreement dated January 8, 2010 between the LP Entities and the LP Administrative Agent. Specifically, section 5.1(j) of the Support Agreement states:

The LP Entities shall not pay any of the legal, financial or other advisors to any other Person, except as expressly contemplated by the Initial Order or with the consent in writing from the Administrative Agent acting in consultation with the Steering Committee.

11 The LP Administrative Agent does not consent to the funding request at this time.

12 On October 6, 2009, the CMI Entities applied for protection pursuant to the provisions of the CCAA. In that restructuring, the CMI Entities themselves moved to appoint and fund a law firm as representative counsel for former employees and retirees. That order was granted.

13 Counsel were urged by me to ascertain whether there was any possibility of resolving this issue. Some time was spent attempting to do so, however, I was subsequently advised that those efforts were unsuccessful.

Issues

14 The issues on this motion are as follows:

(1) Should the Representatives be appointed?

(2) Should Nelligan O'Brien Payne LLP and Shibley Righton LLP be appointed as representative counsel?

(3) If so, should the request for funding be granted?

Positions of Parties

15 In brief, the moving parties submit that representative counsel should be appointed where vulnerable creditors have little means to pursue a claim in a complex CCAA proceeding; there is a social benefit to be derived from assisting vulnerable creditors; and a benefit would be provided to the overall CCAA process by introducing efficiency for all parties involved. The moving parties submit that all of these principles have been met in this case.

16 The LP Entities oppose the relief requested on the grounds that it is premature. The amounts outstanding to the representative group are pre-filing unsecured obligations. Unless a superior offer is received in the SISF that is currently underway, the LP Entities will implement a support transaction with the LP Secured Lenders that does not contemplate any recoveries for unsecured creditors. As such, there is no current need to carry out a claims process. Although a superior offer may materialize in the SISF, the outcome of the SISF is currently unknown.

17 Furthermore, the LP Entities oppose the funding request. The fees will deplete the resources of the Estate without any possible corresponding benefit and the Support Agreement with the LP Secured Lenders does not authorize any such payment.

18 The LP Senior Lenders support the position of the LP Entities.

19 In its third report, the Monitor noted that pursuant to the Support Agreement, the LP Entities are not permitted to pay any of the legal, financial or other advisors absent consent in writing from the LP Administrative Agent which has not been forthcoming. Accordingly, funding of the fees requested would be in contravention of the Support Agreement with the LP Secured Lenders. For those reasons, the Monitor supported the LP Entities refusal to fund.

Discussion

20 No one challenged the court's jurisdiction to make a representation order and such orders have been granted in large CCAA proceedings. Examples include Nortel Networks Corp., Fraser Papers Inc., and Canwest Global Communications Corp. (with respect to the television side of the enterprise). Indeed, a human resources manager at the Ottawa Citizen advised one of the Representatives, Mr. Saumure, that as part of the CCAA process, it was normal practice for the court to appoint a law firm to represent former employees as a group.

21 Factors that have been considered by courts in granting these orders include:

- the vulnerability and resources of the group sought to be represented;
- any benefit to the companies under CCAA protection;
- any social benefit to be derived from representation of the group;
- the facilitation of the administration of the proceedings and efficiency;
- the avoidance of a multiplicity of legal retainers;
- the balance of convenience and whether it is fair and just including to the creditors of the Estate;
- whether representative counsel has already been appointed for those who have similar interests to the group seeking representation and who is also prepared to act for the group seeking the order; and
- the position of other stakeholders and the Monitor.

22 The evidence before me consists of affidavits from three of the four proposed Representatives and a partner with the Nelligan O'Brien Payne LLP law firm, the Monitor's Third Report, and a compendium containing an affidavit of an investment manager for noteholders filed on an earlier occasion in these CCAA proceedings. This evidence addresses most of the aforementioned factors.

23 The primary objection to the relief requested is prematurity. This is reflected in correspondence sent by counsel for the LP Entities to counsel for the Senior Lenders' Administrative Agent. Those opposing the relief requested submit that the moving parties can keep

an eye on the Monitor's website and depend on notice to be given by the Monitor in the event that unsecured creditors have any entitlement. Counsel for the LP Entities submitted that counsel for the proposed representatives should reapply to court at the appropriate time and that I should dismiss the motion without prejudice to the moving parties to bring it back on.

24 In my view, this watch and wait suggestion is unhelpful to the needs of the Salaried Employees and Retirees and to the interests of the Applicants. I accept that the individuals in issue may be unsecured creditors whose recovery expectation may prove to be non-existent and that ultimately there may be no claims process for them. I also accept that some of them were in the executive ranks of the LP Entities and continue to benefit from payment of some pension benefits. That said, these are all individuals who find themselves in uncertain times facing legal proceedings of significant complexity. The evidence is also to the effect that members of the group have little means to pursue representation and are unable to afford proper legal representation at this time. The Monitor already has very extensive responsibilities as reflected in paragraph 30 and following of the Initial Order and the CCAA itself and it is unrealistic to expect that it can be fully responsive to the needs and demands of all of these many individuals and do so in an efficient and timely manner. Desirably in my view, Canadian courts have not typically appointed an Unsecured Creditors Committee to address the needs of unsecured creditors in large restructurings. It would be of considerable benefit to both the Applicants and the Salaried Employees and Retirees to have Representatives and representative counsel who could interact with the Applicants and represent the interests of the Salaried Employees and Retirees. In that regard, I accept their evidence that they are a vulnerable group and there is no other counsel available to represent their interests. Furthermore, a multiplicity of legal retainers is to be discouraged. In my view, it is a false economy to watch and wait. Indeed the time taken by counsel preparing for and arguing this motion is just one such example. The appointment of the Representatives and representative counsel would facilitate the administration of the proceedings and information flow and provide for efficiency.

25 The second basis for objection is that the LP Entities are not permitted to pay any of the legal, financial or other advisors to any other person except as expressly contemplated by the Initial Order or with consent in writing from the LP Administrative Agent acting in consultation with the Steering Committee. Funding by the LP Entities would be in contravention of the Support Agreement entered into by the LP Entities and the LP Senior Secured Lenders. It was for this reason that the Monitor stated in its Report that it supported the LP Entities' refusal to fund.

26 I accept the evidence before me on the inability of the Salaried Employees and Retirees to afford legal counsel at this time. There are in these circumstances three possible sources of funding: the LP Entities; the Monitor pursuant to paragraph 31 (i) of the Initial Order although quere whether this is in keeping with the intention underlying that provision; or the LP Senior Secured Lenders. It seems to me that having exercised the degree of control that they have, it is certainly arguable that relying on inherent jurisdiction, the court has the power to compel the Senior Secured Lenders

to fund or alternatively compel the LP Administrative Agent to consent to funding. By executing agreements such as the Support Agreement, parties cannot oust the jurisdiction of the court.

27 In my view, a source of funding other than the Salaried Employees and Retirees themselves should be identified now. In the CMI Entities' CCAA proceeding, funding was made available for Representative Counsel although I acknowledge that the circumstances here are somewhat different. Staged payments commencing with the sum of \$25,000 may be more appropriate. Funding would be prospective in nature and would not extend to investigation of or claims against directors.

28 Counsel are to communicate with one another to ascertain how best to structure the funding and report to me if necessary at a 9:30 appointment on March 22, 2010. If everything is resolved, only the Monitor need report at that time and may do so by e-mail. If not resolved, I propose to make the structuring order on March 22, 2010 on a nunc pro tunc basis. Ottawa counsel may participate by telephone but should alert the Commercial List Office of their proposed mode of participation.

Motion granted.

2014 BCSC 1732
British Columbia Supreme Court

Bul River Mineral Corp., Re

2014 CarswellBC 2702, 2014 BCSC 1732, [2014] B.C.W.L.D.
6764, [2014] B.C.W.L.D. 6765, [2014] B.C.W.L.D. 6771, [2014]
B.C.W.L.D. 6779, 16 C.B.R. (6th) 173, 245 A.C.W.S. (3d) 333

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

In the Matter of the Business Corporations Act, S.B.C. 2002,
c. 57 and the Business Corporations Act, R.S.A. 2000, c. B-9

In the Matter of Bul River Mineral Corporation, Big Bear Metal Mining Corporation,
Earth's Vital Extractors Limited, Fort Steele Mineral Corporation, Fort Steele
Metals Corporation, Fused Heat Ltd., Gallowai Metal Mining Corporation, Giant
Steeple's Mineral Corporation, Grand Mineral Corporation, International Feldspar
Ltd., Jao Mine Developers Ltd., Kutteni Diamonds Ltd., Stanfield Mining Group of
Canada Ltd., Sullibin Mineral Corporation, Sullibin Multi Metal Corporation, Super
Feldspars Corporation, White Cat Metal Mining Corporation, Zeus Metal Mining
Corporation, Zeus Metals Corporation and Zeus Mineral Corporation, Petitioners

Fitzpatrick J.

Heard: September 3, 5, 2014
Judgment: September 15, 2014
Docket: Vancouver S113459

Counsel: Colin D. Brousson for Petitioners
William C. Kaplan, Q.C., Peter Bychawski for CuVeras, LLC
J. Roger Webber, Q.C. for Eldon Clarence Stafford
Robert M. Curtis, Q.C. for Gordon Preston and Carol Preston
Tevia R.M. Jeffries for Monitor, Deloitte Restructuring Inc.

Fitzpatrick J.:

Introduction

1 These are longstanding proceedings under the *Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act*, R.S.C., 1985, c. C-36 (the "CCAA"), having been commenced some three and a half years ago in May 2011. Since that time, the petitioners have made slow and steady progress toward the goal of presenting a plan of arrangement to their creditors and certain equity participants.

2 The principal petitioners, being Bul River Mineral Corporation ("Bul River") and Gallowai Metal Mining Corporation ("Gallowai"), are the owners of certain mining properties and related assets in the Kootenay region of British Columbia. As a result of these proceedings, Bul River and Gallowai now have some indication that the mine is viable. This has been accomplished mainly due to the participation of CuVeras, LLC ("CuVeras") who has, since late 2011, provided interim financing which allowed this further development work to continue to this point in time.

3 Some years ago, Bul River and Gallowai completed a claims process to identify not only trade creditors but also claims of its common and preferred shareholders. Now that Bul River and Gallowai, with the assistance and sponsorship of CuVeras, are on the cusp of preparing a plan of arrangement for consideration by the stakeholders, those claims have become of central importance.

4 Some of the claims that were advanced through the claims process were not critically considered by either the petitioners or the court-appointed monitor, Deloitte Restructuring Inc. (the "Monitor"). However, at this late date, the characterization of certain claims and the validity of certain claims have been put in issue and will have a profound impact on the manner in which these restructuring proceedings go forward.

5 At present, the general intention is that the restructuring will take place along the lines of a Letter of Agreement between the petitioners and CuVeras dated May 23, 2014. By that agreement, a newly formed British Columbia entity ("Newco") will be created and the shares in Newco will be distributed to CuVeras and other related parties and also to non-voting preferred shareholders. Trade creditors will also participate in Newco. This Letter of Agreement is the product of some history, sometimes contentious, between the petitioners and CuVeras which was discussed in the court's earlier reasons: *Bul River Mineral Corp, Re*, 2014 BCSC 645 (B.C. S.C.).

6 One of the claims is that advanced by Gordon and Carol Preston (the "Preston Claim"), which CuVeras contends is an equity claim as opposed to a debt claim. Another claim is that advanced by Eldon Stafford (the "Stafford Claim"), which CuVeras contends is not a valid claim against Bul River or Gallowai. The substance of the issue before the court therefore is two-fold: (a) the proper categorization of the Preston Claim and (b) whether the Stafford Claim is a valid claim against the petitioners.

7 As will become apparent from the discussion below, the resolution of these issues will significantly impact how any restructuring plan can be crafted and will also impact all stakeholders

in terms of how the Newco shares will be distributed between the various stakeholders. There is some urgency in resolving these last issues before the restructuring can proceed. All involved, including the Monitor, state that it is necessary for the petitioners to exit this *CCAA* proceeding as quickly as possible. At this time, a plan of arrangement sponsored by CuVeras is the only option available to the petitioners so as to avoid a liquidation and bankruptcy.

Background

8 The petitioners are also known as the Stanfield Mining Group (the "Group"). The Group carried on the business of developing a mining property situated near the Bull River just outside of Fernie, British Columbia. It is effectively controlled by the estate of Ross Stanfield ("Stanfield") which holds 100% and 99.9% of the voting common shares in the parent companies, Zeus Mineral Corporation and Fort Steele Mineral Corporation, respectively. As stated above, the two principal companies involved in the development and operation of the mine within the Group are Bul River and Gallowai.

9 The mine, known as the Gallowai Bul River Mine, is not currently in production. There has been significant underground development to this point such that the petitioners and CuVeras consider that with a relatively modest further investment the mine could be placed into production.

10 Bul River and Gallowai were incorporated in the 1980s. Commencing in the mid-1990s, Stanfield began raising funds for the development of the mine. The marketing program focused on "sophisticated investors" which are, through securities regulation statutes, defined as persons with a net worth in excess of \$1 million willing to invest a minimum of \$100,000 in a given venture. The persons targeted by Stanfield's marketing campaign were farmers in Alberta, particularly around Edmonton, Red Deer and Medicine Hat, as well as farmers from the area around Regina, Saskatchewan.

11 Until 2010, Stanfield engaged in a sophisticated marketing program to sell redeemable preferred non-voting shares to these investors. Over that period of time, approximately \$229 million was invested in consideration of which preferred shares in Bul River and Gallowai were issued.

12 The marketing program involved repeated representations as to the ore content of the mine. Stanfield continually referred to the mine as an "elephant" mine, meaning that the mineral resources were enormous. Over the years, the program included visits to the mine site and presentations to potential investors by Stanfield. Those presentations referred to the history of the mine and the future prospects of the mine, including development plans and the levels of ore content (copper, gold and platinum). The presentations also involved discussion as to when production would commence and typically production was forecast to commence within a foreseeable period of time, be it one or two years from the date of the meeting.

13 The same representations were also made in written materials, including a report from Phillip De Souza ("De Souza"), a professional engineer.

14 Some potential investors executed subscription agreements for shares during those visits to the mine or immediately thereafter. Some returned to the mine for subsequent tours and subsequent purchases. In some instances, Stanfield recruited current investors to further market the preferred shares to other investors.

15 These representations by Stanfield were made in the face of contemporaneous reports which questioned the value of the resources announced by the Group. These included papers published by the British Columbia Ministry of Energy and Mines in 2000 in which it was reported that they were unable to confirm the gold grades reported by the Group. In 2006, a professional conduct hearing in Alberta was held arising from charges that De Souza's report was "deficient and misleading". The panel issued reasons which were published in January 2008 in which it concluded that De Souza's conduct constituted unskilled practice and unprofessional conduct.

16 Eventually, Stanfield's activities caught the attention of various provincial securities regulators. In May 2010, the British Columbia Securities Commission (the "Commission") issued a Notice of Hearing against Stanfield, Bul River and Gallowai seeking to order them to produce an independently prepared technical report fully compliant with NI 43-101 (Standards of Disclosure for Mineral Projects) that would include an estimate of the mineral resources available at the mine.

17 Ross Stanfield died on August 3, 2010.

18 By the fall of 2010, in addition to being faced with the Commission proceedings, certain preferred shareholders had taken legal action against the Group in light of the failure to comply with redemption obligations arising in respect of the preferred shares. Stanfield's grandson, George Hewison, is the sole beneficiary of Stanfield's estate. He stepped in to continue the work of the Group as best he could. In late 2010 or early 2011, undertakings were given to the securities regulators in British Columbia and Alberta by which the petitioners agreed not to issue any new securities without their consent.

19 The evidence would later establish that the representations made by Stanfield regarding the mine resources were false. A technical report was later prepared by Rosco Postle and Associates Inc. ("RPA") in March 2011 that provided some review of the available mineral resources at the mine. Both the RPA report and a later report prepared by Snowden Mining Industry Consultants in March 2013 would indicate that while there is valuable ore in the mine, the quantity of the resources is markedly less than what was indicated in the representations made to investors.

20 On May 26, 2011, the Group sought and obtained creditor protection pursuant to the *CCAA* and an Initial Order was granted at that time.

21 At the time of the *CCAA* filing, the Class A common voting shares in Bul River and Gallowai were held by the Stanfield estate. Other Class B and Class E common non-voting shares were held by investors.

22 As of the date of filing, the petitioners had no secured creditors. The petition referenced debt obligations of \$904,000 to trade suppliers and two unsecured judgments totalling \$386,135. Various preferred non-voting shares were held by investors in Classes C, D and F. The petition materials indicated that amounts owing for "redeemable shares" (i.e., the preferred shares) were approximately \$137,718,557. The holders of both common and preferred shares comprise some 3,500 individual investors.

23 The subscription agreements for the preferred shares provided that the shares were redeemable at the end of five years from the date of the subscription together with a "preferred cumulative annual dividend" of 12.75%. There is no evidence of any significant redemption of the preferred shares. Rather, as redemption dates arose, preferred shareholders were approached to execute extension agreements extending their redemption rights from a given date to a date defined by the commencement of production from the mine. Many preferred shareholders signed those extension agreements, some did not. For those who did not, some of them demanded redemption of their shares. For the most part, those investors were told that there was no money to redeem the shares.

24 Accordingly, the largest liability faced by the petitioners is that arising from the preferred shares. The preferred shareholders appear to have certain claims arising from their holdings. Firstly, they have a claim for payment of the redemption amount plus the accumulated dividend. Secondly, they may have a claim for misrepresentation against the Group, giving rise to potential remedies of rescission of their subscription agreements, damages, or both.

The Claims Process

25 In August 2011, the Group prepared a list of creditors (the "Creditor List") in support of seeking a claims process order. The list actually included not only trade claims but also shareholder claims. Not surprisingly, the purpose of the claims process was to assist the Group in developing its restructuring plan.

26 On August 19, 2011, the court approved a Claims Process Order, which authorized the petitioners to conduct a claims process for the determination of any and all claims against them (the "Claims Process"). The Claims Process Order defined "claims" that were to be determined in the Claims Process as follows:

... indebtedness, liability or obligation (including an equity obligations arising from the ownership of equity shares) ...

... all obligations of or ownership interests in the Petitioners or any of them arising from or relating to the holding of a Share.

27 Under the Claims Process Order, all "Known Creditors" (defined in the Claims Process Order as all creditors shown on the books and records of the petitioners as having a claim in excess of \$250), including holders of shares, were to receive a claims package from the petitioners that included an instruction letter, a Notice of Dispute, a Proof of Claim, and a copy of the Claims Process Order (the "Claims Package"). The Claims Process was also advertised in certain publications. The Creditor List indicating such Known Creditors was posted on the Monitor's website, as was noted in the Claims Package, such that both creditors and shareholders were able to view it. The process of determining claims was as follows:

- a) all creditors and shareholders were given the opportunity to review the Creditor List;
- b) in the event a creditor or shareholder agreed with the "Claim Particulars" listed in the Creditor List (which included the number and class of shares), the creditor or shareholder did not need to file a Proof of Claim with the petitioners. In that event, the Claim Particulars in the Creditor List would be deemed to be the creditor or shareholder's proven claim for voting and distribution purposes under any restructuring plan subsequently filed by the petitioners;
- c) in the event a creditor or shareholder objected to the Claim Particulars in the Creditor List, or wished to advance another claim, the creditor or shareholder had to, on or before October 17, 2011 (the "Claims Bar Date"), deliver to the petitioners, with a copy to the Monitor, a notice of such objection in the form of a Notice of Dispute, together with a Proof of Claim and supporting documentation;
- d) in the event a Notice of Dispute was not submitted on or before the Claims Bar Date, the creditor or shareholder was deemed to have accepted the amount owing and all other Claim Particulars set out in the Creditor List, and was forever barred from advancing any other claim against the petitioners or participating in any plan subsequently filed by the petitioners;
- e) where a Notice of Dispute and/or Proof of Claim was filed by a creditor or shareholder, the petitioners were deemed to have accepted it unless they delivered to the creditor or shareholder a Notice of Disallowance on or before October 31, 2011 (later extended to November 15, 2011); and
- f) in the event of the petitioners delivering a Notice of Disallowance, a creditor or shareholder had 21 days to seek a determination from the court of the validity and value of and particulars of the claim by filing and serving the petitioners and the Monitor with application materials. A creditor or shareholder who failed to file and serve such

materials by the deadline was deemed to have accepted the particulars of its claim set out in the Notice of Disallowance.

28 The Claims Process Order did not contemplate the appointment of a claims officer or the participation of the Monitor in the process of assessing the validity of the Proofs of Claim and/or Notices of Dispute submitted to the petitioners through the Claims Process. Nor did the Claims Process allow any independent review of claims submitted by other creditors of the petitioners or by CuVeras as the interim financier.

(i) Jurisdiction of the Court

29 Before turning to claims process orders specifically, it is important to keep in mind the broad remedial objectives of the *CCAA* to facilitate a restructuring rather than a liquidation of assets: *Ted Leroy Trucking Ltd., Re*, 2010 SCC 60 (S.C.C.) [hereinafter *Century Services*] at paras. 15-18, 56. As the Supreme Court of Canada has noted, it is now well recognized that a supervising judge of a *CCAA* proceeding has a "broad and flexible authority" or statutory jurisdiction to make such orders as are necessary to achieve those objectives: *Century Services* at paras. 19, 57-66.

30 The discretionary authority of the court is confirmed by s. 11 of the *CCAA* which provides that the court may make any order that it considers "appropriate in the circumstances". As Madam Justice Deschamps observed in *Century Services*, whether an order will be appropriate is driven by the policy objectives of the *CCAA*:

[70] The general language of the *CCAA* should not be read as being restricted by the availability of more specific orders. However, the requirements of appropriateness, good faith, and due diligence are baseline considerations that a court should always bear in mind when exercising *CCAA* authority. Appropriateness under the *CCAA* is assessed by inquiring whether the order sought advances the policy objectives underlying the *CCAA*. The question is whether the order will usefully further efforts to achieve the remedial purpose of the *CCAA* — avoiding the social and economic losses resulting from liquidation of an insolvent company. I would add that appropriateness extends not only to the purpose of the order, but also to the means it employs. Courts should be mindful that chances for successful reorganizations are enhanced where participants achieve common ground and all stakeholders are treated as advantageously and fairly as the circumstances permit.

31 Claims process orders are an important step in most restructuring proceedings. In *Timminco Ltd., Re*, 2014 ONSC 3393 (Ont. S.C.J.), Mr. Justice Morawetz reviewed the "first principles" relating to claims process orders and their purpose within *CCAA* proceedings:

[41] It is also necessary to return to first principles with respect to claims-bar orders. The *CCAA* is intended to facilitate a compromise or arrangement between a debtor company and its creditors and shareholders. For a debtor company engaged in restructuring under the

CCAA, which may include a liquidation of its assets, it is of fundamental importance to determine the quantum of liabilities to which the debtor and, in certain circumstances, third parties are subject. It is this desire for certainty that led to the development of the practice by which debtors apply to court for orders which establish a deadline for filing claims.

[42] Adherence to the claims-bar date becomes even more important when distributions are being made (in this case, to secured creditors), or when a plan is being presented to creditors and a creditors' meeting is called to consider the plan of compromise. These objectives are recognized by s. 12 of the CCAA, in particular the references to "voting" and "distribution".

[43] In such circumstances, stakeholders are entitled to know the implications of their actions. The claims-bar order can assist in this process. By establishing a claims-bar date, the debtor can determine the universe of claims and the potential distribution to creditors, and creditors are in a position to make an informed choice as to the alternatives presented to them. If distributions are being made or a plan is presented to creditors and voted upon, stakeholders should be able to place a degree of reliance in the claims bar process.

32 The overall objective of achieving certainty within the restructuring proceedings - for both debtor and creditor - is what drives this process. In this vein, counsel makes an effort to draft a claims process order to achieve these objectives. A claims bar date is typically set. The process is typically designed with some idea of the issues that either have arisen or might arise in the restructuring. My comments in *0487826 B.C. Ltd., Re*, 2012 BCSC 1501 (B.C. S.C.) [hereinafter *Steels Products*] are apposite:

[38] Similar issues often arise in *CCAA* proceedings where counsel and the Court must be mindful of issues that may arise in relation to the determination of claims in that proceeding. There are no set rules, but care must be taken in the drafting of the claims process order to ensure that the process by which claims are determined is fair and reasonable to all stakeholders, including those who will be directly affected by the acceptance of other claims. In *Winalta Inc. (Re)*, 2011 ABQB 399, Madam Justice Topolniski stated that "[p]ublic confidence in the insolvency system is dependent on it being fair, just and accessible".

[39] Many *CCAA* proceedings provide for an independently run claims process (for example, by the monitor), the cost of which again would be borne by the general body of creditors: see for example, *Pine Valley Mining Corp. (Re)*, 2008 BCSC 356. To this extent, the statutory procedure under the *BIA* and the claims process under the *CCAA* will have similar features, which is understandable since the overriding intention under both is to conduct a proper claims process: see *Century Services Inc. v. Canada (Attorney General)*, 2010 SCC 60 at paras. 24 and 47.

33 Nevertheless, issues can and do arise that no one is able to foresee at the time of the claims process order. In that event, the court retains its discretion to address the application of the claims

process order: *Timminco* at para. 38. In that case, the claims process order specifically allowed the court to order a further claims bar date. No such provision is found in the Claims Process Order but I do not consider that its absence is sufficient to oust the statutory jurisdiction of the court in appropriate circumstances.

34 This, of course, is a different issue in that by the failure of the petitioners to deliver a Notice of Disallowance in respect of the claims in issue, they were deemed to have been accepted by the petitioners. This is not a case where a creditor is seeking to avoid the consequences of not filing materials by the time of the Claims Bar Date. Nevertheless, in my view, the court still retains the statutory jurisdiction to consider the validity of claims that might otherwise, by the Claims Process Order, be deemed to have been accepted.

35 The Prestons and Mr. Stafford do not suggest that the court lacks the jurisdiction to reconsider the issues that arise in relation to their claims. The Prestons do, however, contend that it is not appropriate that any reconsideration take place at this time.

(ii) Review of the Claims

36 The stated purpose of the *CCAA* is to facilitate compromises and arrangements between companies and their creditors (see also s. 6 of the *CCAA*). In accordance with that fundamental objective or purpose, it is axiomatic that it is necessary to determine what are the true claims of the creditors as might be compromised or arranged.

37 A "creditor" is not defined in the *CCAA*, unlike the *Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act*, R.S.C. 1985, c.B-3 (the "*BIA*") where it is defined as meaning "a person having a claim provable as a claim" under that *Act* (s. 2). Both the *CCAA* and the *BIA* define "claim" by reference to liabilities "provable" under the *BIA*. Specifically, s. 2(1) of the *CCAA* defines "claim" as meaning:

any indebtedness, liability or obligation of any kind that would be a claim provable within the meaning of section 2 of the *Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act*.

Section 2 of the *BIA* defines a "claim provable in bankruptcy" as "any claim or liability provable in proceedings under this Act by a creditor".

38 Section 121(1) of the *BIA* addresses which claims are "provable claims":

121(1) All debts and liabilities, present or future, to which the bankrupt is subject on the day on which the bankrupt becomes bankrupt or to which the bankrupt may become subject before the bankrupt's discharge by reason of any obligation incurred before the day on which the bankrupt becomes bankrupt shall be deemed to be claims provable in proceedings under this Act.

39 In substance, this same statutory definition is applied in the *CCAA* and represents a point of convergence consistent with the harmonization of certain aspects of insolvency law under both the *CCAA* and *BIA: Century Services* at para. 24. In addition, as noted by CuVeras, this definition is essentially used in the Claims Process Order by its definition of "Claim".

40 Various authorities establish that a "provable debt" must be due either at law, or in equity, by the bankrupt to the person seeking to prove a claim and must be recoverable by legal process: *Excelsior Electric Dairy Machinery Ltd., Re* (1922), 2 C.B.R. 599, [1923] 3 D.L.R. 1176 (Ont. S.C.); *Farm Credit Corp. v. Holowach (Trustee of)* (1988), 68 C.B.R. (N.S.) 255, 51 D.L.R. (4th) 501 (Alta. C.A.), leave to appeal to S.C.C. refused, (1989), 73 C.B.R. (N.S.) xxvii (note), 60 D.L.R. (4th) vii (note) (S.C.C.); *Central Capital Corp., Re* (1995), 29 C.B.R. (3d) 33, [1995] O.J. No. 19 (Ont. Gen. Div. [Commercial List]) ("*Central Capital*"), aff'd (1996), 27 O.R. (3d) 494, 38 C.B.R. (3d) 1 (Ont. C.A.) ("*Central Capital (ONCA)*"); *Negus v. Oakley's General Contracting* (1996), 40 C.B.R. (3d) 270, 152 N.S.R. (2d) 172 (N.S. S.C.).

41 In a *CCAA* proceeding, a claims process order is the means by which the "claims" of the creditors are determined. By reason of that process, the debtor is able to determine the nature and extent of its debts and liabilities so as to enable it to formulate a plan of arrangement. There are no rules as to when a claims process may be implemented although it is usually early in the process in anticipation of a plan and distributions to creditors. In that respect, a debtor company will be seeking some certainty regarding the determination of claims for that purpose.

42 In *Timminco*, the Court, prior to citing relevant authorities at para. 52, outlined many of the factors that might be considered by the court in relation to deciding whether to allow claims to be advanced after the claims bar date:

[51] Counsel to Mr. Walsh submit that courts have historically considered the following factors in determining whether to exercise their discretion to consider claims after the claims-bar date: (a) was the delay caused by inadvertence and, if so, did the claimant act in good faith? (b) what is the effect of permitting the claim in terms of the existence and impact of any relevant prejudice caused by the delay[?]; (c) if relevant prejudice is found, can it be alleviated by attaching appropriate conditions to an order permitting late filing? and (d) if relevant prejudice is found which cannot be alleviated, are there any other considerations which may nonetheless warrant an order permitting late filing?

43 As I have stated above, the broad jurisdiction of the court under s. 11 of the *CCAA* allows the court to make such orders as are "appropriate". While the above factors have been considered in the past, there is no finite list that detracts from a consideration of all relevant circumstances. Nevertheless, the general considerations of delay and prejudice typically arise, just as they do in this case.

44 I return to the factual circumstances relating to the Claims Process and the Claims Process Order. The petitioners were themselves responsible for reviewing the Proofs of Claim and/or Notices of Dispute submitted in the Claims Process. The principal individual involved in the review was Mr. Hewison who did so with the assistance of counsel. It is apparent that the only factors considered in his review included whether a claim related to a trade debt or whether it related to an equity interest in the petitioners.

45 The Prestons argue that the Claims Process was well known to everyone and that its purpose was to establish the amount and nature of all claims. This is clearly self-evident, but back in late 2011, it was the case that the course of the restructuring proceedings was anything but certain. In fact, the ability of the petitioners to continue the proceedings was tenuous and they were scrambling to find interim financing which they eventually secured with CuVeras in November 2011. By that time, the Claims Process was essentially completed. Even so, understandably, the parties were concerned to proceed as quickly as possible to obtain further technical reports on the proven or inferred mine resources in order to determine whether a viable mine even existed. They did receive those later reports, which included a further RPA report and the Snowden report. In these circumstances, Mr. Hewison did not undertake any substantive review of the claims.

46 The Prestons further say that, since they faithfully complied with the Claims Process Order, it would be patently unfair to now revisit the characterization of their claim. While they raise the matter of the three year plus delay, no elements of prejudice have been alleged. In my view, the delay, while relevant, will have little effect on the ability of the parties to address the substance of the matter. Nor have any rights been extinguished or compromised by reason of any delay. Accordingly, the objective of certainty has less force in this case where the plan of arrangement has yet to be formulated and the claimants have yet to consider that plan and vote on it. I note that similar considerations were at play in *Timminco* where it was apparent that no plan would ever be put to the creditors.

47 Finally, the Prestons argue that the Claims Process Order constituted the sole form of adjudication of the validity and nature of the claims submitted. It is true, of course, that the petitioners had an opportunity to consider these claims.

48 As discussed below, the petitioners did not forward any Notice of Disallowance in respect of the Proofs of Claim later filed by the Prestons and Mr. Stafford. Mr. Hewison considered that the Stafford Claim should be categorized as an "investment" in the mine. Further, with respect to the Preston Claim, he was not aware of the significance of the distinction between an equity claim and a debt claim. In retrospect, and now knowing what type of plan of arrangement is possible, Mr. Hewison recognizes that this was in error. It appears that a combination of factors - including Mr. Hewison's lack of familiarity with the past transactions, inadequate record keeping, lack of

resources and distraction in terms of larger issues more relevant to the survival of the mine - all contributed to a less rigorous review and analysis of these claims.

49 It is the case, however, that the petitioners were acting in good faith, albeit without a full appreciation of the issues arising in respect of these claims and the also the consequences of their inaction.

50 More importantly, aside from the petitioners, other stakeholders have a significant interest in whether a claim is valid or not and that any claim be properly characterized. Based on the anticipated form of the restructuring plan, the inclusion of the Stafford Claim and characterization of the Preston Claim will impact the recovery of these stakeholders. These other creditors or stakeholders of the petitioners did not have any opportunity up to this point in time to review the claims. I would again note that the Claims Process Order did not contemplate any review of the claims by these other stakeholders, such as was the case in *Steels Products* (see paras. 13-15).

51 Nor has the Monitor participated in any review of these claims. I do not say this as any criticism of the Monitor as the Claims Process Order did not expressly provide for any such independent review. Nor does the Claims Process Order contemplate that any other independent review of the claims be completed which might have highlighted the issues. The Monitor did report on the Claims Process from time to time (particularly, its report from June 2012 and January 2013), however, no such issues were identified. As such, the Monitor did not conduct a critical review of the claims, similar to what a trustee in bankruptcy might have done under s. 135 of the *BIA*.

52 In these circumstances, and in retrospect, the Claims Process lacked procedural safeguards that might have avoided this problem: *Steels Products* at paras. 38-39.

53 In these circumstances, I disagree with the Prestons that the Claims Process Order constitutes an adjudication of these issues by which CuVeras or any other stakeholder is estopped in bringing these issues forward. It is clear that to this point, no such adjudication has occurred.

54 As I have indicated above, a Claims Process Order is intended to be a fair, reasonable and transparent method of determining and resolving claims against the estate. In certain circumstances, these objectives fail to be achieved through no fault of the participants. That does not preclude the court from considering the issues on their merits so as to achieve the fundamental objective under the *CCAA* to facilitate a restructuring based on valid claims. This would also include a consideration of the proper characterization of the Preston's claim: *Steels Products* at para. 42.

55 Simply put, if the Claims Process results in a claim being advanced which is not truly a debt of the petitioners or results in a claim being improperly characterized, the fairness and transparency of these proceedings are inevitably compromised such that the objectives of the *CCAA* will not be fulfilled.

56 My comments in *Steels Products* apply equally here:

[46] In conclusion, an independent review of these claims is necessary in the circumstances. An adequate review of these related party claims has not been made. The consequences of a successful challenge to some or all of these claims would have significant financial repercussions to the Disputing Creditors and other unsecured creditors who have also proved their claims. To deny an independent review at this time would be to deny any creditor the fair, reasonable and transparent process that is expected in insolvency proceedings in determining claims before any distribution of estate assets is made.

57 Even at this late stage in the proceedings, and considering the ongoing supervisory role of the court, I consider that it is appropriate to address the issues relating to both the Preston Claim and the Stafford Claim on their merits. This is particularly so given the significant repercussions to other stakeholders and the lack of any prejudice to the Prestons and Mr. Stafford.

Discussion

(a) The Preston Claim

58 The Preston Claim is advanced as a debt claim in these proceedings, a position that is disputed by CuVeras who contends that in fact, it is an equity claim as defined in the *CCAA*.

(i) The Proof of Claim

59 The Creditor List referenced the Prestons as holding various Class E (2,102) and Class F (2,400) preferred shares.

60 In October 2011, the Prestons, through their counsel, submitted a Proof of Claim and Notice of Dispute.

61 The genesis of the claim was as described in a Statement of Claim filed in the Alberta Court of Queen's Bench against Gallowai on May 27, 2010. The claim was as follows: in October 2004, the Prestons subscribed for 2,400 Class F preferred shares in Gallowai in consideration of the payment to Gallowai of \$120,000; Gallowai is alleged to have covenanted to redeem the preferred shares at the expiry of five years after the allotment date; the Prestons demanded redemption of the shares and the payment of dividends which was to be by way of issuance of Class E shares; Gallowai refused to respond to their demands; and the Prestons claimed the right to redeem the Class F preferred shares for \$120,000 plus either dividends in the form of Class E common shares or, alternatively, cash payment of dividends at 12.75% per annum.

62 On November 19, 2010, default judgment was granted in favour of the Prestons for the claimed amount of \$120,000 plus the cash dividend interest rate for a total judgment of

\$214,527.10 including court ordered costs. The Prestons attempted to register their judgment in British Columbia in June 2011 after the court ordered a stay arising under the Initial Order, but nothing turns on that step.

63 The Proof of Claim indicates that the Prestons were advancing both a trade claim for the judgment amount and also a claim for non-voting shares arising from the allegation that they continue to hold the 2,102 Class E shares noted on the Creditor List.

(ii) Historical Approach to Equity Claims

64 Before I turn to the current statutory regime arising from amendments to the *CCAA* and *BIA* in 2009, I will review the authorities which applied before these amendments were enacted.

65 Historically, equity and debt claims have been treated differently in an insolvency proceeding given the fundamental difference in the nature of such claims. That different treatment resulted in the subordination of equity to debt claims. The basis for this judicially developed principle was that equity investors are understood to be higher risk participants. Creditors, on the other hand, have been held by the courts to have chosen a lower level of risk exposure that should generally result in priority over equity investors in an insolvency context.

66 In *Sino-Forest Corp., Re*, 2012 ONCA 816 (Ont. C.A.), affirming 2012 ONSC 4377 (Ont. S.C.J. [Commercial List]), the Court of Appeal commented with approval on the analysis of Morawetz J. in the court below:

[30] Even before the 2009 amendments to the *CCAA* codified the treatment of equity claims, the courts subordinated shareholder equity claims to general creditors' claims in an insolvency. As the supervising judge described [at paras. 23-25]:

Essentially, shareholders cannot reasonably expect to maintain a financial interest in an insolvent company where creditor claims are not being paid in full. Simply put, shareholders have no economic interest in an insolvent enterprise.

The basis for the differentiation flows from the fundamentally different nature of debt and equity investments. Shareholders have unlimited upside potential when purchasing shares. Creditors have no corresponding upside potential.

As a result, courts subordinated equity claims and denied such claims a vote in plans of arrangement [citations omitted].

67 See also *Central Capital* at paras. 41-42; *Central Capital* (ONCA) at 510-11, 519.

68 In light of that key distinction, courts in the past have embarked upon a consideration as to the true characterization of certain claims in an insolvency context. There is considerable authority

that in making that determination, the court will consider the true substantive nature or character of the claim, rather than the form of the claim.

69 The leading case is the Supreme Court of Canada's decision in *Canada Deposit Insurance Corp. v. Canadian Commercial Bank*, [1992] 3 S.C.R. 558 (S.C.C.) ("*CDIC*"). In that case, the issue was whether money advanced to the debtor bank was in the nature of a loan or a capital investment for the purpose of determining whether the creditors advancing the funds ranked *pari passu* with other unsecured creditors in a winding-up proceeding. Mr. Justice Iacobucci stated that the approach was to determine the "substance" or "true nature" of the transaction (563, 588). His oft quoted statements are found at 590-91, the relevant principles of which can be summarized as follows:

- a) the fact that a transaction contains both debt and equity features does not, in itself, determine its characterization as either debt or equity;
- b) the characterization of a transaction under review requires the determination of the intention of the parties;
- c) it does not follow that each and every aspect of a "hybrid" debt and equity transaction must be given the exact same weight when addressing a characterization issue; and
- d) a court should not too easily be distracted by aspects of a transaction which are, in reality, only incidental or secondary in nature to the main thrust of the agreement.

70 One type of financial instrument that typically has elements of both equity and debt are preferred shares, where arguably rights of redemption and rights to payment of dividends evidence debt characteristics.

71 The issue of the characterization of preferred shareholder claims in an insolvency context was addressed in *Central Capital (ONCA)*. In that case, the court had to characterize a claim arising from the right of retraction in respect of certain preferred shares. Although differing in the result, the majority opinions and the dissenting opinion at the appellate court level were consistent in an approach toward determining the *substance* of the claim in terms of whether it was a "provable debt". In dissent, Finlayson J.A. stated:

... I do not think that describing the documents as preferred shares is conclusive as to what instrument the parties thought they were creating. In the second place, it is not what the parties call the documents that is determinative of their identity, but rather it is what the facts require the court to call them. The character of the instrument is revealed by the language creating it and the circumstances of its creation.

(at 509).

...

Thus, in looking at the substance of the transaction that led to the issuance of the preference shares, it appears to me that the retraction clauses were promises by Central Capital to pay fixed amounts on definite dates to the appellants. They evidenced a debt to the appellants.

(at 512).

Justice Laskin specifically addressed the "substance of the relationship" at 535-36. In addition, Weiler J.A. focused on the "true nature" of the transaction or relationship:

In order to decide whether the obligation of Central Capital to redeem the preferred shares of the appellants is a claim provable in bankruptcy, it is necessary to characterize the true nature of the transaction. The court must look to the surrounding circumstances to determine whether the true nature of the relationship is that of a shareholder who has equity in the company or whether it is that of a creditor owed a debt or liability by the company: *Canada Deposit Insurance Corp. v. Canadian Commercial Bank*, [1992] 3 S.C.R. 558, 97 D.L.R. (4th) 385. In this case, the decision is not an easy one. Where, as here, the agreements between the parties are reflected in the articles of the corporation, it is necessary to examine them carefully to characterize the true relationship. It is not disputed that if the true nature of the relationship is that of a shareholder-equity relationship after the retraction date and at the time of the reorganization, then the appellants do not have a claim provable in bankruptcy. Consequently, they will not have a claim under the CCAA.

(at 519).

72 In *Blue Range Resource Corp., Re*, 2000 ABQB 4 (Alta. Q.B.), Madam Justice Romaine found that a shareholder's claim for alleged share loss, transaction costs and cash share purchase damages was in substance an equity claim or a claim by the shareholder for a return of its investment. See also *EarthFirst Canada Inc., Re*, 2009 ABQB 316 (Alta. Q.B.).

73 In *Return on Innovation Capital Ltd. v. Gandi Innovations Ltd.*, 2011 ONSC 5018 (Ont. S.C.J. [Commercial List]), leave to appeal refused, 2012 ONCA 10 (Ont. C.A.), the Court was characterizing indemnity claims advanced by certain individual directors and officers against the debtor, the Gandi Group. That indemnity claim arose by reason of a claim by TA Associates Inc. against them for damages for claims relating in part to TA's US\$50 million equity investment in the Gandi Group. Mr. Justice Newbould at the Ontario Superior Court concluded that TA's claim was an equity claim and that therefore, the indemnity claim was also, in substance, an equity claim.

74 I have also been referred to *Dexior Financial Inc., Re*, 2011 BCSC 348 (B.C. S.C. [In Chambers]). Mr. Justice Masuhara there found the claim to be an equity claim even though the shareholder had given notice of an intention to seek retraction of the shares prior to the filing.

Citing *CDIC* and *Central Capital* (ONCA), the Court found that the notice did not change the original intention or substance of the claim.

(iii) The New Statutory Approach

75 In September 2009, Parliament enacted substantial amendments to the *BIA* and *CCAA* in relation to the treatment of claims arising from equity in an insolvency proceeding.

76 One of the principle amendments was the prohibition that the court may not sanction a plan of arrangement unless all debt claims are to be paid in full before payment of any "equity claims". Section 6(8) of the *CCAA* provides:

(8) No compromise or arrangement that provides for the payment of an equity claim is to be sanctioned by the court unless it provides that all claims that are not equity claims are to be paid in full before the equity claim is to be paid.

77 The definitions of "equity claim" and "equity interest" are found in the *CCAA*, s. 2(1):

"equity claim" means a claim that is in respect of an equity interest, including a claim for, among others,

(a) a dividend or similar payment,

(b) a return of capital,

(c) a redemption or retraction obligation,

(d) a monetary loss resulting from the ownership, purchase or sale of an equity interest or from the rescission, or, in Quebec, the annulment, of a purchase or sale of an equity interest, or

(e) contribution or indemnity in respect of a claim referred to in any of paragraphs (a) to (d);

"equity interest" means

(a) in the case of a company other than an income trust, a share in the company — or a warrant or option or another right to acquire a share in the company — other than one that is derived from a convertible debt[.]

78 Section 22.1 further restricts the right of creditors having equity claims from voting on a plan of arrangement:

22.1 Despite subsection 22(1), creditors having equity claims are to be in the same class of creditors in relation to those claims unless the court orders otherwise and may not, as members of that class, vote at any meeting unless the court orders otherwise.

79 Substantially these same amendments were made to the *BIA* in respect of proposal proceedings under that *Act* in ss. 2, 54(2)(d) and 60(1.7).

80 The effect of the amendments was considered by Pepall J. (as she then was) in *Nelson Financial Group Ltd., Re*, 2010 ONSC 6229 (Ont. S.C.J. [Commercial List]). In that case, the court had no difficulty in finding that the claims of preferred shareholders for declared but unpaid dividends and requests for redemption were equity claims within the above definition. In addition, the approach of the courts in the past in looking at the substance or true nature of the claim was applied in finding that related claims for compensatory damages or amounts due on rescission were caught by the definition of "equity claim": paras. 32-34. As such, all the claims were not provable debts under the *CCAA*.

81 The court in *Nelson Financial Group* noted that the introduction of section 6(8) in the *CCAA* provided greater certainty in the treatment to be accorded equity claims and lessened the "judicial flexibility" that previously prevailed in characterizing such claims.

82 Accordingly, while the 2009 amendments did represent in part a codification of the previous case law concerning equity claims, it also represented a more concrete definition of "equity claims" and by such definition a broadening and more expansive definition of such claims: *Sino-Forest Corporation* (ONCA) at paras. 24, 34-60. Parliament has now clearly cast the net widely in terms of the broad definition of equity claims such that claims that might have previously escaped such characterization will now be caught by the *CCAA*.

83 The claim of the Prestons is set out in their Statement of Claim. The claim is for the return of their capital investment under the redemption rights of the preferred shares. Their claim also included a claim to unpaid dividends, whether by cash payment or the issuance of other shares, being Class E common shares. It is clear that their claims, as evidenced by the Statement of Claim, fall within the definition of "equity claim" in subparas. (a)-(c).

84 The Prestons do not dispute that their claim, as described and but for one qualification, would fall within the definition. They contend, however, that by reason of their obtaining default judgment against Gallowai, they have transformed their equity claim into a debt claim that is a provable claim in the *CCAA* proceeding.

(iv) *The Effect of the Judgment*

85 The 2009 amendments have not affected the ability of the court to continue to analyze the *substance* of the claims, albeit in the context of the expanded definition of "equity claim". This is evident from the approach of the court in *Nelson Financial Group* at paras. 28 and 34.

86 In *Sino-Forest Corporation*, the court found that certain Shareholder Claims for damages claimed in a class action lawsuit clearly fell within the definition of "equity claims": ONSC at para. 84. Further, certain Related Indemnity Claims were also advanced against the estate by the auditors who were named in the class action lawsuit. These auditors also faced claims for damages relating to their role in what were said to be misrepresentations in the financial statements that led to the loss of equity by the class members. Again, consistent with the historical approach of the courts, Morawetz J. focused on the "substance" of the claim: para. 85. He stated:

[79] The plain language in the definition of "equity claim" does not focus on the identity of the claimant. Rather, it focuses on the nature of the claim. In this case, it seems clear that the Shareholder Claims led to the Related Indemnity Claims. Put another way, the inescapable conclusion is that the Related Indemnity Claims are being used to recover an equity investment.

[80] The plain language of the CCAA dictates the outcome, namely, that the Shareholder Claims and the Related Indemnity Claims constitute "equity claims" within the meaning of the CCAA. This conclusion is consistent with the trend towards an expansive interpretation of the definition of "equity claims" to achieve the purpose of the CCAA.

...

[82] It would be totally inconsistent to arrive at a conclusion that would enable either the auditors or the Underwriters, through a claim for indemnification, to be treated as creditors when the underlying actions of the shareholders cannot achieve the same status. To hold otherwise would indeed provide an indirect remedy where a direct remedy is not available.

The Court of Appeal upheld this approach: *Sino-Forest Corporation* (ONCA) at paras. 37, 58.

87 I would note in this regard that the Claims Process Order expressly provided:

THIS COURT ORDERS that the categorization of Claims into Trade Claims, non-voting Shares, and Voting Shares does not in any way set classes or categories for the purposes of priority or voting on a restructuring plan issued by the Creditors and shall not prejudice any party or the Petitioners from applying at a later date to set such classes or priorities in connection with voting on a plan;

88 The Prestons argue that their obtaining of a judgment against Gallowai has resulted in a replacement or transformation of their equity claim with a debt claim.

89 The Prestons place considerable reliance on the decision in *I. Waxman & Sons Ltd., Re* (2008), 89 O.R. (3d) 427, 40 C.B.R. (5th) 307 (Ont. S.C.J. [Commercial List]), which was decided prior to the 2009 amendments to the *CCAA*. In that case, Morris sued I. Waxman & Sons Limited ("IWS") for lost profits, profit diversions and improper distributions for bonuses paid. He obtained judgment against IWS and asserted that claim in the later bankruptcy proceedings.

90 The court began by noting that Morris' claim was not for his share of his current equity in IWS, but was, in substance, a claim related to dividends and diverted profits by way of bonuses. Justice Pepall found that the judgment was a debt claim:

[24] There is support in the case law for the proposition that equity may become debt. For example, declared dividends are treated as constituting a debt that is provable in bankruptcy. As Laskin J.A. stated in *Central Capital Corp. (Re)*, "It seems to me that these appellants must be either shareholders or creditors. Except for declared dividends, they cannot be both." And later, "Moreover, as Justice Finlayson points out in his reasons, courts have always accepted the proposition that when a dividend is declared, it is a debt on which each shareholder can sue the corporation." Similarly, in that same decision, Weiler J.A. stated, "As I understand it, counsel does not question that when a dividend has been lawfully declared by a corporation, it is a debt of the corporation and each shareholder is entitled to sue the corporation for his [portion]: see *Fraser and Stewart*, supra, at p. 220 for a list of authorities." In *East Chilliwack Fruit Growers Co-operative (Re)*, the B.C. Court of Appeal held that an agricultural co-operative member who had exercised a right of redemption and remained only to be paid was an unsecured creditor with a provable debt. Declared bonuses may also sometimes constitute debt: *Stuart v. Hamilton Jockey Club* [footnotes omitted].

[25] Secondly, the claims advanced by Morris are judgment debts. As stated by Weiler J.A. in *Central Capital*, ". . . in order to be a provable claim within the meaning of s.121 of the BIA, the claim must be one recoverable by legal process: *Farm Credit Corp. v. Holowach (Trustee of)*." Clearly a judgment constitutes a claim recoverable by legal process. By virtue of the judgment, the money award becomes debt and it is properly the subject of a proof of claim in bankruptcy. In this regard, the facts in this case are unlike those in *Re Blue Range Resource Corp. (Re)*, or *National Bank of Canada v. Merit Energy Ltd.* Those cases involved causes of action that had been asserted in court proceedings, but in neither case had judgment been rendered [footnotes omitted].

91 In my view, *Waxman* is of little assistance to the Prestons.

92 Firstly, the facts are distinguishable by reason of the fact that the Preston Claim is for recovery of their capital or equity, rather than simply a return on capital as was the case in *Waxman*. I would note that the Preston default judgment obtained in 2010 does include the dividend interest on the preferred shares. What is somewhat anomalous is that this was claimed in the alternative to the

issuance of the Class E common shares. Even so, the Prestons in their Statement of Claim did advance a claim for 2,102 Class E common shares and continue to do so by their Proof of Claim, all consistent with what the petitioners had ascribed to them in the Creditor List. It is not clear to me how they can advance both claims.

93 Secondly, in para. 24 of *Waxman*, the Court focused on the prevailing authority at the time prior to the amendments by which declared dividends were considered debt as opposed to equity. At present, the 2009 amendments make clear that this type of claim now clearly falls within the definition of "equity claim" in subpara. (a): *CCAA*, s.2(1).

94 With respect to the comments of the Court in *Waxman*, para. 25, I agree with CuVeras that the Court was simply observing that a judgment debt will normally satisfy the requirements of the claim being recoverable by legal process, one of the requirements of a "provable claim", as noted above. These comments do nothing more than note the obvious - that in ordinary circumstances, a judgment is a claim recoverable by legal process. I do not interpret these comments as obviating an analysis of the true nature of a claim, whether represented by a judgment or not.

95 Accordingly, I do not view *Waxman* as standing for the proposition advanced by the Prestons, namely that a judgment transforms an equity claim into a debt claim such that no further analysis or characterization by the court is necessary. This would have applied even before the enactment of the 2009 amendments, but certainly is more evident now given the expansive definition now contained in the *CCAA*.

96 Indeed, the later comments of Justice Pepall in *Nelson Financial Group* suggest that she only decided in *Waxman* that by reason of a judgment, an equity claim *may* become debt:

[32] The substance of the arrangement between the preferred shareholders and Nelson was a relationship based on equity and not debt. Having said that, as I observed in *I. Waxman & Sons*. there is support in the case law for the proposition that equity may become debt. For instance, in that case, I held that a judgment obtained at the suit of a shareholder constituted debt. An analysis of the nature of the claims is therefore required. If the claims fall within the parameters of section 2 of the *CCAA*, clearly they are to be treated as equity claims and not as debt claims [footnotes omitted].

97 The Court in *Dexior Financial* at para. 16 commented on *Waxman* but those comments were clearly *obiter* as no judgment had been obtained in that case. See also *EarthFirst Canada* at para. 4.

98 At its core, the issue before the court is a narrow one - namely, whether a shareholder, having an equity claim but who obtains a judgment before the filing, has become a debt claimant rather than an equity claimant for the purposes of the insolvency proceeding? In my view, they do not, for the reasons below.

99 In light of the dearth of authority on the issue, I consider that the court must start from first principles.

100 I return to the comments in *Century Services* regarding the remedial purposes of the *CCAA* and the broad and flexible authority of this court to facilitate a restructuring that is fair, reasonable and equitable in accordance with either the express will of Parliament, as specifically dictated in the *CCAA*, or as might be reasonably interpreted as falling within those broad purposes.

101 At its core, the policy objectives of the *CCAA* are a fair and efficient resolution of competing claims in a situation (insolvency) where all obligations or expectations cannot be fulfilled. What is "fair" is a flexible or uncertain concept and needless to say, what is fair will likely be differently interpreted depending on which stakeholder you ask. Nevertheless, Parliament has clearly signalled that the policy objectives continue to be that equity will take a back seat in terms of any recovery where there are outstanding debt claims. This was so before September 2009 and is even more decidedly so now, given the express and expansive statutory treatment of equity claims that now applies.

102 In my view, the characterization of claims by the court continues to have an important role in fulfilling that purpose. I have already outlined the considerable authority from Canadian courts in respect of such claims, both pre- and post-amendments. Particularly, the court continues to have a role in applying these new equity claims provisions by considering the true nature or substance of those claims. In many cases, the matter is now considerably clearer given the definition of "equity claims". What is most important, however, is that form will still not trump substance in the consideration of this issue.

103 As was noted by counsel for CuVeras, the obtaining of a judgment does not necessarily mean that it will be recognized as a debt for the purpose of an insolvency proceeding. There are many provisions of the *BIA* and *CCAA* which allow for the challenge of certain pre-filing transactions or events that may be the basis for supposed rights in the proceeding. For example, the payment of a dividend and redemption of shares may be attacked (*BIA*, s. 101). Another example is that either the granting of a judgment against the debtor or payment of monies such as redemption amounts that resulted in a preference being obtained may be challenged (*BIA*, s. 95). Both of these provisions apply in a *CCAA* proceeding: *CCAA*, s 36.1.

104 These types of provisions reflect the policy choices of Parliament in terms of allowing for the recovery of assets transferred away from the debtor even before the filing so that those assets are brought back into the estate for the benefit of the entire stakeholder group to be distributed in accordance with the legislation. Similarly, some established rights may be challenged in certain circumstances (such as by way of the preference provisions).

105 In the same manner, the new equity provisions in the *CCAA* reinforce that it remains an important policy objective that equity claims be subordinated to debt claims. In *Sino-Forest Corporation*, the Court of Appeal focused on the purpose of the 2009 amendments and stated:

[56] In our view, in enacting s. 6(8) of the *CCAA*, Parliament intended that a monetary loss suffered by a shareholder (or other holder of an equity interest) in respect of his or her equity interest not diminish the assets of the debtor available to general creditors in a restructuring. If a shareholder sues auditors and underwriters in respect of his or her loss, in addition to the debtor, and the auditors or underwriters assert claims of contribution or indemnity against the debtor, the assets of the debtor available to general creditors would be diminished by the amount of the claims for contribution and indemnity.

106 This same recognition of the sound policy objectives of insolvency legislation was noted by Laskin J.A. in *Central Capital (ONCA)*. He commented at 546 that "[p]ermitting preferred shareholders to be turned into creditors by endowing their shares with retraction rights runs contrary to this policy of creditor protection."

107 I see no principled basis upon which a different approach should be taken in respect of an equity claimant who has had the foresight, energy or just plain luck to seek and obtain a judgment prior to the filing date.

108 Some arguments were advanced by CuVeras and the Prestons as to the timing of the judgment. Indeed, the Preston judgment was obtained well in advance of the filing, by some six months. The Prestons cite *Blue Range* at para. 38 in respect of the importance of timing. However, the timing issue there was the filing of the insolvency proceeding, not the granting of a judgment. I agree that the filing of the proceeding is a significant crystallizing event, however, what is important in this case is the ability of the court to analyze the true nature of the claim. Further, whether a judgment is obtained on the eve of the filing or even years before, I consider that it is a distinction without a difference in terms of the court's role in ensuring that a proper characterizing of the claim has taken place in accordance with the *CCAA*.

109 The fact remains that there are thousands of other preferred shareholders holding shares in Bul River and Gallowai whose claims are in essence the same - namely, for a return of their capital and the promised return on that capital (and perhaps other damage claims). The evidence indicates that many of them had also made demand for a return of their preferred share investments and their return on capital well before the filing date. Those claims are clearly equity claims. From the perspective of the policy objective of treating similar claims in a similar fashion (i.e., fairness), it makes little sense to me that a similarly situated preferred shareholder without a judgment should be treated differently than one who does.

110 Nor does it accord with the policy objectives particularly identified in s. 6(8) of the *CCAA* that by the simple mechanism of obtaining a judgment an equity claimant should be elevated to a debt claimant which would inevitably diminish the recovery of other "true" debt claimants.

111 The Prestons argue that this will open the floodgates to an endless analysis of claims reduced to judgments resulting in increased cost and inefficiencies in these types of proceedings. I see no merit in this submission given that this decision relates to only equity claims and by no stretch of the imagination has the previous litigation on the point overwhelmed the court system across Canada. In any event, if that is the will of Parliament, then there is little ability in this court to take a different approach.

112 The courts have not been hesitant in preventing claimants from recharacterizing their claims such that an equity claim is indirectly advanced where no direct claim could be made: *Sino-Forest Corporation*, ONSC at para. 84 (although the Court of Appeal preferred to express the same sentiment in terms of the purpose of the *CCAA*). In *Return on Innovation*, Newbould J. stated, consistent with the "substance over form" approach that the court's decision will not be driven by the form of the legal action:

[59] The Claimants assert that the claim for US \$50 million by TA Associates cannot be an equity claim because it is based on breaches of contract, torts and equity. I do not see that as being the deciding factor. TA Associates seeks the return of its US \$50 million equity investment because of various wrongdoings alleged against the Claimants and the fact that the claim is based on these causes of action does not make it any less a claim in equity. The legal tools that are used [are] not the important thing. It is the fact that they are being used to recover an equity investment that is important.

113 Similarly, in addition to the "legal tools" not being determinative, neither are the legal *forms* of recovery determinative, such as the obtaining of a judgment.

114 In summary, the *CCAA* policy objectives in relation to equity claims are clear. In my view, those objectives are best achieved by the continued approach of the court, both pre- and post-*CCAA* amendments, to consider the substance or true nature of the claim. This accords with the ongoing supervisory jurisdiction of the court to exercise its statutory discretion to achieve the purposes of the *CCAA*. In particular, the court's fundamental role is to facilitate a restructuring that is fair and reasonable to all stakeholders in accordance with the now very clearly stated objective of allowing recovery to debt claimants before any recovery of equity claims. Section 6(8) reflects that the court has no ability to proceed otherwise.

115 Within those broad objectives, in my view, it is of no importance that prior to the court filing, a claimant with an equity claim has obtained a judgment. That judgment still, in substance, reflects a recovery of that equity claim and therefore, the claim comes within the broad and expansive

definition in the *CCAA*. Accordingly, for the purposes of the *CCAA*, that claim or judgment must still, of necessity, bear that characterization in terms of any recovery sought within this proceeding. I conclude that any contrary interpretation, such as advanced by the Prestons, would result in the clear policy objectives under the *CCAA* being defeated.

116 Nor I do not accept that, as argued by the Prestons, applying this characterization amounts to a collateral attack or an "undoing" of the judgment from the Alberta court. As noted by CuVeras, the obtaining of a judgment by a creditor does not mean that insolvency laws do not apply to it. Judgments are affected by insolvency proceedings all the time. Recoveries of judgments are stayed by such proceedings and as stated above, they can be attacked as fraudulent preferences. All that results from my conclusions is that notwithstanding the granting of the judgment, within these *CCAA* proceedings, the judgment is to be characterized in accordance with the true nature of the underlying claim, which is an equity claim.

117 For the above reasons, I conclude that the Preston Claim is an equity claim within the meaning of the *CCAA*.

(b) The Stafford Claim

118 The Stafford Claim is advanced as a debt claim in these proceedings. That position is disputed by CuVeras who contends that, in fact, it is a claim owed by Stanfield personally and not by either Bul River or Gallowai such that it cannot be advanced in this *CCAA* proceeding.

(i) The Proof of Claim

119 The Creditor List referenced Mr. Stafford as holding Class B common shares (3,340), Class D preferred shares (4,200) and Class E preferred shares (17,548). He therefore received a Claims Package from the petitioners.

120 Mr. Stafford took no issue with the shareholdings alleged to be held by him in accordance with the Creditor List. However, on October 14, 2011, a Notice of Dispute and Proof of Claim were submitted on behalf of Mr. Stafford. This was done by Carol Morrison, who was exercising a power of attorney for Mr. Stafford by reason of his mental and physical incapacity that occurred at least as early as November 2010.

121 The Notice of Dispute refers to "claim not listed" as the "reason for dispute". The Proof of Claim submitted by Mr. Stafford notes the "type of claim" as "other — loan and accrued interest 50% Bul River Mineral Corp. and 50% Gallowai Metal Mining Corp." The Stafford Claim submitted is for outstanding principal and interest under a loan in the total amount of \$2,587,174.

122 The supporting documentation submitted for Mr. Stafford includes a copy of a loan agreement between Stanfield in his personal capacity, as borrower, and Mr. Stafford, as lender,

dated June 12, 1990, 21 years before the CCAA filing (the "Stafford Loan Agreement"). The Stafford Loan Agreement references a loan in the principal amount of \$150,000, accruing interest in the amount of 20% per annum "on the Principal", calculated yearly and not in advance.

123 Pursuant to the terms of the Stafford Loan Agreement, Stanfield borrowed these funds for the purpose of "investing the funds in the costs of the ongoing research and development of a Process" with "Process" being defined as a "new improved method or process for extracting precious metals from ore". Paragraphs 6 and 8 of the Stafford Loan Agreement provided for a bonus payable to Mr. Stafford equal to the amount of the Principal, if the "Process" proved successful (as declared by an independent metallurgical consultant). As CuVeras submits, on its face, this was not a loan directly related to the mine or the petitioners.

(ii) Dealings in Respect of the Stafford Loan Agreement

124 For obvious reasons, the death of Ross Stanfield and the incapacity of Mr. Stafford result in a situation where no individual is in a position to shed light on the intentions of the parties in relation to this loan. Mr. Hewison is similarly unable to provide any evidence about the loan, save for referring to such documents as have been found in relation to this loan. Those documents do provide some indication as to the how Stanfield, Bul River and Gallowai addressed this loan up to the time of the CCAA filing.

125 There are two resolutions of the directors of Bul River, dated October 1994 and February 1996 respectively, that are essentially the same. Both refer to the "need of major amounts of additional financing" and authorize Stanfield to negotiate, on behalf of Bul River, potential sources of debt or equity financing, to settle the terms of the financing, and to sign, seal and deliver any agreements necessary to secure funding required by the company. I agree that these resolutions on their face clearly do not authorize Stanfield to act as an agent for Bul River. They merely authorize him to act directly in the name of the company with the company as principal in respect to those transactions. These resolutions also do not reference any loan by Mr. Stafford to Stanfield made years before in June 1990.

126 Bul River also appears to have prepared a schedule of loan payments as of December 31, 2006. That schedule shows payment of interest to Mr. Stafford by Stanfield personally from June 1995 to September 1998 totalling approximately \$183,000. In 1999 and 2000, Gallowai appears to have made interest payments of \$40,000 and from that time forward, some person (unidentified) made interest payments of \$25,000 for 2001 and 2002. From 2004 to 2006, it appears that Bul River made interest payments of \$22,500 and principal payments of \$26,000 to Mr. Stafford. Mr. Stafford's own calculations show further payments of interest from 2007 to 2009 totalling \$58,000.

127 Accordingly, in respect of his \$150,000 loan, as of 2009, Mr. Stafford had received \$328,100 in interest payments and \$26,000 in principal payments for a total recovery of \$354,100.

128 Leaving aside the interest and principal payments referred to above, the involvement of Bul River and Gallowai in respect of the Stafford Loan Agreement arose, from a corporate perspective, in 2003. At that time, various resolutions were passed by the directors of Bul River. Mr. Stafford places great reliance on these resolutions and as will become apparent from the discussion below, the issue largely turns on the legal effect of these resolutions. As such, I will describe the resolutions in some detail.

129 The first resolution is dated May 13, 2003. It provides:

WHEREAS:

- A. Loans, loan repayments and principal and interest payments which were property for the benefit of, or were the responsibility of, the Company have for some years been done, as a matter of convenience, in the name of the Company's President, [Stanfield] - and as a result debit and credit entries have improperly been posted to Stanfield's Shareholder Loan Account.
- B. Stanfield has requested that the situation described above be corrected...
- C. The Companies' accountant has examined the financial records and has verified that the said situation has occurred with respect to the Company as well as Gallowai...
- D. Management has proposed, based on professional advice, that for convenience and simplicity the various Loan Accounts involving Stanfield, the Company and the Other Companies be consolidated in the books of the Company.

...

NOW THEREFORE, IT IS RESOLVED:

1. THAT the Loan Accounts and payments referred to above be recognized as solely the responsibility of the Company and it be confirmed that Stanfield was, in being named in the transactions, acting solely on behalf of the Company and that he had no personal, legal or beneficial interest in, or any liabilities as a result of, any of the transactions.
2. THAT the Agreement dated this May 13, 2003 between the Company, Stanfield and the Other Companies be approved and that Stanfield or any other officer or director of the Company be authorized to sign and deliver it on behalf of the Company.
3. THAT the Company assume the obligations of the Other Companies to Stanfield pursuant to the shareholder account in their records, to be offset by inter-company accounts whereby each of the Other Companies will be indebted to the Company for the amount of shareholders accounts assumed by the Company.

130 The second resolution of Bul River is dated October 20, 2003 and relates to the May 2003 resolution. The resolution references that Stanfield is having difficulty providing full documentary verification and back-up for his expenditures for which he was requesting reimbursement. In addition, the preamble to the resolution states in part:

D. Acceptance of liability to Stanfield at this date poses some special problems due to the fact that some of the disbursements that he has requested to be reimbursed for precede the last date that the financial statements of the company were audited — and such statements did not include the expenditures.

Concern was expressed whether or not the acceptance of these responsibilities would be acceptable to Bul River's auditors. The resolution authorizes the engagement of the auditors for the purpose of conducting a special audit of the expenditures made by Stanfield. There is no evidence as to the result of that special audit or if it even took place.

131 The third resolution of Bul River is dated November 30, 2003 and is of particular significance. It reads as follows:

WHEREAS:

A. Ross Stanfield ...has submitted various claims for recognition of corporate liabilities to third parties ... as shareholder's loans for transactions undertaken as agent on behalf of the Company, Gallowai ... to finance the exploration of the British Columbia properties owned by the Companies ("Properties").

B. Stanfield and the Companies signed an Agreement dated May 13, 2003 recognizing the fact that Stanfield has acted as agent on behalf of the Companies since 1972 and had personally undertaken a variety of transactions as agent for the Companies to finance the exploration of the Properties.

C. Stanfield has submitted the following claims pursuant to the Agreement for the Director's consideration and approval.

1. Exploration Loans

These loans were negotiated between 1983 and 2002 personally by Stanfield, as the agent of the Company, and all funds were advanced to the Companies as shareholders loans from him. Payments were made on the loans with his own personal funds or shareholdings. The Directors were provided with a summary of individual loans and accrued interest for review. Files have been prepared for corporate record keeping purposes that include the documentation and amortization schedules supporting each loan.

Balances as at December 31, 2002

Loan principal	\$1,886,413
Accrued interest	\$6,281,004

...

NOW THEREFORE, the undersigned acting as a group excluding ... [Stanfield],
RESOLVE:

1. THAT the loans, accrued interest and share subscriptions detailed in paragraph C.1 above, negotiated by Stanfield as agent on behalf of the Companies, be accepted as liabilities of the Companies.

...

3. THAT the resolution passed by the full Board dated May 13, 2003 that the Company accept all of the above described liabilities on behalf of the other Companies — to be offset by inter-company accounts whereby each of the other Companies will be indebted to the Company for the amounts assumed by the Company — be further approved and ratified.

132 It should be noted that the agreement between Stanfield and Bul River (and perhaps others) dated May 13, 2003 has not been located. Nor have any similar resolutions from the directors of Gallowai been found.

133 In addition, no one has been able to locate a copy of the summary of the loans as of December 2002 referred to in paragraph C.1 of the November 2003 resolution. Mr. Hewison refers in his evidence to a spreadsheet in the name of Bul River referencing "Mine Development Loans" for the year ended December 2003 which indicates a loan from Mr. Stafford of \$150,000 with accrued interest of \$899,236.39. The total interest figure for all loans is slightly different (lower) than the interest amount referenced in the November 2003 resolution which was as of December 31, 2002. In any event, CuVeras does not dispute that Mr. Stafford would likely have been on the list referred to in the November 2003 resolution.

134 No audited financial statements have been produced pre-2003, as might have been amended arising from the special audit authorized in October 2003.

135 Also in evidence are various letters from Bul River to Mr. Stafford concerning these loans.

136 On April 23, 2007, a letter was sent to Mr. Stafford's accountant enclosing various amended 2006 T5 (Statement of Investment Income) forms or slips that were apparently issued to Mr. Stafford by Gallowai and Bul River, each as to 50% of interest paid or payable pursuant to the Stafford Loan Agreement. The letter indicates that as of 2006, the amount of such interest was

just over \$1.5 million (which included the \$150,000 bonus amount supposedly due pursuant to the Stafford Loan Agreement).

137 On March 6, 2008, Mr. Stafford received correspondence from Bul River's controller concerning the 2006 T5s slips from Bul River and Gallowai. Later letters from the controller dated April 2, 2008, February 12, 2009 and January 19, 2010 refer to T5 slips being issued by Bul River and Gallowai for 2007, 2008 and 2009 relating to accrued interest on the Stafford Loan Agreement. Finally, T5 slips for 2010 appear to have been issued by Bul River and Gallowai for that taxation year.

138 There is no evidence that Mr. Stafford knew anything about the 2003 resolutions by Bul River. It does appear to be the case that he began receiving interest payments from Gallowai in 1999 and these would continue together with the payment of some principal by either Gallowai or Bul River to 2009. Bul River would also later send Mr. Stafford, commencing in 2007 and continuing to 2010, certain details or statements relating to the loan and the T5 slips.

(iii) Legal Basis for the Stafford Claim

139 For the reasons set out below, CuVeras submits that the Stafford Claim is not a debt claim against Bul River and Gallowai and ought to be expunged from the Creditor List. CuVeras argues that Mr. Stafford cannot satisfy the onus placed upon him to prove his claim against those petitioners.

140 At the outset, it is clear that Mr. Stafford advanced his loan to Stanfield personally, and not to either Bul River or Gallowai. The 2003 resolutions confirm that such was the case and, indeed, the amounts were noted in the books of Bul River and Gallowai as shareholder loans owing to Stanfield personally in that respect.

141 CuVeras made substantial arguments on the later involvement of Bul River and Gallowai in terms of whether those petitioners became the principal obligants under the Stafford Loan Agreement. These arguments related to whether or not there had been a valid assignment of the Stafford Loan Agreement from Stanfield to Bul River and Gallowai. While Mr. Stafford agreed with these submissions, it is helpful to set out these issues and arguments in order to put in focus the later arguments of Mr. Stafford (which are contested by CuVeras).

142 I agree that there is no basis upon which Mr. Stafford can contend that Stanfield assigned the Stafford Loan Agreement to Bul River and Gallowai. There is no evidence that Gallowai agreed to anything, since the resolutions were only that of Bul River's directors.

143 Even assuming that the November 2003 resolution was intended to effect a valid assignment of the obligations under the Stafford Loan Agreement from Stanfield to Bul River and Gallowai, it is of no legal effect in that it purports to assign the burden of Stanfield's obligations to Bul River

and Gallowai. It is trite law that neither the common law nor equity has ever permitted a debtor to unilaterally assign the burdens or obligations (as opposed to the benefits) of a contract to a third party without the consent of the creditor. Rather, in that case a novation is required: *Mills v. Triple Five Corp.* [1992 CarswellAlta 172 (Alta. Master)], 1992 CanLII 6204 at paras. 13-14, (1992), 136 A.R. 67 (Alta. Master).

144 Novation involves the substitution of a new contract or obligation for an old one which is thereby extinguished: *Royal Bank v. Netupsky*, 1999 BCCA 561 (B.C. C.A.). In *Netupsky* at paras. 11-13, the court set out the essential elements that must be established to satisfy the test to establish novation:

1. the new debtor must assume complete liability for the debt;
2. the creditor must accept the new debtor as a principal debtor, and not merely as an agent or guarantor; and
3. the creditor must accept the new contract in full satisfaction and substitution for the old contract.

145 Mr. Stafford bears the burden of proving novation which the Court in *Netupsky* described as a "heavy onus". Further, while the courts may look at the surrounding circumstances, including the conduct of the parties, they will not infer that a novation has occurred in the face of ambiguous evidence as to the parties' intention to effect a new agreement with the substituted party.

146 As is noted by CuVeras, it is somewhat ironic to suppose that Mr. Stafford might have advanced this issue since he is the creditor and as noted in *Netupsky*, it is usually the "unwilling creditor" who is objecting to any suggestion of a novation. In any event, in this case there is no evidence to suggest that:

- a) Mr. Stafford had any knowledge of the 2003 resolutions or was in any other way even advised by Stanfield, Bul River or Gallowai that it was intended that Bul River and Gallowai would assume the obligations under the Stafford Loan Agreement in place of Stanfield; and
- b) Stanfield, Bul River, Gallowai and Mr. Stafford reached a consensus with respect to the terms upon which any purported new or substituted agreement would operate.

147 Accordingly, it is clear, as agreed by CuVeras and Mr. Stafford, that novation did not occur such that Bul River and Gallowai assumed the obligations of Stanfield under the Stafford Loan Agreement with the consensus of Mr. Stafford. In addition, no privity of contract arose simply by reason of later payments to Mr. Stafford or issuance of T5 slips by Bul River and Gallowai. That Mr. Stafford was not directly involved in any such new contractual arrangements and that he

only later "assumed" that Bul River and Gallowai were involved is made evident by his own loan summary attached to his Proof of Claim:

Commencing in 2006, T5 slips were issued by Bul River Mineral Corporation and Gallowai Metal Mining Corporation (50% each). Assumption is therefore that $\frac{1}{2}$ of Grand Total is receivable from each.

[Emphasis added].

148 Nor is there any suggestion that Bul River or Gallowai provided a guarantee of the Stafford Loan Agreement to Mr. Stafford. Finally, Mr. Stafford does not argue that Bul River and Gallowai are somehow estopped from denying that they are debtors of Mr. Stafford, particularly by reason of the interest and principal payments made by them and the T5 slips prepared by them which were then forwarded to Mr. Stafford.

149 Having confirmed the agreement of CuVeras and Mr. Stafford on the above issues, I turn to Mr. Stafford's position, which is solely rooted in agency:

The corporate minutes of Bul River Mineral Corporation confirm that the actions of Ross Hale Stanfield were as agent for the company and associated companies and confirmed by resolution to accept liability of agreements signed by Stanfield as legitimate debts of a company and acted on it accordingly[.]

150 Essentially, Mr. Stafford's argument is that Stanfield was retroactively appointed as the agent of Bul River and Gallowai by reason of the November 2003 resolution such that he had the express or implied authority to bind Bul River and Gallowai at the time of the loan. He relies in particular on s. 193(2) and (4) of the *Business Corporations Act*, S.B.C. 2002, c. 57:

193 (2) A contract that, if made between individuals, would, by law, be required to be in writing and signed by the parties to be charged, may be made for a company in writing signed by a person acting under the express or implied authority of the company and may, in the same manner, be varied or discharged.

...

(4) A contract made according to this section is effectual in law and binds the company and all other parties to it.

151 It seems to be common ground that Stanfield was not acting as the agent of Bul River and Gallowai in 1990 when the loan was made. The Stafford Loan Agreement does not reference Stanfield acting as an agent and the Proof of Claim does not allege an agency relationship at the time of the Stafford Loan Agreement. Nor was Stanfield acting as the agent of Bul River and Gallowai during the ensuing 13 years when the loan was being administered. The allegation is that

changes only occurred in 2003 when Stanfield decided he wanted to be reimbursed by Bul River and Gallowai for certain loans he had earlier made.

152 I was referred to only one authority on the agency issue by CuVeras, being *Spidell v. LaHave Equipment Ltd.*, 2014 NSSC 255 (N.S. S.C.).

153 In *Spidell*, LaHave Equipment Ltd. was a dealer for Case Canada Limited. The plaintiff Spidell purchased a Case Canada excavator from LeHave which was financed by Case Credit Limited. Spidell alleged that employees of LaHave made representations to him about the performance of the equipment. Spidell believed LaHave was a representative or agent or dealer for Case Canada. Spidell did not make the required payments to Case Credit and the equipment was repossessed. Spidell sued LaHave claiming damages for alleged misrepresentations. LaHave defended the action but subsequently went into bankruptcy. Only then did Spidell amend his pleading to add Case Credit and Case Canada as defendants, claiming LaHave was their agent. The issue on the summary trial was whether LaHave was in fact the agent of the Case companies.

154 Mr. Justice Coughlan reviewed the law of agency, as follows:

[21] In *Halsbury's Laws of Canada First Edition*, "Agency" paragraph HAY-2 the three essential ingredients of an agency relationship are:

1. The consent of both the principal and the agent.
2. Authority given to the agent by the principal, allowing the former to affect the latter's legal position.
3. The principal's control of the agent's actions.

And at Agency paragraph HAY -11 the manner in which an agency relationship may be created are set out:

- "1. the express or implied consent of principal and agent,
2. by implication of law from the conduct or situation of the parties or from the necessities of the case,
3. by subsequent ratification by the principal of the agent's act done on the principal's behalf, whether the person doing the act was an agent exceeding his authority or was a person having no authority to act for the principal at all,
4. by estoppel, or
5. by operation of the principles of law."

[Emphasis added].

155 Mr. Stafford relies in particular on the creation of agency by ratification as referred to above. Justice Coughlan said this about agency by ratification:

[25] The conditions for an agency by ratification to be established were set out in *Halsbury's Laws of Canada, supra*, at Agency HAY-22 as follows:

"**Three Conditions.** Actions by a principal after the agent has purported to act on the principal's behalf may amount to creation of agency by ratification. For this to occur, three conditions must be satisfied. First, the agent whose act is sought to be ratified must have purported to act for the principal; second, at the time the act was done the agent must have had a competent principal; and third, at the time of the ratification the principal must be legally capable of doing the act himself.["]

156 The key consideration from the above quote is the first requirement. In this case, there is no evidence that Stanfield "purported to act" for Bul River and Gallowai as principals in 1990 when he entered into the Stafford Loan Agreement. In fact, the evidence is to the contrary in that he acted in his personal capacity and not as agent.

157 I agree with CuVeras that agency by ratification assumes that there exists a relationship (even though perhaps mistaken) between the principal and agent at the time of the transaction which must later be ratified. One example is as noted in the *Halsbury's* quote above, namely where the agent exceeded his or his authority but later the unauthorized transaction is ratified or adopted by the principal. That is not what occurred in this case. Ratification of an agent's actions in that case cannot occur when no agency relationship existed in the first place. The second example of ratification described in *Halsbury's* (where the person had no authority to act but their actions were later ratified) still requires that the actions be done by the agent "on the principal's behalf" in purported furtherance of an agency relationship.

158 Accordingly, the concept of ratification by Bul River and Gallowai of Stanfield's actions concerning the Stafford Loan Agreement as their agent has no application in this case.

159 What occurred in this case is that many years later, in 2003, Stanfield, Bul River and Gallowai agreed that the companies would take over responsibility for payment of the Stafford Loan Agreement in place of Stanfield. But those arrangements were only between Bul River, Gallowai and Stanfield and not Mr. Stafford.

160 Accordingly, we start from the proposition that there was no agency relationship between Stanfield and Bul River and Gallowai in 1990. The only parties to the Stafford Loan Agreement are Stanfield and Mr. Stafford.

161 The only evidence suggesting any link between Mr. Stafford and Bul River and Gallowai arise from the fact that, commencing in April 2007, Mr. Stafford began to receive T5 slips from

them. Payments were also made by Bul River and Gallowai commencing in 1999. Mr. Stafford argues that by reason of such actions, Bul River and Gallowai treated the Stafford Loan Agreement as their debt since they could not have issued T5 slips for someone else's debt. The 2003 resolutions are, of course, an internal document of Bul River but do indicate that Bul River at least intended to accept the Stafford Loan Agreement as its obligation. The basis upon which Bul River was able to accept this obligation on behalf of Gallowai is unclear and not substantiated.

162 Mr. Stafford argues that these events confirm that Bul River and Gallowai had assumed the obligations of Stanfield. But this argument brings us back to the legal bases for any liability on the part of Bul River and Gallowai that CuVeras raised and I discussed above (assignment, novation, guarantee and estoppel) and which arguments Mr. Stafford agreed did not apply.

163 I agree with the submissions of CuVeras that these later actions of Bul River and Gallowai evidence an intention on the part of Bul River (and perhaps Gallowai) to take over or assume payment of the obligations of Stanfield under the Stafford Loan Agreement. In that sense, and without a novation, in substance these arrangements amount to Bul River and Gallowai agreeing to indemnify Stanfield in respect of his obligations to pay the Stafford Loan Agreement amounts and nothing more.

164 I conclude that Mr. Stafford has not met the onus of proving that the amounts under the Stafford Loan Agreement are obligations or "provable debts" of Bul River and Gallowai.

165 Both CuVeras and Mr. Stafford made submissions concerning the issue as to whether the Stafford Loan Agreement provided for compound interest or not. In light of my conclusions above, it is not necessary to address that issue.

Conclusion

166 In accordance with the above reasons, the Court declares that:

- a) the Preston Claim is an equity claim for the purposes of this *CCAA* proceeding; and
- b) the Stafford Claim is not a debt claim as against Bul River and Gallowai. It follows that the Creditor List should be amended accordingly and that Mr. Stafford is not entitled to vote on or receive any distribution under any plan of arrangement as may subsequently be filed by those petitioners.

167 If any party is seeking costs, then written submissions should be delivered to the court and the party against whom costs are sought within 30 days of delivery of these reasons. Any response shall be delivered within 15 days and any reply to that response shall be delivered with seven days of that date.

One claim found to be in equity; second claim found not to be in debt.

2009 NSSC 136
Nova Scotia Supreme Court

ScoZinc Ltd., Re

2009 CarswellNS 229, 2009 NSSC 136, 177 A.C.W.S. (3d)
293, 277 N.S.R. (2d) 251, 53 C.B.R. (5th) 96, 882 A.P.R. 251

**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 ScoZinc Ltd. (Applicant)

D.R. Beveridge J.

Heard: April 3, 2009

Judgment: April 3, 2009

Written reasons: April 28, 2009

Docket: Hfx. 305549

Counsel: John G. Stringer, Q.C., Mr. Ben R. Durnford for Applicant
Robert MacKeigan, Q.C. for Grant Thornton

D.R. Beveridge J. (orally):

1 On December 22, 2008 ScoZinc Ltd. was granted protection by way of a stay of proceedings of all claims against it pursuant to s.11 of the *Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act* R.S.C. 1985, c. C-36. The stay has been extended from time to time. Grant Thornton was appointed as the Monitor of the business and financial affairs of ScoZinc pursuant to s.11.7 of the *CCAA*.

2 The determination of creditors' claims was set by a Claims Procedure Order. This order set dates for the submission of claims to the Monitor, and for the Monitor to assess the claims. The Monitor brought a motion seeking directions from the court on whether it has the necessary authority to allow a revision of a claim after the claim's bar date but before the date set for the Monitor to complete its assessment of claims.

3 The motion was heard on April 3, 2009. At the conclusion of the hearing of the motion I concluded that the Monitor did have the necessary authority. I granted the requested order with reasons to follow. These are my reasons.

Background

4 The procedure for the identification and quantification of claims was established pursuant to my order of February 18, 2009. Any persons asserting a claim was to deliver to the Monitor a Proof of Claim by 5:00 p.m. on March 16, 2009, including a statement of account setting out the full details of the claim. Any claimant that did not deliver a Proof of Claim by the claims bar date, subject to the Monitor's agreement or as the court may otherwise order, would have its claim forever extinguished and barred from making any claim against ScoZinc.

5 The Monitor was directed to review all Proofs of Claim filed on or before March 16, 2009 and to accept, revise or disallow the claims. Any revision or disallowance was to be communicated by Notice of Revision or Disallowance, no later than March 27, 2009. If a creditor disagreed with the assessment of the Monitor, it could dispute the assessment before a Claims Officer and ultimately to a judge of the Supreme Court.

6 The three claims that have triggered the Monitor's motion for directions were submitted by Acadian Mining Corporation, Royal Roads Corp., and Komatsu International (Canada) Inc.

7 ScoZinc is 100% owned by Acadian Mining Corp. These two corporations share office space, managerial staff, and have common officers and directors. Acadian Mining is a substantial shareholder in Royal Roads and also have some common officers and directors.

8 Originally Royal Roads asserted a claim as a secured creditor on the basis of a first charge security held by it on ScoZinc's assets for a loan in the amount of approximately \$2.3 million. Acadian Mining also claimed to be a secured creditor due to a second charge on ScoZinc's assets securing approximately \$23.5 million of debt. Both Royal Roads and Acadian Mining have released their security. Each company submitted Proofs of Claim dated March 4, 2009 as unsecured creditors.

9 Royal Roads claim was for \$579, 964.62. The claim by Acadian Mining was for \$23,761,270.20. John Rawding, Financial Officer for Acadian Mining and ScoZinc, prepared the Proofs of Claim for both Royal Roads and Acadian Mining. It appears from the affidavit and materials submitted, and the Monitor's fifth report dated March 31, 2009 that there were errors in each of the Proofs of Claim.

10 Mr. Rawding incorrectly attributed \$1,720,035.38 as debt by Acadian Mining to Royal Roads when it should have been debt owed by ScoZinc to Royal Roads. In addition, during year end audit procedures for Royal Roads, Acadian Mining and ScoZinc, other erroneous entries were discovered. The total claim that should have been advanced by Royal Roads was \$2,772,734.19.

11 The appropriate claim that should have been submitted by Acadian Mining was \$22,041,234.82, a reduction of \$1,720,035.38. Both Royal Roads and Acadian Mining submitted revised Proofs of Claim on March 25, 2009 with supporting documentation.

12 The third claim is by Komatsu. Its initial Proof of Claim was dated March 16, 2009 for both secured and unsecured claims of \$4,245,663.78. The initial claim did not include a secured claim for the equipment that had been returned to Komatsu, nor include a claim for equipment that was still being used by ScoZinc. A revised Proof of Claim was filed by Komatsu on March 26, 2009.

13 The Monitor, sets out in its fifth report dated March 31, 2009, that after reviewing the relevant books and records, the errors in the Proofs of Claim by Royal Roads, Acadian Mining and Komatsu were due to inadvertence. For all of these claims it issued a Notice of Revision or Disallowance on March 27, 2009, allowing the claims as revised "if it is determined by the court that the Monitor has the power to do so".

14 The request for directions and the circumstances pose the following issue:

Issue

15 Does the Monitor have the authority to allow the revision of a claim by increasing it based on evidence submitted by a claimant within the time period set for the monitor to carry out its assessment of claims?

Analysis

16 The jurisdiction of the Monitor stems from the jurisdiction of the court granted to it by the *CCAA*. Whenever an order is made under s.11 of the *CCAA* the court is required to appoint a monitor. Section 11.7 of the *CCAA* provides:

11.7(1) When an order is made in respect of a company by the court under section 11, the court shall at the same time appoint a person, in this section and in section 11.8 referred to as "the monitor", to monitor the business and financial affairs of the company while the order remains in effect.

(2) Except as may be otherwise directed by the court, the auditor of the company may be appointed as the monitor.

(3) The monitor shall

(a) for the purposes of monitoring the company's business and financial affairs, have access to and examine the company's property, including the premises, books, records, data, including data in electronic form, and other financial documents of the company to the extent necessary to adequately assess the company's business and financial affairs;

(b) file a report with the court on the state of the company's business and financial affairs, containing prescribed information,

- (i) forthwith after ascertaining any material adverse change in the company's projected cash-flow or financial circumstances,
 - (ii) at least seven days before any meeting of creditors under section 4 or 5, or
 - (iii) at such other times as the court may order;
- (c) advise the creditors of the filing of the report referred to in paragraph (b) in any notice of a meeting of creditors referred to in section 4 or 5; and
- (d) carry out such other functions in relation to the company as the court may direct.

...

17 It appears that the purpose of the *CCAA* is to grant to an insolvent company protection from its creditors in order to permit it a reasonable opportunity to restructure its affairs in order to reach a compromise or arrangement between the company and its creditors. The court has the power to order a meeting of the creditors or class of creditors for them to consider a compromise or arrangement proposed by the debtor company (s. 4, 5). Where a majority of the creditors representing two thirds value of the creditors or class of creditors agree to a compromise or arrangement, the court may sanction it and thereafter such compromise or arrangement is binding on all creditors, or class of creditors (s. 6).

18 Section 12 of the *Act* defines a claim to mean "any indebtedness, liability or obligation of any kind that, if unsecured, would be a debt provable in bankruptcy within the meaning of the *Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act*." However, as noted by McElcheran in *Commercial Insolvency in Canada* (LexisNexis Canada Inc., Markham, Ontario, 2005 at p. 279-80) the *CCAA* does not set out a process for identification or determination of claims; instead, the Court creates a claims process by court order.

19 The only guidance provided by the *CCAA* is that in the event of a disagreement the amount of a claim shall be determined by the court on summary application by the company or by the creditor. Section 12(2) of the *Act* provides:

Determination of amount of claim

(2) For the purposes of this Act, the amount represented by a claim of any secured or unsecured creditor shall be determined as follows:

(a) the amount of an unsecured claim shall be the amount

- (i) in the case of a company in the course of being wound up under the Winding-up and Restructuring Act, proof of which has been made in accordance with that Act,

(ii) 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, proof of which has been made in accordance with that Act, or

(iii) in the case of any other company, proof of which might be made under the Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act, but if the amount so provable is not admitted by the company, the amount shall be determined by the court on summary application by the company or by the creditor; and

(b) the amount of a secured claim shall be the amount, proof of which might be made in respect thereof under the Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act if the claim were unsecured, but the amount if not admitted by the company shall, in the case of a company subject to pending proceedings under the Winding-up and Restructuring Act or the Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act, be established by proof in the same manner as an unsecured claim under the Winding-up and Restructuring Act or the Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act, as the case may be, and in the case of any other company the amount shall be determined by the court on summary application by the company or the creditor.

20 The only parties who appeared on this motion were the Monitor, ScoZinc and Komatsu. No specific submissions were requested nor made by the parties with respect to the nature of the court's jurisdiction to determine the mechanism and time lines to classify and quantify claims against the debtor company.

21 Under the *Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act* the Trustee is the designated gatekeeper who first determines whether a Proof of Claim submitted by a creditor is valid. The trustee may admit the claim or disallow it in whole or in part (s.135(2) *BIA*). A creditor who is dissatisfied with a decision by the trustee may appeal to a judge of the Bankruptcy Court.

22 In contrast, the *CCAA* does not set out the procedure beyond the language in s.12. The language only accomplishes two things. The first is that the debtor company can agree on the amount of a secured or unsecured claim; and secondly, if there is a disagreement, then on application of either the company or the creditor, the amount shall be determined by the court on "summary application".

23 The practice has arisen for the court to create by order a claims process that is both flexible and expeditious. The Monitor identifies, by review of the debtor's records, all potential claimants and sends to them a claim package. To ensure that all creditors come forward and participate on a timely basis, there is a provision in the claims process order requiring creditors to file their claims by a fixed date. If they do not, subject to further relief provided by the claims process order, or by the court, the creditor's claim is barred.

24 If the Monitor disagrees with the claim, and the disagreement cannot be resolved, then a claimant can present its case to a claims officer who is usually given the power to adjudicate disputed claims, with the right of appeal to a judge of the court overseeing the *CCAA* proceedings.

25 The establishment of a claims process utilizing the monitor and or a claims officer by court order appears to be a well accepted practice (See for example *Federal Gypsum Co., Re*, 2007 NSSC 384 (N.S. S.C.); *Olympia & York Developments Ltd. v. Royal Trust Co.* (1993), 17 C.B.R. (3d) 1 (Ont. Gen. Div.); *Air Canada, Re* (2004), 2 C.B.R. (5th) 23 (Ont. S.C.J. [Commercial List]); *Triton Tubular Components Corp., Re*, [2005] O.J. No. 3926 (Ont. S.C.J.); *Muscletech Research & Development Inc., Re*, [2006] O.J. No. 4087 (Ont. S.C.J.); *Pine Valley Mining Corp., Re*, 2008 BCSC 356 (B.C. S.C.); *Blue Range Resource Corp., Re*, 2000 ABCA 285 (Alta. C.A.); *Carlen Transport Inc. v. Juniper Lumber Co. (Monitor of)* (2001), 21 C.B.R. (4th) 222 (N.B. Q.B.).

26 I could find no reported case that doubt the authority of the court to create a claims process. Kenneth Kraft in his article "The CCAA and the Claims Bar Process", (2000), 13 *Commercial Insolvency Reporter* 6, endorsed the utilization of a claims process on the basis of reliance on the court's inherent jurisdiction, provided the process adhered to the specific mandates of the *CCAA*. In unrelated contexts, caution has been expressed with respect to reliance on the inherent jurisdiction of the superior court as the basis for dealing with the myriad issues that can arise under the *CCAA* (See: *Skeena Cellulose Inc., Re* (2003), 43 C.B.R. (4th) 187 (B.C. C.A.)) and *Stelco Inc., Re*, [2005] O.J. No. 1171 (Ont. C.A.)).

27 Sir J.H. Jacob, Q.C. in his seminal article "The Inherent Jurisdiction of the Court", (1970) *Current Legal Problems* 23, concluded that it has been clear law from the earliest times that superior courts of justice, as part of their inherent jurisdiction, have the power to control their own proceedings and process. He wrote:

Under its inherent jurisdiction, the court has power to control and regulate its process and proceedings, and it exercises this power in a great variety of circumstances and by many different methods. Some of the instances of the exercise of this power have been of far-reaching importance, others have dealt with matters of detail or have been of transient value. Some have involved the exercise of administrative powers, others of judicial powers. Some have been turned into rules of law, others by long usage or custom may have acquired the force of law, and still others remain mere rules of practice. The exercise of this power has been pervasive throughout the whole legal machinery and has been extended to all stages of proceedings, pre-trial, trial and post-trial. Indeed, it is difficult to set the limits upon the powers of the court in the exercise of its inherent jurisdiction to control and regulate its process, for these limits are coincident with the needs of the court to fulfil its judicial functions in the administration of justice.

28 The *CCAA* gives no specific guidance to the court on how to determine the existence, nature, validity or extent of a claim against a debtor company. As noted earlier, the only reference is in s. 12 of the *Act* that if there is a dispute as to the amount of a claim, then the amount shall be determined by the court "on summary application". In *Freeman, Re*, [1922] N.S.J. No. 15, [1923] 1 D.L.R. 378 (N.S. C.A.) (en banc) the court considered the words "on summary application" as they appeared in the *Probate Act* R.S.N.S. 1900 c.158. Harris C.J. wrote:

[17] The words "summary application" do not mean without notice, but simply imply that the proceedings before the Court are not to be conducted in the ordinary way, but in a concise way.

[18] The Oxford Dictionary p. 140 gives as one of the meanings of "summary" dispensing with needless details or formalities — done with despatch.

[19] In the case of the *Western &c R. Co. v. Atlanta* (1901), 113 Ga. 537, the meaning of the words "summary proceeding" is discussed at some length and the Court held at pp. 543-544: —

"In a summary manner does not at all mean that they may be abated without notice or hearing, but simply that it may be done without a trial in the ordinary forms prescribed by law for a regular judicial procedure."

[20] I cite this not because it is a binding authority, but because its reasoning commends itself to my judgment and I adopt it.

29 In my opinion, whatever process may be appropriate and necessary to adjudicate disputed claims that ultimately end up before a judge of the superior court, the determination by the court that claims must initially be identified and assessed by the Monitor, and heard first by a Claims Officer, is a valid exercise of the court's inherent jurisdiction.

30 The *CCAA* gives to the court the express and implied jurisdiction to do a variety of things. They need not all be enumerated. The court is required to appoint a monitor (s.11.7). Once appointed, the monitor is required to monitor the company's business and financial affairs. The *Act* mandates that the monitor have access to and examine the company's property including all records. The monitor must file a report with the court on the state of the company's business and financial affairs and contain prescribed information. In addition, the monitor shall carry out such other functions in relation to the company as the court may direct (s.11.7(3)(d)).

31 In these circumstances, it is not only logical, but eminently practical that the monitor, as an officer of the court, be directed by court order to fulfil the analogous role to that of the trustee under the *BIA*. The Claims Procedure Order of February 18, 2009 accomplishes this.

Power of the Monitor

32 The Monitor was required by the Order to publish a notice to claimants in the newspaper regarding the claims procedure. It was also required to send a claims package to known potential claimants identified by the Monitor through its review of the books and records of ScoZinc. The claims bar date was set as March 16, 2009, or such later date as may be ordered by the court.

33 The duties of the Monitor, once a claim was received by it, were set out in paragraphs 9 and 10 of the Claims Procedure Order. They provide as follows:

9. Upon receipt of a Proof of Claim:

a. The Monitor is hereby authorized and directed to use reasonable discretion as to the adequacy of compliance as to the manner in which Proofs of Claim are completed and executed and may, where it is satisfied that a Claim has been adequately proven, waive strict compliance with the requirements of this Order as to the completion and the execution of a Proof of Claim. A Claim which is accepted by the Monitor shall constitute a Proven Claim;

b. the Monitor and ScoZinc may attempt to consensually resolve the classification and amount of any Claim with the claimant prior to accepting, revising or disallowing such Claim; and

...

10. The Monitor shall review all Proofs of Claim filed on or before the Claims Bar Date. The Monitor shall accept, revise or disallow such Proofs of Claim as contemplated herein. The Monitor shall send a Notice of Revision or Disallowance and the form of Notice of Dispute to the Claimant as soon as the Claim has been revised or disallowed but in any event no later than 11:59 p.m. (Halifax time) on March 27, 2009 or such later date as the Court may order. Where the Monitor does not send a Notice of Revision or Disallowance by the aforementioned date to a Claimant who has submitted a Proof of Claim, the Monitor shall be deemed to have accepted such Claim.

34 Any person who wished to dispute a Notice of Revision or Disallowance was required to file a notice to the monitor and to the Claims Officer no later than April 6, 2009. The Claims Officer was designated to be Richard Cregan, Q.C., serving in his personal capacity and not as Registrar in Bankruptcy. Subject to the direction of the court, the Claims Officer was given the power to determine how evidence would be brought before him and any other procedural matters that may arise with respect to the claim. A claimant or the Monitor may appeal the Claims Officer's decision to the court.

35 The Monitor suggests that the power given to it under paragraph 9(a) and 10 is sufficient to permit it to accept the revised Proofs of Claim filed after the claim's bar date of March 16, 2009, but before its assessment date of March 27, 2009.

36 Reliance is also placed on the decision of the Alberta Court of Appeal in *Blue Range Resource Corp., Re*, 2000 ABCA 285 (Alta. C.A.). As noted by the Monitor, the decision in *Blue Range* did not directly deal with the issue on which the Monitor here seeks directions. In *Blue Range*, the claims procedure established by the court set the claims bar date of June 15, 1999. Claims of creditors not proven in accordance with the procedures set out were deemed to be forever barred. Some creditors filed their Notice of Claim after the claims bar date. The monitor disallowed their claims. There were a second group of creditors who filed their Notice of Claim prior to the applicable claims bar date, but then sought to amend their claims after the claims bar date had passed. The monitor also disallowed these claims as late. What is not clear from the reported decisions is whether this second group of creditors requested amendments of their claims during the time period granted to the Monitor to carry out its assessment.

37 The chambers judge allowed the late and amended claims to be filed. Enron Capital Corp. and the creditor's committee sought leave to appeal that decision. Leave to appeal was granted on January 14, 2000 with respect to the following question:

What criteria in the circumstances of these cases should the Court use to exercise its discretion in deciding whether to allow late claimants to file claims which, if proven, may be recognized, notwithstanding a previous claims bar order containing a claims bar date which would otherwise bar the claim of the late claimants, and applying the criteria to each case, what is the result?

Blue Range Resource Corp., Re, 2000 ABCA 16 (Alta. C.A. [In Chambers])

38 Wittmann J.A. delivered the judgment of the court. He noted that all counsel conceded that the court had the authority to allow the late filing of claims and that the appeal was really a matter of what criteria the court should use in exercising that power. Accordingly, a Claims Procedure Order that contains a claims bar date should not purport to forever bar a claim without a saving provision. Wittmann J.A. set out the test for determining when a late claim may be included to be as follows:

[26] Therefore, the appropriate criteria to apply to the late claimants is as follows:

1. Was the delay caused by inadvertence and if so, did the claimant act in good faith?
2. What is the effect of permitting the claim in terms of the existence and impact of any relevant prejudice caused by the delay?

3. If relevant prejudice is found can it be alleviated by attaching appropriate conditions to an order permitting late filing?

4. If relevant prejudice is found which cannot be alleviated, are there any other considerations which may nonetheless warrant an order permitting late filing?

[27] In the context of the criteria, "inadvertent" includes carelessness, negligence, accident, and is unintentional. I will deal with the conduct of each of the respondents in turn below and then turn to a discussion of potential prejudice suffered by the appellants.

2000 ABCA 285 (Alta. C.A.)

39 The appellants claimed that they would be prejudiced if the late claims were allowed because if they had known the late claims would be allowed they would have voted differently. This assertion was rejected by the chambers judge. With respect to what is meant by prejudiced, Wittmann J.A. wrote:

40 In a CCAA context, as in a BIA context, the fact that Enron and the other Creditors will receive less money if late and late amended claims are allowed is not prejudice relevant to this criterion. Re-organization under the CCAA involves compromise. Allowing all legitimate creditors to share in the available proceeds is an integral part of the process. A reduction in that share can not be characterized as prejudice: *Re Cohen* (1956), 36 C.B.R. 21 (Alta. C.A.) at 30-31. Further, I am in agreement with the test for prejudice used by the British Columbia Court of Appeal in 312630 *British Columbia Ltd.* It is: did the creditor(s) by reason of the late filings lose a realistic opportunity to do anything that they otherwise might have done? Enron and the other creditors were fully informed about the potential for late claims being permitted, and were specifically aware of the existence of the late claimants as creditors. I find, therefore, that Enron and the Creditors will not suffer any relevant prejudice should the late claims be permitted.

40 In considering how the Monitor should carry out its duties and responsibilities under the Claims Procedure Order it is important to note that the Monitor is an officer of the court and is obliged to ensure that the interests of the stakeholders are considered including all creditors, the company and its shareholders (See *Laidlaw Inc., Re* (2002), 34 C.B.R. (4th) 72 (Ont. S.C.J. [Commercial List])).

41 In a different context Turnball J.A. in *Siscoe & Savoie v. Royal Bank* (1994), 29 C.B.R. (3d) 1 (N.B. C.A.) commented that the monitor is an agent of the court and as a result is responsible and accountable to the court, owing a fiduciary duty to all of the parties (para. 28).

42 In my opinion, para. 9(a) is not of assistance in determining the authority of the Monitor to revise upward a claim filed after the claim's bar date but before the assessment date. Paragraph

9(a) authorizes the Monitor to use reasonable discretion as to the adequacy of compliance as to *the manner* to which Proofs of Claim are completed and executed. If it satisfied that the claim has been adequately proven it may waive strict compliance with the requirements of the order as to *completion* and the *execution* of a Proof of Claim.

43 Paragraph 10 of the Claims Procedure Order mandates the Monitor shall review all Proofs of Claim filed on or before the claims bar date. It shall "accept, revise or disallow such Proofs of Claim as contemplated herein". While normally a monitor's revision would be to reduce a Proof of Claim, there is in fact nothing in the Claims Procedure Order that so restricts the Monitor's authority. It is obviously contemplated by para. 10 that the monitor is to carry out some assessment of the claims that are submitted.

44 In my view, the Proofs of Claim that are filed act both as a form of pleading and an opportunity for the claimant to provide supporting documents to evidence its claim. In the case before me, the creditors discovered that the claims they had submitted were inaccurate and further evidence was tendered to the Monitor to demonstrate. The Monitor, after reviewing the evidence, accepted the validity of the claims.

45 Courts in a general way are engaged in dispensing justice. They do so by setting up and applying procedural rules to ensure that litigants are afforded a fair hearing. The resolution of disputes through the litigation process, including the ultimate hearing, is fundamentally a truth-seeking process to determine the facts and to apply the law to those facts. Can it be any different where the process is not in the court but under its supervision pursuant to a claims process under the *CCAA*?

46 To suggest that the monitor does not have the authority to receive evidence and submissions and to consider them is to say that it does not have any real authority to carry out its court appointed role to assess the claims that have been submitted. The notion that the monitor cannot look at documentary evidence on its own initiative or at the instance of a claimant, and even consider submissions, is to deny it any real power to consider and make a preliminary determination of the merits of a claim.

47 The Claims Procedure Order contains a number of provisions that anticipate the exchange of information between the Monitor, the company and a creditor. Paragraph 9(b) authorizes the Monitor and ScoZinc to attempt to consensually resolve the classification and the amount of any claim with a claimant prior to accepting, revising or disallowing such claim. Paragraph 17 of the Claims Procedure Order directs that the Monitor shall at all times be authorized to enter into negotiations with claimants and settle any claim on such terms as the Monitor may consider appropriate.

48 In my opinion, it does not matter that revised claims were submitted after the claims bar date. In essence, the Monitor simply acted to revise the Proofs of Claim already submitted

to conform with the evidence elicited by the Monitor, or submitted to it. The Monitor had the necessary authority to revise the claims, either as to classification or amount.

49 If a claimant seeks to revise or amend its claim after the assessment date set out in the Claims Procedure Order, different considerations may come into play. The appropriate procedure will depend on the provisions of the Claims Procedure Order. In addition, the court, as the ultimate arbiter of disputed claims under s. 12 of the *CCAA*, should always be viewed as having the jurisdiction to permit appropriate revision of claims.

Order accordingly.

2014 ONSC 3393
Ontario Superior Court of Justice

Timminco Ltd., Re

2014 CarswellOnt 9328, 2014 ONSC 3393, 14 C.B.R. (6th) 113, 242 A.C.W.S. (3d) 764

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

In the Matter of a Plan of Compromise or Arrangement
of Timminco Limited and Bécancour Silicon Inc.

Morawetz R.S.J.

Heard: July 22, 2013

Judgment: July 7, 2014

Docket: CV-12-9539-00CL

Counsel: Jane Dietrich, Kate Stigler for Board of Directors, except John Walsh
Kenneth D. Kraft for Chubb Insurance Company of Canada
James C. Orr for Plaintiff, St. Clair Pennyfeather in the Class Action
Maria Konyukhova for Timminco Entities
Robert Staley for John Walsh
Linc Rogers for Monitor

Morawetz R.S.J.:

Introduction

1 On May 14, 2009, Kim Orr Barristers PC, counsel to the representative plaintiff Mr. St. Clair Pennyfeather ("Plaintiff's Counsel"), initiated the proposed class action (the "Class Action"), which names as defendants Timminco Limited ("Timminco"), a third party, Photon Consulting LLC, and certain of the directors and officers of Timminco, (the "Directors").

2 The Class Action focusses on alleged public misrepresentations that Timminco possessed a proprietary metallurgical process that provided a significant cost advantage in manufacturing solar grade silicon for use in manufacturing solar cells.

3 Mr. Pennyfeather alleges that the representations were first made in March 2008, after which the shares of Timminco gained rapidly in value to more than \$18 per share by June 5, 2008.

Subsequently, Mr. Pennyfeather alleges that as Timminco began to acknowledge problems with the alleged proprietary process, the share price fell to the point where the equity was described as "penny stock" prior to its delisting in January 2012.

4 In the initial order, granted January 3, 2012 in the *Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act.*, R.S.C. 1985, c. C-36, as amended (the "CCAA") proceedings, Timminco sought and obtained stays of all proceedings including the Class Action as against Timminco and the Directors (the "Initial Order").

5 Timminco also obtained a Claims Procedure Order on June 15, 2012 (the "CPO"). Among other things, the CPO established a claims-bar date of July 23, 2012 for claims against the Directors. Mr. Pennyfeather did not file a proof of claim by this date.

6 No CCAA plan has been put forward by Timminco and there is no intention to advance a CCAA plan.

7 Mr. Pennyfeather moves to lift the stay to allow the Class Action to be dealt with on the merits against all named defendants and, if necessary, for an order amending the CPO to exclude the Class Action from the CPO or to allow the filing of a proof of claim relating to those claims.

8 The Class Action seeks to access insurance moneys and potentially the assets of Directors.

9 The respondents on this motion, (the Directors named in the Class Action), contend that the failure to file a claim under the CPO bars any claim against officers and directors or insurance proceeds.

10 Neither Timminco nor the Monitor take any position on this motion.

11 For the reasons that follow, the motion of Mr. Pennyfeather is granted and the stay is lifted so as to permit Mr. Pennyfeather to proceed with the Class Action.

The Stay and CPO

12 The Initial Order contains the relevant stay provision (as extended in subsequent orders):

24. This Court Orders that during the Stay Period... no Proceeding may be commenced or continued against any former, current or future directors or officers of the Timminco Entities with respect to any claim against the directors or officers that arose before the date hereof and that relates to any obligations of the Timminco Entities whereby the directors or officers are alleged under any law to be liable in their capacities as directors or officers for the payment or performance of such obligations, **until a compromise or arrangement in respect of the Timminco Entities, if one is filed, is sanctioned by this court or is refused by the creditors of the Timminco Entities or this Court.**

[emphasis added]

13 In May and June 2012, The Court approved sales transactions comprising substantially all of the Timminco Entities' assets. In their June 7, 2012 Motion, the Timminco Entities sought an extension of the Stay Period to "give the Timminco Entities sufficient time to, among other things, close the transactions relating to the Successful Bid and carry out the Claims Procedure". The Timminco Entities sought court approval of a proposed claims procedure to "identify claims which may be entitled to distributions of potential proceeds of the ... transactions..." The Timminco entities took the position that the Claims Procedure was "a fair and reasonable method of determining the potential distribution rights of creditors of the Timminco Entities".

14 The mechanics of the CPO are as follows. Paragraph 2(h) of the CPO defines the Claims Bar Date as 5:00 p.m. on July 23, 2012. "D&O Claims" are defined in para. 2(f)(iii):

Any existing or future right or claim of any person against one or more of the directors and/or officers of the Timminco Entity which arose or arises as a result of such directors or officers position, supervision, management or involvement as a director or officer of a Timminco Entity, whether such right, or the circumstances giving rise to it arose before or after the Initial Order up to and including this Claims Procedure whether enforceable in any civil, administrative, or criminal proceeding (each a "D&O Claim") (and collectively the "D&O Claims"), including any right:

- a. relating to any of the categories of obligations described in paragraph 9 of the Initial Order, whether accrued or falling due before or after the Initial Order, in respect of which a director or officer may be liable in his or her capacity as such;
- b. in respect of which a director or officer may be liable in his or her capacity as such concerning employee entitlements to wages or other debts for services rendered to the Timminco Entities or any one of them or for vacation pay, pension contributions, benefits or other amounts related to employment or pension plan rights or benefits or for taxes owing by the Timminco Entities or amounts which were required by law to be withheld by the Timminco Entities;
- c. in respect of which a director or officer may be liable in his or her capacity as such as a result of any act, omission or breach of duty; or
- d. that is or is related to a penalty, fine or claim for damages or costs.

Provided however that in any case "Claim" shall not include an Excluded Claim.

15 The CPO appears to bar a person who fails to file a D&O Claim by the Claims Bar Date from asserting or enforcing the claim:

19. This Court orders that any Person who does not file a proof of a D&O Claim in accordance with this order by the claims-bar date **or such other later date as may be ordered by the Court**, shall be forever barred from asserting or enforcing such D&O Claim against the directors and officers and the directors and officers shall not have any liability whatsoever in respect of such D&O Claim and such D&O Claim shall be extinguished without any further act or notification.

[emphasis added]

Mr. Pennyfeather's Position

16 Mr. Pennyfeather advances a number of arguments. Most significantly, he argues that it is not fair and reasonable to allow the defendants to bar and extinguish the Class Actions claims through the use of an interim and procedural court order. He submits that the respondents attempt to use the CCAA in a tactical and technical fashion to achieve a result unrelated to any legitimate aspect of either a restructuring or orderly liquidation. The operation of the fair and reasonable standard under the CCAA calls for the exercise of the Court's discretion to lift the stay and, if necessary, amend the CPO to either exclude the Class Action claims or permit submissions of a class proof of claim.

17 In support of this argument, Mr. Pennyfeather adds that there is no evidence that any of the Directors who are defendants in the class action contributed anything to the CCAA process, and that the targeted insurance proceeds are not available to other creditors. Thus, he submits, a bar against pursuing these funds benefits only the insurance companies who are not stakeholders in the restructuring or liquidation.

18 Mr. Pennyfeather advances a number of additional arguments. Because I am persuaded by this first submission, it is not necessary to discuss the additional arguments in great detail. However, I will give a brief summary of these additional arguments below.

19 First, Mr. Pennyfeather submits, since the stay was ordered, he has attempted to have the stay lifted as it relates to the Class Action.

20 Second, Mr. Pennyfeather submits that the CPO did not permit the filing of representative claims, unlike, for example, claims processed in *Labourers' Pension Fund of Central and Eastern Canada v. Sino-Forest Corp.*, 2013 ONSC 1078, 100 C.B.R. (5th) 30 (Ont. S.C.J. [Commercial List]). Representative claims are generally not permitted under the CCAA and the solicitors for the representative plaintiff do not act for class members prior to certification (see: *Muscletech Research & Development Inc., Re* (2006), 25 C.B.R. (5th) 218 (Ont. S.C.J. [Commercial List])). Therefore, Mr. Pennyfeather submits that the omission in the order obtained by the Timminco entities, of the type of provision contained in the *Sino-Forest* Claims Order, precluded the action that they now assert should have been taken.

21 Third, Mr. Pennyfeather responds to the significant argument made by the responding parties that the CPO bars the claim. He submits that the Class Action, which alleges, *inter alia*, misrepresentations and breaches of the *Securities Act*, R.S.O. 1990, c. S.5, is unaffected by the CPO. There are several reasons for this. First, the CPO excludes claims that cannot be compromised as a result of the provisions of s. 5.1(2) of the CCAA. Alternatively, even if Mr. Pennyfeather and other class members are not creditors pursuant to section 5.1(2), he submits that Parliament has clearly intended to exclude claims for misrepresentation by directors regardless of who brought them. In addition, insofar as the Class Action seeks to recover insurance proceeds, the CPO did not, according to Mr. Pennyfeather, affect that claim.

22 In summary, Mr. Pennyfeather's most significant argument is that the CCAA process should not be used in a tactical manner to achieve a result collateral to the proper purposes of the legislation. The rights of putative class members should be determined on the merits of the Class Action, which are considerable given the evidence. Further, the lifting of the stay is fair and reasonable in all of the circumstances.

Directors' Position

23 Counsel to directors and officers named in the proposed class action, other than Mr. Walsh (the "Defendant Directors") submit there are three issues to be considered on the motion: (a) should the CPO be amended to grant Mr. Pennyfeather the authority to file a claim on behalf of the class members in the D&O Claims Procedure? (b) if Mr. Pennyfeather is granted the authority to file a claim on behalf of the class members, should the claims-bar date be extended to allow him the opportunity to file a late claim against the Defendant Directors? and (c) if Mr. Pennyfeather is permitted to file a late claim against the Defendant Directors, should the D&O stay be lifted to allow the proposed class action to proceed against the Defendant Directors?

24 The Defendant Directors take the position that: (a) Mr. Pennyfeather does not have the requisite authority and/or right to file a claim on behalf of the class action members and the CPO and should not be amended to permit such; (b) if Mr. Pennyfeather is granted the authority to file a claim on behalf of the class members, the claims-bar date should not be extended to allow Mr. Pennyfeather to file a late claim; and (c) if Mr. Pennyfeather is permitted to file a late claim, the D&O stay should not be lifted to allow the proposed class action to proceed against the Defendant Directors.

25 The Defendant Directors counter Mr. Pennyfeather's arguments with a number of points. They take the position that while they were holding office, they assisted with every aspect of the CCAA process, including (i) the sales process through which the Timminco Entities sold substantially all of their assets and obtained recoveries for the benefit of their creditors; and (ii) the establishment of the claims procedure, resigning only after the claims-bar date passed.

26 The Defendant Directors also submit that Mr. Pennyfeather has been aware of, and participated in, the CCAA proceedings since the weeks following the granting of the Initial Order. They submit that at no time prior to this motion did Mr. Pennyfeather take any position on the claims procedures established to seek the authority to file a claim on behalf of the class members. They submit that, at this point, Mr. Pennyfeather is asking the court to exercise its discretion to (i) amend the CPO to grant him the authority to file a claim on behalf of the class members; (ii) extend the claims-bar date to allow him to file such claim; and (iii) lift the stay of proceedings. They submit that Mr. Pennyfeather asks this discretion be exercised to allow him to pursue a claim against the Defendant Directors which remains uncertified, is in part statute barred, and lacks merit.

27 Counsel to the Defendant Directors submits that the D&O Claims Procedure was initiated for the purpose of determining, with finality, the claims against the directors and officers. They submit that the D&O Claims Procedure has at no time been contingent on, tied to, or dependent on the filing of a Plan of Arrangement by the Timminco Entities.

28 Simply put, the Defendant Directors submit that the CPO sets a claims-bar date of July 23, 2012 for claims against Directors and Mr. Pennyfeather did not file any Proof of Claim against the Defendant Directors by the claims-bar date. Accordingly, they submit that the claims against the Defendant Directors contemplated by the Class Action are currently barred and extinguished by the CPO.

29 The arguments put forward by Mr. Walsh are similar.

30 Counsel to Mr. Walsh attempts to draw similarities between this case and *Sino-Forest*. Counsel submits this is a case where Mr. Pennyfeather intentionally refused to file a Proof of Claim in support of a securities misrepresentation claim against Timminco and its directors and officers.

31 They further submit that Mr. Pennyfeather is asking for the Court to exercise its discretion in his favour to lift the stay of proceedings, in order to allow him to pursue a proceeding which has been largely, if not entirely neutered by the Court of Appeal (leave to appeal to the Supreme Court of Canada dismissed). They point out that just like in *Sino-Forest*, to lift the stay would be an exercise in futility where the Court commented that "there is no right to opt out of any CCAA process...by virtue of deciding, on their own volition, not to participate in the CCAA process", the objectors relinquished their right to file a claim and take steps, in a timely way, to assert their rights to vote in the CCAA proceeding.

32 Counsel to Mr. Walsh also takes the position that Mr. Pennyfeather's only argument is a strained effort to avoid the plain language of the CPO in an effort to say that his claim is an "excluded claim" and therefore a Proof of Claim was never required. Even if Mr. Pennyfeather was right, counsel to Mr. Walsh submits that Mr. Pennyfeather still would have been required to

file a Proof of Claim, failing which his claim would have been barred. Under the CPO, proofs of such claims were still called for, even if they were not to be adjudicated.

33 They note that Mr. Pennyfeather was aware of the CCAA proceeding and the Initial Order. As early as January 17, 2012, counsel to Mr. Pennyfeather contacted counsel for Timminco, asking for consent to lift the Stay.

34 Counsel contends that the "excluded claim" language that Mr. Pennyfeather relies on is not found in the definition of D&O Claim. Under the terms of the CPO, the language is a carve-out from the larger definition of "claim", not the subset definition of D&O Claim. As a result, counsel submits that proofs of claim are still required for D&O Claims, regardless of whether they are excluded claims. In that way, the universe of D&O Claims would be known, even if excluded claims would ultimately not be part of a plan.

35 Mr. Walsh also takes the position that Mr. Pennyfeather made an intentional decision not to file a claim. Mr. Walsh emphasizes that Mr. Pennyfeather had full notice of the motion for the CPO and chose not to oppose or appear on the motion. Further, at no time did Mr. Pennyfeather request the Monitor apply to court for directions with respect to the terms of the CPO.

36 Mr. Walsh submits he is prejudiced by the continuation of the Class Action and he wants to get on with his life but is unable to do so while the claim is extant.

Law and Analysis

37 For the purposes of this motion, I must decide whether the CPO bars Mr. Pennyfeather from proceeding with the Class Action and whether I should lift the stay of proceedings as it applies to the Class Action. For the reasons that follow, I conclude that the CPO should not serve as a bar to proceeding with the Class Action and that the stay should be lifted.

38 As I explain below, the application of the claims bar order and lifting the stay are discretionary. This discretion should be exercised in light of the purposes of both claims-bar orders and stays under the CCAA. A claim bar order and a stay under the CCAA are intended to assist the debtor in the restructuring process, which may encompass asset realizations. At this point, Timminco's assets have been sold, distributions made to secured creditors, no CCAA plan has been put forward by Timminco, and there is no intention to advance a CCAA plan. It seems to me that neither the stay, nor the claims bar order continue to serve their functional purposes in these CCAA proceedings by barring the Class Action. In these circumstances, I fail to see why the stay and the claim bar order should be utilized to obstruct the plaintiff from proceeding with its Class Action.

The Purpose of Stay Orders and Claims-Bar Orders

39 For the purposes of this motion, it is necessary to consider the objective of the CCAA stay order. The stay of proceedings restrains judicial and extra-judicial conduct that could impair the ability of the debtor company to continue in business and the debtor's ability to focus and concentrate its efforts on negotiating of a compromise or arrangement: *Campeau v. Olympia & York Developments Ltd.* (1992), 14 C.B.R. (3d) 303 (Ont. Gen. Div.).

40 Sections 2, 12 and 19 of the CCAA provide the definition of a "Claim" for the purposes of the CCAA and also provide guidance as to how claims are to be determined. Section 12 of the CCAA states

12. The court may fix deadlines for the purposes of voting and for the purposes of distributions under a compromise or arrangement.

The use of the word "may" in s. 12 indicates that fixing deadlines, which includes granting a claims bar order, is discretionary. Additionally, as noted above the CPO provided at para. 19 that a D&O Claim could be filed on "such other later date as may be ordered by the Court".

41 It is also necessary to return to first principles with respect to claims-bar orders. The CCAA is intended to facilitate a compromise or arrangement between a debtor company and its creditors and shareholders. For a debtor company engaged in restructuring under the CCAA, which may include a liquidation of its assets, it is of fundamental importance to determine the quantum of liabilities to which the debtor and, in certain circumstances, third parties are subject. It is this desire for certainty that led to the development of the practice by which debtors apply to court for orders which establish a deadline for filing claims.

42 Adherence to the claims-bar date becomes even more important when distributions are being made (in this case, to secured creditors), or when a plan is being presented to creditors and a creditors' meeting is called to consider the plan of compromise. These objectives are recognized by s. 12 of the CCAA, in particular the references to "voting" and "distribution".

43 In such circumstances, stakeholders are entitled to know the implications of their actions. The claims-bar order can assist in this process. By establishing a claims-bar date, the debtor can determine the universe of claims and the potential distribution to creditors, and creditors are in a position to make an informed choice as to the alternatives presented to them. If distributions are being made or a plan is presented to creditors and voted upon, stakeholders should be able to place a degree of reliance in the claims bar process.

44 Stakeholders in this context can also include directors and officers, as it is not uncommon for debtor applicants to propose a plan under the CCAA that compromises certain claims against directors and officers. In this context, the provisions of s. 5.1 of the CCAA must be respected.

45 In the case of Timminco, there have been distributions to secured creditors which are not the subject of challenge. The Class Action claim is subordinate in ranking to the claims of the secured creditors and has no impact on the distributions made to secured creditors. Further, there is no CCAA plan. There will be no compromise of claims against directors and officers. I accept that at the outset of the CCAA proceedings there may very well have been an intention on the part of the debtor to formulate a CCAA plan and further, that plan may have contemplated the compromise of certain claims against directors and officers. However, these plans did not come to fruition. What we are left with is to determine the consequence of failing to file a timely claim in these circumstances.

46 In the circumstances of this case, i.e., in the absence of a plan, the purpose of the claims bar procedure is questionable. Specifically, in this case, should the claims bar procedure be used to determine the Class Action?

47 In my view, it is not the function of the court on this motion to determine the merits of Mr. Pennyfeather's claim. Rather, it is to determine whether or not the claims-bar order operates as a bar to Mr. Pennyfeather being able to put forth a claim. It does not act as such a bar.

48 It seems to me that CCAA proceedings should not be used, in these circumstances, as a tool to bar Mr. Pennyfeather from proceeding with the Class Action claim. In the absence of a CCAA proceeding, Mr. Pennyfeather would be in position to move forward with the Class Action in the usual course. On a principled basis, a claims bar order in a CCAA proceeding, where there will be no CCAA plan, should not be used in such a way as to defeat the claim of Mr. Pennyfeather. The determination of the claim should be made on the merits in the proper forum. In these circumstances, where there is no CCAA plan, the CCAA proceeding is, in my view, not the proper forum.

49 Similar considerations apply to the Stay Order. With no prospect of a compromise or arrangement, and with the sales process completed, there is no need to maintain the status quo to allow the debtor to focus and concentrate its efforts on negotiating a compromise or arrangement. In this regard, the fact that neither Timminco nor the Monitor take a position on this motion or argue prejudice is instructive.

Applicability of Established Tests

50 The lifting of a stay is discretionary. In determining whether to lift the stay, the court should consider whether there are sound reasons for doing so consistent with the objectives of the CCAA, including a consideration of (a) the balance of convenience; (b) the relative prejudice to the parties; and (c) where relevant, the merits of the proposed action: *Canwest Global Communications Corp., Re*, 2011 ONSC 2215, 75 C.B.R. (5th) 156 (Ont. S.C.J. [Commercial List]), at para. 27.

51 Counsel to Mr. Walsh submit that courts have historically considered the following factors in determining whether to exercise their discretion to consider claims after the claims-bar date: (a) was the delay caused by inadvertence and, if so, did the claimant act in good faith? (b) what is the effect of permitting the claim in terms of the existence and impact of any relevant prejudice caused by the delay; (c) if relevant prejudice is found, can it be alleviated by attaching appropriate conditions to an order permitting late filing? and (d) if relevant prejudice is found which cannot be alleviated, are there any other considerations which may nonetheless warrant an order permitting late filing?

52 These are factors that have been considered by the courts on numerous occasions (see, for example, *Sino-Forest; Sammi Atlas Inc., Re* (1998), 3 C.B.R. (4th) 171 (Ont. Gen. Div. [Commercial List]), *Blue Range Resource Corp., Re*, 2000 ABCA 285, 193 D.L.R. (4th) 314 (Alta. C.A.) , leave to appeal to S.C.C. refused, (S.C.C.); *Canadian Red Cross Society / Société Canadienne de la Croix-Rouge, Re* (2008), 48 C.B.R. (5th) 41 (Ont. S.C.J.); and *Ivorylane Corp. v. Country Style Realty Ltd.*, [2004] O.J. No. 2662 (Ont. S.C.J. [Commercial List])).

53 However, it should be noted that all of these cases involved a CCAA Plan that was considered by creditors.

54 In the present circumstances, it seems to me there is an additional factor to take into account: there is no CCAA Plan.

55 I have noted above that certain delay can be attributed to the CCAA proceedings and the impact of *Green v. Canadian Imperial Bank of Commerce*, 2014 ONCA 90 (Ont. C.A.), at the Court of Appeal. That is not a full answer for the delay but a partial explanation.

56 The prejudice experienced by a director not having a final resolution to the proposed Class Action has to be weighed as against the rights of the class action plaintiff to have this matter heard in court. To the extent that time constitutes a degree of prejudice to the defendants, it can be alleviated by requiring the parties to agree upon a timetable to have this matter addressed on a timely basis with case management.

57 I have not addressed in great detail whether the CPO requires excluded claims to be filed. In my view, it is not necessary to embark on an analysis of this issue, nor have I embarked on a review of the merits. Rather, the principles of equity and fairness dictate that the class action plaintiff can move forward with the claim. The claim may face many hurdles. Some of these have been outlined in the factum submitted by counsel to Mr. Walsh. However, that does not necessarily mean that the class action plaintiff should be disentitled from proceeding.

58 In the result, the motion of Mr. Pennyfeather is granted and the stay is lifted so as to permit Mr. Pennyfeather to proceed with the Class Action. The CPO is modified so as to allow Mr. Pennyfeather to file his claim.

Motion granted.

2002 SCC 41, 2002 CSC 41
Supreme Court of Canada

Sierra Club of Canada v. Canada (Minister of Finance)

2002 CarswellNat 822, 2002 CarswellNat 823, 2002 SCC 41, 2002 CSC 41, [2002] 2 S.C.R. 522, [2002] S.C.J. No. 42, 113 A.C.W.S. (3d) 36, 18 C.P.R. (4th) 1, 20 C.P.C. (5th) 1, 211 D.L.R. (4th) 193, 223 F.T.R. 137 (note), 287 N.R. 203, 40 Admin. L.R. (3d) 1, 44 C.E.L.R. (N.S.) 161, 93 C.R.R. (2d) 219, J.E. 2002-803, REJB 2002-30902

Atomic Energy of Canada Limited, Appellant v. Sierra Club of Canada, Respondent and The Minister of Finance of Canada, the Minister of Foreign Affairs of Canada, the Minister of International Trade of Canada and the Attorney General of Canada, Respondents

McLachlin C.J.C., Gonthier, Iacobucci, Bastarache, Binnie, Arbour, LeBel JJ.

Heard: November 6, 2001

Judgment: April 26, 2002

Docket: 28020

Proceedings: reversing (2000), 2000 CarswellNat 970, (sub nom. Atomic Energy of Canada Ltd. v. Sierra Club of Canada) 187 D.L.R. (4th) 231, 256 N.R. 1, 24 Admin. L.R. (3d) 1, [2000] 4 F.C. 426, 182 F.T.R. 284 (note), 2000 CarswellNat 3271, [2000] F.C.J. No. 732 (Fed. C.A.); affirming (1999), 1999 CarswellNat 2187, [2000] 2 F.C. 400, 1999 CarswellNat 3038, 179 F.T.R. 283, [1999] F.C.J. No. 1633 (Fed. T.D.)

Counsel: *J. Brett Ledger* and *Peter Chapin*, for appellant

Timothy J. Howard and *Franklin S. Gertler*, for respondent Sierra Club of Canada

Graham Garton, Q.C., and *J. Sanderson Graham*, for respondents Minister of Finance of Canada, Minister of Foreign Affairs of Canada, Minister of International Trade of Canada, and Attorney General of Canada

The judgment of the court was delivered by *Iacobucci J.*:

I. Introduction

1 In our country, courts are the institutions generally chosen to resolve legal disputes as best they can through the application of legal principles to the facts of the case involved. One of the underlying principles of the judicial process is public openness, both in the proceedings of the

dispute, and in the material that is relevant to its resolution. However, some material can be made the subject of a confidentiality order. This appeal raises the important issues of when, and under what circumstances, a confidentiality order should be granted.

2 For the following reasons, I would issue the confidentiality order sought and, accordingly, would allow the appeal.

II. Facts

3 The appellant, Atomic Energy of Canada Ltd. ("AECL"), is a Crown corporation that owns and markets CANDU nuclear technology, and is an intervener with the rights of a party in the application for judicial review by the respondent, the Sierra Club of Canada ("Sierra Club"). Sierra Club is an environmental organization seeking judicial review of the federal government's decision to provide financial assistance in the form of a \$1.5 billion guaranteed loan relating to the construction and sale of two CANDU nuclear reactors to China by the appellant. The reactors are currently under construction in China, where the appellant is the main contractor and project manager.

4 The respondent maintains that the authorization of financial assistance by the government triggered s. 5(1)(b) of the *Canadian Environmental Assessment Act*, S.C. 1992, c. 37 ("CEAA"), which requires that an environmental assessment be undertaken before a federal authority grants financial assistance to a project. Failure to undertake such an assessment compels cancellation of the financial arrangements.

5 The appellant and the respondent Ministers argue that the CEAA does not apply to the loan transaction, and that if it does, the statutory defences available under ss. 8 and 54 apply. Section 8 describes the circumstances where Crown corporations are required to conduct environmental assessments. Section 54(2)(b) recognizes the validity of an environmental assessment carried out by a foreign authority provided that it is consistent with the provisions of the CEAA.

6 In the course of the application by Sierra Club to set aside the funding arrangements, the appellant filed an affidavit of Dr. Simon Pang, a senior manager of the appellant. In the affidavit, Dr. Pang referred to and summarized certain documents (the "Confidential Documents"). The Confidential Documents are also referred to in an affidavit prepared by Dr. Feng, one of AECL's experts. Prior to cross-examining Dr. Pang on his affidavit, Sierra Club made an application for the production of the Confidential Documents, arguing that it could not test Dr. Pang's evidence without access to the underlying documents. The appellant resisted production on various grounds, including the fact that the documents were the property of the Chinese authorities and that it did not have authority to disclose them. After receiving authorization by the Chinese authorities to disclose the documents on the condition that they be protected by a confidentiality order, the appellant sought to introduce the Confidential Documents under R. 312 of the *Federal Court Rules, 1998*, SOR/98-106, and requested a confidentiality order in respect of the documents.

7 Under the terms of the order requested, the Confidential Documents would only be made available to the parties and the court; however, there would be no restriction on public access to the proceedings. In essence, what is being sought is an order preventing the dissemination of the Confidential Documents to the public.

8 The Confidential Documents comprise two Environmental Impact Reports on Siting and Construction Design (the "EIRs"), a Preliminary Safety Analysis Report (the "PSAR"), and the supplementary affidavit of Dr. Pang, which summarizes the contents of the EIRs and the PSAR. If admitted, the EIRs and the PSAR would be attached as exhibits to the supplementary affidavit of Dr. Pang. The EIRs were prepared by the Chinese authorities in the Chinese language, and the PSAR was prepared by the appellant with assistance from the Chinese participants in the project. The documents contain a mass of technical information and comprise thousands of pages. They describe the ongoing environmental assessment of the construction site by the Chinese authorities under Chinese law.

9 As noted, the appellant argues that it cannot introduce the Confidential Documents into evidence without a confidentiality order; otherwise, it would be in breach of its obligations to the Chinese authorities. The respondent's position is that its right to cross-examine Dr. Pang and Dr. Feng on their affidavits would be effectively rendered nugatory in the absence of the supporting documents to which the affidavits referred. Sierra Club proposes to take the position that the affidavits should therefore be afforded very little weight by the judge hearing the application for judicial review.

10 The Federal Court of Canada, Trial Division, refused to grant the confidentiality order and the majority of the Federal Court of Appeal dismissed the appeal. In his dissenting opinion, Robertson J.A. would have granted the confidentiality order.

III. Relevant Statutory Provisions

11 *Federal Court Rules, 1998, SOR/98-106*

151.(1) On motion, the Court may order that material to be filed shall be treated as confidential.

(2) Before making an order under subsection (1), the Court must be satisfied that the material should be treated as confidential, notwithstanding the public interest in open and accessible court proceedings.

IV. Judgments below

A. Federal Court of Canada, Trial Division, [2000] 2 F.C. 400

12 Pelletier J. first considered whether leave should be granted pursuant to R. 312 to introduce the supplementary affidavit of Dr. Pang to which the Confidential Documents were filed as exhibits. In his view, the underlying question was that of relevance, and he concluded that the documents were relevant to the issue of the appropriate remedy. Thus, in the absence of prejudice to the respondent, the affidavit should be permitted to be served and filed. He noted that the respondents would be prejudiced by delay, but since both parties had brought interlocutory motions which had contributed to the delay, the desirability of having the entire record before the court outweighed the prejudice arising from the delay associated with the introduction of the documents.

13 On the issue of confidentiality, Pelletier J. concluded that he must be satisfied that the need for confidentiality was greater than the public interest in open court proceedings, and observed that the argument for open proceedings in this case was significant given the public interest in Canada's role as a vendor of nuclear technology. As well, he noted that a confidentiality order was an exception to the rule of open access to the courts, and that such an order should be granted only where absolutely necessary.

14 Pelletier J. applied the same test as that used in patent litigation for the issue of a protective order, which is essentially a confidentiality order. The granting of such an order requires the appellant to show a subjective belief that the information is confidential and that its interests would be harmed by disclosure. In addition, if the order is challenged, then the person claiming the benefit of the order must demonstrate objectively that the order is required. This objective element requires the party to show that the information has been treated as confidential, and that it is reasonable to believe that its proprietary, commercial and scientific interests could be harmed by the disclosure of the information.

15 Concluding that both the subjective part and both elements of the objective part of the test had been satisfied, he nevertheless stated: "However, I am also of the view that in public law cases, the objective test has, or should have, a third component which is whether the public interest in disclosure exceeds the risk of harm to a party arising from disclosure" (para. 23).

16 A very significant factor, in his view, was the fact that mandatory production of documents was not in issue here. The fact that the application involved a voluntary tendering of documents to advance the appellant's own cause as opposed to mandatory production weighed against granting the confidentiality order.

17 In weighing the public interest in disclosure against the risk of harm to AECL arising from disclosure, Pelletier J. noted that the documents the appellant wished to put before the court were prepared by others for other purposes, and recognized that the appellant was bound to protect the confidentiality of the information. At this stage, he again considered the issue of materiality. If the documents were shown to be very material to a critical issue, "the requirements of justice militate in favour of a confidentiality order. If the documents are marginally relevant, then the voluntary

nature of the production argues against a confidentiality order" (para. 29). He then decided that the documents were material to a question of the appropriate remedy, a significant issue in the event that the appellant failed on the main issue.

18 Pelletier J. also considered the context of the case and held that since the issue of Canada's role as a vendor of nuclear technology was one of significant public interest, the burden of justifying a confidentiality order was very onerous. He found that AECL could expunge the sensitive material from the documents, or put the evidence before the court in some other form, and thus maintain its full right of defence while preserving the open access to court proceedings.

19 Pelletier J. observed that his order was being made without having perused the Confidential Documents because they had not been put before him. Although he noted the line of cases which holds that a judge ought not to deal with the issue of a confidentiality order without reviewing the documents themselves, in his view, given their voluminous nature and technical content as well as his lack of information as to what information was already in the public domain, he found that an examination of these documents would not have been useful.

20 Pelletier J. ordered that the appellant could file the documents in current form, or in an edited version if it chose to do so. He also granted leave to file material dealing with the Chinese regulatory process in general and as applied to this project, provided it did so within 60 days.

B. Federal Court of Appeal, [2000] 4 F.C. 426

(1) Evans J.A. (Sharlow J.A. concurring)

21 At the Federal Court of Appeal, AECL appealed the ruling under R. 151 of the *Federal Court Rules, 1998*, and Sierra Club cross-appealed the ruling under R. 312.

22 With respect to R. 312, Evans J.A. held that the documents were clearly relevant to a defence under s. 54(2)(b), which the appellant proposed to raise if s. 5(1)(b) of the CEAA was held to apply, and were also potentially relevant to the exercise of the court's discretion to refuse a remedy even if the Ministers were in breach of the CEAA. Evans J.A. agreed with Pelletier J. that the benefit to the appellant and the court of being granted leave to file the documents outweighed any prejudice to the respondent owing to delay and thus concluded that the motions judge was correct in granting leave under R. 312.

23 On the issue of the confidentiality order, Evans J.A. considered R. 151, and all the factors that the motions judge had weighed, including the commercial sensitivity of the documents, the fact that the appellant had received them in confidence from the Chinese authorities, and the appellant's argument that without the documents it could not mount a full answer and defence to the application. These factors had to be weighed against the principle of open access to court documents. Evans J.A. agreed with Pelletier J. that the weight to be attached to the public interest

in open proceedings varied with context and held that, where a case raises issues of public significance, the principle of openness of judicial process carries greater weight as a factor in the balancing process. Evans J.A. noted the public interest in the subject matter of the litigation, as well as the considerable media attention it had attracted.

24 In support of his conclusion that the weight assigned to the principle of openness may vary with context, Evans J.A. relied upon the decisions in *AB Hassle v. Canada (Minister of National Health & Welfare)*, [2000] 3 F.C. 360 (Fed. C.A.), where the court took into consideration the relatively small public interest at stake, and *Ethyl Canada Inc. v. Canada (Attorney General)* (1998), 17 C.P.C. (4th) 278 (Ont. Gen. Div.), at p. 283, where the court ordered disclosure after determining that the case was a significant constitutional case where it was important for the public to understand the issues at stake. Evans J.A. observed that openness and public participation in the assessment process are fundamental to the CEAA, and concluded that the motions judge could not be said to have given the principle of openness undue weight even though confidentiality was claimed for a relatively small number of highly technical documents.

25 Evans J.A. held that the motions judge had placed undue emphasis on the fact that the introduction of the documents was voluntary; however, it did not follow that his decision on the confidentiality order must therefore be set aside. Evans J.A. was of the view that this error did not affect the ultimate conclusion for three reasons. First, like the motions judge, he attached great weight to the principle of openness. Secondly, he held that the inclusion in the affidavits of a summary of the reports could go a long way to compensate for the absence of the originals, should the appellant choose not to put them in without a confidentiality order. Finally, if AECL submitted the documents in an expunged fashion, the claim for confidentiality would rest upon a relatively unimportant factor, i.e., the appellant's claim that it would suffer a loss of business if it breached its undertaking with the Chinese authorities.

26 Evans J.A. rejected the argument that the motions judge had erred in deciding the motion without reference to the actual documents, stating that it was not necessary for him to inspect them, given that summaries were available and that the documents were highly technical and incompletely translated. Thus, the appeal and cross-appeal were both dismissed.

(2) Robertson J.A. (dissenting)

27 Robertson J.A. disagreed with the majority for three reasons. First, in his view, the level of public interest in the case, the degree of media coverage, and the identities of the parties should not be taken into consideration in assessing an application for a confidentiality order. Instead, he held that it was the nature of the evidence for which the order is sought that must be examined.

28 In addition, he found that without a confidentiality order, the appellant had to choose between two unacceptable options: either suffering irreparable financial harm if the confidential

information was introduced into evidence or being denied the right to a fair trial because it could not mount a full defence if the evidence was not introduced.

29 Finally, he stated that the analytical framework employed by the majority in reaching its decision was fundamentally flawed as it was based largely on the subjective views of the motions judge. He rejected the contextual approach to the question of whether a confidentiality order should issue, emphasizing the need for an objective framework to combat the perception that justice is a relative concept, and to promote consistency and certainty in the law.

30 To establish this more objective framework for regulating the issuance of confidentiality orders pertaining to commercial and scientific information, he turned to the legal rationale underlying the commitment to the principle of open justice, referring to *Edmonton Journal v. Alberta (Attorney General)*, [1989] 2 S.C.R. 1326 (S.C.C.). There, the Supreme Court of Canada held that open proceedings foster the search for the truth, and reflect the importance of public scrutiny of the courts.

31 Robertson J.A. stated that, although the principle of open justice is a reflection of the basic democratic value of accountability in the exercise of judicial power, in his view, the principle that justice itself must be secured is paramount. He concluded that justice as an overarching principle means that exceptions occasionally must be made to rules or principles.

32 He observed that, in the area of commercial law, when the information sought to be protected concerns "trade secrets," this information will not be disclosed during a trial if to do so would destroy the owner's proprietary rights and expose him or her to irreparable harm in the form of financial loss. Although the case before him did not involve a trade secret, he nevertheless held that the same treatment could be extended to commercial or scientific information which was acquired on a confidential basis and attached the following criteria as conditions precedent to the issuance of a confidentiality order (at para. 13):

(1) the information is of a confidential nature as opposed to facts which one would like to keep confidential; (2) the information for which confidentiality is sought is not already in the public domain; (3) on a balance of probabilities the party seeking the confidentiality order would suffer irreparable harm if the information were made public; (4) the information is relevant to the legal issues raised in the case; (5) correlatively, the information is "necessary" to the resolution of those issues; (6) the granting of a confidentiality order does not unduly prejudice the opposing party; and (7) the public interest in open court proceedings does not override the private interests of the party seeking the confidentiality order. The onus in establishing that criteria one to six are met is on the party seeking the confidentiality order. Under the seventh criterion, it is for the opposing party to show that a *prima facie* right to a protective order has been overtaken by the need to preserve the openness of the court proceedings. In addressing these criteria one must bear in mind two of the threads woven into the fabric of

the principle of open justice: the search for truth and the preservation of the rule of law. As stated at the outset, I do not believe that the perceived degree of public importance of a case is a relevant consideration.

33 In applying these criteria to the circumstances of the case, Robertson J.A. concluded that the confidentiality order should be granted. In his view, the public interest in open court proceedings did not override the interests of AECL in maintaining the confidentiality of these highly technical documents.

34 Robertson J.A. also considered the public interest in the need to ensure that site-plans for nuclear installations were not, for example, posted on a web-site. He concluded that a confidentiality order would not undermine the two primary objectives underlying the principle of open justice: truth and the rule of law. As such, he would have allowed the appeal and dismissed the cross-appeal.

V. Issues

35

A. What is the proper analytical approach to be applied to the exercise of judicial discretion where a litigant seeks a confidentiality order under R. 151 of the *Federal Court Rules, 1998*?

B. Should the confidentiality order be granted in this case?

VI. Analysis

A. The Analytical Approach to the Granting of a Confidentiality Order

(1) The General Framework: Herein the Dagenais Principles

36 The link between openness in judicial proceedings and freedom of expression has been firmly established by this Court. In *Canadian Broadcasting Corp. v. New Brunswick (Attorney General)*, [1996] 3 S.C.R. 480 (S.C.C.) [hereinafter *New Brunswick*], at para. 23, La Forest J. expressed the relationship as follows:

The principle of open courts is inextricably tied to the rights guaranteed by s. 2(b). Openness permits public access to information about the courts, which in turn permits the public to discuss and put forward opinions and criticisms of court practices and proceedings. While the freedom to express ideas and opinions about the operation of the courts is clearly within the ambit of the freedom guaranteed by s. 2(b), so too is the right of members of the public to obtain information about the courts in the first place.

Under the order sought, public access and public scrutiny of the Confidential Documents would be restricted; this would clearly infringe the public's freedom of expression guarantee.

37 A discussion of the general approach to be taken in the exercise of judicial discretion to grant a confidentiality order should begin with the principles set out by this Court in *Dagenais v. Canadian Broadcasting Corp.*, [1994] 3 S.C.R. 835 (S.C.C.). Although that case dealt with the common law jurisdiction of the court to order a publication ban in the criminal law context, there are strong similarities between publication bans and confidentiality orders in the context of judicial proceedings. In both cases a restriction on freedom of expression is sought in order to preserve or promote an interest engaged by those proceedings. As such, the fundamental question for a court to consider in an application for a publication ban or a confidentiality order is whether, in the circumstances, the right to freedom of expression should be compromised.

38 Although in each case freedom of expression will be engaged in a different context, the *Dagenais* framework utilizes overarching *Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms* principles in order to balance freedom of expression with other rights and interests, and thus can be adapted and applied to various circumstances. As a result, the analytical approach to the exercise of discretion under R. 151 should echo the underlying principles laid out in *Dagenais, supra*, although it must be tailored to the specific rights and interests engaged in this case.

39 *Dagenais, supra*, dealt with an application by four accused persons under the court's common law jurisdiction requesting an order prohibiting the broadcast of a television programme dealing with the physical and sexual abuse of young boys at religious institutions. The applicants argued that because the factual circumstances of the programme were very similar to the facts at issue in their trials, the ban was necessary to preserve the accuseds' right to a fair trial.

40 Lamer C.J. found that the common law discretion to order a publication ban must be exercised within the boundaries set by the principles of the *Charter*. Since publication bans necessarily curtail the freedom of expression of third parties, he adapted the pre-*Charter* common law rule such that it balanced the right to freedom of expression with the right to a fair trial of the accused in a way which reflected the substance of the test from *R. v. Oakes*, [1986] 1 S.C.R. 103 (S.C.C.). At p. 878 of *Dagenais*, Lamer C.J. set out his reformulated test:

A publication ban should only be ordered when:

- (a) Such a ban is *necessary* in order to prevent a real and substantial risk to the fairness of the trial, because reasonably available alternative measures will not prevent the risk; and
- (b) The salutary effects of the publication ban outweigh the deleterious effects to the free expression of those affected by the ban. [Emphasis in original.]

41 In *New Brunswick, supra*, this Court modified the *Dagenais* test in the context of the related issue of how the discretionary power under s. 486(1) of the *Criminal Code* to exclude the public from a trial should be exercised. That case dealt with an appeal from the trial judge's order excluding the public from the portion of a sentencing proceeding for sexual assault and sexual interference dealing with the specific acts committed by the accused on the basis that it would avoid "undue hardship" to both the victims and the accused.

42 La Forest J. found that s. 486(1) was a restriction on the s. 2(b) right to freedom of expression in that it provided a "discretionary bar on public and media access to the courts": *New Brunswick, supra*, at para. 33; however, he found this infringement to be justified under s. 1 provided that the discretion was exercised in accordance with the *Charter*. Thus, the approach taken by La Forest J. at para. 69 to the exercise of discretion under s. 486(1) of the *Criminal Code*, closely mirrors the *Dagenais* common law test:

- (a) the judge must consider the available options and consider whether there are any other reasonable and effective alternatives available;
- (b) the judge must consider whether the order is limited as much as possible; and
- (c) the judge must weigh the importance of the objectives of the particular order and its probable effects against the importance of openness and the particular expression that will be limited in order to ensure that the positive and negative effects of the order are proportionate.

In applying this test to the facts of the case, La Forest J. found that the evidence of the potential undue hardship consisted mainly in the Crown's submission that the evidence was of a "delicate nature" and that this was insufficient to override the infringement on freedom of expression.

43 This Court has recently revisited the granting of a publication ban under the court's common law jurisdiction in *R. v. Mentuck*, 2001 SCC 76 (S.C.C.), and its companion case *R. v. E. (O.N.)*, 2001 SCC 77 (S.C.C.). In *Mentuck*, the Crown moved for a publication ban to protect the identity of undercover police officers and operational methods employed by the officers in their investigation of the accused. The accused opposed the motion as an infringement of his right to a fair and public hearing under s. 11(d) of the *Charter*. The order was also opposed by two intervening newspapers as an infringement of their right to freedom of expression.

44 The Court noted that, while *Dagenais* dealt with the balancing of freedom of expression on the one hand, and the right to a fair trial of the accused on the other, in the case before it, both the right of the accused to a fair and public hearing, and freedom of expression weighed in favour of denying the publication ban. These rights were balanced against interests relating to the proper

administration of justice, in particular, protecting the safety of police officers and preserving the efficacy of undercover police operations.

45 In spite of this distinction, the Court noted that underlying the approach taken in both *Dagenais* and *New Brunswick* was the goal of ensuring that the judicial discretion to order publication bans is subject to no lower a standard of compliance with the *Charter* than legislative enactment. This goal is furthered by incorporating the essence of s. 1 of the *Charter* and the *Oakes* test into the publication ban test. Since this same goal applied in the case before it, the Court adopted a similar approach to that taken in *Dagenais*, but broadened the *Dagenais* test (which dealt specifically with the right of an accused to a fair trial) such that it could guide the exercise of judicial discretion where a publication ban is requested in order to preserve *any* important aspect of the proper administration of justice. At para. 32, the Court reformulated the test as follows:

A publication ban should only be ordered when:

- (a) such an order is necessary in order to prevent a serious risk to the proper administration of justice because reasonably alternative measures will not prevent the risk; and
- (b) the salutary effects of the publication ban outweigh the deleterious effects on the rights and interests of the parties and the public, including the effects on the right to free expression, the right of the accused to a fair and public trial, and the efficacy of the administration of justice.

46 The Court emphasized that under the first branch of the test, three important elements were subsumed under the "necessity" branch. First, the risk in question must be a serious risk well-grounded in the evidence. Second, the phrase "proper administration of justice" must be carefully interpreted so as not to allow the concealment of an excessive amount of information. Third, the test requires the judge ordering the ban to consider not only whether reasonable alternatives are available, but also to restrict the ban as far as possible without sacrificing the prevention of the risk.

47 At para. 31, the Court also made the important observation that the proper administration of justice will not necessarily involve *Charter* rights, and that the ability to invoke the *Charter* is not a necessary condition for a publication ban to be granted:

The [common law publication ban] rule can accommodate orders that must occasionally be made in the interests of the administration of justice, which encompass more than fair trial rights. As the test is intended to "reflect . . . the substance of the *Oakes* test", *we cannot require that Charter rights be the only legitimate objective of such orders any more than we require that government action or legislation in violation of the Charter be justified exclusively by the pursuit of another Charter right.* [Emphasis added.]

The Court also anticipated that, in appropriate circumstances, the *Dagenais* framework could be expanded even further in order to address requests for publication bans where interests other than the administration of justice were involved.

48 *Mentuck* is illustrative of the flexibility of the *Dagenais* approach. Since its basic purpose is to ensure that the judicial discretion to deny public access to the courts is exercised in accordance with *Charter* principles, in my view, the *Dagenais* model can and should be adapted to the situation in the case at bar where the central issue is whether judicial discretion should be exercised so as to exclude confidential information from a public proceeding. As in *Dagenais*, *New Brunswick* and *Mentuck*, granting the confidentiality order will have a negative effect on the *Charter* right to freedom of expression, as well as the principle of open and accessible court proceedings, and, as in those cases, courts must ensure that the discretion to grant the order is exercised in accordance with *Charter* principles. However, in order to adapt the test to the context of this case, it is first necessary to determine the particular rights and interests engaged by this application.

(2) The Rights and Interests of the Parties

49 The immediate purpose for AECL's confidentiality request relates to its commercial interests. The information in question is the property of the Chinese authorities. If the appellant were to disclose the Confidential Documents, it would be in breach of its contractual obligations and suffer a risk of harm to its competitive position. This is clear from the findings of fact of the motions judge that AECL was bound by its commercial interests and its customer's property rights not to disclose the information (para. 27), and that such disclosure could harm the appellant's commercial interests (para. 23).

50 Aside from this direct commercial interest, if the confidentiality order is denied, then in order to protect its commercial interests, the appellant will have to withhold the documents. This raises the important matter of the litigation context in which the order is sought. As both the motions judge and the Federal Court of Appeal found that the information contained in the Confidential Documents was relevant to defences available under the CEAA, the inability to present this information hinders the appellant's capacity to make full answer and defence or, expressed more generally, the appellant's right, as a civil litigant, to present its case. In that sense, preventing the appellant from disclosing these documents on a confidential basis infringes its right to a fair trial. Although in the context of a civil proceeding this does not engage a *Charter* right, the right to a fair trial generally can be viewed as a fundamental principle of justice: *M. (A.) v. Ryan*, [1997] 1 S.C.R. 157 (S.C.C.), at para. 84, *per* L'Heureux-Dubé J. (dissenting, but not on that point). Although this fair trial right is directly relevant to the appellant, there is also a general public interest in protecting the right to a fair trial. Indeed, as a general proposition, all disputes in the courts should be decided under a fair trial standard. The legitimacy of the judicial process alone demands as

much. Similarly, courts have an interest in having all relevant evidence before them in order to ensure that justice is done.

51 Thus, the interests which would be promoted by a confidentiality order are the preservation of commercial and contractual relations, as well as the right of civil litigants to a fair trial. Related to the latter are the public and judicial interests in seeking the truth and achieving a just result in civil proceedings.

52 In opposition to the confidentiality order lies the fundamental principle of open and accessible court proceedings. This principle is inextricably tied to freedom of expression enshrined in s. 2(b) of the *Charter: New Brunswick, supra*, at para. 23. The importance of public and media access to the courts cannot be understated, as this access is the method by which the judicial process is scrutinized and criticized. Because it is essential to the administration of justice that justice is done and is *seen* to be done, such public scrutiny is fundamental. The open court principle has been described as "the very soul of justice," guaranteeing that justice is administered in a non-arbitrary manner: *New Brunswick, supra*, at para. 22.

(3) Adapting the Dagenais Test to the Rights and Interests of the Parties

53 Applying the rights and interests engaged in this case to the analytical framework of *Dagenais* and subsequent cases discussed above, the test for whether a confidentiality order ought to be granted in a case such as this one should be framed as follows:

A confidentiality order under R. 151 should only be granted when:

- (a) such an order is necessary in order to prevent a serious risk to an important interest, including a commercial interest, in the context of litigation because reasonably alternative measures will not prevent the risk; and
- (b) the salutary effects of the confidentiality order, including the effects on the right of civil litigants to a fair trial, outweigh its deleterious effects, including the effects on the right to free expression, which in this context includes the public interest in open and accessible court proceedings.

54 As in *Mentuck, supra*, I would add that three important elements are subsumed under the first branch of this test. First, the risk in question must be real and substantial, in that the risk is well-grounded in the evidence and poses a serious threat to the commercial interest in question.

55 In addition, the phrase "important commercial interest" is in need of some clarification. In order to qualify as an "important commercial interest," the interest in question cannot merely be specific to the party requesting the order; the interest must be one which can be expressed in terms of a public interest in confidentiality. For example, a private company could not argue simply that the existence of a particular contract should not be made public because to do so would cause

the company to lose business, thus harming its commercial interests. However, if, as in this case, exposure of information would cause a breach of a confidentiality agreement, then the commercial interest affected can be characterized more broadly as the general commercial interest of preserving confidential information. Simply put, if there is no general principle at stake, there can be no "important commercial interest" for the purposes of this test. Or, in the words of Binnie J. in *Re N. (F.)*, [2000] 1 S.C.R. 880, 2000 SCC 35 (S.C.C.), at para. 10, the open court rule only yields "where the *public* interest in confidentiality outweighs the public interest in openness" (emphasis added).

56 In addition to the above requirement, courts must be cautious in determining what constitutes an "important commercial interest." It must be remembered that a confidentiality order involves an infringement on freedom of expression. Although the balancing of the commercial interest with freedom of expression takes place under the second branch of the test, courts must be alive to the fundamental importance of the open court rule. See generally Muldoon J. in *Eli Lilly & Co. v. Novopharm Ltd.* (1994), 56 C.P.R. (3d) 437 (Fed. T.D.), at p. 439.

57 Finally, the phrase "reasonably alternative measures" requires the judge to consider not only whether reasonable alternatives to a confidentiality order are available, but also to restrict the order as much as is reasonably possible while preserving the commercial interest in question.

B. Application of the Test to this Appeal

(1) Necessity

58 At this stage, it must be determined whether disclosure of the Confidential Documents would impose a serious risk on an important commercial interest of the appellant, and whether there are reasonable alternatives, either to the order itself or to its terms.

59 The commercial interest at stake here relates to the objective of preserving contractual obligations of confidentiality. The appellant argues that it will suffer irreparable harm to its commercial interests if the confidential documents are disclosed. In my view, the preservation of confidential information constitutes a sufficiently important commercial interest to pass the first branch of the test as long as certain criteria relating to the information are met.

60 Pelletier J. noted that the order sought in this case was similar in nature to an application for a protective order which arises in the context of patent litigation. Such an order requires the applicant to demonstrate that the information in question has been treated at all relevant times as confidential and that on a balance of probabilities its proprietary, commercial and scientific interests could reasonably be harmed by the disclosure of the information: *AB Hassle v. Canada (Minister of National Health & Welfare)* (1998), 83 C.P.R. (3d) 428 (Fed. T.D.), at p. 434. To this I would add the requirement proposed by Robertson J.A. that the information in question must be of a "confidential nature" in that it has been "accumulated with a reasonable expectation of it being

kept confidential" (para. 14) as opposed to "facts which a litigant would like to keep confidential by having the courtroom doors closed" (para. 14).

61 Pelletier J. found as a fact that the *AB Hassle* test had been satisfied in that the information had clearly been treated as confidential both by the appellant and by the Chinese authorities, and that, on a balance of probabilities, disclosure of the information could harm the appellant's commercial interests (para. 23). As well, Robertson J.A. found that the information in question was clearly of a confidential nature as it was commercial information, consistently treated and regarded as confidential, that would be of interest to AECL's competitors (para. 16). Thus, the order is sought to prevent a serious risk to an important commercial interest.

62 The first branch of the test also requires the consideration of alternative measures to the confidentiality order, as well as an examination of the scope of the order to ensure that it is not overly broad. Both courts below found that the information contained in the Confidential Documents was relevant to potential defences available to the appellant under the CEAA and this finding was not appealed at this Court. Further, I agree with the Court of Appeal's assertion (para. 99) that, given the importance of the documents to the right to make full answer and defence, the appellant is, practically speaking, compelled to produce the documents. Given that the information is necessary to the appellant's case, it remains only to determine whether there are reasonably alternative means by which the necessary information can be adduced without disclosing the confidential information.

63 Two alternatives to the confidentiality order were put forward by the courts below. The motions judge suggested that the Confidential Documents could be expunged of their commercially sensitive contents, and edited versions of the documents could be filed. As well, the majority of the Court of Appeal, in addition to accepting the possibility of expungement, was of the opinion that the summaries of the Confidential Documents included in the affidavits could go a long way to compensate for the absence of the originals. If either of these options is a reasonable alternative to submitting the Confidential Documents under a confidentiality order, then the order is not necessary, and the application does not pass the first branch of the test.

64 There are two possible options with respect to expungement, and, in my view, there are problems with both of these. The first option would be for AECL to expunge the confidential information without disclosing the expunged material to the parties and the court. However, in this situation the filed material would still differ from the material used by the affiants. It must not be forgotten that this motion arose as a result of Sierra Club's position that the summaries contained in the affidavits should be accorded little or no weight without the presence of the underlying documents. Even if the relevant information and the confidential information were mutually exclusive, which would allow for the disclosure of all the information relied on in the affidavits, this relevancy determination could not be tested on cross-examination because the expunged material would not be available. Thus, even in the best case scenario, where only

irrelevant information needed to be expunged, the parties would be put in essentially the same position as that which initially generated this appeal in the sense that at least some of the material relied on to prepare the affidavits in question would not be available to Sierra Club.

65 Further, I agree with Robertson J.A. that this best case scenario, where the relevant and the confidential information do not overlap, is an untested assumption (para. 28). Although the documents themselves were not put before the courts on this motion, given that they comprise thousands of pages of detailed information, this assumption is at best optimistic. The expungement alternative would be further complicated by the fact that the Chinese authorities require prior approval for any request by AECL to disclose information.

66 The second option is that the expunged material be made available to the Court and the parties under a more narrowly drawn confidentiality order. Although this option would allow for slightly broader public access than the current confidentiality request, in my view, this minor restriction to the current confidentiality request is not a viable alternative given the difficulties associated with expungement in these circumstances. The test asks whether there are *reasonably* alternative measures; it does not require the adoption of the absolutely least restrictive option. With respect, in my view, expungement of the Confidential Documents would be a virtually unworkable and ineffective solution that is not reasonable in the circumstances.

67 A second alternative to a confidentiality order was Evans J.A.'s suggestion that the summaries of the Confidential Documents included in the affidavits "may well go a long way to compensate for the absence of the originals" (para. 103). However, he appeared to take this fact into account merely as a factor to be considered when balancing the various interests at stake. I would agree that at this threshold stage to rely on the summaries alone, in light of the intention of Sierra Club to argue that they should be accorded little or no weight, does not appear to be a "reasonably alternative measure" to having the underlying documents available to the parties.

68 With the above considerations in mind, I find the confidentiality order necessary in that disclosure of the Confidential Documents would impose a serious risk on an important commercial interest of the appellant, and that there are no reasonably alternative measures to granting the order.

(2) The Proportionality Stage

69 As stated above, at this stage, the salutary effects of the confidentiality order, including the effects on the appellant's right to a fair trial, must be weighed against the deleterious effects of the confidentiality order, including the effects on the right to free expression, which, in turn, is connected to the principle of open and accessible court proceedings. This balancing will ultimately determine whether the confidentiality order ought to be granted.

(a) Salutary Effects of the Confidentiality Order

70 As discussed above, the primary interest that would be promoted by the confidentiality order is the public interest in the right of a civil litigant to present its case or, more generally, the fair trial right. Because the fair trial right is being invoked in this case in order to protect commercial, not liberty, interests of the appellant, the right to a fair trial in this context is not a *Charter* right; however, a fair trial for all litigants has been recognized as a fundamental principle of justice: *Ryan, supra*, at para. 84. It bears repeating that there are circumstances where, in the absence of an affected *Charter* right, the proper administration of justice calls for a confidentiality order: *Mentuck, supra*, at para. 31. In this case, the salutary effects that such an order would have on the administration of justice relate to the ability of the appellant to present its case, as encompassed by the broader fair trial right.

71 The Confidential Documents have been found to be relevant to defences that will be available to the appellant in the event that the CEAA is found to apply to the impugned transaction and, as discussed above, the appellant cannot disclose the documents without putting its commercial interests at serious risk of harm. As such, there is a very real risk that, without the confidentiality order, the ability of the appellant to mount a successful defence will be seriously curtailed. I conclude, therefore, that the confidentiality order would have significant salutary effects on the appellant's right to a fair trial.

72 Aside from the salutary effects on the fair trial interest, the confidentiality order would also have a beneficial impact on other important rights and interests. First, as I discuss in more detail below, the confidentiality order would allow all parties and the court access to the Confidential Documents, and permit cross-examination based on their contents. By facilitating access to relevant documents in a judicial proceeding, the order sought would assist in the search for truth, a core value underlying freedom of expression.

73 Second, I agree with the observation of Robertson J.A. that, as the Confidential Documents contain detailed technical information pertaining to the construction and design of a nuclear installation, it may be in keeping with the public interest to prevent this information from entering the public domain (para. 44). Although the exact contents of the documents remain a mystery, it is apparent that they contain technical details of a nuclear installation, and there may well be a substantial public security interest in maintaining the confidentiality of such information.

(b) Deleterious Effects of the Confidentiality Order

74 Granting the confidentiality order would have a negative effect on the open court principle, as the public would be denied access to the contents of the Confidential Documents. As stated above, the principle of open courts is inextricably tied to the s. 2(b) *Charter* right to freedom of expression, and public scrutiny of the courts is a fundamental aspect of the administration of justice: *New Brunswick, supra*, at paras. 22-23. Although as a *general* principle, the importance

of open courts cannot be overstated, it is necessary to examine, in the context of this case, the *particular* deleterious effects on freedom of expression that the confidentiality order would have.

75 Underlying freedom of expression are the core values of (1) seeking the truth and the common good, (2) promoting self-fulfilment of individuals by allowing them to develop thoughts and ideas as they see fit, and (3) ensuring that participation in the political process is open to all persons: *Irwin Toy Ltd. c. Québec (Procureur général)*, [1989] 1 S.C.R. 927 (S.C.C.), at p. 976, *R. v. Keegstra*, [1990] 3 S.C.R. 697 (S.C.C.), *per* Dickson C.J., at pp. 762-764. *Charter* jurisprudence has established that the closer the speech in question lies to these core values, the harder it will be to justify a s. 2(b) infringement of that speech under s. 1 of the *Charter*: *Keegstra, supra*, at pp. 760-761. Since the main goal in this case is to exercise judicial discretion in a way which conforms to *Charter* principles, a discussion of the deleterious effects of the confidentiality order on freedom of expression should include an assessment of the effects such an order would have on the three core values. The more detrimental the order would be to these values, the more difficult it will be to justify the confidentiality order. Similarly, minor effects of the order on the core values will make the confidentiality order easier to justify.

76 Seeking the truth is not only at the core of freedom of expression, but it has also been recognized as a fundamental purpose behind the open court rule, as the open examination of witnesses promotes an effective evidentiary process: *Edmonton Journal, supra, per* Wilson J., at pp. 1357-1358. Clearly, the confidentiality order, by denying public and media access to documents relied on in the proceedings, would impede the search for truth to some extent. Although the order would not exclude the public from the courtroom, the public and the media would be denied access to documents relevant to the evidentiary process.

77 However, as mentioned above, to some extent the search for truth may actually be *promoted* by the confidentiality order. This motion arises as a result of Sierra Club's argument that it must have access to the Confidential Documents in order to test the accuracy of Dr. Pang's evidence. If the order is denied, then the most likely scenario is that the appellant will not submit the documents, with the unfortunate result that evidence which may be relevant to the proceedings will not be available to Sierra Club or the court. As a result, Sierra Club will not be able to fully test the accuracy of Dr. Pang's evidence on cross-examination. In addition, the court will not have the benefit of this cross-examination or documentary evidence, and will be required to draw conclusions based on an incomplete evidentiary record. This would clearly impede the search for truth in this case.

78 As well, it is important to remember that the confidentiality order would restrict access to a relatively small number of highly technical documents. The nature of these documents is such that the general public would be unlikely to understand their contents, and thus they would contribute little to the public interest in the search for truth in this case. However, in the hands of the parties and their respective experts, the documents may be of great assistance in probing the truth of

the Chinese environmental assessment process, which would, in turn, assist the court in reaching accurate factual conclusions. Given the nature of the documents, in my view, the important value of the search for truth which underlies both freedom of expression and open justice would be promoted to a greater extent by submitting the Confidential Documents under the order sought than it would by denying the order, and thereby preventing the parties and the court from relying on the documents in the course of the litigation.

79 In addition, under the terms of the order sought, the only restrictions on these documents relate to their public distribution. The Confidential Documents would be available to the court and the parties, and public access to the proceedings would not be impeded. As such, the order represents a fairly minimal intrusion into the open court rule, and thus would not have significant deleterious effects on this principle.

80 The second core value underlying freedom of speech, namely, the promotion of individual self-fulfilment by allowing open development of thoughts and ideas, focuses on individual expression, and thus does not closely relate to the open court principle which involves institutional expression. Although the confidentiality order would restrict individual access to certain information which may be of interest to that individual, I find that this value would not be significantly affected by the confidentiality order.

81 The third core value, open participation in the political process, figures prominently in this appeal, as open justice is a fundamental aspect of a democratic society. This connection was pointed out by Cory J. in *Edmonton Journal*, *supra*, at p. 1339:

It can be seen that freedom of expression is of fundamental importance to a democratic society. It is also essential to a democracy and crucial to the rule of law that the courts are seen to function openly. The press must be free to comment upon court proceedings to ensure that the courts are, in fact, seen by all to operate openly in the penetrating light of public scrutiny.

Although there is no doubt as to the importance of open judicial proceedings to a democratic society, there was disagreement in the courts below as to whether the weight to be assigned to the open court principle should vary depending on the nature of the proceeding.

82 On this issue, Robertson J.A. was of the view that the nature of the case and the level of media interest were irrelevant considerations. On the other hand, Evans J.A. held that the motions judge was correct in taking into account that this judicial review application was one of significant public and media interest. In my view, although the public nature of the case may be a factor which strengthens the importance of open justice in a particular case, the level of media interest should not be taken into account as an independent consideration.

83 Since cases involving public institutions will generally relate more closely to the core value of public participation in the political process, the public nature of a proceeding should be taken

into consideration when assessing the merits of a confidentiality order. It is important to note that this core value will *always* be engaged where the open court principle is engaged owing to the importance of open justice to a democratic society. However, where the political process is also engaged by the *substance* of the proceedings, the connection between open proceedings and public participation in the political process will increase. As such, I agree with Evans J.A. in the court below, where he stated, at para. 87:

While all litigation is important to the parties, and there is a public interest in ensuring the fair and appropriate adjudication of all litigation that comes before the courts, some cases raise issues that transcend the immediate interests of the parties and the general public interest in the due administration of justice, and have a much wider public interest significance.

84 This motion relates to an application for judicial review of a decision by the government to fund a nuclear energy project. Such an application is clearly of a public nature, as it relates to the distribution of public funds in relation to an issue of demonstrated public interest. Moreover, as pointed out by Evans J.A., openness and public participation are of fundamental importance under the CEAA. Indeed, by their very nature, environmental matters carry significant public import, and openness in judicial proceedings involving environmental issues will generally attract a high degree of protection. In this regard, I agree with Evans J.A. that the public interest is engaged here more than it would be if this were an action between private parties relating to purely private interests.

85 However, with respect, to the extent that Evans J.A. relied on media interest as an indicium of public interest, this was an error. In my view, it is important to distinguish *public* interest from *media* interest, and I agree with Robertson J.A. that media exposure cannot be viewed as an impartial measure of public interest. It is the public *nature* of the proceedings which increases the need for openness, and this public nature is not necessarily reflected by the media desire to probe the facts of the case. I reiterate the caution given by Dickson C.J. in *Keegstra, supra*, at p. 760, where he stated that, while the speech in question must be examined in light of its relation to the core values, "we must guard carefully against judging expression according to its popularity."

86 Although the public interest in open access to the judicial review application *as a whole* is substantial, in my view, it is also important to bear in mind the nature and scope of the information for which the order is sought in assigning weight to the public interest. With respect, the motions judge erred in failing to consider the narrow scope of the order when he considered the public interest in disclosure, and consequently attached excessive weight to this factor. In this connection, I respectfully disagree with the following conclusion of Evans J.A., at para. 97:

Thus, having considered the nature of this litigation, and having assessed the extent of public interest in the openness of the proceedings in the case before him, the Motions Judge cannot be said in all the circumstances to have given this factor undue weight, even though

confidentiality is claimed for only three documents among the small mountain of paper filed in this case, and their content is likely to be beyond the comprehension of all but those equipped with the necessary technical expertise.

Open justice is a fundamentally important principle, particularly when the substance of the proceedings is public in nature. However, this does not detract from the duty to attach weight to this principle in accordance with the specific limitations on openness that the confidentiality order would have. As Wilson J. observed in *Edmonton Journal, supra*, at pp. 1353-1354:

One thing seems clear and that is that one should not balance one value at large and the conflicting value in its context. To do so could well be to pre-judge the issue by placing more weight on the value developed at large than is appropriate in the context of the case.

87 In my view, it is important that, although there is significant public interest in these proceedings, open access to the judicial review application would be only slightly impeded by the order sought. The narrow scope of the order coupled with the highly technical nature of the Confidential Documents significantly temper the deleterious effects the confidentiality order would have on the public interest in open courts.

88 In addressing the effects that the confidentiality order would have on freedom of expression, it should also be borne in mind that the appellant may not have to raise defences under the CEAA, in which case the Confidential Documents would be irrelevant to the proceedings, with the result that freedom of expression would be unaffected by the order. However, since the necessity of the Confidential Documents will not be determined for some time, in the absence of a confidentiality order, the appellant would be left with the choice of either submitting the documents in breach of its obligations or withholding the documents in the hopes that either it will not have to present a defence under the CEAA or that it will be able to mount a successful defence in the absence of these relevant documents. If it chooses the former option, and the defences under the CEAA are later found not to apply, then the appellant will have suffered the prejudice of having its confidential and sensitive information released into the public domain with no corresponding benefit to the public. Although this scenario is far from certain, the possibility of such an occurrence also weighs in favour of granting the order sought.

89 In coming to this conclusion, I note that if the appellant is not required to invoke the relevant defences under the CEAA, it is also true that the appellant's fair trial right will not be impeded, even if the confidentiality order is not granted. However, I do not take this into account as a factor which weighs in favour of denying the order because, if the order is granted and the Confidential Documents are not required, there will be no deleterious effects on *either* the public interest in freedom of expression *or* the appellant's commercial interests or fair trial right. This neutral result is in contrast with the scenario discussed above where the order is denied and the possibility arises that the appellant's commercial interests will be prejudiced with no corresponding public benefit.

As a result, the fact that the Confidential Documents may not be required is a factor which weighs in favour of granting the confidentiality order.

90 In summary, the core freedom of expression values of seeking the truth and promoting an open political process are most closely linked to the principle of open courts, and most affected by an order restricting that openness. However, in the context of this case, the confidentiality order would only marginally impede, and in some respects would even promote, the pursuit of these values. As such, the order would not have significant deleterious effects on freedom of expression.

VII. Conclusion

91 In balancing the various rights and interests engaged, I note that the confidentiality order would have substantial salutary effects on the appellant's right to a fair trial, and freedom of expression. On the other hand, the deleterious effects of the confidentiality order on the principle of open courts and freedom of expression would be minimal. In addition, if the order is not granted and in the course of the judicial review application the appellant is not required to mount a defence under the CEAA, there is a possibility that the appellant will have suffered the harm of having disclosed confidential information in breach of its obligations with no corresponding benefit to the right of the public to freedom of expression. As a result, I find that the salutary effects of the order outweigh its deleterious effects, and the order should be granted.

92 Consequently, I would allow the appeal with costs throughout, set aside the judgment of the Federal Court of Appeal, and grant the confidentiality order on the terms requested by the appellant under R. 151 of the *Federal Court Rules, 1998*.

Appeal allowed.

Pourvoi accueilli.