

2022 01G 0709

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF NEWFOUNDLAND AND LABRADOR

IN BANKRUPTCY AND INSOLVENCY

IN THE MATTER OF an application of Grant Thornton Limited, as Court- Appointed Monitor of 92834 Newfoundland and Labrador Inc., ("**92834**" or the "**Company**"); and

AND IN THE MATTER OF the Companies Creditors Arrangement Act R.S.C., 1985 c. C-36 as Amended (the "**CCAA**")

MEMORANDUM OF FACT AND LAW OF APPLICANT

SUMMARY OF CURRENT DOCUMENT

Court File Number(s):	2022 01G 0709
Date of Filing of Document:	January 23, 2024
Name of Party Filing or Person:	Grant Thornton Limited, in its capacity as Court- Appointed Monitor (the " Applicant ") of the Company
Application to which Document being filed relates:	Notice of Motion filed by the Applicant to extend the stay of proceedings, approve the distribution of funds and lift the stay of proceedings to allow for an assignment into bankruptcy of 92834, pursuant to the CCAA
Statement of Purpose in filing:	Memorandum in support of the Application
Court Sub-File Number, if any	N/A

FACTS:

1. As of February 21, 2022, Canada Fluorspar Inc., and Canada Fluorspar (NL) (hereinafter referred to as the “**Original Entities**”) were insolvent and were unable to meet its debt obligations as they became due. As a result, PricewaterhouseCoopers Inc., in its capacity as court-appointed receiver and manager of Bridging Finance Inc., and Bridging Income Fund LP (“**PWC**”) applied for an interim receivership order pursuant to s.47(1) of the *Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act*, RSC 1985 c. B-3 (the “**BIA**”) over substantially all the assets and undertaking of the Original Entities, which order was issued by this Honourable Court on the 21st day of February, 2022 (the “**Interim Receivership Order**”). Pursuant to the Interim Receivership Order, Grant Thornton Limited (“**GTL**”) was appointed as Interim Receiver of all the assets and undertaking of the Original Entities, with the exception of those assets and undertakings that were carved out of the receivership (defined therein as the “**Excluded Property**”).
2. On the 8th day of March 2022, GTL as Interim Receiver made an application to this Honourable Court declaring that Canada Fluorspar Inc., Canada Fluorspar (NL) Inc., and Newspar (hereinafter the “**New Entities**”) were a company to which the CCAA applied and requesting protection under the CCAA. As a result of that application, the Court granted an initial CCAA Order on the 11th day of March 2022 (the “**Initial CCAA Order**”) and the Court subsequently granted the ARIO on the 18th day of March 2022. In both orders, GTL was appointed and confirmed as CCAA Monitor.
3. In the Initial CCAA Order, this Honourable Court authorized the Monitor, on behalf of the New Entities, to enter into a DIP Financing Agreement with the DIP Lenders referenced in the Initial CCAA Order (the “**DIP Lenders**”).
4. Following the 18th day of March 2022, the Monitor conducted a Sales and Investment Solicitation Process (“**SISP**”) as contemplated in the order of this Honourable Court issued on the same day as the ARIO (the “**SISP Order**”). The activities of the Monitor in executing the SISP during this period are outlined generally in the Monitor’s Third, Fourth and Fifth Report.
5. On the 31st day of May 2022, the Monitor made an application to this Honourable Court seeking an extension of the stay period until the 2nd day of September 2022 and amending the SISP procedures to extend the dates of the Phase 2 Bid Deadline and each step

thereafter in order to correspond with the CCAA stay period (the “**Amended SISP Order**”). The extension was requested to allow the Monitor to arrange the completion of a National Instruments 43-101 Technical Report with the expectation that it would assist in increasing the purchase price for the New Entities’ assets. The court granted these amendments by Order dated the 10th day of June 2022.

6. As outlined in the Monitor’s Fifth Report, the Monitor received multiple bids for the New Entities’ assets through the SISP process. The Monitor made a recommendation to the DIP Lenders as to its preferred choice with respect to the bids received. The DIP Lenders supported the Monitor’s recommendation, and the Monitor therefore notified the successful bidder (the “**Successful Bidder**”) on August 18, 2022.
7. On the 30th day of August 2022, this Honourable Court issued the 2nd Amended ARIO extending the CCAA stay period until the 17th day of October 2022 and amended the SISP procedures in order to allow time to (i) complete the SISP; (ii) enter into a definitive agreement with the Successful Bidder; and (iii) obtain court approval.
8. As outlined in the Monitor’s Fifth Report, the Monitor completed the SISP and awarded, with the consent and the agreement of the DIP Lenders, the sale of the New Entities’ assets to the Successful Bidder.
9. As outlined in the Monitor’s Sixth Report, the Monitor and the New Entities worked diligently to complete the definitive agreement. However, the Successful Bidder failed to top up the agreed upon deposit as required by the SISP, and therefore failed to complete a key deadline as outlined in the SISP. As a result of this material adverse change, the agreement with the Successful Bidder was then terminated and the Monitor filed with this Honourable Court a Material Adverse Change Report.
10. On the 12th day of October 2022, this court issued the 3rd Amended ARIO extending the CCAA stay period until the 26th day of February, 2023 to allow the senior secured creditors and the DIP Lenders time to determine next steps as it related to the New Entities’ assets, including the possibility of another SISP or a different type of sale or liquidation process.
11. Following the 12th day of October 2022, the Monitor and the Company worked diligently to solicit bids from parties that previously submitted proposals during the SISP. As of

January 26, 2023, the Monitor selected, and the DIP Lenders approved a new successful bidder (the "**Purchaser**").

12. On the 13th day of February 2023, the Monitor entered into a Letter of Intent with the Purchaser.
13. On the 21st day of February 2023, this court issued the 4th Amended ARIO extending the CCAA stay period until the 31st day of May, 2023 to allow (i) the Purchaser to complete its due diligence (ii) enter into a definitive agreement; and (iii) obtain court approval.
14. On the 18th day of May, 2023, the court issued the 5th Amended ARIO extending the CCAA stay period until the 16th day of June, 2023 to allow the Purchaser (i) to complete the definitive agreement and (ii) obtain court approval and close the transaction. In addition, the court approved the addition of CFI Newspaper Holdings Inc., to these proceedings (CFI Newspaper Holdings Inc., the Original Entities and the New Entities are hereinafter referred to as "**CFI**").
15. On the 7th day of June, 2023, the court issued the Approval and Reverse Vesting Order ("**ARVO**") (i) approving the sale to the Purchaser and (ii) issuing the 6th Amended ARIO extending the CCAA stay period until the 31st day of October, 2023.
16. Pursuant to the ARVO, all the Excluded Liabilities, Claims and Encumbrances (except for the Permitted Encumbrances) as defined in the Share Purchase Agreement between CFI and the Purchaser were vested out to ResidualCo, being 92834, and 92834 was added as an applicant in these CCAA proceedings.
17. On the 13th day of June, 2023 the share transaction with the Purchaser closed and the sale proceeds were paid by the Purchaser to the Monitor.
18. On the 25th day of October, 2023, the court issued (i) the Claims Identification Order, (ii) the 7th amendment to the ARIO extending the stay of proceedings until the 31st day of March, 2024, (iii) the interim distribution of funds by the Monitor in an amount of \$14,100,000.00 as set out in the Monitor's Tenth Report; and (iv) approval of the activities, fees and disbursements of the Monitor and its Legal Counsel.
19. On the 26th day of October 2023, the Monitor remitted the amount of \$14,112,409.00 to Bridging, which amount included outstanding interest due and owing.

20. Since October, the Monitor has conducted the claims process as approved in the Claims Identification Order. To date the Monitor has received 53 Pre-Filing Unsecured Claims, 3 Pre-Filing Priority Claims, 15 Pre-Filing Secured Claims, 10 Restructuring Unsecured Claims, and 2 Restructuring Secured Claims, all as outlined in paragraphs 33-53 of the Monitor's Eleventh Report. The Monitor has reviewed all claims filed by the claimants and has responded to each claimant with an acceptance, disallowance and/or a distribution as outlined in Appendix "F" to the Monitor's Eleventh Report.
21. At this time, the Monitor has determined that it is appropriate to proceed with the distribution of the remaining funds in trust for the Company to priority claimants and Bridging.
22. The Monitor has further determined that the assignment of 92834 into bankruptcy upon the distribution of funds to the priority claimants and Bridging is necessary to wind up 92834 as the company will have no assets.

ISSUES:

23. The issues before this Honourable Court are as follows:
 - (a) Whether the requested extension to the stay of proceedings should be granted;
 - (b) Whether the distribution of funds should be granted; and
 - (c) Whether the Monitor can make an assignment into bankruptcy of 92834 Newfoundland and Labrador Inc.

LAW AND ARGUMENT:

Whether the requested extension to the stay of proceedings should be granted.

24. The current stay period expires on the 31st day of March 2024. The Applicant is now requesting an extension of the stay until the 30th day of June 2024.
25. Section 11.02(2) of the CCAA provides that a court has discretion to grant a requested stay of proceedings, on any terms it may impose:

11.02 (2) A court may, on an application in respect of a debtor company other than an initial application, make an order, on any terms that it may impose,

(a) staying, until otherwise ordered by the court, for any period that the court considers necessary, all proceedings taken or that might be taken in respect of the company under an Act referred to in paragraph (1)(a);

(b) restraining, until otherwise ordered by the court, further proceedings in any action, suit or proceeding against the company; and

(c) prohibiting, until otherwise ordered by the court, the commencement of any action, suit or proceeding against the company.

Reference: CCAA s., 11.02(2) [TAB 1]

26. The requested stay is necessary as it will allow the Monitor time to review and determine any appeals to the Claims Identification Process, make an assignment into bankruptcy of 92834 and distribute any remaining funds.
27. Section 11.02 (3) of the CCAA outlines when a court should make an order to extend a stay:

(3) The court shall not make the order unless

(a) the applicant satisfies the court that circumstances exist that make the order appropriate; and

(b) in the case of an order under subsection (2), the applicant also satisfies the court that the applicant has acted, and is acting, in good faith and with due diligence.

Reference: CCAA s., 11.02(3) [TAB 2]

28. The Applicant submits that the request is appropriate in these circumstances, as it will allow for the necessary time needed to review and determine any appeals to the Claims Identification Process, make an assignment into bankruptcy of 92834 and distribute any remaining funds.
29. Further, the Applicant has acted in good faith and with due diligence throughout these CCAA proceedings.

30. In *Harte Gold Corp (Re)*, 2022 ONSC 653, the Ontario Supreme Court of Justice discussed the test for extending a stay of proceedings under s. 11.02 of the CCAA.

The current stay period expires on January 31, 2022. Under s. 11.02 of the CCAA, the court may grant an extension of a stay of proceedings where: (a) circumstances exist that make the order appropriate; and (b) the debtor company satisfies the court that it has acted, and is acting, in good faith and with due diligence.

Harte Gold is seeking to extend the stay period to and including March 29, 2022 to allow it to proceed with the closing of the Silver Lake transaction, while at the same time preserving the status quo and preventing creditors and others from taking any steps to try and better their positions in comparison to other creditors.

No creditors are expected to suffer material prejudice as a result of the extension of the stay of proceedings. Harte Gold is acting in good faith and will continue to pay its post-filing obligations in the ordinary course. As detailed in Harte Gold's cash flow forecast, it is expected to have sufficient liquidity to continue its operations during the contemplated extension of the stay.

For these reasons the stay is extended to March 29, 2022

Reference: *Harte Gold Corp (Re)*, 2022 ONSC 653 at paragraphs 87-90 [TAB 3]

31. As noted above, the Monitor requires additional time to review and determine any appeals to the Claims Identification Process, make an assignment into bankruptcy of 92834 and distribute any remaining funds.
32. No creditors will suffer material prejudice as a result of the extension.
33. The Monitors Receipts and Disbursements attached as Exhibit "H" to the Monitor's Eleventh Report confirms that the Company will have sufficient liquidity throughout the stay period and therefore supports the requested extension of the stay of proceedings in the within matter.

Whether the distribution of funds should be granted.

34. The Monitor seeks a distribution order for the following reasons:

- (a) Substantially all of the assets of CFI have been sold;
 - (b) The Claims Identification Process has been completed by the Monitor and it has received 53 Pre-Filing Unsecured Claims, 3 Pre-Filing Priority Claims, 15 Pre-Filing Secured Claims, 10 Restructuring Unsecured Claims, and 2 Restructuring Secured Claims, all as outlined in paragraphs 33-53 of the Monitor's Eleventh Report. The Monitor has reviewed all claims filed by the claimants and has responded to each claimant with an acceptance, disallowance and/or a distribution as outlined in Appendix "F" to the Monitor's Eleventh Report; and
 - (c) Bridging is the senior secured creditor and any surplus funds would be due to Bridging pursuant to its security;
 - (d) No material prejudice will result to creditors from the approval of the proposed distribution order.
35. The Monitor relies on the statements set out in the Monitor's Eleventh Report at paragraphs 33-64.
36. In addition, the proposed distribution calculation is set out in paragraph 54 of the Monitor's Eleventh Report.
37. In *Nortel Networks Corp, Re*, the Ontario Superior Court discussed distributions to creditors in CCAA proceedings:

[53] I first note that the CCAA makes no provision as to how money is to be distributed to creditors. This is not surprising taken that plans of reorganization do not necessarily provide for payments to creditors and taken that the CCAA does not expressly provide for a liquidating CCAA process. There is no provision that requires distributions to be made under a plan of arrangement.

[54] A court has wide powers in a CCAA proceeding to do what is just in the circumstances. Section 11(1) provided that a court may make any order it considers appropriate in the circumstances. Although this section was provided by an amendment that came into force after Nortel filed under the CCAA, and [page242] therefore by the amendment the new section does not apply to Nortel, it has been held that the provision merely reflects past jurisdiction. In *Century Services*, Deschamps J. stated [at paras. 65, 67-68]:

I agree with Justice Georgina R. Jackson and Professor Janis Sarra that the most appropriate approach is a hierarchical one in which courts rely first on an interpretation of the provisions of the CCAA text before turning to inherent or equitable jurisdiction to anchor measures taken in a CCAA proceeding (see G. R. Jackson and J. Sarra, "Selecting the Judicial Tool to get the Job Done: An Examination of Statutory Interpretation, Discretionary Power and Inherent Jurisdiction in Insolvency Matters", in J. P. Sarra, ed., *Annual Review of Insolvency Law 2007* (2008), 41, at p. 42). The authors conclude that when given an appropriately purposive and liberal interpretation, the CCAA will be sufficient in most instances to ground measures necessary to achieve its objectives (p. 94).

.....

The initial grant of authority under the CCAA empowered a court "where an application is made under this Act in respect of a company . . . on the application of any person interested in the matter . . . , subject to this Act, [to] make an order under this section" (CCAA, s. 11(1)). The plain language of the statute was very broad.

In this regard, though not strictly applicable to the case at bar, I note that Parliament has in recent amendments changed the wording contained in s. 11(1), making explicit the discretionary authority of the court under the CCAA. Thus in s. 11 of the CCAA as currently enacted, a court may, "subject to the restrictions set out in this Act, . . . make any order that it considers appropriate in the circumstances" (S.C. 2005, c. 47, s. 128). Parliament appears to have endorsed the broad reading of CCAA authority developed by the jurisprudence.

[55] I note also that payments to creditors without plans of arrangement or compromises are often ordered. In *Timminco Ltd. (Re)*, [2014] O.J. No. 3270, 2014 ONSC 3393 (S.C.J.), Morawetz J. noted, at para. 38, that the assets of Timminco had been sold and distributions made to secured creditors without any plan and with no intention to advance a plan. In that case, there was a shortfall to the secured creditors and no assets available to the unsecured creditors. The fact that the distributions went to the secured creditors rather than to an unsecured creditor makes no difference to the jurisdiction under the CCAA to do so.

[56] In *AbitibiBowater Inc. (Re)*, [2009] Q.J. No. 19125, 2009 QCCS 6461 (Sup. Ct.), Gascon J.C.S. (as he then was) granted a large interim distribution from the proceeds of a sale transaction to senior secured noteholders ("SSNs"). The bondholders opposed the distribution on the same grounds as advanced by the bondholders in this case [at paras. 56-58]: [page243]

Reference: *Nortel Networks Corp, Re* 2014 ONSC 4777, at paragraphs 53-55 [TAB 4]

38. In this case, the Applicant submits that it is reasonable and appropriate for this Honourable Court to exercise its discretion and approve the distributions.
39. Similar orders have been made in other CCAA proceedings.

Reference: *AbitibiBowater, (Re)* 2009 CarswellQue 14224, at paragraph 71 [TAB 5]

Reference: *Re Windsor Machine & Stamping Ltd.*, 2009 CarswellOnt 4505 [TAB 6]

40. For the reasons outlined above, the Monitor is of the opinion that the proposed interim distribution order as outlined in the Monitor's Eleventh Report is fair and reasonable in the circumstances.

Whether the Monitor can bankrupt 92834 Newfoundland and Labrador Inc.

41. The Monitor is requesting approval to make an assignment into bankruptcy of 92834. 92834 will have no assets at the time of the assignment into bankruptcy.
42. In addition, Bridging has informed the Monitor, that it intends to pursue litigation in relation to potential claims against Ares Strategic Mining Inc., and the former directors and officers of CFI. As outlined in the Monitor's Eleventh Report, any recovery from these potential claims would be for the sole benefit of Bridging. As such, the Monitor has declined to pursue any such claims. The Monitor understands that Bridging intends to make an application to this Honourable Court to approve a motion for Bridging to pursue these claims pursuant to section 38 of the BIA, following the assignment into bankruptcy of 92834. The Monitor does not object to the proposed section 38 action by Bridging.
43. In order to proceed with the assignment into bankruptcy of 92834, the Monitor requires that the stay of proceedings be lifted.
44. In *Ted Leroy Trucking [Century Services] Ltd., Re*, the Supreme Court of Canada stated that the CCAA confers on a supervising judge a broad discretionary jurisdiction to lift the stay of proceedings of an ongoing CCAA restructuring to allow a debtor company to make an assignment under the BIA.

[1] For the first time this Court is called upon to directly interpret the provisions of the *Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act*, R.S.C. 1985, c. C-36 ("CCAA"). In that respect, two questions are raised.

The first requires reconciliation of provisions of the CCAA and the Excise Tax Act, R.S.C. 1985, c. E-15 ("ETA"), which lower courts have held to be in conflict with one another. The second concerns the scope of a court's discretion when supervising reorganization. The relevant statutory provisions are reproduced in the Appendix. On the first question, having considered the evolution of Crown priorities in the context of insolvency and the wording of the various statutes creating Crown priorities, I conclude that it is the CCAA and not the ETA that provides the rule. On the second question, I conclude that the broad discretionary jurisdiction conferred on the supervising judge must be interpreted having regard to the remedial nature of the CCAA and insolvency legislation generally. Consequently, the court had the discretion to partially lift a stay of proceedings to allow the debtor to make an assignment under the Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act, R.S.C. 1985, c. B-3 ("BIA"). I would allow the appeal.

Reference *Ted Leroy Trucking [Century Services Ltd] (Re)*, 2010 SCC 60, at paragraph 1 [TAB 7]

45. The Supreme Court of Canada further outlined in *Ted Leroy Trucking [Century Services] Ltd., Re*, the primary consideration that a court must take when deciding to lift a stay of proceedings;

[75] The question remains whether the order advanced the underlying purpose of the CCAA. The Court of Appeal held that it did not because the reorganization efforts had come to an end and the CCAA was accordingly spent. I disagree.

Reference *Ted Leroy Trucking [Century Services Ltd] (Re)*, 2010 SCC 60, at paragraph 75 [TAB 7]

46. In addition, the Supreme Court of Canada confirmed that it was well established that efforts to reorganize under the CCAA can be terminated to lift the stay of proceedings.

[71] It is well-established that efforts to reorganize under the CCAA can be terminated and the stay of proceedings against the debtor lifted if the reorganization is "doomed to failure" (see *Chef Ready*, at p. 88; *Philip's Manufacturing Ltd., Re* (1992), 9 C.B.R. (3d) 25 (B.C. C.A.), at paras. 6-7). However, when an order is sought that does realistically advance the CCAA's purposes, the ability to make it is within the discretion of a CCAA court.

Reference *Ted Leroy Trucking [Century Services Ltd] (Re)*, 2010 SCC 60, at paragraph 75 [TAB 7]

47. In *Ivaco Inc.*, *Re*, the Ontario Court of Appeal outlined factors to consider when lifting the stay of proceedings.

[76] Therefore, I do not accept the Superintendent's unfairness argument. Also, in my view, numerous considerations supported the motions judge's decision to lift the stay and permit the bankruptcy petitions to proceed. These considerations include the following:

- The CCAA proceedings are spent. There are no entities to reorganize and no further compromises can be negotiated between the Companies and their creditors. There remains only a pool of money to distribute. The BIA is the regime Parliament has chosen to effect this distribution.
- The petitioning creditors have met the technical requirements for bankruptcy. And their desire to use the BIA to alter priorities is a legitimate reason to seek a bankruptcy order. See for example *Bank of Montreal v. Scott Road Enterprises Ltd.* (1989), 57 D.L.R. (4th) 623 (B.C. C.A.), at 627, 630-631; *Harrop of Milton Inc., Re* (1979), 22 O.R. (2d) 239 (Ont. Bkcty.), at 244-245.
- The Superintendent and the QPC agreed to the CCAA process. They recognized that it benefitted the pension claimants. Thus, they did not oppose either the pension stay order or the sale to Heico. They did not ask to have the deemed trusts satisfied or an amount to satisfy them set aside, though they knew that bankruptcy was pending. They likely recognized that if they had insisted on a segregation order, the other creditors may not have agreed to the sale. It is now too late for the Superintendent and the QPC to ask for relief that they never sought during the entire CCAA process.
- The motions judge would have gone beyond his role as a referee in the CCAA proceedings if he had given effect to the Superintendent's claim. The Superintendent wants to jump ahead of all the other creditors by obtaining an extraordinary payment at the end of a long CCAA process. If the motions judge had ordered this payment, he would have upset the ground rules that all stakeholders agreed to and that he supervised for over two years.

[77] The motions judge took into account the likely result of the Superintendent's claims if the Companies are put into bankruptcy. He recognized that bankruptcy would potentially reverse the priority accorded to the pension claims outside bankruptcy. Nonetheless, having weighed all the competing considerations, he exercised his discretion to lift the stay and permit the bankruptcy petitions to proceed. In my view, he exercised his discretion properly. I would not give effect to this ground of appeal.

Reference *Ivaco Inc., Re*, 2006 CarswellOnt 6292 at paragraphs 76 and 77 [TAB 8]


48. In the case at hand, the Applicant submits that temporarily lifting the stay of proceedings and permitting the Monitor to make an assignment into bankruptcy of 92834 advances the purposes of the CCAA. The Applicant provides the following reasons;
- (a) The Monitor is proposing to distribute 92834's estate in accordance with the Monitor's Eleventh Report. Upon the distribution, 92834 will not have any assets, and the filing of the assignment will provide the necessary wind-up. Similarly, to *Ivaco*, this case has been a liquidating CCAA proceeding.
 - (b) Prolonging the CCAA proceeding would incur unnecessary costs. 92834 will not be the beneficiary of any increased assets as time continues under the CCAA proceeding. As such, further costs would be incurred to the detriment of 92834's creditors, and prolonging the CCAA proceeding would therefore be prejudicial to the creditors.
 - (c) 92834 has met the technical requirements for bankruptcy, and its desire to use the BIA is a legitimate reason to seek a bankruptcy order.
 - (d) 92834 does not foresee any creditors opposing the bankruptcy order. In fact, the senior secured creditor, Bridging, is supporting the bankruptcy order, such that potential claims can be assigned to it under section 38 of the BIA.
49. For the reasons outlined above, the Monitor is of the opinion that lifting the stay of proceedings is necessary in order to assign 92834 into bankruptcy.

CONCLUSION

50. The Applicant respectfully requests that this Honourable Court grant the Orders attached to the within Application.

ALL OF WHICH IS RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED.

DATED at the City of St. John's, in the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador, this 23 day of January, 2024.



Geoffrey Spencer
McInnes Cooper
Solicitors for the Applicant
Whose address for service is:
5th Floor, Baine Johnston Centre
10 Fort William Place
St. John's, NL A1C 5X4

TO: Supreme Court of Newfoundland & Labrador
General Division (In Bankruptcy)
P.O. Box 937
313 Duckworth Street
St. John's, NL A1C 5M3

AND TO: The Service List attached as Schedule "A" to the Application

List of Authorities:

1. *Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act*, R.S.C. 1985, C. c-36, as amended, s. 11.02(2)
2. *Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act*, R.S.C. 1985, C. c-36, as amended, s. 11.02(3)
3. *Harte Gold Corp (Re)*, 2022 ONSC 653
4. *Nortel Networks Corp, Re* 2014 ONSC 4777
5. *AbitibiBowater, (Re)* 2009 CarswellQue 14224
6. *Re Windsor Machine & Stamping Ltd.*, 2009 CarswellOnt 4505
7. *Ted Leroy Trucking [Century Services Ltd] (Re)*, 2010 SCC 60
8. *Ivaco Inc ., Re*, 2006 CarswellOnt 6292

TAB 1

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

Most Recently Cited in: Harte Gold Corp. (Re) , 2022 ONSC 653, 2022 CarswellOnt 1698 | (Ont. S.C.J. [Commercial List], Feb 4, 2022)

R.S.C. 1985, c. C-36, s. 11.02

s 11.02

Currency

11.02

11.02(1) Stays, etc. — initial application

A court may, on an initial application in respect of a debtor company, make an order on any terms that it may impose, effective for the period that the court considers necessary, which period may not be more than 10 days,

- (a) staying, until otherwise ordered by the court, all proceedings taken or that might be taken in respect of the company under the *Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act* or the *Winding-up and Restructuring Act*;
- (b) restraining, until otherwise ordered by the court, further proceedings in any action, suit or proceeding against the company; and
- (c) prohibiting, until otherwise ordered by the court, the commencement of any action, suit or proceeding against the company.

11.02(2) Stays, etc. — other than initial application

A court may, on an application in respect of a debtor company other than an initial application, make an order, on any terms that it may impose,

- (a) staying, until otherwise ordered by the court, for any period that the court considers necessary, all proceedings taken or that might be taken in respect of the company under an Act referred to in paragraph (1)(a);
- (b) restraining, until otherwise ordered by the court, further proceedings in any action, suit or proceeding against the company; and
- (c) prohibiting, until otherwise ordered by the court, the commencement of any action, suit or proceeding against the company.

11.02(3) Burden of proof on application

The court shall not make the order unless

- (a) the applicant satisfies the court that circumstances exist that make the order appropriate; and
- (b) in the case of an order under subsection (2), the applicant also satisfies the court that the applicant has acted, and is acting, in good faith and with due diligence.

11.02(4) Restriction

Orders doing anything referred to in subsection (1) or (2) may only be made under this section.

Amendment History

2005, c. 47, s. 128; 2019, c. 29, s. 137

Judicial Consideration (1)

Currency

Federal English Statutes reflect amendments current to February 15, 2022

Federal English Regulations Current to Gazette Vol. 156:3 (February 2, 2022)

End of Document

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

TAB 2

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

Most Recently Cited in: Harte Gold Corp. (Re) , 2022 ONSC 653, 2022 CarswellOnt 1698 | (Ont. S.C.J. [Commercial List], Feb 4, 2022)

R.S.C. 1985, c. C-36, s. 11.02

s 11.02

Currency

11.02

11.02(1) Stays, etc. — initial application

A court may, on an initial application in respect of a debtor company, make an order on any terms that it may impose, effective for the period that the court considers necessary, which period may not be more than 10 days,

- (a) staying, until otherwise ordered by the court, all proceedings taken or that might be taken in respect of the company under the *Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act* or the *Winding-up and Restructuring Act*;
- (b) restraining, until otherwise ordered by the court, further proceedings in any action, suit or proceeding against the company; and
- (c) prohibiting, until otherwise ordered by the court, the commencement of any action, suit or proceeding against the company.

11.02(2) Stays, etc. — other than initial application

A court may, on an application in respect of a debtor company other than an initial application, make an order, on any terms that it may impose,

- (a) staying, until otherwise ordered by the court, for any period that the court considers necessary, all proceedings taken or that might be taken in respect of the company under an Act referred to in paragraph (1)(a);
- (b) restraining, until otherwise ordered by the court, further proceedings in any action, suit or proceeding against the company; and
- (c) prohibiting, until otherwise ordered by the court, the commencement of any action, suit or proceeding against the company.

11.02(3) Burden of proof on application

The court shall not make the order unless

- (a) the applicant satisfies the court that circumstances exist that make the order appropriate; and
- (b) in the case of an order under subsection (2), the applicant also satisfies the court that the applicant has acted, and is acting, in good faith and with due diligence.

11.02(4) Restriction

Orders doing anything referred to in subsection (1) or (2) may only be made under this section.

Amendment History

2005, c. 47, s. 128; 2019, c. 29, s. 137

Judicial Consideration (1)

Currency

Federal English Statutes reflect amendments current to February 15, 2022

Federal English Regulations Current to Gazette Vol. 156:3 (February 2, 2022)

End of Document

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

TAB 3

2022 ONSC 653
Ontario Superior Court of Justice [Commercial List]

Harte Gold Corp. (Re)

2022 CarswellOnt 1698, 2022 ONSC 653, 97 C.B.R. (6th) 202

**THE COMPANIES' CREDITORS ARRANGEMENT ACT, R.S.C. 1985,
c. C-36, AS AMENDED (Applicant) and A PLAN OF COMPROMISE
OR ARRANGEMENT OF HARTE GOLD CORP. (Applicant)**

Penny J.

Heard: January 28, 2022
Judgment: February 4, 2022
Docket: CV-21-00673304-00CL

Counsel: Guy P. Martel, Danny Duy Vu, Lee Nicholson, William Rodler Dumais, for Applicant
Joseph Pasquariello, Chris Armstrong, Andrew Harmes, for Court appointed Monitor
Leanne M. Williams, for Board of Directors of the Applicant
Marc Wasserman, Kathryn Esaw, Dave Rosenblat, Justin Kanji, for 1000025833 Ontario Inc.
Stuart Brotman, Daniel Richer, for BNP Paribas
Sean Collins, Walker W. MacLeod, Natasha Rambaran, for Appian Capital Advisory LLP, 2729992 Ontario Corp., ANR Investments B.V. and AHG (Jersey) Limited
David Bish, for OMF Fund II SO Ltd., Orion Resource Partners (USA) LP and their affiliates
Orlando M. Rosa, Gordon P. Acton, for Netmizaaggamig Nishnaabeg First Nation (Pic Mobert First Nation)
Timothy Jones, for Attorney General of Ontario

Related Abridgment Classifications

Bankruptcy and insolvency
XIX Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act
 XIX.1 General principles
 XIX.1.e Jurisdiction
 XIX.1.e.i Court
Bankruptcy and insolvency
XIX Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act
 XIX.2 Initial application
 XIX.2.b Grant of stay
 XIX.2.b.vii Extension of order
Bankruptcy and insolvency
XIX Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act
 XIX.2 Initial application
 XIX.2.g Monitor

Headnote

Bankruptcy and insolvency --- Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act — General principles — Jurisdiction — Court
Company operated gold mine — Company encountered growing liquidity problem — Company developed plan to attract new capital through potential sale — No binding offers were received — Further sale and investment solicitation process led to two competing proposals from its primary secured creditors — One of creditors had winning bid and proposed purchase was structured as reverse vesting order — Company brought motion for orders approving creditor transaction, including reverse vesting order structure, extending stay and expanding monitor's powers — Motion granted — Section 11 of Companies Creditors

Arrangement Act clearly provided court with jurisdiction to issue reverse vesting order, provided discretion available under s. 11 of Act was exercised in accordance with objects and purposes of Act — Reverse vesting order should continue to be regarded as unusual or extraordinary measure and approval of such structure should involve close scrutiny — Reverse vesting order sought in instant case was in creditors' and stakeholders' interests — Order was appropriate as it would provide for timely, efficient and impartial resolution of company's insolvency; preserve and maximize value of company's assets; ensure fair and equitable treatment of claims against company; protect public interest; and balance costs and benefits of company's restructuring or liquidation.

Bankruptcy and insolvency --- Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act — Initial application — Grant of stay — Extension of order

Company operated gold mine — Company encountered growing liquidity problem — Company developed plan to attract new capital through potential sale — No binding offers were received — Further sale and investment solicitation process led to two competing proposals from its primary secured creditors — One of creditors had winning bid and proposed purchase was structured as reverse vesting order — Company brought motion for orders approving creditor transaction, including reverse vesting order structure, extending stay and expanding monitor's powers — Motion granted — Company was seeking to extend stay period to allow it to proceed with closing transaction, while at same time preserving status quo and preventing creditors and others from taking steps to try and better their positions — No creditors were expected to suffer material prejudice as result of extension of stay of proceedings.

Bankruptcy and insolvency --- Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act — Initial application — Monitor

Company operated gold mine — Company encountered growing liquidity problem — Company developed plan to attract new capital through potential sale — No binding offers were received — Further sale and investment solicitation process led to two competing proposals from its primary secured creditors — One of creditors had winning bid and proposed purchase was structured as reverse vesting order — Company brought motion for orders approving creditor transaction, including reverse vesting order structure, extending stay and expanding monitor's powers — Motion granted — Order for monitor's expanded powers was intended to provide monitor with power to administer affairs of new companies, established to complete transaction, along with powers necessary to wind down proceedings and put new companies into bankruptcy following close of transaction.

Table of Authorities

Cases considered by Penny J.:

Arrangement relatif à Nemaska Lithium inc. (2020), 2020 CarswellQue 10601, 2020 QCCS 3218 (Que. Bkcty.) — considered

Arrangement relatif à Nemaska Lithium inc. (2020), 2020 QCCA 1488, 2020 CarswellQue 11925 (C.A. Que.) — referred to
Lydian International Limited (Re) (2020), 2020 ONSC 4006, 2020 CarswellOnt 9768, 81 C.B.R. (6th) 218 (Ont. S.C.J. [Commercial List]) — followed

Plasco Energy, Re (July 17, 2015), Doc. Toronto CV-15-10869-00C (Ont. S.C.J. [Commercial List]) — considered

Quest University Canada (Re) (2020), 2020 BCSC 1883, 2020 CarswellBC 3091, 85 C.B.R. (6th) 41 (B.C. S.C.) — considered

Royal Bank v. Soundair Corp. (1991), 7 C.B.R. (3d) 1, 83 D.L.R. (4th) 76, 46 O.A.C. 321, 4 O.R. (3d) 1, 1991 CarswellOnt 205 (Ont. C.A.) — considered

Sino-Forest Corp., Re (2012), 2012 ONSC 4377, 2012 CarswellOnt 9430, 92 C.B.R. (5th) 99 (Ont. S.C.J. [Commercial List]) — referred to

Southern Star Developments Ltd. v. Quest University Canada (2020), 2020 BCCA 364, 2020 CarswellBC 3252, 85 C.B.R. (6th) 96 (B.C. C.A.) — referred to

Stelco Inc., Re (2006), 2006 CarswellOnt 863, 18 C.B.R. (5th) 173 (Ont. S.C.J. [Commercial List]) — referred to

Target Canada Co., Re (2015), 2015 ONSC 1487, 2015 CarswellOnt 3261, 23 C.B.R. (6th) 314 (Ont. S.C.J.) — referred to
Victor Cantore v. Nemaska Lithium Inc. (Formerly Nemaska Lithium Inc., Nemaska Lithium Whabouchi Mine Inc., Nemaska Lithium Shawinigan Transformation Inc., Nemaska Lithium Plp Inc. and Nemaska Lithium Innovation Inc.), et al. (2021), 2021 CarswellQue 4589, 2021 CarswellQue 4590 (S.C.C.) — referred to

9354-9186 Québec inc. v. Callidus Capital Corp. (2020), 2020 SCC 10, 2020 CSC 10, 2020 CarswellQue 3772, 2020 CarswellQue 3773, 78 C.B.R. (6th) 1, 444 D.L.R. (4th) 373, 1 B.L.R. (6th) 1 (S.C.C.) — followed

Statutes considered:

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

Generally — referred to

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

Generally — referred to

s. 168 — referred to

s. 168(1)(g) — referred to

s. 186(1) "reorganization" — referred to

s. 186(2) — referred to

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

Generally — referred to

s. 5.1(2) [en. 1997, c. 12, s. 122] — referred to

s. 6(2) — referred to

s. 6(8) — referred to

s. 11 — pursuant to

s. 11.02 [en. 2005, c. 47, s. 128] — referred to

s. 11.3 [en. 1997, c. 12, s. 124] — referred to

s. 11.3(4) [en. 2005, c. 47, s. 128] — referred to

s. 22(1) — referred to

s. 23(1)(k) — referred to

s. 36 — referred to

s. 36(1) — referred to

s. 36(3) — referred to

Penny J.:

1 This is a motion by Harte Gold for an approval and reverse vesting order involving the sale of Harte Gold's mining enterprise to a strategic purchaser (that is, an entity in the gold mining business) and for an order extending the stay and expanding the Monitor's powers to include new entities to be created for the purposes of implementing Harte Gold's proposed restructuring. There was no opposition to the relief sought. All those who appeared at the hearing supported approval of the transaction.

2 Following the conclusion of oral submissions on Friday, January 28, 2022, I issued the orders sought with written reasons to follow. These are the reasons.

Background

3 Harte Gold is a public company incorporated under the Business Corporations Act (Ontario). Prior to January 17, 2022, its shares publicly traded on the Toronto Stock Exchange, Frankfurt Stock Exchange and over-the-counter. Harte Gold operates a gold mine located in northern Ontario within the Sault Ste. Marie Mining Division and approximately 30 km north of the town

of White River. This mine, referred to as the Sugar Loaf Mine, produces gold bullion. Harte Gold has a total of 260 employees on payroll, as well as 19 employees retained through various agencies. Harte Gold's payroll obligations are current.

4 Of some importance to the form of transaction proposed in this case, involving an approval and reverse vesting order (RVO), is the fact that Harte Gold has 12 material permits and licenses that are required to maintain its mining operations, 24 active work permits and licenses that allow the performance of exploration work on various parts of the Sugar Loaf property and many other forest resource licenses, fire permits and the like, all necessary in one way or another to Harte Gold's continued operations. Harte Gold also has 513 mineral tenures, consisting of three freehold properties, seven leasehold properties, 468 mineral claims and 35 additional tenures. The transfer of these permits and licenses etc. would involve a complex transfer or new application process of indeterminate risk, delay and cost.

5 It is also important to note that Harte Gold is party to an Impact Benefits Agreement dated April 2018 between Harte Gold and Netmizaaggamig Nishnaabeg First Nation.

6 Harte Gold has two primary secured creditors. They are: a numbered company (833) owned by Silver Lake Resources Limited (an Australian gold mine company). 833 is a very recent assignee of significant secured debt from BNPP; and, AHG Jersey Limited (AHG is part of the Appian group). Appian entities are also counterparties to a number of offtake agreements under which Harte Gold sells gold in exchange for prices determined by a pricing formula tied to the London bullion market. Orion is, similarly, a counterparty to additional offtake agreements. BNPP, following the assignment of its secured debt, has retained additional obligations in respect of certain hedging arrangements provided to Harte Gold. Harte Gold also has a number of trade and other unsecured creditors who are owed an estimated \$7.5 million for pre-filing obligations and further amounts for services rendered post-filing.

7 At the time of its initial application to the court, Harte Gold's assets were valued at \$163.8 million. Its liabilities were valued at \$166.1 million. On a balance sheet basis, therefore, Harte Gold was insolvent.

8 Since about 2019, Harte Gold has been pursuing a number of measures to address a growing liquidity problem, a problem only exacerbated by the Covid-19 pandemic. Despite these efforts, in 2020 Harte Gold was obliged to seek agreement from its prime lender, BNPP, to defer debt payments and to seek a forbearance from enforcement of BNPP's security. In May 2021, Harte Gold initiated a strategic review of options to achieve the desired liquidity and to fund the acquisition of new capital. Harte Gold appointed a strategic committee of its board and, shortly thereafter, a special committee of independent directors. The special committee retained FTI as financial advisor (FTI was subsequently appointed Monitor by this Court) and developed a plan to attract new capital through a potential sale.

9 This pre-filing strategic process involved approaching over 250 potential buyers. 31 of these entities executed confidentiality agreements; 28 of those conducted due diligence through Harte Gold's virtual data room. Harte Gold received four nonbinding expressions of interest but, by the bid deadline in September 2021, no binding offers had been received.

10 In the aftermath of this unsuccessful process, Silver Lake through 833 acquired BNPP's debt and advanced a proposal to acquire Harte Gold's operations by way of a credit bid and to provide interim financing in connection with any proceedings under the CCAA. An initial order under the CCAA issued from this Court on December 7, 2021.

11 In the midst of this process, Harte Gold received a competing proposal to make a credit bid from Harte Gold's second secured creditor, Appian. As a result of these developments, Harte Gold resolved to conduct a further (albeit brief, given the extensive process that had just been completed) sale and investment solicitation process, this time with a stalking horse bid. Further competing proposals took place between Silver Lake and Appian over who would be the stalking horse bidder. As a result of this process, the stalking horse bid of Silver Lake was significantly improved. Appian was then content to let Silver Lake's credit bid form the basis of the SISP. I approved this process in an order dated December 20, 2021.

12 The Monitor provided a new solicitation notice to a total of 48 known and previously unknown potential bidders (other than Silver Lake and Appian). None of the potentially interested parties signed a confidentiality agreement or requested access to the data room.

13 Only one competing bid was received — a further credit bid from Appian with improved conditions over those proposed by Silver Lake. Ultimately, all parties agreed that the responding commitment from Silver Lake which was at least as favourable to stakeholders as the Appian bid would be, in effect, the prevailing and winning bid.

14 This took the form of a Second Amended and Restated Subscription Agreement (SARSA) with 833, the actual purchaser. The improved terms were: (a) the assumption by the purchaser of Harte Gold's office lease at 161 Bay Street in Toronto; (b)(i) the proviso that the \$10 million cap on payment of cure costs and pre-filing trade creditors does not apply to the assumption of post-filing trade creditor obligations; and (ii) all amounts owing by Harte Gold to any of the Appian parties are subject to a settlement agreement between 833 Ontario, Silver Lake and Appian and excluded from the pre-filing cure costs; and, (c) the undertaking to pay an additional cash deposit of US\$1,693,658.72, equivalent to approximately 5% of the Appian indebtedness.

15 In broad brush terms, the Silver Lake/833 purchase is structured as a reverse vesting order. The transaction will involve:

- the cancellation of all Harte Gold shares and the issue of new shares to the purchaser
- payment by the purchaser of all secured debt
- payment by the purchaser of virtually all pre-filing trade amounts (estimated at \$7.5 million but with a \$10 million cap) and post-filing trade amounts
- certain excluded contracts and liabilities being assigned to newly formed companies which will, ultimately, be put into bankruptcy. The excluded contracts and liabilities include a number of agreements involving ongoing or future services in respect of which there is little if any money currently owed. They also include a number of contracts with Appian entities and Orion, both of which support approval of the transaction. The employment contracts of four terminated executives will, however, be excluded liabilities, which will nullify the value of any termination claims. Notably, excluded liabilities does not include regulatory or environmental liabilities to any government authority
- retaining on the payroll all but four employees (the four members of the executive team whose employment contracts will be terminated), and
- releases, including of Harte Gold and its directors and officers, the Monitor and its legal counsel and Silver Lake and its directors and officers.

There is no provision for any break fee. Nor is there a request for any form of sealing order.

16 I should add that the value of what the purchaser is paying for Harte Gold's business, including the secured debt, the pre and post-filing trade amounts, interim financing and the like, totals well over \$160 million.

Issues

17 There are three principal issues:

- (1) Whether the proposed transaction should be approved, including the reverse vesting order transaction structure and the form of the proposed release;
- (2) Whether the stay should be extended; and,
- (3) Whether the Monitor's mandate should be extended to include additional companies (newcos) being incorporated for the purposes of executing the proposed transaction.

Analysis

18 Section 11 of the CCAA confers jurisdiction on the Court in the broadest of terms: "the court, on the application of any person interested in the matter, may, subject to the restrictions set out in this Act, on notice to any other person or without notice as it may see fit, make any order that it considers appropriate in the circumstances".

19 Section 36(1) of the CCAA provides:

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

20 Section 36(3) of the CCAA provides a non-exhaustive list of factors to be considered on a motion to approve a sale. These include:

- (a) whether the process leading to the proposed sale or disposition was reasonable in the circumstances;
- (b) whether the monitor approved the process leading to the proposed sale or disposition;
- (c) whether the monitor filed with the court a report stating that in their opinion the sale or disposition would be more beneficial to the creditors than a sale or disposition under a bankruptcy;
- (d) the extent to which the creditors were consulted;
- (e) the effects of the proposed sale or disposition on the creditors and other interested parties; and
- (f) whether the consideration to be received for the assets is reasonable and fair, taking into account their market value.

21 The s. 36(3) criteria largely correspond to the principles articulated in *Royal Bank v. Soundair Corp*^{1991 CanLII 2727 (ONCA)} for the approval of the sale of assets in an insolvency scenario:

- (a) whether sufficient effort has been made to obtain the best price and that the debtor has not acted improvidently;
- (b) the interests of all parties;
- (c) the efficacy and integrity of the process by which offers have been obtained; and
- (d) whether there has been unfairness in the working out of the process:

see *Target Canada Co. (Re)*, 2015 ONSC 1487, at paras. 14-17.

22 The purchase transaction for which approval is being sought in this case does not provide for a sale of assets but, rather, provides for a "reverse vesting order" under which the purchaser will become the sole shareholder of Harte Gold and certain excluded assets, excluded contracts and excluded liabilities will be vested out to new companies incorporated for that purpose.

23 In determining whether the transaction should be approved and the RVO granted, it is appropriate to consider:

- (a) the statutory basis for a reverse vesting order and whether a reverse vesting order is appropriate in the circumstances; and,
- (b) the factors outlined in s. 36(3) of the CCAA, making provision or adjustment, as appropriate, for the unique aspects of a reverse vesting transaction.

The Statutory Basis (Jurisdiction) for a Reverse Vesting Order

24 The first reverse vesting sale transaction appears to have been approved by this Court in *Plasco Energy (Re)*, (July 17, 2015), CV-15-10869-00CL in the handwritten endorsement of Justice Wilton-Siegel. The use of the reverse vesting order structure was not in dispute (indeed, in most of the cases, reported and otherwise, there has been no dispute). Wilton-Siegel J. found "the Court has authority under section 11 of the CCAA to authorize such transactions notwithstanding that the applicants are not proceeding under s. 6(2) of the CCAA insofar as it is not contemplated that the applicants will propose a plan of arrangement or compromise."

25 A few dozen of these orders have been made since that time, mostly in a context where there was no opposition and no obvious or identified unfairness arising from the use of the RVO structure. The frequency of applications based on court approval of an RVO structure has increased significantly in the past few years.

26 More recently, two reverse vesting orders have been approved in contested cases and been considered by appellate courts in Canada. I cite these two cases in particular because, being opposed and appealed, there tends to be a more in-depth analysis of the issues than is usually the case in the context of unopposed orders.

27 In *Arrangement relatif à Nemaska Lithium Inc.*, 2020 QCCS 3218, at paras. 52 and 71 (leave to appeal to QCCA refused, *Arrangement relatif à Nemaska Lithium Inc.*, 2020 QCCA 1488; leave to appeal to SCC refused, *Arrangement relatif à Nemaska Lithium Inc.*, 2021 CarswellQue 4589), Justice Gouin of the Quebec Superior Court approved a reverse vesting transaction in the face of opposition by a creditor. Following a nine day hearing, Gouin J. reviewed the context of the transaction in detail and carefully analyzed the purpose and efficiency of the RVO in maintaining the going concern operations of the debtor companies. He also found that the approval of the RVO should be considered under s. 36 CCAA, subject to determining, for example:

- Whether sufficient efforts to get the best price have been made and whether the parties acted providently
- The efficacy and integrity of the process followed
- The interests of the parties, and
- Whether any unfairness resulted from the process.

Gouin J. considered that these criteria had been met and found the issuance of the RVO to be a valid exercise of his discretion, concluding that it would serve to maximize creditor recoveries while maintaining the debtor companies as a going concern and allowing an efficient transfer of the necessary permits, licences and authorizations to the purchaser.

28 In denying leave to appeal, the Quebec Court of Appeal noted that the CCAA judge found that "the terms 'sell or otherwise dispose of assets outside the ordinary course of business' under subsection 36(1) of the CCAA should be broadly interpreted to allow a CCAA judge to grant innovative solutions such as RVOs on a case by case basis, in accordance with the wide discretionary powers afforded the supervising judge pursuant to section 11 CCAA, as recognized by the Supreme Court in *Callidus*": *Nemaska QCCA* at para 19.

29 Similarly, in *Quest University Canada (Re)*, 2020 BCSC 1883, Justice Fitzpatrick of the British Columbia Supreme Court extensively reviewed the caselaw related to a CCAA court's authority to grant a reverse vesting order. Fitzpatrick J. found that the CCAA provided sufficient authority to grant the reverse vesting order being sought, which was consistent "with the remedial purposes of the CCAA" and consistent with the Supreme Court of Canada's ruling on CCAA jurisdiction in *9354-9186 Québec Inc. v. Callidus Capital Corp.*, 2020 SCC 10. She found, therefore, that the issue in each case is not whether the court has sufficient jurisdiction but whether the relief is "appropriate" in the circumstances and stakeholders are treated as fairly and reasonably as the circumstances permit.

30 In *Quest*, the debtor was in the process of putting forward a plan of compromise under the CCAA. It encountered resistance from an unsecured creditor whose vote could potentially have prevented the necessary creditor approval of the plan. The debtor revised its approach, deleting all conditions precedent requiring creditor and court approval and proceeded with a motion for

the approval of an RVO to achieve what it was really after; that is, a sale of certain assets to a new owner with Quest continuing as a going concern academic institution.

31 Fitzpatrick J. relied on *Callidus* to the effect that:

- Courts have long recognized that s. 11 of the CCAA signals legislative endorsement of the "broad reading of CCAA authority developed by the jurisprudence". On the plain wording of the provision, the jurisdiction granted by s. 11 is constrained only by restrictions set out in the CCAA itself, and the requirement that the order made be "appropriate in the circumstances"
- the CCAA generally prioritizes "avoiding the social and economic losses resulting from liquidation of an insolvent company"
- Where a party seeks an order relating to a matter that falls within the supervising judge's purview, and for which there is no CCAA provision conferring more specific jurisdiction, s. 11 necessarily is the provision of first resort in anchoring jurisdiction. As Blair J.A. put it in *Stelco*, s. 11 "for the most part supplants the need to resort to inherent jurisdiction" in the CCAA context
- The exercise of the discretion under s. 11 must further the remedial objectives of the CCAA and be guided by the baseline considerations of appropriateness, good faith, and due diligence
- Whether this discretion ought to be exercised in a particular case is a circumstance-specific inquiry that must balance the various objectives of the CCAA. The supervising judge is best positioned to undertake this inquiry.

32 The SCC in *Callidus* made an important point in the context of the limits of broad discretion; all discretion has limits and its exercise under s. 11 must accord with the objectives of the CCAA and other insolvency legislation in Canada. These objectives include: providing for timely, efficient and impartial resolution of a debtor's insolvency; preserving and maximizing the value of a debtor's assets; ensuring fair and equitable treatment of the claims against a debtor; protecting the public interest; and, in the context of a commercial insolvency, balancing the costs and benefits of restructuring or liquidating the company. Further, the discretion under s. 11 must also be exercised in furtherance of three baseline considerations: (a) that the order sought is appropriate in the circumstances, and (b) that the applicant has been acting in good faith and (c) with due diligence.

33 Ultimately, Fitzpatrick J. held that, in the complex and unique circumstances of that case, it was appropriate to exercise her discretion to allow the RVO structure. Quest sought this relief in good faith and while acting with due diligence to promote the best outcome for all stakeholders. She considered the balance between the competing interests at play and concluded that the proposed transaction was unquestionably the fairest and most reasonable means by which the greatest benefit can be achieved for the overall stakeholder group.

34 The British Columbia Court of Appeal refused leave to appeal, concluding that the appeal was not "meritorious", also noting that reverse vesting orders had been granted in other contested proceedings, namely *Nemaska*. The BCCA also stated that the reverse vesting order granted by Fitzpatrick J. "reflect[ed] precisely the type of intricate, fact-specific, real-time decision making that inheres in judges supervising CCAA proceedings": *Southern Star Developments Ltd. v. Quest University Canada*, 2020 BCCA 364.

35 It is worthy of note that, in both *Nemaska* and *Quest*, the *bona fides* of the objectors were front and centre in the judicial analysis and, in both cases, the motivations and objectives of the objectors were found suspect and inadequate.

36 The jurisdiction of the court to issue an RVO is frequently said to arise from s. 11 and s. 36(1) of the CCAA. However, the structure of the transaction employing an RVO typically does not involve the debtor 'selling or otherwise disposing of assets outside the ordinary course of business', as provided in s. 36(1). This is because the RVO structure is really a purchase of shares of the debtor and "vesting out" from the debtor to a new company, of unwanted assets, obligations and liabilities.

37 I am, therefore, not sure I agree with the analysis which finds jurisdiction to issue an RVO in s. 36(1). But that can be left for another day because I am wholeheartedly in agreement that s. 11, as broadly interpreted in the jurisprudence including, most recently, *Callidus*, clearly provides the court with jurisdiction to issue such an order, provided the discretion available under s. 11 is exercised in accordance with the objects and purposes of the CCAA. And it is for this reason that I also wholeheartedly agree that the analytical framework of s. 36(3) for considering an asset sale transaction, even though s. 36 may not support a standalone basis for jurisdiction in an RVO situation, should be applied, with necessary modifications, to an RVO transaction.

38 Given this context, however, I think it would be wrong to regard employment of the RVO structure in an insolvency situation as the "norm" or something that is routine or ordinary course. Neither the BIA nor the CCAA deal specifically with the use or application of an RVO structure. The judicial authorities approving this approach, while there are now quite a few, do not generally provide much guidance on the positive and negative implications of this restructuring technique or what to look out for. Broader-based commentary and discussion is only now just now starting to emerge. This suggests to me that the RVO should continue to be regarded as an unusual or extraordinary measure; not an approach appropriate in any case merely because it may be more convenient or beneficial for the purchaser. Approval of the use of an RVO structure should, therefore, involve close scrutiny. The Monitor and the court must be diligent in ensuring that the restructuring is fair and reasonable to all parties having regard to the objectives and statutory constraints of the CCAA. This is particularly the case where there is no party with a significant stake in the outcome opposing the use of an RVO structure. The debtor, the purchaser and especially the Monitor, as the court appointed officer overseeing the process and answerable to the court (and in addition to all the usual enquiries and reporting obligations), must be prepared to answer questions such as:

- (a) Why is the RVO necessary in this case?
- (b) Does the RVO structure produce an economic result at least as favourable as any other viable alternative?
- (c) Is any stakeholder worse off under the RVO structure than they would have been under any other viable alternative? and
- (d) Does the consideration being paid for the debtor's business reflect the importance and value of the licences and permits (or other intangible assets) being preserved under the RVO structure?

39 With this in mind, I will turn to the enumerated s. 36(3) factors. To the extent there are RVO specific issues of concern apart from those enumerated in s. 36(3), I will also address those in the following section of my analysis.

The Section 36 Factors in the RVO Context

Reasonableness of the Process Leading to the Proposed Sale

40 Between the pre-filing strategic review process and the court approved SISF, the business and assets of Harte Gold have been extensively marketed on a global basis. While the SISF was subject to variation from the format contemplated in my earlier order, the ability of the applicant, in conjunction with the Monitor, to vary the process was already established in that order. I find, in any event, that the adjustments made were appropriate in the circumstances, given there were no new bidders and the only offers came from the two competing secured creditors who had already been extensively involved in the process and whose status, interests and objectives were well known to the applicant and the Monitor.

41 Prior to its appointment as Monitor, FTI was intimately involved at all stages of the strategic review process, including the implementation of the pre-filing marketing process and the negotiation of the original proposed subscription agreement that was executed prior to the commencement of the CCAA proceedings and subsequently replaced by the stalking horse bid and the SARSA.

42 Following the commencement of the CCAA proceedings, the Monitor was involved in the negotiations that resulted in the execution of the stalking horse bid and the SARSA. In addition, the Monitor has overseen the implementation of the SISF and is satisfied that it was carried out in accordance with the SISF procedures, including the Monitor's consent to the amendment of the SISF procedures to cancel the auction as unnecessary and accept the SARSA as the best option available.

43 The Monitor's opinion is that the process was reasonable, leading to the best outcome reasonably available in the circumstances.

44 I am satisfied that the sales process was reasonable. The transaction now before the Court was the culmination of approximately seven months of extensive solicitation efforts on the part of both Harte Gold and FTI as part of the profiling strategic process and the SISP.

45 Harte Gold and FTI broadly canvassed the market by contacting 241 parties regarding their potential interest in acquiring Harte Gold's business and assets. This process ultimately culminated in initial competing bids from Silver Lake and Appian and, subsequently, additional competing bids from both entities as part of the SISP. The competitive tension in this process resulted in material improvements for stakeholders on both occasions.

Comparison with Sale in Bankruptcy

46 The Monitor has considered whether the completion of the transaction contemplated by the SARSA would be more beneficial to creditors of the applicant and stakeholders generally than a sale or disposition of the business and assets of Harte Gold under a bankruptcy. The Monitor is unambiguously of the view that the SARSA transaction is the vastly more beneficial option.

47 The SISP has shown that the SARSA represents the highest and best offer available for Harte Gold's business and assets. The Monitor is satisfied that the approval and completion of the transactions contemplated by the SARSA are in the best interests of the creditors of Harte Gold and its stakeholders generally.

48 In addition to anything else, a bankruptcy would jeopardize ongoing operations and the permits and licences necessary to maintain such operations. A sale in bankruptcy would delay and, again, jeopardize the approval and closing of the proposed transaction as it would be necessary to first assign Harte Gold into bankruptcy or obtain a bankruptcy order, convene a meeting of creditors, appoint inspectors and obtain the approval of the inspectors for the transaction prior to seeking a more traditional AVO or an RVO. Additional costs would also be incurred in undertaking those steps. Silver Lake would have to continue to advance additional funds to finance ongoing operations during this extended period. There is no indication it would be willing to do so. In any event, requiring such a process would fundamentally change the value proposition the purchaser has relied upon and is willing to accept.

49 Taking all this into account, a sale or disposition of the business and assets of the applicant in a bankruptcy would almost certainly result in a lower recovery for stakeholders and would not be more beneficial than closing the RVO transaction in the CCAA proceedings.

Consultation with Creditors

50 Harte Gold's major creditors are Silver Lake, the Appian parties and BNPP. BNPP still has potential claims of approximately \$28 million in respect of its hedge agreements. Silver Lake has claims of approximately \$95 million in respect of the DIP facility and the first lien credit facilities it acquired from BNPP. The Appian parties have claims of approximately US\$34 million in respect of amounts owing under the Appian facility and additional potential claims in respect of obligations under royalty and offtake agreements.

51 BNPP was consulted throughout the strategic review process and has executed a support agreement with the purchaser. In addition, as previously described, the purchaser and the Appian Parties have been extensively involved in the SISP.

52 While there is no evidence of consultations with unsecured creditors, I do not regard that as a material deficiency given that virtually all creditors, secured and unsecured alike, are going to be paid in full under the terms of the SARSA.

53 The Monitor is of the view that the degree of creditor consultation has been appropriate in the circumstances. The Monitor does not consider that any material change in the outcome of efforts to sell the business and assets of the Applicant would have resulted from additional creditor consultation.

54 I find, on the evidence, that the Monitor's assessment of this factor is well supported and correct.

The Effect of the Proposed Sale on Creditors and Other Interested Parties

55 The proposed transaction affords the following benefits to the creditors and to stakeholders generally:

- (a) the retention and payment in full of the claims of almost all creditors of Harte Gold;
- (b) continued employment for all except four of the Harte Gold's employees;
- (c) ongoing business opportunities for suppliers of goods and services to the Sugar Loaf Mine; and
- (d) the continuation of the benefits of the existing Impact Benefits Agreement with Netmizaaggamig Nishnaabeg First Nation.

56 The Monitor's opinion is that the effect of the proposed transaction is overwhelming positive for the vast majority of Harte Gold's creditors and other stakeholders apart (as discussed below) from the shareholders who have no reasonable economic interest at this point.

57 Unlike *Quest*, this is not a case in which the RVO is being used to thwart creditor opposition. Indeed, the evidence is that almost all creditors, secured and unsecured, will be paid in full. To the extent there might be concerns that an RVO structure could be used to thwart creditor democracy and voting rights, those concerns are not present here. This is not a traditional "compromise" situation. It is hard to see how anything would change under a creditor class vote scenario because almost all of the creditors are being paid in full.

58 The evidence is that there is no creditor being placed in a worse position, because of the use of an RVO transaction structure, than they would have been in under a more traditional asset sale and AVO structure (or, for that matter, under any plausible plan of compromise).

59 Because the transaction contemplates the cancellation of all existing shares and related rights in Harte Gold and the issue of new shares to the purchaser, the existing shareholders of Harte Gold will receive no recovery on their investment. Being a public company, Harte Gold has issued material change notices as the events described above were unfolding. By the time of the commencement of the CCAA proceedings, the shareholders had been advised in no uncertain terms that there was no prospect of shareholders realizing any value for their equity investment.

60 The evidence of Harte's financial problems and balance sheet insolvency, the unsuccessful pre-filing strategic review process, and the hard reality that the only parties willing to bid anything for Harte Gold were the holders of secured debt (and only for, effectively, the value of the secured debt plus carrying and process costs) only serves to emphasize that equity holders will not see, and on any other realistic scenario would not see, any recovery of their equity investment in Harte Gold.

61 Under s. 186(1) of the OBCA, "reorganization" includes a court order made under the *Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act* or an order made under the *Companies Creditors Arrangement Act* approving a proposal. While the term "proposal" is unfortunate (because there are no formal "proposals" under the CCAA), I view the use of this term in the non-technical sense of the word; that is, as encompassing any proposal such as the proposed transaction brought forward for the approval of the Court under the provisions of the CCAA in this case.

62 Section 186(2) of the OBCA provides that if a corporation is subject to a reorganization, its articles may be amended by the court order to effect any change that might lawfully be made by an amendment under s. 168. Section 168(1)(g) provides

that a corporation may from time to time amend its articles to add, change or remove any provision that is set out in its articles, including to change the designation of all or any of its shares, and add, change or remove any rights, privileges, restrictions and conditions, including rights to accrued dividends, in respect of all or any of its shares. This provides the jurisdiction of the court to approve the cancellation of all outstanding shares and the issuance of new shares to the purchaser.

63 Section 36(1) of the CCAA contemplates that despite any requirement for shareholder approval, the court may authorize a sale or disposition out of the ordinary course even if shareholder approval is not obtained. While, again, s. 36(1) is concerned with asset sales, the underlying logic of this provision applies to an assessment of cancellation of shares as well. In this case, there is no prospect of shareholder recovery on any realistic scenario.

64 Equity claims are subject to special treatment under the CCAA. Section 6(8) prohibits court approval of a plan of compromise if any equity is to be paid before payment in full of all claims that are not equity claims. Section 22(1) provides that equity claimants are prohibited from voting on a plan unless the court orders otherwise. In short, shareholders have no economic interest in an insolvent enterprise: *Sino-Forest Corporation (Re)*, 2012 ONSC 4377, paras. 23-29. In circumstances like Harte Gold's, where the shareholders have no economic interest, present or future, it would be unnecessary and, indeed, inappropriate to require a vote of the shareholders: *Stelco Inc. (Re)*, 2006 CanLII 4500 at para. 11. The order requested for the cancellation of existing shares is, for these reasons, justified in the circumstances.

65 Taking all this into account, I find that the effect of the transaction on creditors and stakeholders is overwhelmingly positive and the best outcome reasonably available in the circumstances.

Fairness of Consideration

66 Harte Gold's business and assets have been extensively marketed both prior to and during the CCAA proceedings. At the conclusion of the SISP, two bids were available, which were equivalent in all material respects and represented the highest and best offers received. As described earlier, all parties concurred that the Silver Lake-sponsored SARSA should be determined to be the successful bid. As also described above, the closing of the SARSA transaction will provide a vastly superior recovery for creditors than would a liquidation of Harte Gold's assets in bankruptcy. Based on the market, therefore, the consideration must be considered fair and reasonable.¹

67 A further concern with an RVO transaction structure such as this one could be whether, in effect, a purchaser making a credit bid might be getting something (i.e., the licences and permits) for nothing (i.e., the licences and permits were not subject to the creditor's security). It is possible that in a bankruptcy, for example, the licences and permits might have no value. The evidence here is that the purchaser is paying more than Harte Gold would be worth in a bankruptcy. The evidence is also that the purchaser is paying considerably more than just the value of the secured debt. This includes cure costs for third party trade creditors and DIP financing to keep the Mine operational — both payments being made to bring about the acquisition of the Mine as a going concern.

68 It is true that no attempt has been made to put an independent value on the transfer of the licences and permits. However, any strategic buyer (Silver Lake is a strategic buyer and acquired the BNPP debt for this purpose) would need the licences and permits. The results of the pre-filing strategic process and the SISP constitutes evidence that no one else among the universe of potential purchasers of an operating gold mine in Northern Ontario was willing to pay more than Silver Lake was willing to pay. In the circumstances, I do not think it could be seriously suggested that Silver Lake is getting "something" for "nothing".

69 The Monitor is satisfied that the consideration is fair in the circumstances. I agree with the Monitor's assessment for the reasons outlined above.

Other Considerations Re Appropriateness of RVO vs. AVO

70 As noted, Harte Gold has twelve material permits and licenses that are required to maintain its mining operations, as well as twenty-four active work permits and licenses that allow the performance of exploration work and many other forest resource licences and fire permits.

71 The principal objective and benefit of employing the RVO approach in this case is the preservation of Harte Gold's many permits and licences necessary to conduct operations at the Sugar Loaf Mine. Under a traditional asset sale and AVO structure, the purchaser would have to apply to the various agencies and regulatory authorities for transfers of existing licences and permits or, if transfers are not possible, for new licences and permits. This is a process that would necessarily involve risk, delay, and cost. The RVO sought in this case achieves the timely and efficient preservation of the necessary licences and permits necessary for the operations of the Mine.

72 It is no secret that time is not on the side of a debtor company faced with Harte Gold's financial challenges. It is also relevant that the purchaser has agreed to provide DIP financing up to \$10.8 million and substantial cure costs of pre and post filing trade obligations. This is all financing required to be able to continue operations as a going concern at the Mine post closing and to fund the CCAA process.

73 The position of the purchaser is, not unreasonably, that it will not *both* continue to fund ongoing operations and the CCAA process *and* undertake a process of application to relevant government agencies for transfers of the Harte Gold licenses and permits (or, if necessary, for new ones) with all of the risks and uncertainties of possible adverse outcomes and indeterminant delays and costs associated with such a process. The RVO structure will enable the transaction to be completed efficiently and expeditiously, without exposure to these material risks, delays and costs.

74 The Monitor supports the use of the RVO transaction structure. The Monitor has also pointed out that the applicant holds some 513 mineral tenures, consisting of three freehold properties, seven leasehold properties, 468 mineral claims and 35 additional tenures. The reverse vesting structure avoids the need to amend the various registrations to reflect a new owner, which would add more cost and delay if the proposed purchase transaction was to proceed through a traditional asset purchase and vesting order.

75 In addition, Harte Gold has a significant number of contracts that will be retained under the SARSA. Again, the RVO transaction structure will avoid potentially significant delays and costs associated with having to seek consent to assignment from contract counter-parties or, if consents could not be obtained, orders assigning such contracts under s. 11.3 of the CCAA. The Monitor has also pointed out that under the SARSA and the RVO, the purchaser will be required to pay applicable cure costs in respect of the retained contracts which has been structured in substantially the same manner as contemplated by s. 11.3(4) of the CCAA if a contract was assigned by court order.

76 For all these reasons, I accept that the proposed RVO transaction structure is necessary to achieve the clear benefits of the Silver Lake purchase and that it is appropriate to approve this transaction in the circumstances.

Conclusion on RVO/Section 36 Issues

77 In all the circumstances, I find that the RVO sought in the circumstances of this case is in the interests of the creditors and stakeholders in general. I consider the RVO to be appropriate in the circumstances. The RVO will: provide for timely, efficient and impartial resolution of Harte Gold's insolvency; preserve and maximize the value of Harte Gold's assets; ensure a fair and equitable treatment of the claims against Harte Gold; protect the public interest (in the sense of preserving employment for well over 250 employees as well as numerous third party suppliers and service providers and maintaining Harte Gold's commitments to the First Nations peoples of the area); and, balances the costs and benefits of Harte Gold's restructuring or liquidation.

Release

78 Harte Gold seeks a Release which includes the present and former directors and officers of Harte Gold and the newcos, the Monitor and its legal counsel, and the purchaser and its directors, and officers. The proposed Release covers all present and future claims against the released parties based upon any fact, matter of occurrence in respect of the SARSA transactions or Harte Gold and its assets, business or affairs, except any claim for fraud or willful misconduct or any claim that is not permitted to be released under s. 5.1(2) of the CCAA.

79 CCAA courts have frequently approved releases, both in the context of a plan and in the absence of a CCAA plan, both on consent and in contested matters. These releases have been in favour of the parties, directors, officers, monitors, counsel, employees, shareholders and advisors.

80 I find that the requested Release is reasonable and appropriate in the circumstances. I base my decision on an assessment of following factors taken from *Lydian International Limited (Re)*, 2020 ONSC 4006 at para. 54. As is often the case in the exercise of discretionary powers, it is not necessary for each of the factors to apply for the release to be approved.

81 *Whether the claims to be released are rationally connected to the purpose of the restructuring:* The claims released are rationally connected to Harte Gold's restructuring. The Release will have the effect of diminishing claims against the released parties, which in turn will diminish indemnification claims by the released parties against the Administration Charge and the Directors' Charge. The result is a larger pool of cash available to satisfy creditor claims. Given that a purpose of a CCAA proceeding is to maximize creditor recovery, a release that helps achieve this goal is rationally connected to the purpose of the Company's restructuring.

82 *Whether the releasees contributed to the restructuring:* The released parties made significant contributions to Harte Gold's restructuring, both prior to and throughout these CCAA Proceedings. Among other things, the extensive efforts of the directors and management of Harte Gold were instrumental in the conduct of the prefiling strategic process, the SISF and the continued operations of Harte Gold during the CCAA proceedings. With a proposed sale that will maintain Harte Gold as a going concern and permit most creditors to receive recovery in full, these CCAA proceedings have had what must be considered a "successful" outcome for the benefit of Harte Gold's stakeholders. The released parties have clearly contributed time, energy and resources to achieve this outcome and accordingly, are deserving of a release.

83 *Whether the Release is fair, reasonable and not overly broad:* The Release is fair and reasonable. Harte Gold is unaware of any outstanding director claims or liabilities against its directors and officers. Similarly, Harte Gold is unaware of any claims against the advisors related to their provision of services to Harte Gold or to the purchaser relating to Harte Gold or these CCAA proceedings. As such, the Release is not expected to materially prejudice any stakeholders. Further, the Release is sufficiently narrow. Regulatory or environmental liabilities owed to any government authority have not been disclaimed and the language of the Release was specifically negotiated with the Ministry of Northern Development and Mines to preserve those identified obligations. Further, the Release carves out and preserves claims that are not permitted to be released pursuant to s. 5.1(2) of the CCAA and claims arising from fraud or wilful misconduct. The scope of the Release is sufficiently balanced and will allow Harte Gold and the released parties to move forward with the transaction and to conclude these CCAA proceedings.

84 *Whether the restructuring could succeed without the Release:* The Release is being sought, with the support of Silver Lake and the Appian parties (the most significant stakeholders in these CCAA proceedings) as it will enhance the certainty and finality of the transaction. Additionally, Harte Gold and the purchaser both take the position that the Release is an essential component to the transaction.

85 *Whether the Release benefits Harte Gold as well as the creditors generally:* The Release benefits Harte Gold and its creditors and other stakeholders by reducing the potential for the released parties to seek indemnification, thus minimizing further claims against the Administration Charge and the Directors' Charge.

86 *Creditors' knowledge of the nature and effect of the Release:* All creditors on the service list were served with materials relating to this motion. Harte Gold also made additional efforts to serve all parties with excluded claims under the transaction. Additionally, the form of the Release was included in the draft approval and reverse vesting order that was included in the original Application Record in these CCAA proceedings. All of this provided stakeholders with ample notice and time to raise concerns with Harte Gold or the Monitor. No creditor (or any other stakeholder) has objected to the Release. A specific claims process for claims against the released parties in these circumstances would only result in additional costs and delay without any apparent corresponding benefit.

Extension of the Stay

87 The current stay period expires on January 31, 2022. Under s. 11.02 of the CCAA, the court may grant an extension of a stay of proceedings where: (a) circumstances exist that make the order appropriate; and (b) the debtor company satisfies the court that it has acted, and is acting, in good faith and with due diligence.

88 Harte Gold is seeking to extend the stay period to and including March 29, 2022 to allow it to proceed with the closing of the Silver Lake transaction, while at the same time preserving the status quo and preventing creditors and others from taking any steps to try and better their positions in comparison to other creditors.

89 No creditors are expected to suffer material prejudice as a result of the extension of the stay of proceedings. Harte Gold is acting in good faith and will continue to pay its post-filing obligations in the ordinary course. As detailed in Harte Gold's cash flow forecast, it is expected to have sufficient liquidity to continue its operations during the contemplated extension of the stay.

90 For these reasons the stay is extended to March 29, 2022.

Expansion of Monitor's Powers

91 The CCAA provides the Court with broad discretion in respect of the Monitor's functions. Section 23(1)(k) of the CCAA provides that the Monitor can "carry out any other functions in relation to the [debtor] company that the court may direct". In addition, of course, s. 11 of the CCAA authorizes this Court to make any order that is necessary and appropriate in the circumstances.

92 The order for the Monitor's expanded powers is intended to provide the Monitor with the power, effective upon the issuance of the approval and reverse vesting order, to administer the affairs of the newcos (which is necessary to complete the transaction), along with powers necessary to wind down these CCAA proceedings and to put the newcos into bankruptcy following the close of the transaction. No creditor is prejudiced by the expansion of the Monitor's powers to facilitate the transaction and the wind-down of the CCAA proceedings. On the contrary, the granting of such powers is necessary to achieve the benefits of the transaction to stakeholders which have been described above.

93 I approve the grant of the requested powers to the Monitor.

Conclusion

94 For all these reasons, the motion for an order approving the Silver Lake transaction, including the RVO structure, is granted. The additional requests for orders extending the stay and expanding the Monitor's powers are also granted.

Motion granted.

Footnotes

- 1 The total value of the consideration is, perhaps coincidentally, also roughly equivalent to the value of Harte Gold's assets as shown in its audited financial statements in the last full year prior to the commencement of these proceedings.

TAB 4

CITATION: Re Nortel Networks Corporation et al, 2014 ONSC 4777
COURT FILE NO.: 09-CL-7950
DATE: 20140819

**SUPERIOR COURT OF JUSTICE – ONTARIO
COMMERCIAL LIST**

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

**AND IN THE MATTER OF A PLAN OF COMPROMISE OR
ARRANGEMENT OF NORTEL NETWORKS CORPORATION, NORTEL
NETWORKS LIMITED, NORTEL NETWORKS GLOBAL
CORPORATION, NORTEL NETWORKS INTERNATIONAL
CORPORATION and NORTEL NETWORKS TECHNOLOGY
CORPORATION**

**APPLICATION UNDER THE COMPANIES' CREDITORS
ARRANGEMENT ACT, R.S.C. 1985, c. C-36, AS AMENDED**

BEFORE: Newbould J.

COUNSEL: *Benjamin Zarnett and Graham Smith*, for the Monitor and Canadian Debtors

Ken Rosenberg, for the Canadian Creditors' Committee

Michael Barrack, D.J. Miller and Michael Shakra, for the UK Pension Claimants

Tracy Wynne, for EMEA Debtors

Kenneth Kraft, for the Wilmington Trust, National Association

Richard Swan, Gavin Finlayson and Kevin Zych, for the Ad Hoc Group of Bondholders

Shayne Kukulowicz, for the US Unsecured Creditors' Committee

John D. Marshall, for Law Debenture Trust Company of New York

Brett Harrison, for Bank of New York Mellon

Andrew Gray and Scott Bomhof, for the US Debtors

HEARD: July 25, 2014

ENDORSEMENT

[1] Nortel Networks Corporation ("NNC") and other Canadian debtors filed for and were granted protection under the *Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act*, R.S.C. 1985, c. c-36, ("CCAA") on January 14, 2009. On the same date, Nortel Network Inc. ("NNI") and other US debtors filed petitions in Delaware under the United States Bankruptcy Code, 11 U.S.C., Chapter 11.

[2] Beginning in 1996, unsecured *pari passu* notes were issued under three separate bond indentures, first by a US Nortel corporation guaranteed by Nortel Networks Limited ("NNL"), a Canadian corporation, and then by NNL in several tranches jointly and severally guaranteed by NNC and NNI (the "crossover bonds"). Thus all of the notes are payable by Nortel entities in both Canada and the US, either as the maker or guarantor. Under claims procedures in both the Canadian and US proceedings, claims by bondholders for principal and pre-filing interest in the amount of US\$4.092 billion have been made against each of the Canadian and US estates. The bondholders also claim to be entitled to post-filing interest and related claims under the terms of the bonds which, as of December 31, 2013, amounted to approximately US\$1.6 billion.

[3] The total assets realized on the sale of Nortel assets worldwide which are the subject of the allocation proceedings amongst the Canadian, US, and European, Middle East and African estates ("EMEA") are approximately US\$7.3 billion, and thus the post-filing bond interest claims of now more than US\$1.6 billion represent a substantial portion of the total assets available to all three estates. While the post-filing bond interest grows at various compounded rates under the terms of the bonds, the US\$7.3 billion is apparently not growing at any appreciable rate because of the very conservative nature of the investments made with it pending the outcome of the insolvency proceedings. Apart from the bondholders, the main claimants against the Canadian debtors are Nortel disabled employees, former employees and retirees.

[4] The bond claims in the Canadian proceedings have been filed pursuant to a claims procedure order in the CCAA proceedings dated July 30, 2009. The order contemplated that the claims filed under it would be finally determined in accordance with further procedures to be authorized, including by a further claims resolution order. By order dated September 16, 2010, a further order was made in the CCAA proceedings that authorized procedures to determine claims for all purposes.

[5] By direction of June 24, 2014, it was ordered that the following issues be argued:

- (a) whether the holders of the crossover bond claims are legally entitled in each jurisdiction to claim or receive any amounts under the relevant indentures above and beyond the outstanding principal debt and pre-petition interest (namely, above and beyond US\$4.092 billion); and
- (b) if it is determined that the crossover bondholders are so entitled, what additional amounts are such holders entitled to so claim and receive.

[6] The hearing in the US Bankruptcy Court was scheduled to proceed at the same time as the hearing in this Court but was adjourned due to an apparent settlement between the US Debtors and the US Unsecured Creditors Committee.

[7] The Monitor and Canadian debtors, supported by the Canadian Creditors' Committee, the UK Pension Claimants, the EMEA debtors, and the Wilmington Trust take the position that in a liquidating CCAA proceeding such as this, post-filing interest is not legally payable on the crossover bonds as a result of the "interest stops" rule. The Ad Hoc Group of Bondholders, supported by the US Unsecured Creditors' Committee, Law Debenture Trust Company of New York and Bank of New York Mellon take the position that there is no "interest stops" rule in CCAA proceedings and that the right to interest on the crossover bonds is not lost on the filing of CCAA proceedings and can be the subject of negotiations regarding a CCAA plan of reorganization. They take the position that no distribution of Nortel's sale proceeds that fails to recognize the full amount of the crossover bondholders' claims, including post-filing interest,

can be ordered under the CCAA except under a negotiated CCAA plan duly approved by the requisite majorities of creditors and sanctioned by the court.

[8] For the reasons that follow, I accept the position and hold that post-filing interest is not legally payable on the crossover bonds in this case.

The interest stops rule

[9] In this case, the bondholders have a contractual right to interest. The other major claimants, being pensioners, do not. The Canadian debtors contend that the reason for the interest stops rule is one of fundamental fairness and that the rule should apply in this case.

[10] The Canadian debtors contend that the interest-stops rule is a common law rule corollary to the *pari passu* rule governing rateable payments of an insolvent's debts and that while the CCAA is silent as to the right to post-filing interest, it does not rule out the interest-stops rule.

[11] The bondholders contend that to deny them the right to post-filing interest would amount to a confiscation of a property right to interest and that absent express statutory authority the court has no ability to interfere with their contractual entitlement to interest. I do not see their claim to interest as being a property right, as the bonds are unsecured. See *Thibodeau v. Thibodeau* (C.A.), 104 O.R. (3d) 161, at para. 43. However, the question remains as to whether their contractual rights should prevail.

[12] It is a fundamental tenet of insolvency law that all debts shall be paid *pari passu* and all unsecured creditors receive equal treatment. See *Shoppers Trust Co. (Liquidator of) v. Shoppers Trust Co.* (2005), 74 O.R. (3d) 652 (C.A.) at para. 25, per Blair J.A. and *Indalex Ltd. (Re)* (2009), 55 C.B.R. (5th) 64 (Ont. S.C.), at para. 16 per Morawetz J. This common law principle has led to the development of the interest stops rule. In *Canada (Attorney General) v. Confederation Life Insurance Co.*, [2001] O.J. No. 2610, (Ont. S.C.), Blair J. (as he then was) stated the following:

20 One of the governing principles of insolvency law - including proceedings in a winding-up - is that the assets of the insolvent debtor are to be distributed amongst classes of creditors rateably and equally, as those assets are found at the date of the insolvency. This principle has led to the development of the "interest stops rule", i.e., that no interest is payable on a debt from the date of the winding-up or bankruptcy. As Lord Justice James put it, colourfully, in *Re Savin* (1872), L.R. 7 Ch. 760 (C.A.), at p. 764:

I believe, however, that if the question now arose for the first time I should agree with the rule [i.e. the "interest stops rule"], seeing that the theory in bankruptcy is to stop all things at the date of the bankruptcy, and to divide the wreck of the man's property as it stood at that time.

[13] This rule is "judge-made" law. See *In re Humber Ironworks and Shipbuilding Company* (1869), L.R. 4 Ch. App. 643 at 647, per Sir G. M. Giffard, L.J.

[14] In *Shoppers Trust*, Blair J.A. referred to *pari passu* principles in the context of the interest stops rule and the common law understanding of those rules in liquidation proceedings. He stated:

25. The rationale underlying this approach rests on a fundamental principle of insolvency law, namely, that "in the case of an insolvent estate, all the money being realized as speedily as possible, should be applied equally and rateably in payment of the debts as they existed at the date of the winding-up": *Humber Ironworks, supra*, at p. 646 Ch. App. Unless this is the case, the principle of *pari passu* distribution cannot be honoured. See also *Re McDougall*, [1883] O.J. No. 63, 8 O.A.R. 309, at paras. 13-15; *Principal Savings & Trust Co. v. Principal Group Ltd. (Trustee of)* (1993), 109 D.L.R. (4th) 390, 14 Alta. L.R. (3d) 442 (C.A.), at paras. 12-16; and *Canada (Attorney General) v. Confederation Trust Co.* (2003), 65 O.R. (3d) 519, [2003] O.J. No. 2754 (S.C.J.), at p. 525 [O.R.] While these cases were decided in the context of what is known as the "interest stops" rule, they are all premised on the common law understanding that claims for principal and interest are provable in liquidation proceedings to the date of the winding-up.

[15] The interest stops rule has been applied in winding-up cases in spite of the fact that the legislation did not provide for it. In *Shoppers Trust*, Blair J.A. stated:

26. Thus, it was of little moment that the provisions of the *Winding-up Act* in force at the time of the March 10, 1993 order did not contain any such term. The 1996 amendment to s. 71(1) of the *Winding-up and Restructuring Act*, establishing that claims against the insolvent estate are to be calculated as at the

date of the winding-up, merely clarified and codified the position as it already existed in insolvency law.

[16] In *Abacus Cities Ltd. (Trustee of) v. AMIC Mortgage Investment Corp.* (1992), 11 C.B.R. (3d) 193 (Alta. C.A.), Kerans J.A. applied the interest stops rule in a bankruptcy proceeding under the BIA even although, in his view, the BIA assumed that interest was not payable after bankruptcy but did not expressly forbid it. He did so on the basis of the common law rule enunciated in *Re Savin*, quoted by Blair J. in *Confederation Life*. Kerans J.A. stated:

19. ... I accept that *Savin* expresses the law in Canada today: claims provable in bankruptcy cannot include interest after bankruptcy.

[17] In *Confederation Life*, Blair J. was of the view that the Winding-Up Act and the BIA could be interpreted to permit post-filing interest. Yet he held that the common law insolvency interest stops rule applied. He stated:

22 This common law principle has been applied consistently in Canadian bankruptcy and winding-up proceedings. This is so notwithstanding the language of subsection 71(1) of the Winding-Up Act and section 121 of the BIA, which might be read to the contrary, in my view....

23 Yet the "interest stops" principle has always applied to the payment of post-insolvency interest, and the provisions of subsection 71(1) have never been interpreted to trump the common law insolvency "interest stops rule".

[18] Thus I see no reason to not apply the interest stops rule to a CCAA proceeding because the CCAA does not expressly provide for its application. The issue is whether the rule should apply to this CCAA proceeding.

Nature of the CCAA proceeding

[19] When the Nortel entities filed for CCAA protection on January 14, 2009, and filed on the same date in the US and the UK, the stated purpose was to stabilize the Nortel business to maximize the chances of preserving all or a portion of the enterprise. However that hope quickly evaporated and on June 19, 2009 Nortel issued a news release announcing it had sold its CMDA business and LTE Access assets and that it was pursuing the sale of its other business interests. Liquidation followed, first by a sale of Nortel's eight business lines in 2009-2011 for US\$2.8

billion and second by the sale of its residual patent portfolio under a stalking-horse bid process in June 2011 for US\$4.5 billion. The sale of the CMDA and LTE assets was approved on June 29, 2009.

[20] The Canadian debtors contend that this CCAA proceeding is a liquidating proceeding, and thus in substance the same as a bankruptcy under the BIA. The bondholders contend that there is no definition of a “liquidating” CCAA proceeding and no distinct legal category of a liquidating CCAA, essentially arguing that like beauty, it is in the eyes of the beholder.

[21] In this case, I think there is little doubt that this is a liquidating CCAA process and has been since June, 2009, notwithstanding that there was some consideration given to monetizing the residual intellectual property in a new company to be formed (referred to as IPCO) before it was decided to sell the residual intellectual property that resulted in the sale to the Rockstar consortium for US\$4.5 billion. In *Re Nortel Networks Corp.*, 2012 ONSC 1213, 88 C.B.R. (5th) 111, Morawetz J. referred to his recognizing in his June 29, 2009 Nortel decision approving the sale of the CMDA and LTE assets that the CCAA can be applied in “a liquidating insolvency”. See also Dr. Janis P. Sarra, *Rescue! The Companies’ Creditors Arrangement Act*, 2nd ed. (Toronto: Carswell, 2013) at p. 167, in which she states “increasingly, there are ‘liquidating CCAA’ proceedings, whereby the debtor corporation is for all intents and purposes liquidated”.

[22] In *re Lehndorff General Partners Ltd.* (1993), 17 C.B.R. (3d) 24 (Ont. S.C.), Farley J. recognized in para. 7 that a CCAA proceeding might involve liquidation. He stated:

It appears to me that the purpose of the CCAA is also to protect the interests of creditors and to enable an orderly distribution of the debtor company's affairs. This may involve a winding-up or liquidation of a company ... provided the same is proposed in the best interests of the creditors generally.

[23] It is quite common now for there to be liquidating CCAA proceedings in which there is no successful restructuring of the business but rather a sale of the assets and a distribution of the proceeds to the creditors of the business. Nortel is unfortunately one of such CCAA proceedings.

Can the interest stops rule apply in a CCAA proceeding?

[24] There is no controlling authority in Canada in a case such as this in which there is a contested claim being made by bondholders for post-filing interest against an insolvent estate under the CCAA, let alone under a liquidating CCAA process, or in which the other creditors are mainly pensioners with no contractual right to post-filing interest. Accordingly, it is necessary to deal with first principles and with various cases raised by the parties.

[25] The Canadian debtors contend that the rationale for the interest stops rule is equally applicable to a liquidating CCAA proceeding as it is in a BIA or Winding-Up proceeding. They assert that the reason for the interest stops rule is one of fundamental fairness. An insolvency filing under the CCAA stays creditor enforcement. Accordingly, it is unfair to permit the bondholders with a contractual right to receive a payment on account of interest, and thus compensation for the delay in receipt of payment, while other creditors such as the pension claimants, who have been equally delayed in payment by virtue of the insolvency, receive no compensation. They cite Sir G. M. Giffard, L.J. in *Humber Ironworks*:

I do not see with what justice interest can be computed in favour of creditors whose debts carry interest, while creditors whose debts do not carry interest are stayed from recovering judgment, and so obtaining a right to interest.

[26] In *Century Services Inc. v. Canada (Attorney General)*, 2010 SCC 60, [2010] 3 S.C.R. 379, Deschamps J. reaffirmed that the purpose of a CCAA stay of proceedings is to preserve the *status quo*. She stated at para. 77:

The CCAA creates conditions for preserving the *status quo* while attempts are made to find common ground amongst stakeholders for a reorganization that is fair to all.

[27] If post-filing interest is available to one set of creditors while the other creditors are prevented from asserting their rights and obtaining post-judgment interest, the Canadian Creditors' Committee contend that the *status quo* has not been preserved.

[28] It has long been recognized that the federal insolvency regime includes the CCAA and the BIA and that the two statutes create a complimentary and interrelated scheme for dealing

dealing with the property of insolvent companies. See *Re Ivaco Inc.* (2006), 83 O.R. (3d) 108 (C.A.), at paras. 62 and 64, per Laskin J.A.

[29] Recently the Supreme Court of Canada analysed the CCAA and indicated that the BIA and CCAA are to be considered parts of an integrated insolvency scheme, the court will favour interpretations that give creditors analogous entitlements under the CCAA and BIA, and the court will avoid interpretations that give creditors incentives to prefer BIA processes.

[30] In *Century Services*, Deschamps J. enunciated guiding principles for interpreting the CCAA. Deschamps J. also stated that the case was the first time that the Supreme Court was called upon to directly interpret the provisions of the CCAA. The case involved competing interpretations of the federal *Excise Tax Act* ("ETA") and the CCAA in considering a deemed trust for GST collections. The ETA expressly excluded the provisions in the BIA rendering deemed trusts ineffective, but did not exclude similar provisions in the CCAA. In holding in favour of a stay under the CCAA, Deschamps J. was guided in her interpretation of the relevant CCAA provision by the desire to have similar results under the BIA and CCAA.

[31] In her analysis, Deschamps J. made a number of statements, including

Because the CCAA is silent about what happens if reorganization fails, the *BIA* scheme of liquidation and distribution necessarily supplies the backdrop for what will happen if a CCAA reorganization is ultimately unsuccessful. (para. 23)

With parallel CCAA and BIA restructuring schemes now an accepted feature of the insolvency law landscape, the contemporary thrust of legislative reform has been towards harmonizing aspects of insolvency law common to the two statutory schemes to the extent possible and encouraging reorganization over liquidation. (para. 24)

Moreover, a strange asymmetry would arise if the interpretation giving the ETA priority over the CCAA urged by the Crown is adopted here: the Crown would retain priority over GST claims during CCAA proceedings but not in bankruptcy. As courts have reflected, this can only encourage statute shopping by secured creditors in cases such as this one where the debtor's assets cannot satisfy both the secured creditors' and the Crown's claims (*Gauntlet*, at para. 21). If creditors' claims were better protected by liquidation under the BIA, creditors' incentives would lie overwhelmingly with avoiding proceedings under the CCAA and not risking a failed reorganization. Giving a key player in any insolvency such

skewed incentives against reorganizing under the CCAA can only undermine that statute's remedial objectives and risk inviting the very social ills that it was enacted to avert. (para. 47)

Notably, acting consistently with its goal of treating both the BIA and the CCAA as sharing the same approach to insolvency, Parliament made parallel amendments to both statutes... (para. 54)

The CCAA and BIA are related and no gap exists between the two statutes which would allow the enforcement of property interests at the conclusion of CCAA proceedings that would be lost in bankruptcy. (para. 78)

[32] In *Re Indalex*, [2013] S.C.R. 271, a case involving a competition between a deemed trust under provincial pension legislation and the right of a lender to security granted under the DIP lending provisions of the CCAA, Deschamps J. had occasion to refer to the *Century Services* case and her statement in *Century Services* in para 23 referred to above. She then stated:

In order to avoid a race to liquidation under the BIA, courts will favour an interpretation of the CCAA that affords creditors analogous entitlements.

[33] Thus it is a fair comment taken the direction of the Supreme Court in *Century Services* and *Indalex* regarding the aims of insolvency law in Canada to say that if the common law principle of the interest stops rule was applicable to proceedings under the BIA and *Winding-Up Act* before legislative amendments to those statutes were made, (or if the comments of Blair J. in *Confederation Life* are accepted that the BIA still might be read to prevent its application but does not trump the application of the rule), there is no reason not to apply the interest stops rule in liquidating CCAA proceedings. I accept this and note that there is no provision in the CCAA that would not permit the application of the rule.

[34] There are also policy reasons for this result, and they flow from *Century Services* and *Indalex*. I accept the argument of the Canadian Creditors' Committee that to permit some creditors' claims to grow disproportionately to others during the stay period would not maintain the *status quo* and would encourage creditors whose interests are being disadvantaged to immediately initiate bankruptcy proceedings, threatening the objectives of the CCAA.

[35] In my view, there is no need for there to be a “liquidating” CCCAA proceeding in order for the interest stops rule to apply to a CCAA proceeding. The reasoning for the application of the common law insolvency rule, being the desire to prevent a stay of proceedings from militating against one group of unsecured creditors over another in violation of the *pari passu* rule, is equally applicable to a CCAA proceeding that is not a liquidating proceeding. In such a proceeding, the parties would of course be free to include post-filing interest payments in a plan of arrangement, as is sometimes done.

[36] The bondholders contend, however, that *Re Stelco Inc.*, 2007 ONCA 483, 32 C.B.R. (4th) 77 is binding authority that the interest stops rule does not apply in any CCAA proceeding. I do not agree. The facts of the case were quite different and did not involve a claim for post-filing interest against the debtor. Stelco was successfully restructured under the CCAA by a plan of compromise and arrangement approved by the creditors. The sanctioned plan did not provide for payment of post-petition interest. As among senior unsecured debenture holders, subordinated (junior) debenture holders and ordinary unsecured creditors, the plan treated all in the same class and *pro rata* distributions were calculated on the basis that no post-filing interest was allowed. That result was not challenged.

[37] The relevant pre-filing indenture in *Stelco* provided that in the event of any insolvency, the holders of all senior debt would first be entitled to receive payment in full of the principal and interest due thereon, before the junior debenture holders would be entitled to receive any payment or distribution of any kind which might otherwise be payable in respect of their debentures. While the plan cancelled all Stelco debentures, subject to section 6.01(2) of the plan, that section provided that the rights between the debenture holders were preserved. The plan was agreed to by the junior debenture holders. After the plan had been sanctioned, the junior debenture holders challenged the senior debt holders' right to receive the subordinated payments towards their outstanding interest.

[38] Wilton-Siegel J. rejected the argument, holding that the subordination agreement continued to operate independently of the sanctioned plan and was not affected by it. While it is not clear why, the junior Noteholders contended that interest stopped accruing in respect of the claims of the senior debenture holders against Stelco after the CCAA filing. There was no issue

about a claim against Stelco for post-filing interest, as no such claim had ever been made. The issue was a contest between the two levels of debenture holders. However, Wilton-Siegel J. stated that in situations in which there was value to the equity, a CCAA plan could include post-filing interest. I take this statement to be *obiter*, but in any event, it is not the situation in Nortel as there is no equity at all. At the Court of Appeal, O'Connor A.C.J.O, Goudge and Blair JJ.A. agreed that the interest stops rule did not preclude the continuation of interest to the senior note holders from the subordinated payments to be made by the junior note holders under the binding inter-creditor arrangements.

[39] In the course of its reasons, the Court of Appeal stated that there was no persuasive authority that supports an interest stops rule in a CCAA proceeding, and referred to statements of Binnie J. in *Canada 3000 Inc., Re; Inter-Canadian (1991) Inc. (Trustee of)*, 2006 SCC 24, [2006] 1 S.C.R. 865, [*NAV Canada*]. A number of comments can be made.

[40] First, *Stelco* did not involve proceeding or claims against the debtor for post-filing interest. Second, the decision in *Stelco* was derived from the terms of negotiated inter-creditor agreements in the note indenture that were protected by plan. There was nothing about the common law interest stops rule that precluded one creditor from being held to its agreement to subordinate its realization to that of another creditor including foregoing its right to payment until the creditor with priority received principal and interest. That is what the Court of Appeal concluded by stating "We do not accept that there is a 'Interest Stops Rule' that precludes such a result". Third, the general statements made in *Stelco* and *NAV Canada* must now be considered in light of the later direction in *Century Services* and *Indalex*. I now turn to *NAV Canada*.

[41] In *NAV Canada*, Canada 3000 Airlines filed for protection under the CCAA. Three days later the Monitor filed an assignment in bankruptcy on its behalf. Federal legislation gave the airport authorities a right to apply to the court authorizing the seizure of aircraft for outstanding payments owed by an airline for using an airport. The contest in the case was between the airport authorities and the owners/lessors of the aircraft as to the extent that the owners/lessors were liable for those payments and whether a seizure order could be made against the aircraft leased to the airline. It was ultimately held that the owners/lessors were not liable for the outstanding payments owed by the airline but that the aircraft could be seized.

[42] Interest on the arrears was raised in the first instance before Ground J. He held that the airport authorities were entitled as against the bankrupt airline to detain the aircraft until all amounts with interest were paid in full or security for such payment was posted under the provisions of the legislation, i.e. interest continued to accrue and be payable after bankruptcy. The Court of Appeal did not deal with interest as in their view it was relevant only if the airport authorities had a claim against the owners/lessors of the aircraft, which the court held they did not.

[43] In the Supreme Court, which also dealt with an appeal from Quebec which dealt with the same issues, nearly the entire reasons of Binnie J. dealt with the issues as to whether the owners/lessors of the aircraft were liable for the outstanding charges and whether the aircraft could be seized by the airport authorities. It was held that the owners/lessors were not directly liable for the charges owed by the airline but that the aircraft could be seized until the charges were paid.

[44] At the end of his reasons, Binnie J. dealt with interest and held that it continued to run until the earlier of payment, the posting of security, or bankruptcy. The bondholders rely on the last two sentences of the following paragraph from the reasons of Binnie J. which refer to the running of interest under the CCAA:

96 Given the authority to charge interest, my view is that interest continues to run to the first of the date of payment, the posting of security or bankruptcy. If interest were to stop accruing before payment has been made, then the airport authorities and NAV Canada would not recover the full amount owed to them in real terms. Once the owner, operator or titleholder has provided security, the interest stops accruing. The legal titleholder is then incurring the cost of the security and losing the time value of money. It should not have to pay twice. While a *CCAA* filing does not stop the accrual of interest, the unpaid charges remain an unsecured claim provable against the bankrupt airline. The claim does not accrue interest after the bankruptcy: ss. 121 and 122 of the *Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act*.

[45] The Quebec airline in question had first filed to make a proposal under the BIA and when that proposal was rejected by its creditors, it was deemed to have made an assignment in bankruptcy as of the date its proposal was filed. Thus the comments of Binnie J. regarding the CCAA could not have related to the Quebec airline, but only to Canada 3000, which had been

under the CCAA for only three days before it was assigned into bankruptcy. It is by no means clear how much effort, if any, was spent in argument on the three days' interest issue. Binnie J. did not refer to any argument on the point.

[46] There was no discussion of the common law interest stops rule and whether it could apply during the three day period in question or whether it should apply to a liquidating CCAA proceeding. Nor was there any discussion of the definition of claim in the CCAA, being a claim provable within the meaning of the BIA, and how that might impact a claim for post-filing interest under the CCAA. The statement regarding interest under the CCAA was simply conclusory. It may be fair to say that the statement of Binnie J. was *per incuriam*.

[47] In my view, the statement of Binnie J. should not be taken as a blanket statement that interest always accrues in a CCAA proceeding, regardless of whether or not it is a liquidating proceeding. The circumstances in *NAV Canada* were far different from Nortel involving several years of compound interest in excess of US\$1.6 billion out of a total world-wide asset base of US\$7.3 billion. The statement of Binnie J. should now be construed in light of *Century Services* and *Indalex*.

Need for a CCAA plan

[48] The bondholders contend that there is no authority under the CCAA to effect a distribution of a debtor's assets absent a plan of arrangement or compromise that must be negotiated by the debtor with its creditors, and that as a plan can include payment of post-filing interest, it is not possible for a court to conclude that the bondholders have no right to post-filing interest. They assert that there is no jurisdiction for a court to compromise a creditor's claim in a CCAA proceeding except in the context of approving a plan approved by the creditors. They also assert that plan negotiations cannot meaningfully take place "in earnest" until the allocation decision as to how much of the US\$7.3 billion is to be allocated to each of the Canadian, US, or EMEA estates.

[49] One may ask what is left over in this case to negotiate. The assets have long been sold and what is left is to determine the claims against the Canadian estate and, once the amount of

the assets in the Canadian estate are known, distribute the assets on a *pari passu* basis. This is not a case in which equity is exchanged for debt in a reorganization of a business such as *Stelco*.

[50] However, even if there were things to negotiate, they would involve creditors compromising some right, and bargaining against those rights. What those rights are need to be determined, and often are in CCAA proceedings.

[51] In this case, compensation claims procedure orders were made by Morawetz J. The order covering claims by bondholders is dated July 30, 2009. It was made without any objection by the bondholders. That order provides for a claim to be proven for the purposes of voting and distribution under a plan. The claims resolution order of Morawetz J. dated September 16, 2010 provides for a proven claim to be for all purposes, including for the purposes of voting and distribution under any plan. The determination now regarding the bondholders claim for post-filing interest is consistent with the process of determining whether these claims by the bondholders are finally proven. Contrary to the contention of the bondholders, it is not a process in which the court is being asked to compromise the bondholders' claim for post-filing interest. It is rather a determination of whether they have a right to such interest.

[52] It is perhaps not necessary to determine at this stage how the assets will be distributed and whether a plan, or what type of plan, will be necessary. However, in light of the argument advanced on behalf of the bondholders, I will deal with this issue.

[53] I first note that the CCAA makes no provision as to how money is to be distributed to creditors. This is not surprising taken that plans of reorganization do not necessarily provide for payments to creditors and taken that the CCAA does not expressly provide for a liquidating CCAA process. There is no provision that requires distributions to be made under a plan of arrangement.

[54] A court has wide powers in a CCAA proceeding to do what is just in the circumstances. Section 11(1) provides that a court may make any order it considers appropriate in the circumstances. Although this section was provided by an amendment that came into force after Nortel filed under the CCAA, and therefore by the amendment the new section does not apply to

Nortel, it has been held that the provision merely reflects past jurisdiction. In *Century Services*, Deschamps J. stated:

65 I agree with Justice Georgina R. Jackson and Professor Janis Sarra that the most appropriate approach is a hierarchical one in which courts rely first on an interpretation of the provisions of the *CCAA* text before turning to inherent or equitable jurisdiction to anchor measures taken in a *CCAA* proceeding (see G. R. Jackson and J. Sarra, "Selecting the Judicial Tool to get the Job Done: An Examination of Statutory Interpretation, Discretionary Power and Inherent Jurisdiction in Insolvency Matters", in J. P. Sarra, ed., *Annual Review of Insolvency Law 2007* (2008), 41, at p. 42). The authors conclude that when given an appropriately purposive and liberal interpretation, the *CCAA* will be sufficient in most instances to ground measures necessary to achieve its objectives (p. 94).

67 The initial grant of authority under the *CCAA* empowered a court "where an application is made under this Act in respect of a company ... on the application of any person interested in the matter ..., subject to this Act, [to] make an order under this section" (*CCAA*, s. 11(1)). The plain language of the statute was very broad.

68 In this regard, though not strictly applicable to the case at bar, I note that Parliament has in recent amendments changed the wording contained in s. 11(1), making explicit the discretionary authority of the court under the *CCAA*. Thus in s. 11 of the *CCAA* as currently enacted, a court may, "subject to the restrictions set out in this Act, ... make any order that it considers appropriate in the circumstances" (S.C. 2005, c. 47, s. 128). Parliament appears to have endorsed the broad reading of *CCAA* authority developed by the jurisprudence. (underlining added)

[55] I note also that payments to creditors without plans of arrangement or compromises are often ordered. In *Timminco Limited (Re)*, 2014 ONSC 3393, Morawetz J. noted at para. 38 that the assets of Timminco had been sold and distributions made to secured creditors without any plan and with no intention to advance a plan. In that case, there was a shortfall to the secured creditors and no assets available to the unsecured creditors. The fact that the distributions went to the secured creditors rather than to an unsecured creditor makes no difference to the jurisdiction under the *CCAA* to do so.

[56] In *AbitibiBowater Inc., (Re)*, 2009 QCCS 6461, Gascon J.C.S. (as he then was) granted a large interim distribution from the proceeds of a sale transaction to senior secured noteholders ("SSNs"). The bondholders opposed the distribution on the same grounds as advanced by the bondholders in this case:

56 The Bondholders claim that the proposed distribution violates the CCAA. From their perspective, nothing in the statute authorizes a distribution of cash to a creditor group prior to approval of a plan of arrangement by the requisite majorities of creditors and the Court. They maintain that the SSNs are subject to the stay of proceedings like all other creditors.

57 By proposing a distribution to one class of creditors, the Bondholders contend that the other classes of creditors are denied the ability to negotiate a compromise with the SSNs. Instead of bringing forward their proposed plan and creating options for the creditors for negotiation and voting purposes, the Abitibi Petitioners are thus eliminating bargaining options and confiscating the other creditors' leverage and voting rights.

58 Accordingly, the Bondholders conclude that the proposed distribution should not be considered until after the creditors have had an opportunity to negotiate a plan of arrangement or a compromise with the SSNs.

[57] Justice Gascon did not accept this argument. He stated:

71 Despite what the Bondholders argue, it is neither unusual nor unheard of to proceed with an interim distribution of net proceeds in the context of a sale of assets in a CCAA reorganization. Nothing in the CCAA prevents similar interim distribution of monies. There are several examples of such distributions having been authorized by Courts in Canada. (underlining added)

[58] Justice Gascon was persuaded that the distribution should be made as it was part and parcel of a DIP loan arrangement that he approved. Whatever the particular circumstances were that led to the exercise of his discretion, he did not question that he had jurisdiction to make an order distributing proceeds without a plan of arrangement. I see no difference between an interim distribution, as in the case of *AbitibiBowater*, or a final distribution, as in the case of *Timminco*, or a distribution to an unsecured or secured creditor, so far as a jurisdiction to make the order is concerned without any plan of arrangement.

[59] There is a comment by Laskin J.A. in *Ivaco Inc., (Re)* (2006), 83 O.R. (3d) 108 (C.A.) that questions the right of a judge to order payment out of funds realized on the sale of assets under a CCAA process, in that case to pension plan administrators for funding deficiencies. He stated:

[I]n my view, absent an agreement, I doubt that the CCAA even authorized the motions judge to order this payment. Once restructuring was not possible and the CCAA proceedings were spent, as the motions judge found and all parties acknowledged, I question whether the court had any authority to order a distribution of the sale proceeds.

[60] This was an *obiter* statement. But in any event Justice Laskin was discussing a situation in which all parties agreed that the CCAA proceedings “were spent”. That is, there was effectively no CCAA proceeding any more. This is not the situation with Nortel and I do not see the *obiter* statement as being applicable. As stated by Justice Gascon, distribution orders without a plan are common in Canada.

[61] While it need not be decided, I am not persuaded that it would not be possible for a court to make an order distributing the proceeds of the Nortel sale without a plan of arrangement or compromise.

Conclusion

[62] I hold and declare that holders of the crossover bond claims are not legally entitled to claim or receive any amounts under the relevant indentures above and beyond the outstanding principal debt and pre-petition interest (namely, above and beyond US\$4.092 billion).

[63] Those seeking costs may make cost submissions in writing within 10 days and responding submissions may be made in writing within a further 10 days. Submissions are to be brief and include a proper cost outline for costs sought.



Newbould J.

Date: August 19, 2014

TAB 5

2009 QCCS 6461
Quebec Superior Court

AbitibiBowater, (Re)

2009 CarswellQue 14224, 2009 QCCS 6461, 190 A.C.W.S. (3d) 678, EYB 2009-171231

**AbitibiBowater Inc., Abitibi-Consolidated Inc., Bowater Canadian Holdings Inc.
and The other Petitioners listed on Schedules "A", "B" and "C", Petitioners and
Ernst & Young Inc., Monitor**

Gascon J.C.S.

Heard: November 9, 2009
Judgment: November 16, 2009
Docket: C.S. Qué. Montréal 500-11-036133-094

Counsel: Me Sean Dunphy, Me Joseph Reynaud, for Petitioners
Me Robert Thornton, for the Monitor
Me Jason Dolman, for the Monitor
Me Alain Riendeau, for Wells Fargo Bank, N.A., Administrative Agent under the Credit and Guarantee Agreement Dated April 1, 2008
Me Marc Duchesne, for the Ad hoc Committee of the Senior Secured Noteholders and U.S. Bank National Association, Indenture Trustee for the Senior Secured Noteholders
Me Frederick L. Myers, for the Ad Hoc Committee of Unsecured Noteholders of AbitibiBowater Inc. and certain of its Affiliates
Me Jean-Yves Simard, for the Ad Hoc Committee of Unsecured Noteholders of AbitibiBowater Inc. and certain of its Affiliates
Me Patrice Benoît, for Investissement Québec
Me S. Richard Orzy, for the Official Committee of Unsecured Creditors of AbitibiBowater Inc. & Al.
Me Frédéric Desmarais, for Bank of Montreal
Me Anastasia Flouris, for Alcoa

Gascon J.C.S.:

CORRECTED JUDGMENT, NOVEMBER 23 ON RE-AMENDED MOTION FOR THE APPROVAL OF A SECOND DIP FINANCING AND FOR DISTRIBUTION OF CERTAIN PROCEEDS OF THE MPCo SALE TRANSACTION TO THE TRUSTEE FOR THE SENIOR SECURED NOTES (#312)

Introduction

1 In the context of their CCAA¹ restructuring, the Abitibi Petitioners² present a Motion³ for 1) the approval of a second DIP financing and 2) the distribution of certain proceeds of the Manicouagan Power Company ("MPCo") sale transaction to the Senior Secured Noteholders ("SSNs").

2 More particularly, the Abitibi Petitioners seek:

1) Orders authorizing Abitibi Consolidated Inc. ("ACI") and Abitibi Consolidated Company of Canada Inc. ("ACCC") to enter into a Loan Agreement (the "ULC DIP Agreement") with 3239432 Nova Scotia Company ("ULC"), as lender, providing for a *CDN\$230 million super-priority secured debtor in possession credit facility* (the "ULC DIP Facility").

The ULC DIP Facility is to be funded from the ULC reserve of approximately CDN\$282.3 million (the “*ULC Reserve*”), with terms that will be substantially in the form of the term sheet (the “*ULC DIP Term Sheet*”) attached to the ULC DIP Motion;

2) Orders authorizing the distribution to the SSNs *of up to CDN\$200 million* upon completion of the sale of ACCC’s 60% interest in MPCo and Court approval of the ULC DIP Agreement.

The distribution is to be paid from the net proceeds of the MPCo sale transaction after the payments, holdbacks, reserves and deductions provided for in the Implementation Agreement agreed upon in regard to that transaction; and

3) Orders amending the Second Amended Initial Order to increase the super priority charge set out in paragraph 61.3 (the “*ACI DIP Charge*”) in respect of the ACI DIP Facility by an amount of CDN\$230 million in favour of ULC for all amounts owing in connection with the ULC DIP Facility.

This increase in the ACI DIP Charge is to still be subordinated to any and all subrogated rights in favour of the SSNs, the lenders under the ACCC Term Loan (the “*Term Lenders*”) and McBurney Corporation, McBurney Power Limited and MBB Power Services Inc. (the “*Lien Holders*”) arising under paragraph 61.10 of the Second Amended Initial Order.

3 The SSNs and the Term Lenders, the only two secured creditor groups of the Abitibi Petitioners, do not, in the end, contest the ULC DIP Motion. Pursuant to intense negotiations and following concessions made by everyone, an acceptable wording to the orders sought was finally agreed upon on the eve of the hearing. The efforts of all parties and Counsel involved are worth mentioning; the help and guidance of the Monitor and its Counsel as well.

4 Of the unsecured creditors and other stakeholders, only the Ad Hoc Unsecured Noteholders Committee (the “*Bondholders*”) opposes the ULC DIP Motion, and even there, just in part. At hearing, Counsel for the Official Committee of Unsecured Creditors set up in the corresponding U.S. proceedings pending in the State of Delaware also voiced that his client shared some of the Bondholders’ concerns.

5 In short, while not contesting the request for approval of the second DIP financing, the Bondholders contend that the CDN\$200 million immediate proposed distribution to the SSNs is inappropriate and uncalled for at this time.

6 Before analyzing the various orders sought, an overview of the MPCo sale transaction and of the ULC DIP Facility that are the subject of the debate is necessary.

The MPCo Sale Transaction

7 The MPCo sale transaction is central to the orders sought in the ULC DIP Motion.

8 Under the terms of an Implementation Agreement signed in that regard, Hydro-Québec (“*HQ*”) agreed to pay ACCC CDN\$615 million (the “*Purchase Price*”) for ACCC’s 60% interest in MPCo.

9 Of this amount, it is expected that (i) CDN\$25 million will be paid at closing to Alcoa, the owner of the other 40% interest in MPCo, for tax liabilities; (ii) approximately CDN\$31 million will be held by HQ for two years to secure various indemnifications (the “*HQ Holdback*”); (iii) certain inter-party accounts will be settled; (iv) the CDN\$282.3 million ULC Reserve, set up primarily to guarantee potential contingent pension liabilities and taxes resulting from the Proposed Transactions, will be held by the Monitor in trust for the ULC pending further Order of the Court; and (v) the ACI DIP Facility will be repaid.

10 That said, until the sale, ACCC’s 60% interest in MPCo remains subject to the SSN’s first ranking security. This first ranking security interest has never been contested by any party. In fact, after their review of same, the Monitor’s Counsel concluded that it is valid and enforceable⁴.

11 Accordingly, the proceeds of the sale less adjustments, holdbacks and reserve would normally be paid to the SSNs as

holders of valid first ranking security over this asset.

12 To that end, the SSNs' claim of US\$477,545,769.53 (US\$413 million in principal and US\$64,545,769.53 in interest as at October 1st, 2009) is not really contested except for a 0.5% to 2% additional default interest over the 13.75% original loan rate.

13 In that context, on September 29, 2009, the Court issued an Order approving the sale of ACCC's 60% interest in MPCo on certain conditions. Amongst others, the Court:

- a) Approved the terms and conditions of the Implementation Agreement;
- b) Authorized and directed ACI and ACCC to implement and complete the Proposed Transactions with such non-material alterations or amendments as the parties may agree to with the consent of the Monitor;
- c) Declared that (i) the proceeds from the Proposed Transactions, net of certain payments, holdbacks, reserves and deductions, and (ii) the shares of the ULC, shall constitute and be treated as proceeds of the disposition of ACCC's MPCo shares (collectively, the "*MPCo Share Proceeds*");
- d) Declared that the MPCo Share Proceeds extend to and include (a) ACCC's interest in the HQ Holdback and (b) ACCC's interest in claims arising from the satisfaction of related-party claims;
- e) Declared that the MPCo Share Proceeds will be subject to a replacement charge (the "*MPCo Noteholder Charge*") in favour of the SSNs with the same rank and priority as the security held in respect of the ACCC's MPCo shares;
- f) Declared that the ULC Reserve is subject to a charge in favour of the SSNs which is subordinate to a charge in favour of Alcoa (the "*ULC Reserve Charge*"); and
- g) Ordered that the cash component of the MPCo Share Proceeds and the ULC Reserve be paid to and held by the Monitor in an interest bearing account or investment grade marketable securities pending further Order of the Court.

14 The Proposed Transactions are not expected to close until the latter part of November or early December 2009. ACI has requested and obtained an extension from Investissement Quebec ("*IQ*") to December 15, 2009 for the repayment of the ACI DIP Facility that matured on November 1st, 2009.

15 Based on the amounts of the significant payments, holdbacks, reserves and deductions from the Purchase Price, and considering that the amount drawn under the ACI DIP Facility presently stands at CDN\$54.8 million, the Net Available Proceeds after payment of the ACI DIP Facility would be approximately CDN\$173.9 million.

The ULC DIP Facility

16 Pursuant to the Implementation Agreement, ULC is required to maintain the ULC Reserve. On the closing of the Proposed Transactions, ULC will hold the ULC Reserve in the amount of approximately CDN\$282.3 million.

17 This amount may be used for a limited number of purposes (the "*Permitted Investments*") that are described in the Implementation Agreement. Such Permitted Investments include making a DIP loan to either ACI or ACCC.

18 Based on that, the ULC DIP Term Sheet provides that the ACI Group will borrow CDN\$230 million from the ULC Reserve as a Permitted Investment.

19 According to the Monitor⁵, the significant terms of the ULC DIP Term Sheet are as follows:

- i) *Manner of Borrowing* — Initially, the ULC DIP Facility was to be available by way of an immediate draw of CDN\$230 million. After negotiations with the Term Lenders, it was rather agreed that (i) a first draw of CDN\$130 million will be advanced at closing, (ii) subsequent draws for a maximum total amount of CDN\$50 million in

increments of up to CDN\$25 million will be advanced upon a five (5) business day notice and in accordance with paragraph 61.11 of the Second Amended Initial Order, and (iii) the balance of CDN\$50 million shall become available upon further order of the Court.

ii) *Interest Payments* — No interest will be payable on the ULC DIP Facility;

iii) *Fees* — No fees are payable in respect of the ULC DIP Facility;

iv) *Expenses* — The borrowers will pay all reasonable expenses incurred by ULC and Alcoa in connection with the ULC DIP Facility;

v) *Reporting* — Reporting will be similar to that provided under the ACI DIP Facility and copies of all financial information will be placed in the data room. Reporting will include notice of events of default or maturing events of default;

vi) *Use of Proceeds* — The ULC DIP Facility will be used for general corporate purposes in material compliance with the 13-week cash flow forecasts to be provided no less frequently than the first Friday of each month (the “*Budget*”);

vii) *Events of Default* — The events of default include the following:

- (a) Substantial non-compliance with the Budget;
- (b) Termination of the *CCAA* Stay of Proceedings;
- (c) Failure to file a *CCAA* Plan with the Court by September 30, 2010; and
- (d) Withdrawal of the existing Securitization Program unless replaced with a reasonably similar facility;

viii) *Rights of Alcoa* — Alcoa will receive all reporting noted above and notices of events of default. Alcoa’s consent is required for any amendments or waivers;

ix) *Rights of Senior Secured Noteholders* — The Senior Secured Noteholders’ rights consist of:

- (a) Receiving all reporting noted above and any notice of an Event of Default;
- (b) Consent of Senior Secured Noteholders holding a majority of the principal amount of the Senior Secured Notes is required for any amendments to the maximum amount of the ULC DIP Facility or any change to the Outside Maturity Date or the interest rate;
- (c) Upon an Event of Default, there is no right to accelerate payment or maturity, subject to the right to apply to Court for the termination of the ULC DIP Facility, which right is without prejudice to the right of ACI, ACCC, the ULC or Alcoa to oppose such application;
- (d) Entitlement to review draft of documents, but final approval of such documents is in Alcoa’s sole discretion; and
- (e) Entitlement to request the approval of the Court to amend any monthly cash flow budget which has been filed;

x) *Security* — Security is similar to the existing ACI DIP Facility and ranking immediately after the existing ACI DIP Charge. There are no charges on the assets of the Chapter 11 Debtors (as defined in the existing ACI DIP Facility).

20 The Monitor notes that the ULC DIP Facility will provide the ACI Group with additional net liquidity (after the retirement of the ACI DIP Facility and after the payment of the proposed distribution to the SSNs) in the amount of some CDN\$167 million.

The Questions at Issue

21 In light of this background, the Court must answer the following questions:

- 1) Should the ULC DIP Facility of CDN\$230 million be approved?
- 2) Should the proposed distribution of CDNS\$200 million to the SSNs be authorized?
- 3) Is the wording of the orders sought appropriate, notably with regard to the additions proposed by the Bondholders in terms of the future steps to be taken by the Abitibi Petitioners?

Analysis and Discussion

1) The Approval of the DIP Financing

22 In the Court's opinion, the second DIP financing, that is, the ULC DIP Facility of CDN\$230 million, should be approved on the amended terms agreed upon by the numerous parties involved.

23 In this restructuring, the Court has already approved DIP financing in respect of both the Abitibi Petitioners and the Bowater Petitioners.

24 On April 22, 2009, it issued a Recognition Order (U.S. Interim DIP Order) recognizing an Interim Order of the U.S. Bankruptcy Court for a DIP loan of up to US\$206 million to the Bowater Petitioners. On May 6, 2009, it approved the ACI DIP Facility, a US\$100 million loan to the Abitibi Petitioners by Bank of Montreal ("*BMO*"), guaranteed by IQ.

25 The jurisdiction of the Court to approve DIP financing and the requirement of the Abitibi Petitioners for such were canvassed at length in the May 6 Judgment. The requirements of the Abitibi Petitioners for liquidity and the authority of the Court to approve agreements to satisfy those requirements have already been reviewed and ruled upon.

26 There have been no circumstances intervening since the approval of the ACI DIP Facility that can fairly be characterized as negating the requirement of the Abitibi Petitioners for DIP financing.

27 The only issue here is whether this particular ULC DIP Facility proposal, replacing as it does the prior ACI DIP Facility, is one that the Court ought to approve. As indicated earlier, the answer is yes.

28 At this stage in the proceedings where the phase of business stabilization is largely complete, the Court is not required to approach the subject of DIP financing from the perspective of excessive caution or parsimony.

29 On the one hand, as highlighted notably by the Monitor⁶, the Abitibi Petitioners have presented substantial reasons to support their need for liquidity by way of a DIP loan. Suffice it to note to that end that:

a) Without an adequate cushion, in view of potential adverse exchange rate fluctuations and further adverse price declines in the market, the Abitibi Petitioners' liquidity could easily be insufficient to meet the requirements of its Securitization Program (Monitor's 19th Report at paragraphs 49, 50 and chart at paragraph 61);

b) Absent a DIP loan, there is, in fact, a "high risk of default" under the Securitization Program (Monitor's 19th Report at paragraph 32);

c) Despite Abitibi Petitioners' best efforts at forecasting, weekly cash flow forecasts have varied by as much as US\$26 million. Weekly disbursements have varied by 100%. Each 1¢ variation in the foreign exchange rate as against the US dollar could produce a US\$17 million negative cash flow variation. The ultimate cash flow requirements will be highly dependent on variables that the Abitibi Petitioners cannot control (Monitor's 19th Report at paragraphs 54, 60 and 61);

d) The market decline has eroded the Abitibi Petitioners' liquidity, while foreign exchange fluctuations are placing further strain on this liquidity. Even if prices increase, the resulting need for additional working capital to increase production will paradoxically put yet further strain on this liquidity;

e) Without the ULC DIP Facility, the Abitibi Petitioners would lack access to sufficient operating credit to maintain normal operations. They would be significantly impaired in their ability to operate in the ordinary course and they would face an increase in the risk of unexpected interruptions; and

f) The Abitibi Petitioners have yet to complete their business plan and it is premature to predict the length of the proceedings (Monitor's 19th Report at paragraphs 47 and 48).

30 In fact, based upon its sensitivity analysis, the inter-month variability of the cash flows, the minimum liquidity requirements under the Securitization Program, and the requirement to repay the ACI DIP Facility, the Monitor is of the view that the Abitibi Petitioners need the new ULC DIP Facility to ensure that ACI has sufficient liquidity to complete its restructuring.

31 On the other hand, the reasonableness of the amount of the ULC DIP Facility is supported by the following facts:

a) Only about CDN\$168 million of incremental liquidity is being provided and post-transaction, the Abitibi Petitioners will have, at best, about CDN\$335 million of liquidity (Monitor's 19th Report at paragraph 68);

b) The Bowater Petitioners, a group of the same approximate size as the Abitibi Petitioners, enjoy liquidity of approximately US\$400 million (Monitor's 19th Report at paragraph 69) and a DIP facility of approximately US\$200 million;

c) Even with the ULC DIP Facility, the Abitibi Petitioners will be at the low end of average relative to their peers in terms of available liquidity relative to their size;

d) The cash flow of the Abitibi Petitioners is subject to significant intra-month variations and has risks associated with pricing and currency fluctuations which are larger the longer the period examined; and

e) The Abitibi Petitioners are required by the Securitization Facility to maintain liquidity on a rolling basis above US\$100 million.

32 In addition, the Court and the stakeholders have all the means necessary at their disposal to monitor the use of liquidity without, at the same time, having to ration its access at a level far below that enjoyed by the peers with whom the Abitibi Petitioners compete.

33 In this regard, it is important to emphasize that the ULC DIP Facility includes, after all, particularly interesting conditions in terms of interest payments and associated fees. Because ULC is the lender, none are payable.

34 Finally, the provisions of section 11.2 of the amended *CCAA*, and in particular the factors for review listed in subsection 11.2(4), are instructive guidelines to the exercise of the Court's discretion to approve the ULC DIP Facility.

35 Pursuant to subsection 11.2(4) of the amended *CCAA*, for restructurings undertaken after September 18, 2009, the judge is now directed to consider the following factors in determining whether to exercise his or her discretion to make an order such as this one:

a) The period during which the company is expected to be subject to *CCAA* proceedings;

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;
- 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.

36 Applying these criteria to this case, it is, first, premature to speculate how long the Abitibi Petitioners will remain subject to proceedings under the *CCAA*.

37 The Monitor's 19th Report has considered cash flow forecasts until December 2010. The Abitibi Petitioners are hopeful of progressing to a plan outline by year-end with a view to emergence in the first or second quarter of 2010.

38 In considering a DIP financing proposal, the Court can take note of the fact that the time and energies ought, at this stage in the proceedings, to be more usefully and profitably devoted to completing the business restructuring, raising the necessary exit financing and negotiating an appropriate restructuring plan with the stakeholders.

39 Second, even if the ULC DIP Facility of CDN\$230 million is a high, albeit reasonable, figure under the circumstances, access to the funds and use of the funds remain closely monitored.

40 Based on the compromise reached with the Term Lenders, access to the funds will be progressive and subject to control. The initial draw is limited to CDN\$130 million. Subsequent additional draws up to CDN\$50 million will be in maximum increments of CDN\$25 million and subject to prior notice. The final CDN\$50 million will only be available with the Court's approval.

41 As well, the use of the funds is subject to considerable safeguards as to the interests of all stakeholders. These include the following:

- a) The Monitor is on site monitoring and reviewing cash flow sources and uses in real time with full access to senior management, stakeholders and the Court;
- b) Stakeholders have very close to real time access to financial information regarding sources and use of cash flow by reason of the weekly cash flow forecasts provided to their financial advisors and the weekly calls with such financial advisors, participated in by senior management;
- c) The Monitor provides regular reporting to the Court including as to the tracking of variances in cash use relative to forecast and as to evolution of the business environment in which the Abitibi Petitioners are operating; and
- d) All stakeholders have full access to this Court to bring such motions as they see fit should a material adverse change in the business or affairs intervene.

42 Third, there has been no suggestion that the management of the Abitibi Petitioners has lost the confidence of its major creditors. To the contrary:

- a) Management has successfully negotiated a settlement of very complex and thorny issues with both the Term Lenders and the SSNs, which has enabled this ULC DIP Motion to be brought forward with their support;
- b) While management does not agree with all positions taken by the Bondholders at all times, it has by and large enjoyed the support of that group throughout these proceedings;
- c) Management has been attentive to the suggestions and guidance of the Monitor with the result that there have been few if any instances where the Monitor has been publicly obliged to oppose or take issue with steps taken;

d) Management has been proactive in hiring a Chief Restructuring Officer who has provided management with additional depth and strength in navigating through difficult circumstances; and

e) The Abitibi Petitioners' management conducts regular meetings with the financial advisors of their major stakeholders, in addition to having an "open door" policy.

43 The Court is satisfied that, in requesting the approval of the ULC DIP Facility, management is doing so with a broad measure of support and the confidence of its major creditor constituencies.

44 Fourth, with an adequate level of liquidity, the Abitibi Petitioners will be able to run their business as a going concern on as normal a basis as possible, with a view to enhancing and preserving its value while the restructuring process proceeds.

45 By facilitating a level of financial support that is reasonable and adequate and of sufficient duration to enable them to complete the restructuring on most reasonable assumptions, the Abitibi Petitioners will have the benefit of an umbrella of stability around their core business operations.

46 In the Court's opinion, this can only facilitate the prospects of a viable compromise or arrangement being found.

47 Fifth, there are only two secured creditor groups of the Abitibi Petitioners: the SSNs and the Term Lenders. After long and difficult negotiations, they finally agreed to an acceptable wording to the orders sought. No one argues any longer that it is prejudiced in any way by the proposed security or charge.

48 Lastly, sixth, the Monitor has carefully considered the positions of all of the stakeholders as well as the reasonableness of the Abitibi Petitioners' requirements for the proposed ULC DIP Facility. Having reviewed both the impact of the proposed ULC DIP Facility on stakeholders and its beneficial impact upon the Abitibi Petitioners, the Monitor recommends approval of the ULC DIP Facility.

49 On the whole, in approving this ULC DIP Facility, the Court supports the very large consensus reached and the fine balance achieved between the interests of all stakeholders involved.

2) The Distribution to the SSNs

50 The approval of the terms of the ULC DIP Facility by the SSNs is intertwined with the Abitibi Petitioners' agreement to support a distribution in their favor in the amount of CDN\$200 million.

51 The Abitibi Petitioners and the SSNs consider that since the MPCo proceeds were and are subject to the security of the SSNs, this arrangement or compromise is a reasonable one under the circumstances.

52 They submit that the proposed distribution will be of substantial benefit to the Abitibi Petitioners. Savings of at least CDN\$27.4 million per year in accruing interest costs on the CDN\$200 million to be distributed will be realized based on the 13.75% interest rate payable to the SSNs.

53 Needless to say, they maintain that the costs saved will add to the potential surplus value of SSNs' collateral that could be utilized to compensate any creditor whose security may be impaired in the future in repaying the ULC DIP Facility.

54 The Bondholders oppose the CDN\$200 million distribution to the SSNs.

55 In their view, given the Abitibi Petitioners' need for liquidity, the proposed payment of substantial proceeds to one group of creditors raises important issues of both propriety and timing. It also brings into focus the need for the *CCAA* process to move forward efficiently and effectively towards the goal of the timely negotiation and implementation of a plan of arrangement.

56 The Bondholders claim that the proposed distribution violates the *CCAA*. From their perspective, nothing in the statute

authorizes a distribution of cash to a creditor group prior to approval of a plan of arrangement by the requisite majorities of creditors and the Court. They maintain that the SSNs are subject to the stay of proceedings like all other creditors.

57 By proposing a distribution to one class of creditors, the Bondholders contend that the other classes of creditors are denied the ability to negotiate a compromise with the SSNs. Instead of bringing forward their proposed plan and creating options for the creditors for negotiation and voting purposes, the Abitibi Petitioners are thus eliminating bargaining options and confiscating the other creditors' leverage and voting rights.

58 Accordingly, the Bondholders conclude that the proposed distribution should not be considered until after the creditors have had an opportunity to negotiate a plan of arrangement or a compromise with the SSNs.

59 In the interim, they suggest that the Abitibi Petitioners should provide a business plan to their legal and financial advisors by no later than 5:00 p.m. on November 27, 2009. They submit that a restructuring and recapitalization term sheet on terms acceptable to them and their legal and financial advisors should also be provided by no later than 5:00 p.m. on December 11, 2009.

60 With all due respect for the views expressed by the Bondholders, the Court considers that, similarly to the ULC DIP Facility, the proposed distribution should be authorized.

61 To begin with, the position of the Bondholders is, under the circumstances, untenable. While they support the CDN\$230 million ULC DIP Facility, they still contest the CDN\$200 million proposed distribution that is directly linked to the latter.

62 The Court does not have the luxury of picking and choosing here. What is being submitted for approval is a global solution. The compromise reached must be considered as a whole. The access to additional liquidity is possible because of the corresponding distribution to the SSNs. The amounts available for both the ULC DIP Facility and the proposed distribution come from the same MPCo sale transaction.

63 The compromise negotiated in this respect, albeit imperfect, remains the best available and viable solution to deal with the liquidity requirements of the Abitibi Petitioners. It follows a process and negotiations where the views and interests of most interested parties have been canvassed and considered.

64 To get such diverse interest groups as the Abitibi Petitioners, the SSNs, the Term Lenders, BMO and IQ, and ULC and Alcoa to agree on an acceptable outcome is certainly not an easy task to achieve. Without surprise, it comes with certain concessions.

65 It would be very dangerous, if not reckless, for the Court to put in jeopardy the ULC DIP Facility agreed upon by most stakeholders on the basis that, perhaps, a better arrangement could eventually be reached in terms of distribution of proceeds that, on their face, appear to belong to the SSNs.

66 The Court is satisfied that both aspects of the ULC DIP Motion are closely connected and should be approved together. To conclude otherwise would potentially put everything at risk, at a time where stability is most required.

67 Secondly, it remains that ACCC's interest in MPCo is subject to the SSNs' security. As such, all proceeds of the sale less adjustments, holdbacks and reserves should normally be paid to the SSNs. Despite this, provided they receive the CDN\$200 million proposed distribution, the SSNs have consented to the sale proceeds being used by the Abitibi Petitioners to pay the existing ACI DIP Facility and to the ULC Reserve being used up to CDN\$230M for the ULC DIP Facility funding.

68 It is thus fair to say that the SSNs are not depriving the Abitibi Petitioners of liquidity; they are funding part of the restructuring with their collateral and, in the end, enhancing this liquidity.

69 The net proceeds of the MPCo transaction after payment of the ACI DIP Facility are expected to be CDN\$173.9 million. Accordingly, out of a CDN\$200 million distribution to the SSNs, only CDN\$26.1 million could technically be said to come from the ULC DIP Facility. Contrary to what the Bondholders alluded to, if minor aspects of the claims of the SSNs

are disputed by the Abitibi Petitioners, they do not concern the CDN\$200 million at issue.

70 Thirdly, the ULC DIP Facility bears no interest and is not subject to drawdown fees, while a distribution of CDN\$200 million to the SSNs will create at the same time interest savings of approximately CDN\$27 million per year for the ACI Group. There is, as a result, a definite economic benefit to the contemplated distribution for the global restructuring process.

71 Despite what the Bondholders argue, it is neither unusual nor unheard of to proceed with an interim distribution of net proceeds in the context of a sale of assets in a *CCAA* reorganization. Nothing in the *CCAA* prevents similar interim distribution of monies. There are several examples of such distributions having been authorized by Courts in Canada⁷.

72 While the SSNs are certainly subject to a stay of proceedings much like the other creditors involved in the present *CCAA* reorganization, an interim distribution of net proceeds from the sale of an asset subject to the Court's approval has never been considered a breach of the stay.

73 In this regard, the Bondholders have no economic interest in the MPCo assets and resulting proceeds of sale that are subject to a first ranking security interest in favor of the SSNs. Therefore, they are not directly affected by the proposed distribution of CDN\$200 million.

74 In *Windsor Machine & Stamping Ltd. (Re)*,⁸ Morawetz J. dealt with the opposition of unsecured creditors to an Approval and Distribution Order as follows:

13 Although the outcome of this process does not result in any distribution to unsecured creditors, this does not give rise to a valid reason to withhold Court approval of these transactions. I am satisfied that the unsecured creditors have no economic interest in the assets.

75 Finally, even though the Monitor makes no recommendation in respect of the proposed distribution to the SSNs, this can hardly be viewed as an objection on its part. In the first place, this is not an issue upon which the Monitor is expected to opine. Besides, in its 19th report, the Monitor notes the following in that regard:

- a) According to its Counsel, the SSNs security on the ACCC's 60% interest in MPCo is valid and enforceable;
- b) The amounts owed to the SSNs far exceed the contemplated distribution while the SSNs' collateral is sufficient for the SSNs' claim to be most likely paid in full;
- c) The proposed distribution entails an economy of CDN\$27 million per year in interest savings; and
- d) Even taking into consideration the CDN\$200 million proposed distribution, the ULC DIP Facility provides the Abitibi Petitioners with the liquidity they require for most of the coming year.

76 All things considered, the Court disagrees with the Bondholders' assertion that the proposed distribution is against the goals and objectives of the *CCAA*. For some, it may only be a small step. However, it is a definite step in the right direction.

77 Securing the most needed liquidity at issue here and reducing substantially the extent of the liabilities towards a key secured creditor group no doubt enhances the chances of a successful restructuring while bringing stability to the on-going business.

78 This benefits a large community of interests that goes beyond the sole SSNs.

79 From that standpoint, the Court is satisfied that the restructuring is moving forward properly, with reasonable diligence and in accordance with the *CCAA* ultimate goals.

80 Abitibi Petitioners' firm intention, reiterated at the hearing, to shortly provide their stakeholders with a business plan and a restructuring and recapitalization term sheet confirms it as well.

3) The Orders Sought

81 In closing, the precise wording of the orders sought has been negotiated at length between Counsel. It is the result of a difficult compromise reached between many different parties, each trying to protect distinct interests.

82 Nonetheless, despite their best efforts, this wording certainly appears quite convoluted in some cases, to say the least. The proposed amendment to the subrogation provision of the Second Amended Initial Order is a vivid example. Still, the mechanism agreed upon, however complicated it might appear to some, remains acceptable to all affected creditors.

83 The delicate consensus reached in this respect must not be discarded lightly. In view of the role of the Court in *CCAA* proceedings, that is, one of judicial oversight, the orders sought will thus be granted as amended, save for limited exceptions. To avoid potential misunderstandings, the Court felt necessary to slightly correct the specific wording of some conclusions. The orders granted reflect this.

84 Turning to the conclusions proposed by the Bondholders at paragraphs 8 to 11 of the draft amended order (now paragraphs 6 to 9 of this Order), the Court considers them useful and appropriate. They assist somehow in bringing into focus the need for this *CCAA* process to continue to move forward efficiently.

85 Minor adjustments to some of the wording are, however, required in order to give the Abitibi Petitioners some flexibility in terms of compliance with the ULC DIP documents and cash flow forecast.

86 For the expected upcoming filing by the Abitibi Petitioners of their business plan and restructuring and recapitalization term sheet, the Court concludes that simply giving act to their stated intention is sufficient at this stage. The deadlines indicated correspond to the date agreed upon by the parties for the business plan and to the expected renewal date of the Initial Order for the restructuring and recapitalization term sheet.

FOR THESE REASONS, THE COURT:

ORDERS the provisional execution of this Order notwithstanding any appeal and without the necessity of furnishing any security.

ULC DIP Financing

1 *ORDERS* that the Abitibi Petitioners are hereby authorized and empowered to enter into, obtain and borrow under a credit facility provided pursuant to a loan agreement (the "*ULC DIP Agreement*") among ACI, as borrower, and 3239432 Nova Scotia Company, an unlimited liability company ("*ULC*"), as lender (the "*ULC DIP Lender*"), to be approved by Alcoa acting reasonably, which terms will be consistent with the ULC DIP Term Sheet communicated as *Exhibit R-1* in support of the ULC DIP Motion, subject to such non-material amendments and modifications as the parties may agree with a copy thereof being provided in advance to the Monitor and to modifications required by Alcoa, acting reasonably, which credit facility shall be in an aggregate principal amount outstanding at any time not exceeding \$230 million.

2 *ORDERS* that the credit facility provided pursuant to the ULC DIP Agreement (the "*ULC DIP*") will be subject to the following draw conditions:

- a) a first draw of \$130 million to be advanced at closing;
- b) subsequent draws for a maximum total amount of \$50 million in increments of up to \$25 million to be advanced upon a five (5) business day notice and in accordance with paragraph 61.11 of the Second Amended Initial Order which shall apply mutatis mutandis to advances under the ULC DIP; and
- c) the balance of \$50 million shall become available upon further order of the Court.

At the request of the Borrower, all undrawn amounts under the ULC DIP shall either (i) be transferred to the Monitor to be

held in an interest bearing account for the benefit of the Borrower providing that any requests for advances thereafter shall continue to be made and processed in accordance herewith as if the transfer had not occurred, or (ii) be invested by ULC in an interest bearing account with all interest earned thereon being for the benefit of and remitted to the Borrower forthwith following receipt thereof.

3 *ORDERS* the Petitioners to communicate a draft of the substantially final ULC DIP Agreement (the "*Draft ULC DIP Agreement*") to the Monitor and to any party listed on the Service List which requests a copy of same (an "*Interested Party*") no later than five (5) days prior to the anticipated closing of the MPCo Transaction, as said term is defined in the ULC DIP Motion.

4 *ORDERS* that any Interested Party who objects to any provisions of the Draft ULC DIP Agreement as not being substantially in accordance with the terms of the ULC DIP Term Sheet, Exhibit R-1, or objectionable for any other reason, shall, before the close of business of the day following delivery of the Draft ULC DIP Agreement, make a request for a hearing before this Court stating the grounds upon which such objection is based, failing which the Draft ULC DIP Agreement shall be considered to conform to the ULC DIP Term Sheet and shall be deemed to constitute the ULC DIP Agreement for the purposes of this Order.

5 *ORDERS* that the Abitibi Petitioners are hereby authorized and empowered to execute and deliver the ULC DIP Agreement, subject to the terms of this Order and the approval of Alcoa, acting reasonably, as well as such commitment letters, fee letters, credit agreements, mortgages, charges, hypothecs and security documents, guarantees, mandate and other definitive documents (collectively with the ULC DIP Agreement, the "*ULC DIP Documents*"), as are contemplated by the ULC DIP Agreement or as may be reasonably required by the ULC DIP Lender pursuant to the terms thereof, and the Abitibi Petitioners are hereby authorized and directed to pay and perform all of their indebtedness, interest, fees, liabilities and obligations to the ULC DIP Lender under and pursuant to the ULC DIP Documents as and when same become due and are to be performed, notwithstanding any other provision of this Order.

6 *ORDERS* that the Abitibi Petitioners shall substantially comply with the terms and conditions set forth in the ULC DIP Documents and the 13-week cash flow forecast (the "*Budget*") provided to the financial advisors of the Notice Parties (as defined in the Second Amended Initial Order) and any Interested Party.

7 *ORDERS* that, in accordance with the terms and conditions of the ULC DIP Documents, the Abitibi Petitioners shall use the proceeds of the ULC DIP substantially in compliance with the Budget, that the Monitor shall monitor the ongoing disbursements of the Abitibi Petitioners under the Budget, and that the Monitor shall forthwith advise the Notice Parties (as defined in the Second Amended Initial Order) and any Interested Party of the Monitor's understanding of any pending or anticipated substantial non-compliance with the Budget and/or any other pending or anticipated event of default or termination event under any of the ULC DIP Documents.

8 *GIVES ACT* to the Abitibi Petitioners of their stated intention to provide a business plan to the Notice Parties (as defined in the Second Amended Initial Order) and any Interested Party by no later than 5:00 p.m. on November 27, 2009.

9 *GIVES ACT* to the Abitibi Petitioners of their stated intention to provide a restructuring and recapitalization term sheet (the "*Recapitalization Term Sheet*") to the Notice Parties (as defined in the Second Amended Initial Order) and any Interested Party by no later than 5:00 p.m. on December 15, 2009.

10 *ORDERS* that, notwithstanding any other provision of this Order, the Abitibi Petitioners shall pay to the ULC DIP Lender when due all amounts owing (including principal, interest, fees and expenses, including without limitation, all fees and disbursements of counsel and all other advisers to or agents of the ULC DIP Lender on a full indemnity basis (the "*ULC DIP Expenses*") under the ULC DIP Documents and shall perform all of their other obligations to the ULC DIP Lender pursuant to the ULC DIP Documents and this Order.

11 *ORDERS* that the claims of the ULC DIP Lender pursuant to the ULC DIP Documents shall not be compromised or arranged pursuant to the Plan or these proceedings and the ULC DIP Lender, in such capacity, shall be treated as an unaffected creditor in these proceedings and in any Plan or any proposal filed by any Abitibi Petitioner under the *BIA*.

12 *ORDERS* that the ULC DIP Lender may, notwithstanding any other provision of this Order or the Initial Order:

a) take such steps from time to time as it may deem necessary or appropriate to register, record or perfect the ACI DIP Charge and the ULC DIP Documents in all jurisdictions where it deems it to be appropriate; and

b) upon the occurrence of a Termination Event (as each such term is defined in the ULC DIP Documents), refuse to make any advance to the Abitibi Petitioners and terminate, reduce or restrict any further commitment to the Abitibi Petitioners to the extent any such commitment remains, set off or consolidate any amounts owing by the ULC DIP Lender to the Abitibi Petitioners against any obligation of the Abitibi Petitioners to the ULC DIP Lender, make demand, accelerate payment or give other similar notices, or to apply to this Court for the appointment of a receiver, receiver and manager or interim receiver, or for a bankruptcy order against the Abitibi Petitioners and for the appointment of a trustee in bankruptcy of the Abitibi Petitioners, and upon the occurrence of an event of default under the terms of the ULC DIP Documents, the ULC DIP Lender shall be entitled to apply to the Court to seize and retain proceeds from the sale of any of the Property of the Abitibi Petitioners and the cash flow of the Abitibi Petitioners to repay amounts owing to the ULC DIP Lender in accordance with the ULC DIP Documents and the ACI DIP Charge.

13 *ORDERS* that the foregoing rights and remedies of the ULC DIP Lender shall be enforceable against any trustee in bankruptcy, interim receiver, receiver or receiver and manager of the Abitibi Petitioners or the Property of the Abitibi Petitioners, the whole in accordance with and to the extent provided in the ULC DIP Documents.

14 *ORDERS* that the ULC DIP Lender shall not take any enforcement steps under the ULC DIP Documents or the ACI DIP Charge without providing five (5) business day (the "*Notice Period*") written enforcement notice of a default thereunder to the Abitibi Petitioners, the Monitor, the Senior Secured Noteholders, Alcoa, the Notice Parties (as defined in the Second Amended Initial Order) and any Interested Party. Upon expiry of such Notice Period, and notwithstanding any stay of proceedings provided herein, the ULC DIP Lender shall be entitled to take any and all steps and exercise all rights and remedies provided for under the ULC DIP Documents and the ACI DIP Charge and otherwise permitted at law, the whole in accordance with applicable provincial laws, but without having to send any notices under Section 244 of the *BIA*. For greater certainty, the ULC DIP Lender may issue a prior notice pursuant to Article 2757 *CCQ* concurrently with the written enforcement notice of a default mentioned above.

15 *ORDERS* that, subject to further order of this Court, no order shall be made varying, rescinding, or otherwise affecting paragraphs 61.1 to 61.9 of the Initial Order, the approval of the ULC DIP Documents or the ACI DIP Charge unless either (a) notice of a motion for such order is served on the Petitioners, the Monitor, Alcoa, the Senior Secured Noteholders and the ULC DIP Lender by the moving party and returnable within seven (7) days after the party was provided with notice of this Order in accordance with paragraph 70(a) hereof or (b) each of the ULC DIP Lender and Alcoa applies for or consents to such order.

16 *ORDERS* that 3239432 Nova Scotia Company is authorized to assign its interest in the ULC DIP to Alcoa pursuant to the security agreements and guarantees to be granted pursuant to the Implementation Agreement and this Court's Order dated September 29, 2009.

17 *AMENDS* the Initial Order issued by this Court on April 17, 2009 (as amended and restated) by adding the following at the end of paragraph 61.3:

ORDERS further, that from and after the date of closing of the MPCo Transaction (as said term is defined in the Petitioners' ULC DIP Motion dated November 9, 2009) and provided the principal, interest and costs under the ACI DIP Agreement (as defined in the Order of this Court dated May 6, 2009), are concurrently paid in full, the ACI DIP Charge shall be increased by the aggregate amount of \$230 million (subject to the same limitations provided in the first sentence hereof in relation to the Replacement Securitization Facility) and shall be extended by a movable and immovable hypothec, mortgage, lien and security interest on all property of the Abitibi Petitioners (other than the property of Abitibi Consolidated (U.K.) Inc.) in favour of the ULC DIP Lender for all amounts owing, including principal, interest and ULC DIP Expenses and all obligations required to be performed under or in connection with the ULC DIP Documents. The ACI DIP Charge as so increased shall continue to have the priority established by paragraphs 89 and 91 hereof provided such increased ACI DIP Charge (being the portion of the ACI DIP Charge in favour of the ULC DIP Lender) shall in all respects be subordinate (i) to the subrogation rights in favour of the Senior Secured Noteholders arising from the repayment of the ACI DIP Lender from the proceeds of the sale of the MPCo transaction as approved

by this Court in its Order of September 29, 2009 and as confirmed by paragraph 11 of that Order, notwithstanding the amendment of paragraph 61.10 of this Order by the subsequent Order dated November 16, 2009, as well as the further subrogation rights, if any, in favour of the Term Lenders; and (ii) rights in favour of the Term Lenders arising from the use of cash for the payment of interest fees and accessories as determined by the Monitor. No order shall have the effect of varying or amending the priority of the ACI DIP Charge and the interest of the ULC DIP Lender therein without the consent of the Senior Secured Noteholders and Alcoa. The terms "ULC DIP Lender", "ULC DIP Documents", "ULC DIP Expenses", "Senior Secured Noteholders" and "Alcoa" shall be as defined in the Order of this Court dated November 16, 2009. Notwithstanding the subrogation rights created or confirmed herein, in no event shall the ULC DIP Lender be subordinated to more than approximately \$40 million, being the aggregate of the proceeds of the MPCo Transaction paid to the ACI DIP Lender plus the interest, fees and expenses paid to the ACI DIP Lender as determined by the Monitor.

ACI DIP Agreement

18 *ORDERS* that the Abitibi Petitioners are hereby authorized to make, execute and deliver one or more amendment agreements in connection with the ACI DIP Agreement providing for (i) an extension of the period during which any undrawn portion of the credit facility provided pursuant to the ACI DIP Agreement shall be available and (ii) the modification of the date upon which such credit facility must be repaid from November 1, 2009 to the earlier of the closing of the MPCo Transaction and December 15, 2009, subject to the terms and conditions set forth in the ACI DIP Agreement, save and except for non-material amendments.

Senior Secured Notes Distribution

19 *ORDERS* that the Abitibi Petitioners are authorized and directed to make a distribution to the Trustee of the Senior Secured Notes in the amount of \$200 million upon completion of the MPCo Transaction (as said term is defined in the ULC DIP Motion) from the proceeds of such sale and of the ULC DIP Facility, providing always that the ACI DIP is repaid in full upon completion of the MPCo Transaction.

20 *ORDERS* that, subject to completion of the ULC DIP (including the initial draw of \$130 million thereunder) and providing always that the ACI DIP is repaid in full upon completion of the MPCo Transaction, the distribution referred to in the preceding paragraph and the flow of funds upon completion of the MPCo Transaction and the ULC DIP shall be arranged in accordance with the following principles: (a) MPCo Proceeds shall be used, first, to fund the distribution to the Senior Secured Notes referenced in the previous paragraph and, secondly, to fund the repayment of the ACI DIP; (b) the initial draw of \$130 million made under the ULC DIP shall fund any remaining balance due to repay in full the ACI DIP and this, upon completion of the MPCo Transaction. The Monitor shall be authorized to review the completion of the MPCo Transaction, the ULC DIP and the repayment of the ACI DIP and shall report to the Court regarding compliance with this provision as it deems necessary.

Amendment to the Subrogation Provision

21 *ORDERS* that Subsection 61.10 of the Initial Order, as amended and restated, is replaced by the following:

Subrogation to ACI DIP Charge

[61.10] *ORDERS* that the holders of Secured Notes, the Lenders under the Term Loan Facility (collectively, the "Secured Creditors") and McBurney Corporation, McBurney Power Limited and MBB Power Services Inc. (collectively, the "Lien Holder") that hold security over assets that are subject to the ACI DIP Charge and that, as of the Effective Time, was opposable to third parties (including a trustee in bankruptcy) in accordance with the law applicable to such security (an "Impaired Secured Creditor" and "Existing Security", respectively) shall be subrogated to the ACI DIP Charge to the extent of the lesser of (i) any net proceeds from the Existing Security including from the sale or other disposition of assets, resulting from the collection of accounts receivable or other

claims (other than Property subject to the Securitization Program Agreements and for greater certainty, but without limiting the generality of the foregoing, the ACI DIP Charge shall in no circumstances extend to any assets sold pursuant to the Securitization Program Agreements, any Replacement Securitization Facility or any assets of ACUSFC, the term "Replacement Securitization Facility" having the meaning ascribed to same in Schedule A of the ACI DIP Agreement) and/or cash that is subject to the Existing Security of such Impaired Secured Creditor that is used directly to pay (a) the ACI DIP Lender or (b) another Impaired Secured Creditor (including by any means of realization) on account of principal, interest or costs, in whole or in part, as determined by the Monitor (subject to adjudication by the Court in the event of any dispute) and (ii) the unpaid amounts due and/or becoming due and/or owing to such Impaired Secured Creditor that are secured by its Existing Security. For this purpose "**ACI DIP Lender**" shall be read to include Bank of Montreal, IQ, the ULC DIP Lender and their successors and assigns, including any lender or lenders providing replacement DIP financing should same be approved by subsequent order of this Court. No Impaired Secured Creditor shall be able to enforce its right of subrogation to the ACI DIP Charge until all obligations to the ACI DIP Lender have been paid in full and providing that all rights of subrogation hereunder shall be postponed to the right of subrogation of IQ under the IQ Guarantee Offer, and, for greater certainty, no subrogee shall have any rights over or in respect of the IQ Guarantee Offer. In the event that, following the repayment in full of the ACI DIP Lender in circumstances where that payment is made, wholly or in part, from net proceeds of the Existing Security of an Impaired Secured Creditor (the "**First Impaired Secured Creditor**"), such Impaired Secured Creditor enforces its right of subrogation to the ACI DIP Charge and realizes net proceeds from the Existing Security of another Impaired Secured Creditor (the "**Second Impaired Secured Creditor**"), the Second Impaired Secured Creditor shall not be able to enforce its right of subrogation to the ACI DIP Charge until all obligations to the First Impaired Secured Creditor have been paid in full. In the event that more than one Impaired Secured Creditor is subrogated to the ACI DIP Charge as a result of a payment to the ACI DIP Lender, such Impaired Secured Creditors shall rank *pari passu* as subrogees, rateably in accordance with the extent to which each of them is subrogated to the ACI DIP Charge. The allocation of the burden of the ACI DIP Charge amongst the assets and creditors shall be determined by subsequent application to the Court if necessary.

[21.1] **DECLARES** that for the purposes of paragraphs 1, 5, 10, 12, 13, 17 and 18 of the present Order, the term "Abitibi Petitioners" shall not include Abitibi-Consolidated (U.K.) Inc. added to the schedule of Abitibi Petitioners by Order of this Court on November 10, 2009;

22 *ORDERS* the provisional execution of this Order notwithstanding any appeal and without the necessity of furnishing any security.

23 *WITHOUT COSTS.*

Schedule "A" — Abitibi Petitioners

1. *ABITIBI-CONSOLIDATED INC.*
2. *ABITIBI-CONSOLIDATED COMPANY OF CANADA*
3. *3224112 NOVA SCOTIA LIMITED*
4. *MARKETING DONOHUE INC.*
5. *ABITIBI-CONSOLIDATED CANADIAN OFFICE PRODUCTS HOLDINGS INC.*
6. *3834328 CANADA INC.*
7. *6169678 CANADA INC.*
8. *4042140 CANADA INC.*

9. *DONOHUE RECYCLING INC.*
10. *1508756 ONTARIO INC.*
11. *3217925 NOVA SCOTIA COMPANY*
12. *LA TUQUE FOREST PRODUCTS INC.*
13. *ABITIBI-CONSOLIDATED NOVA SCOTIA INCORPORATED*
14. *SAGUENAY FOREST PRODUCTS INC.*
15. *TERRA NOVA EXPLORATIONS LTD.*
16. *THE JONQUIERE PULP COMPANY*
17. *THE INTERNATIONAL BRIDGE AND TERMINAL COMPANY*
18. *SCRAMBLE MINING LTD.*
19. *9150-3383 QUÉBEC INC.*
20. *ABITIBI-CONSOLIDATED (U.K.) INC.*

Schedule "B" — Bowater Petitioners

1. *BOWATER CANADIAN HOLDINGS INC.*
2. *BOWATER CANADA FINANCE CORPORATION*
3. *BOWATER CANADIAN LIMITED*
4. *3231378 NOVA SCOTIA COMPANY*
5. *ABITIBI-BOWATER CANADA INC.*
6. *BOWATER CANADA TREASURY CORPORATION*
7. *BOWATER CANADIAN FOREST PRODUCTS INC.*
8. *BOWATER SHELburnE CORPORATION*
9. *BOWATER LAHAIE CORPORATION*
10. *ST-MAURICE RIVER DRIVE COMPANY LIMITED*
11. *BOWATER TREATED WOOD INC.*
12. *CANEXEL HARDBOARD INC.*
13. *9068-9050 QUÉBEC INC.*
14. *ALLIANCE FOREST PRODUCTS (2001) INC.*
15. *BOWATER BELLEDUNE SAWMILL INC.*

16. *BOWATER MARITIMES INC.*
17. *BOWATER MITIS INC.*
18. *BOWATER GUÉRETTE INC.*
19. *BOWATER COUTURIER INC.*

Schedule "C" — 18.6 CCAA Petitioners

1. *ABITIBIBOWATER INC.*
2. *ABITIBIBOWATER US HOLDING 1 CORP.*
3. *BOWATER VENTURES INC.*
4. *BOWATER INCORPORATED*
5. *BOWATER NUWAY INC.*
6. *BOWATER NUWAY MID-STATES INC.*
7. *CATAWBA PROPERTY HOLDINGS LLC*
8. *BOWATER FINANCE COMPANY INC.*
9. *BOWATER SOUTH AMERICAN HOLDINGS INCORPORATED*
10. *BOWATER AMERICA INC.*
11. *LAKE SUPERIOR FOREST PRODUCTS INC.*
12. *BOWATER NEWSPRINT SOUTH LLC*
13. *BOWATER NEWSPRINT SOUTH OPERATIONS LLC*
14. *BOWATER FINANCE II, LLC*
15. *BOWATER ALABAMA LLC*
16. *COOSA PINES GOLF CLUB HOLDINGS LLC*

Footnotes

- ¹ *Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act*, R.S.C. 1985, c. C-36 (the "CCAA").
- ² In this Judgment, all capitalized terms not otherwise defined have the meaning ascribed thereto in either: 1) the *Second Amended Initial Order* issued by the Court on May 6, 2009; 2) the *Motion for the Distribution by the Monitor of Certain Proceeds of the MPCo Sale Transaction to U.S. Bank National Association, Indenture and Collateral Trustee for the Senior Secured Noteholders* (the "*Distribution Motion*") of the Ad Hoc Committee of the Senior Secured Noteholders and U.S. Bank National Association, Indenture Trustee for the Senior Secured Notes (respectively, the "*Committee*" and "*Trustee*", collectively the "*SSNs*") dated October 6, 2009; or 3) the Abitibi Petitioners' *Re-Amended Motion for the Approval of a Second DIP Financing in Respect of the Abitibi Petitioners and for the Distribution of Certain Proceeds of the MPCo Sale Transaction to the Trustee for the Senior Secured Notes* (the "*ULC DIP Motion*") dated November 9, 2009.

- ³ *Re-Amended Motion for the Approval of a Second DIP Financing in Respect of the Abitibi Petitioners and for the Distribution of Certain Proceeds of the MPCo Sale Transaction to the Trustee for the Senior Secured Notes* dated November 9, 2009 (the “ULC DIP Motion”).
- ⁴ See Monitor’s 19th Report dated October 27, 2009.
- ⁵ See Monitor’s 19th Report dated October 27, 2009.
- ⁶ See Monitor’s 19th Report dated October 27, 2009.
- ⁷ See *Re Windsor Machine & Stamping Ltd.*, 2009 CarswellOnt 4505 (Ont. Sup. Ct.); *Re Rol-Land Farms Limited* (October 5, 2009), Toronto 08-CL-7889 (Ont. Sup. Ct.); and *Re Pangeo Pharma Inc.*, (August 14, 2003), Montreal 500-11-021037-037 (Que. Sup. Ct.).
- ⁸ *Re Windsor Machine & Stamping Ltd.*, 2009 CarswellOnt 4505 (Ont. Sup. Ct.).

TAB 6

2009 CarswellOnt 4505
Ontario Superior Court of Justice [Commercial List]

Windsor Machine & Stamping Ltd., Re .

2009 CarswellOnt 4505, 179 A.C.W.S. (3d) 513

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

IN THE MATTER OF A PLAN OF COMPROMISE OR ARRANGEMENT OF WINDSOR MACHINE & STAMPING LIMITED, LIPEL INVESTMENTS LTD., WMSL HOLDINGS LTD., 442260 ONTARIO LTD., WINMACH CANADA LTD., PRODUCTION MACHINE SERVICES LTD., 538185 ONTARIO LTD., SOUTHERN WIRE PRODUCTS LIMITED, PELLUS MANUFACTURING LTD., TILBURY ASSEMBLY LTD., ST. CLAIR FORMS INC., CENTROY ASSEMBLY LTD., PIONEER POLYMERS INC., G&R COLD FORGING INC., WINDSOR MACHINE DE MEXICO, WINMACH INC., WINDSOR MACHINE PRODUCTS, INC. WAYNE MANUFACTURING INC. AND 383301 ONTARIO LIMITED (Applicants)

Morawetz J.

Heard: March 11, 2009
Judgment: March 11, 2009
Docket: CV-08-7672-00CL

Counsel: Tony Reyes, Evan Cobb for Monitor, RSM Richter Inc.
Raong Phalavong for Saginaw Pattern
Andrew Hatnay, Andrea McKinnon, D. Youkaris for U.A.W., Local 251
Joseph Marin for Windsor Machine & Stamping Ltd.
D. Dowdall, J. Dietrich for Bank of Montreal
J. Archibald for Magna
John D. Leslie for Ford Motor Company
P. Shea for Johnson Controls Inc.
Jackie Moher for Ryder Finance Corporation

Headnote

Bankruptcy and insolvency --- Proposal — Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act — Miscellaneous issues

Real property --- Sale of land — Agreement of purchase and sale — Miscellaneous

Real property --- Sale of land — Judicial sale — Vesting order

Table of Authorities

Statutes considered:

Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act, R.S.C. 1985, c. C-36
Generally — referred to

Morawetz J.:

1 On March 11, 2009, the motion of RSM Richter Inc. was heard and granted with reasons to follow. These are those reasons.

2 RSM Richter Inc., in its capacity as Monitor, brought this motion for:

- (a) an Approval and Distribution Order;
- (b) a Vesting Order relating to the sale of personal property assets from WMSL to the Canadian Purchaser;
- (c) a Vesting Order relating to the sale of real property from Lipel Investments Ltd. to the Canadian Purchaser;
- (d) a Vesting Order relating to the sale of real property from 383301 to the Canadian Purchaser;
- (e) an Order approving the fees and disbursements of the Monitor and its counsel.

3 The motion has the support of the Applicants, Bank of Montreal (the "Bank"), Magna, Ford and Johnson Controls. The Union was not opposed to the sale. An unsecured creditor, Saginaw Pattern, objected. Ryder Finance, an unaffected party did not oppose.

4 I am satisfied that the record supports the requested relief. During these CCAA proceedings, the Applicants explored a number of restructuring alternatives. The Monitor also ran a sale process to identify a potential buyer or buyers for the business. The Applicants were unable to implement a restructuring within the current corporate entities and were unable to identify an arm's length buyer of the business that would pay an amount greater than the forced liquidation value of the business. The sale process conducted by the Monitor did not result in any offers being submitted to purchase the Applicants' assets.

5 The Monitor is of the view that the Applicants could not carry on as currently structured. Both the Bank and EDC indicated that they would continue their support for the business and they have had negotiations with the Purchasers and the Applicants, with a view to financing the Purchasers and then working with the Applicants to complete a sale of the business to the Purchasers.

6 The Monitor is of the view that the proposed transactions result in an outcome that preserves the business. The Monitor supports the approval of the transactions described in the Seventh Report.

7 With respect to the Approval and Distribution Order and the three Vesting Orders, these transactions notionally result in the Bank's loans being repaid by the Purchasers (who are being financed by the Bank and EDC) and will permit the business to continue. A portion of the secured debt owing by WMSL to WMSL Holdings Ltd. will be paid by way of a promissory note from the Canadian Purchaser to WMSL Holdings Ltd. The Canadian Purchaser will not have the burden of the remaining secured debt owing to WMSL Holdings Inc., nor the burden of substantial unsecured debt.

8 The Monitor is of the view that the holdbacks described in the Approval and Distribution Order are desirable and appropriate in the circumstances so that goods and services supplied post-filing can be paid, and so that the Union, if it is successful in its claims, can be paid.

9 In addition to the three transactions for which the Vesting Orders are sought, a fourth transaction is covered by the Approval and Distribution Order. The fourth transaction is with respect to personal property owned by two U.S. companies. These companies operate in the State of Michigan. The Applicants did not seek formal recognition of the CCAA proceedings in the United States. The parties are of the view that the most cost efficient means of completing the transaction with respect to these assets would be for the Bank to take its remedies under the U.S. Uniform Commercial Code, ("UCC") and issue notices of sale under the UCC with respect to the personal property. The Monitor consented to this process and notices were issued by the Bank.

10 It is specifically noted, that notwithstanding anything in the Approval and Distribution Order, Vesting Orders or purchase agreements referenced therein, the purchase orders or releases issued by Magna Structural Systems Inc. and/or Magna Seating of America, Inc. (collectively, "Magna") or Ford Motor Company ("Ford") to WMSL or any other Applicant will be assigned and vested in and to the purchaser, upon the consent of Magna or Ford, as the case may be, to the assignment of such purchase orders and releases being provided to WMSL and the Purchaser on Closing and the Certificate having been filed.

11 Further, nothing in the Approval and Distribution Order or the Vesting Orders made in accordance with such Approval and Vesting Order shall, unless JCI consents, impact or terminate the IP licence or option to purchase assets granted to JCI pursuant to the Accommodation Agreement dated October 24, 2008 and approved by the Order dated October 29, 2008, and the vesting of assets pursuant to Approval and Distribution Order or the Vesting Orders shall, unless JCI otherwise consents, be subject to the IP licence and option in favour of JCI.

12 Finally, it is noted that employee matters are specifically addressed at Article 2.13 of the Agreement of Purchase and Sale.

13 Although the outcome of this process does not result in any distribution to unsecured creditors, this does not give rise to a valid reason to withhold court approval of these transactions. I am satisfied that the unsecured creditors have no economic interest in the assets.

14 As previously indicated, the record supports the requested relief in all respects. Orders have been signed and issued in the form requested.

TAB 7

2010 SCC 60, 2010 CSC 60
Supreme Court of Canada

Ted Leroy Trucking [Century Services] Ltd., Re

2010 CarswellBC 3419, 2010 CarswellBC 3420, 2010 SCC 60, 2010 CSC 60, [2010] 3 S.C.R. 379, [2010] G.S.T.C. 186, [2010] S.C.J. No. 60, [2011] 2 W.W.R. 383, [2011] B.C.W.L.D. 533, [2011] B.C.W.L.D. 534, 12 B.C.L.R. (5th) 1, 196 A.C.W.S. (3d) 27, 2011 D.T.C. 5006 (Eng.), 2011 G.T.C. 2006 (Eng.), 296 B.C.A.C. 1, 326 D.L.R. (4th) 577, 409 N.R. 201, 503 W.A.C. 1, 72 C.B.R. (5th) 170, J.E. 2011-5

**Century Services Inc. (Appellant) and Attorney General of Canada on
behalf of Her Majesty The Queen in Right of Canada (Respondent)**

Deschamps J., McLachlin C.J.C., Binnie, LeBel, Fish, Abella, Charron, Rothstein, Cromwell JJ.

Heard: May 11, 2010
Judgment: December 16, 2010
Docket: 33239

Proceedings: reversing *Ted Leroy Trucking Ltd., Re* (2009), 2009 CarswellBC 1195, 2009 G.T.C. 2020 (Eng.), 2009 BCCA 205, 270 B.C.A.C. 167, 454 W.A.C. 167, [2009] 12 W.W.R. 684, 98 B.C.L.R. (4th) 242, [2009] G.S.T.C. 79 (B.C. C.A.); reversing *Ted Leroy Trucking Ltd., Re* (2008), 2008 CarswellBC 2895, 2008 BCSC 1805, [2008] G.S.T.C. 221, 2009 G.T.C. 2011 (Eng.) (B.C. S.C. [In Chambers])

Counsel: Mary I.A. Buttery, Owen J. James, Matthew J.G. Curtis for Appellant
Gordon Bourgard, David Jacyk, Michael J. Lema for Respondent

Headnote

Tax --- Goods and Services Tax — Collection and remittance — GST held in trust

Debtor owed Crown under Excise Tax Act (ETA) for unremitted GST — Debtor sought relief under Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act (CCAA) — Under order of BC Supreme Court, amount of GST debt was placed in trust account and remaining proceeds of sale of assets paid to major secured creditor — Debtor's application for partial lifting of stay of proceedings to assign itself into bankruptcy was granted, while Crown's application for payment of tax debt was dismissed — Crown's appeal to BC Court of Appeal was allowed — Creditor appealed to Supreme Court of Canada — Appeal allowed — Analysis of ETA and CCAA yielded conclusion that CCAA provides that statutory deemed trusts do not apply, and that Parliament did not intend to restore Crown's deemed trust priority in GST claims under CCAA when it amended ETA in 2000 — Parliament had moved away from asserting priority for Crown claims under both CCAA and Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act (BIA), and neither statute provided for preferred treatment of GST claims — Giving Crown priority over GST claims during CCAA proceedings but not in bankruptcy would reduce use of more flexible and responsive CCAA regime — Parliament likely inadvertently succumbed to drafting anomaly — Section 222(3) of ETA could not be seen as having impliedly repealed s. 18.3 of CCAA by its subsequent passage, given recent amendments to CCAA — Court had discretion under CCAA to construct bridge to liquidation under BIA, and partially lift stay of proceedings to allow entry into liquidation — No "gap" should exist when moving from CCAA to BIA — Court order segregating funds did not have certainty that Crown rather than creditor would be beneficiary sufficient to support express trust — Amount held in respect of GST debt was not subject to deemed trust, priority or express trust in favour of Crown — Excise Tax Act, R.S.C. 1985, c. E-15, ss. 222(1), (1.1).

Tax --- General principles — Priority of tax claims in bankruptcy proceedings

Debtor owed Crown under Excise Tax Act (ETA) for unremitted GST — Debtor sought relief under Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act (CCAA) — Under order of BC Supreme Court, amount of GST debt was placed in trust account and remaining proceeds of sale of assets paid to major secured creditor — Debtor's application for partial lifting of stay of proceedings to assign itself into bankruptcy was granted, while Crown's application for payment of tax debt was dismissed — Crown's appeal

to BC Court of Appeal was allowed — Creditor appealed to Supreme Court of Canada — Appeal allowed — Analysis of ETA and CCAA yielded conclusion that CCAA provides that statutory deemed trusts do not apply, and that Parliament did not intend to restore Crown's deemed trust priority in GST claims under CCAA when it amended ETA in 2000 — Parliament had moved away from asserting priority for Crown claims under both CCAA and Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act (BIA), and neither statute provided for preferred treatment of GST claims — Giving Crown priority over GST claims during CCAA proceedings but not in bankruptcy would reduce use of more flexible and responsive CCAA regime — Parliament likely inadvertently succumbed to drafting anomaly — Section 222(3) of ETA could not be seen as having impliedly repealed s. 18.3 of CCAA by its subsequent passage, given recent amendments to CCAA — Court had discretion under CCAA to construct bridge to liquidation under BIA, and partially lift stay of proceedings to allow entry into liquidation — No "gap" should exist when moving from CCAA to BIA — Court order segregating funds did not have certainty that Crown rather than creditor would be beneficiary sufficient to support express trust — Amount held in respect of GST debt was not subject to deemed trust, priority or express trust in favour of Crown.

Taxation --- Taxe sur les produits et services — Perception et versement — Montant de TPS détenu en fiducie

Débitrice devait à la Couronne des montants de TPS qu'elle n'avait pas remis, en vertu de la Loi sur la taxe d'accise (LTA) — Débitrice a entamé des procédures judiciaires en vertu de la Loi sur les arrangements avec les créanciers des compagnies (LACC) — En vertu d'une ordonnance du tribunal, le montant de la créance fiscale a été déposé dans un compte en fiducie et la balance du produit de la vente des actifs a servi à payer le créancier garanti principal — Demande de la débitrice visant à obtenir la levée partielle de la suspension de procédures afin qu'elle puisse faire cession de ses biens a été accordée, alors que la demande de la Couronne visant à obtenir le paiement des montants de TPS non remis a été rejetée — Appel interjeté par la Couronne a été accueilli — Créancier a formé un pourvoi — Pourvoi accueilli — Analyse de la LTA et de la LACC conduisait à la conclusion que le législateur ne saurait avoir eu l'intention de redonner la priorité, dans le cadre de la LACC, à la fiducie réputée de la Couronne à l'égard de ses créances relatives à la TPS quand il a modifié la LTA, en 2000 — Législateur avait mis un terme à la priorité accordée aux créances de la Couronne sous les régimes de la LACC et de la Loi sur la faillite et l'insolvabilité (LFI), et ni l'une ni l'autre de ces lois ne prévoyait que les créances relatives à la TPS bénéficiaient d'un traitement préférentiel — Fait de faire primer la priorité de la Couronne sur les créances découlant de la TPS dans le cadre de procédures fondées sur la LACC mais pas en cas de faillite aurait pour effet de restreindre le recours à la possibilité de se restructurer sous le régime plus souple et mieux adapté de la LACC — Il semblait probable que le législateur avait par inadvertance commis une anomalie rédactionnelle — On ne pourrait pas considérer l'art. 222(3) de la LTA comme ayant implicitement abrogé l'art. 18.3 de la LACC, compte tenu des modifications récemment apportées à la LACC — Sous le régime de la LACC, le tribunal avait discrétion pour établir une passerelle vers une liquidation opérée sous le régime de la LFI et de lever la suspension partielle des procédures afin de permettre à la débitrice de procéder à la transition au régime de liquidation — Il n'y avait aucune certitude, en vertu de l'ordonnance du tribunal, que la Couronne était le bénéficiaire véritable de la fiducie ni de fondement pour donner naissance à une fiducie expresse — Montant perçu au titre de la TPS ne faisait l'objet d'aucune fiducie présumée, priorité ou fiducie expresse en faveur de la Couronne.

Taxation --- Principes généraux — Priorité des créances fiscales dans le cadre de procédures en faillite

Débitrice devait à la Couronne des montants de TPS qu'elle n'avait pas remis, en vertu de la Loi sur la taxe d'accise (LTA) — Débitrice a entamé des procédures judiciaires en vertu de la Loi sur les arrangements avec les créanciers des compagnies (LACC) — En vertu d'une ordonnance du tribunal, le montant de la créance fiscale a été déposé dans un compte en fiducie et la balance du produit de la vente des actifs a servi à payer le créancier garanti principal — Demande de la débitrice visant à obtenir la levée partielle de la suspension de procédures afin qu'elle puisse faire cession de ses biens a été accordée, alors que la demande de la Couronne visant à obtenir le paiement des montants de TPS non remis a été rejetée — Appel interjeté par la Couronne a été accueilli — Créancier a formé un pourvoi — Pourvoi accueilli — Analyse de la LTA et de la LACC conduisait à la conclusion que le législateur ne saurait avoir eu l'intention de redonner la priorité, dans le cadre de la LACC, à la fiducie réputée de la Couronne à l'égard de ses créances relatives à la TPS quand il a modifié la LTA, en 2000 — Législateur avait mis un terme à la priorité accordée aux créances de la Couronne sous les régimes de la LACC et de la Loi sur la faillite et l'insolvabilité (LFI), et ni l'une ni l'autre de ces lois ne prévoyait que les créances relatives à la TPS bénéficiaient d'un traitement préférentiel — Fait de faire primer la priorité de la Couronne sur les créances découlant de la TPS dans le cadre de procédures fondées sur la LACC mais pas en cas de faillite aurait pour effet de restreindre le recours à la possibilité de se restructurer sous le régime plus souple et mieux adapté de la LACC — Il semblait probable que le législateur avait par inadvertance commis une

anomalie rédactionnelle — On ne pourrait pas considérer l'art. 222(3) de la LTA comme ayant implicitement abrogé l'art. 18.3 de la LACC, compte tenu des modifications récemment apportées à la LACC — Sous le régime de la LACC, le tribunal avait discrétion pour établir une passerelle vers une liquidation opérée sous le régime de la LFI et de lever la suspension partielle des procédures afin de permettre à la débitrice de procéder à la transition au régime de liquidation — Il n'y avait aucune certitude, en vertu de l'ordonnance du tribunal, que la Couronne était le bénéficiaire véritable de la fiducie ni de fondement pour donner naissance à une fiducie expresse — Montant perçu au titre de la TPS ne faisait l'objet d'aucune fiducie présumée, priorité ou fiducie expresse en faveur de la Couronne.

The debtor company owed the Crown under the Excise Tax Act (ETA) for GST that was not remitted. The debtor commenced proceedings under the Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act (CCAA). Under an order by the B.C. Supreme Court, the amount of the tax debt was placed in a trust account, and the remaining proceeds from the sale of the debtor's assets were paid to the major secured creditor. The debtor's application for a partial lifting of the stay of proceedings in order to assign itself into bankruptcy was granted, while the Crown's application for the immediate payment of the unremitted GST was dismissed.

The Crown's appeal to the B.C. Court of Appeal was allowed. The Court of Appeal found that the lower court was bound by the ETA to give the Crown priority once bankruptcy was inevitable. The Court of Appeal ruled that there was a deemed trust under s. 222 of the ETA or that an express trust was created in the Crown's favour by the court order segregating the GST funds in the trust account.

The creditor appealed to the Supreme Court of Canada.

Held: The appeal was allowed.

Per Deschamps J. (McLachlin C.J.C., Binnie, LeBel, Charron, Rothstein, Cromwell JJ. concurring): A purposive and contextual analysis of the ETA and CCAA yielded the conclusion that Parliament could not have intended to restore the Crown's deemed trust priority in GST claims under the CCAA when it amended the ETA in 2000. Parliament had moved away from asserting priority for Crown claims in insolvency law under both the CCAA and Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act (BIA). Unlike for source deductions, there was no express statutory basis in the CCAA or BIA for concluding that GST claims enjoyed any preferential treatment. The internal logic of the CCAA also militated against upholding a deemed trust for GST claims.

Giving the Crown priority over GST claims during CCAA proceedings but not in bankruptcy would, in practice, deprive companies of the option to restructure under the more flexible and responsive CCAA regime. It seemed likely that Parliament had inadvertently succumbed to a drafting anomaly, which could be resolved by giving precedence to s. 18.3 of the CCAA. Section 222(3) of the ETA could no longer be seen as having impliedly repealed s. 18.3 of the CCAA by being passed subsequently to the CCAA, given the recent amendments to the CCAA. The legislative context supported the conclusion that s. 222(3) of the ETA was not intended to narrow the scope of s. 18.3 of the CCAA.

The breadth of the court's discretion under the CCAA was sufficient to construct a bridge to liquidation under the BIA, so there was authority under the CCAA to partially lift the stay of proceedings to allow the debtor's entry into liquidation. There should be no gap between the CCAA and BIA proceedings that would invite a race to the courthouse to assert priorities.

The court order did not have the certainty that the Crown would actually be the beneficiary of the funds sufficient to support an express trust, as the funds were segregated until the dispute between the creditor and the Crown could be resolved. The amount collected in respect of GST but not yet remitted to the Receiver General of Canada was not subject to a deemed trust, priority or express trust in favour of the Crown.

Per Fish J. (concurring): Parliament had declined to amend the provisions at issue after detailed consideration of the insolvency regime, so the apparent conflict between s. 18.3 of the CCAA and s. 222 of the ETA should not be treated as a drafting anomaly. In the insolvency context, a deemed trust would exist only when two complementary elements co-existed: first, a statutory provision creating the trust; and second, a CCAA or BIA provision confirming its effective operation. Parliament had created the Crown's deemed trust in the Income Tax Act, Canada Pension Plan and Employment Insurance Act and then confirmed in clear and unmistakable terms its continued operation under both the CCAA and the BIA regimes. In contrast, the ETA created a deemed trust in favour of the Crown, purportedly notwithstanding any contrary legislation, but Parliament did not expressly provide for its continued operation in either the BIA or the CCAA. The absence of this confirmation reflected Parliament's intention to allow the deemed trust to lapse with the commencement of insolvency proceedings. Parliament's evident intent was to render GST deemed trusts inoperative upon the institution of insolvency proceedings, and so s. 222 of the ETA mentioned the BIA so as to exclude it from its ambit, rather than include it as the other statutes did. As none of these statutes mentioned the CCAA expressly, the specific reference to the BIA had no bearing on the interaction with the CCAA. It was the confirmatory

provisions in the insolvency statutes that would determine whether a given deemed trust would subsist during insolvency proceedings.

Per Abella J. (dissenting): The appellate court properly found that s. 222(3) of the ETA gave priority during CCAA proceedings to the Crown's deemed trust in unremitted GST. The failure to exempt the CCAA from the operation of this provision was a reflection of clear legislative intent. Despite the requests of various constituencies and case law confirming that the ETA took precedence over the CCAA, there was no responsive legislative revision and the BIA remained the only exempted statute. There was no policy justification for interfering, through interpretation, with this clarity of legislative intention and, in any event, the application of other principles of interpretation reinforced this conclusion. Contrary to the majority's view, the "later in time" principle did not favour the precedence of the CCAA, as the CCAA was merely re-enacted without significant substantive changes. According to the Interpretation Act, in such circumstances, s. 222(3) of the ETA remained the later provision. The chambers judge was required to respect the priority regime set out in s. 222(3) of the ETA and so did not have the authority to deny the Crown's request for payment of the GST funds during the CCAA proceedings.

La compagnie débitrice devait à la Couronne des montants de TPS qu'elle n'avait pas remis, en vertu de la Loi sur la taxe d'accise (LTA). La débitrice a entamé des procédures judiciaires en vertu de la Loi sur les arrangements avec les créanciers des compagnies (LACC). En vertu d'une ordonnance du tribunal, le montant de la créance fiscale a été déposé dans un compte en fiducie et la balance du produit de la vente des actifs de la débitrice a servi à payer le créancier garanti principal. La demande de la débitrice visant à obtenir la levée partielle de la suspension de procédures afin qu'elle puisse faire cession de ses biens a été accordée, alors que la demande de la Couronne visant à obtenir le paiement immédiat des montants de TPS non remis a été rejetée.

L'appel interjeté par la Couronne a été accueilli. La Cour d'appel a conclu que le tribunal se devait, en vertu de la LTA, de donner priorité à la Couronne une fois la faillite inévitable. La Cour d'appel a estimé que l'art. 222 de la LTA établissait une fiducie présumée ou bien que l'ordonnance du tribunal à l'effet que les montants de TPS soient détenus dans un compte en fiducie créait une fiducie expresse en faveur de la Couronne.

Le créancier a formé un pourvoi.

Arrêt: Le pourvoi a été accueilli.

Deschamps, J. (McLachlin, J.C.C., Binnie, LeBel, Charron, Rothstein, Cromwell, JJ., souscrivant à son opinion) : Une analyse téléologique et contextuelle de la LTA et de la LACC conduisait à la conclusion que le législateur ne saurait avoir eu l'intention de redonner la priorité, dans le cadre de la LACC, à la fiducie réputée de la Couronne à l'égard de ses créances relatives à la TPS quand il a modifié la LTA, en 2000. Le législateur avait mis un terme à la priorité accordée aux créances de la Couronne dans le cadre du droit de l'insolvabilité, sous le régime de la LACC et celui de la Loi sur la faillite et l'insolvabilité (LFI). Contrairement aux retenues à la source, aucune disposition législative expresse ne permettait de conclure que les créances relatives à la TPS bénéficiaient d'un traitement préférentiel sous le régime de la LACC ou celui de la LFI. La logique interne de la LACC allait également à l'encontre du maintien de la fiducie réputée à l'égard des créances découlant de la TPS.

Le fait de faire primer la priorité de la Couronne sur les créances découlant de la TPS dans le cadre de procédures fondées sur la LACC mais pas en cas de faillite aurait pour effet, dans les faits, de priver les compagnies de la possibilité de se restructurer sous le régime plus souple et mieux adapté de la LACC. Il semblait probable que le législateur avait par inadvertance commis une anomalie rédactionnelle, laquelle pouvait être corrigée en donnant préséance à l'art. 18.3 de la LACC. On ne pouvait plus considérer l'art. 222(3) de la LTA comme ayant implicitement abrogé l'art. 18.3 de la LACC parce qu'il avait été adopté après la LACC, compte tenu des modifications récemment apportées à la LACC. Le contexte législatif étayait la conclusion suivant laquelle l'art. 222(3) de la LTA n'avait pas pour but de restreindre la portée de l'art. 18.3 de la LACC.

L'ampleur du pouvoir discrétionnaire conféré au tribunal par la LACC était suffisant pour établir une passerelle vers une liquidation opérée sous le régime de la LFI, de sorte qu'il avait, en vertu de la LACC, le pouvoir de lever la suspension partielle des procédures afin de permettre à la débitrice de procéder à la transition au régime de liquidation. Il n'y avait aucune certitude, en vertu de l'ordonnance du tribunal, que la Couronne était le bénéficiaire véritable de la fiducie ni de fondement pour donner naissance à une fiducie expresse, puisque les fonds étaient détenus à part jusqu'à ce que le litige entre le créancier et la Couronne soit résolu. Le montant perçu au titre de la TPS mais non encore versé au receveur général du Canada ne faisait l'objet d'aucune fiducie présumée, priorité ou fiducie expresse en faveur de la Couronne.

Fish, J. (souscrivant aux motifs des juges majoritaires) : Le législateur a refusé de modifier les dispositions en question suivant un examen approfondi du régime d'insolvabilité, de sorte qu'on ne devrait pas qualifier l'apparente contradiction entre l'art.

18.3 de la LACC et l'art. 222 de la LTA d'anomalie rédactionnelle. Dans un contexte d'insolvabilité, on ne pourrait conclure à l'existence d'une fiducie présumée que lorsque deux éléments complémentaires étaient réunis : en premier lieu, une disposition législative qui crée la fiducie et, en second lieu, une disposition de la LACC ou de la LFI qui confirme l'existence de la fiducie. Le législateur a établi une fiducie présumée en faveur de la Couronne dans la Loi de l'impôt sur le revenu, le Régime de pensions du Canada et la Loi sur l'assurance-emploi puis, il a confirmé en termes clairs et explicites sa volonté de voir cette fiducie présumée produire ses effets sous le régime de la LACC et de la LFI. Dans le cas de la LTA, il a établi une fiducie présumée en faveur de la Couronne, sciemment et sans égard pour toute législation à l'effet contraire, mais n'a pas expressément prévu le maintien en vigueur de celle-ci sous le régime de la LFI ou celui de la LACC. L'absence d'une telle confirmation témoignait de l'intention du législateur de laisser la fiducie présumée devenir caduque au moment de l'introduction de la procédure d'insolvabilité. L'intention du législateur était manifestement de rendre inopérantes les fiducies présumées visant la TPS dès l'introduction d'une procédure d'insolvabilité et, par conséquent, l'art. 222 de la LTA mentionnait la LFI de manière à l'exclure de son champ d'application, et non de l'y inclure, comme le faisaient les autres lois. Puisqu'aucune de ces lois ne mentionnait spécifiquement la LACC, la mention explicite de la LFI n'avait aucune incidence sur l'interaction avec la LACC. C'était les dispositions confirmatoires que l'on trouvait dans les lois sur l'insolvabilité qui déterminaient si une fiducie présumée continuerait d'exister durant une procédure d'insolvabilité.

Abella, J. (dissidente) : La Cour d'appel a conclu à bon droit que l'art. 222(3) de la LTA donnait préséance à la fiducie présumée qui est établie en faveur de la Couronne à l'égard de la TPS non versée. Le fait que la LACC n'ait pas été soustraite à l'application de cette disposition témoignait d'une intention claire du législateur. Malgré les demandes répétées de divers groupes et la jurisprudence ayant confirmé que la LTA l'emportait sur la LACC, le législateur n'est pas intervenu et la LFI est demeurée la seule loi soustraite à l'application de cette disposition. Il n'y avait pas de considération de politique générale qui justifierait d'aller à l'encontre, par voie d'interprétation législative, de l'intention aussi clairement exprimée par le législateur et, de toutes manières, cette conclusion était renforcée par l'application d'autres principes d'interprétation. Contrairement à l'opinion des juges majoritaires, le principe de la préséance de la « loi postérieure » ne militait pas en faveur de la préséance de la LACC, celle-ci ayant été simplement adoptée à nouveau sans que l'on ne lui ait apporté de modifications importantes. En vertu de la Loi d'interprétation, dans ces circonstances, l'art. 222(3) de la LTA demeurait la disposition postérieure. Le juge siégeant en son cabinet était tenu de respecter le régime de priorités établi à l'art. 222(3) de la LTA, et il ne pouvait pas refuser la demande présentée par la Couronne en vue de se faire payer la TPS dans le cadre de la procédure introduite en vertu de la LACC.

Table of Authorities

Cases considered by Deschamps J.:

Air Canada, Re (2003), 42 C.B.R. (4th) 173, 2003 CarswellOnt 2464 (Ont. S.C.J. [Commercial List]) — referred to
Air Canada, Re (2003), 2003 CarswellOnt 4967 (Ont. S.C.J. [Commercial List]) — referred to
Alternative granite & marbre inc., Re (2009), (sub nom. *Dep. Min. Rev. Quebec v. Caisse populaire Desjardins de Montmagny*) 2009 G.T.C. 2036 (Eng.), (sub nom. *Quebec (Revenue) v. Caisse populaire Desjardins de Montmagny*) [2009] 3 S.C.R. 286, 312 D.L.R. (4th) 577, [2009] G.S.T.C. 154, (sub nom. *9083-4185 Québec Inc. (Bankrupt), Re*) 394 N.R. 368, 60 C.B.R. (5th) 1, 2009 SCC 49, 2009 CarswellQue 10706, 2009 CarswellQue 10707 (S.C.C.) — referred to
ATB Financial v. Metcalfe & Mansfield Alternative Investments II Corp. (2008), 2008 ONCA 587, 2008 CarswellOnt 4811, (sub nom. *Metcalfe & Mansfield Alternative Investments II Corp., Re*) 240 O.A.C. 245, (sub nom. *Metcalfe & Mansfield Alternative Investments II Corp., Re*) 296 D.L.R. (4th) 135, (sub nom. *Metcalfe & Mansfield Alternative Investments II Corp., Re*) 92 O.R. (3d) 513, 45 C.B.R. (5th) 163, 47 B.L.R. (4th) 123 (Ont. C.A.) — considered
Canadian Airlines Corp., Re (2000), [2000] 10 W.W.R. 269, 20 C.B.R. (4th) 1, 84 Alta. L.R. (3d) 9, 9 B.L.R. (3d) 41, 2000 CarswellAlta 662, 2000 ABQB 442, 265 A.R. 201 (Alta. Q.B.) — referred to
Canadian Red Cross Society / Société Canadienne de la Croix Rouge, Re (2000), 2000 CarswellOnt 3269, 19 C.B.R. (4th) 158 (Ont. S.C.J.) — referred to
Doré c. Verdun (Municipalité) (1997), (sub nom. *Doré v. Verdun (City)*) [1997] 2 S.C.R. 862, (sub nom. *Doré v. Verdun (Ville)*) 215 N.R. 81, (sub nom. *Doré v. Verdun (City)*) 150 D.L.R. (4th) 385, 1997 CarswellQue 159, 1997 CarswellQue 850 (S.C.C.) — distinguished
Dylex Ltd., Re (1995), 31 C.B.R. (3d) 106, 1995 CarswellOnt 54 (Ont. Gen. Div. [Commercial List]) — considered
First Vancouver Finance v. Minister of National Revenue (2002), [2002] 3 C.T.C. 285, (sub nom. *Minister of National Revenue v. First Vancouver Finance*) 2002 D.T.C. 6998 (Eng.), (sub nom. *Minister of National Revenue v. First Vancouver*

Finance) 2002 D.T.C. 7007 (Fr.), 288 N.R. 347, 212 D.L.R. (4th) 615, [2002] G.S.T.C. 23, [2003] 1 W.W.R. 1, 45 C.B.R. (4th) 213, 2002 SCC 49, 2002 CarswellSask 317, 2002 CarswellSask 318, [2002] 2 S.C.R. 720 (S.C.C.) — considered *Gauntlet Energy Corp., Re* (2003), 30 Alta. L.R. (4th) 192, 2003 ABQB 894, 2003 CarswellAlta 1735, [2003] G.S.T.C. 193, 49 C.B.R. (4th) 213, [2004] 10 W.W.R. 180, 352 A.R. 28 (Alta. Q.B.) — referred to *Hongkong Bank of Canada v. Chef Ready Foods Ltd.* (1990), 51 B.C.L.R. (2d) 84, 1990 CarswellBC 394, 4 C.B.R. (3d) 311, (sub nom. *Chef Ready Foods Ltd. v. Hongkong Bank of Canada*) [1991] 2 W.W.R. 136 (B.C. C.A.) — referred to *Ivaco Inc., Re* (2006), 2006 C.E.B. & P.G.R. 8218, 25 C.B.R. (5th) 176, 83 O.R. (3d) 108, 275 D.L.R. (4th) 132, 2006 CarswellOnt 6292, 56 C.C.P.B. 1, 26 B.L.R. (4th) 43 (Ont. C.A.) — referred to *Komunik Corp., Re* (2010), 2010 CarswellQue 686, 2010 QCCA 183 (C.A. Que.) — referred to *Komunik Corp., Re* (2009), 2009 QCCS 6332, 2009 CarswellQue 13962 (C.S. Que.) — referred to *Nova Metal Products Inc. v. Comiskey (Trustee of)* (1990), 1990 CarswellOnt 139, 1 C.B.R. (3d) 101, (sub nom. *Elan Corp. v. Comiskey*) 1 O.R. (3d) 289, (sub nom. *Elan Corp. v. Comiskey*) 41 O.A.C. 282 (Ont. C.A.) — considered *Ottawa Senators Hockey Club Corp., Re* (2005), 2005 G.T.C. 1327 (Eng.), 6 C.B.R. (5th) 293, 2005 D.T.C. 5233 (Eng.), 2005 CarswellOnt 8, [2005] G.S.T.C. 1, 193 O.A.C. 95, 73 O.R. (3d) 737 (Ont. C.A.) — not followed *Pacific National Lease Holding Corp., Re* (1992), 72 B.C.L.R. (2d) 368, 19 B.C.A.C. 134, 34 W.A.C. 134, 15 C.B.R. (3d) 265, 1992 CarswellBC 524 (B.C. C.A. [In Chambers]) — referred to *Philip's Manufacturing Ltd., Re* (1992), 9 C.B.R. (3d) 25, 67 B.C.L.R. (2d) 84, 4 B.L.R. (2d) 142, 1992 CarswellBC 542 (B.C. C.A.) — referred to *Quebec (Deputy Minister of Revenue) c. Rainville* (1979), (sub nom. *Bourgeault, Re*) 33 C.B.R. (N.S.) 301, (sub nom. *Bourgeault's Estate v. Quebec (Deputy Minister of Revenue)*) 30 N.R. 24, (sub nom. *Bourgault, Re*) 105 D.L.R. (3d) 270, 1979 CarswellQue 165, 1979 CarswellQue 266, (sub nom. *Quebec (Deputy Minister of Revenue) v. Bourgeault (Trustee of)*) [1980] 1 S.C.R. 35 (S.C.C.) — referred to *Reference re Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act (Canada)* (1934), [1934] 4 D.L.R. 75, 1934 CarswellNat 1, 16 C.B.R. 1, [1934] S.C.R. 659 (S.C.C.) — referred to *Royal Bank v. Sparrow Electric Corp.* (1997), 193 A.R. 321, 135 W.A.C. 321, [1997] 2 W.W.R. 457, 208 N.R. 161, 12 P.P.S.A.C. (2d) 68, 1997 CarswellAlta 112, 1997 CarswellAlta 113, 46 Alta. L.R. (3d) 87, (sub nom. *R. v. Royal Bank*) 97 D.T.C. 5089, 143 D.L.R. (4th) 385, 44 C.B.R. (3d) 1, [1997] 1 S.C.R. 411 (S.C.C.) — considered *Skeena Cellulose Inc., Re* (2003), 2003 CarswellBC 1399, 2003 BCCA 344, 184 B.C.A.C. 54, 302 W.A.C. 54, 43 C.B.R. (4th) 187, 13 B.C.L.R. (4th) 236 (B.C. C.A.) — referred to *Skydome Corp., Re* (1998), 16 C.B.R. (4th) 118, 1998 CarswellOnt 5922 (Ont. Gen. Div. [Commercial List]) — referred to *Solid Resources Ltd., Re* (2002), [2003] G.S.T.C. 21, 2002 CarswellAlta 1699, 40 C.B.R. (4th) 219 (Alta. Q.B.) — referred to *Stelco Inc., Re* (2005), 253 D.L.R. (4th) 109, 75 O.R. (3d) 5, 2 B.L.R. (4th) 238, 9 C.B.R. (5th) 135, 2005 CarswellOnt 1188, 196 O.A.C. 142 (Ont. C.A.) — referred to *United Used Auto & Truck Parts Ltd., Re* (1999), 12 C.B.R. (4th) 144, 1999 CarswellBC 2673 (B.C. S.C. [In Chambers]) — referred to *United Used Auto & Truck Parts Ltd., Re* (2000), 2000 BCCA 146, 135 B.C.A.C. 96, 221 W.A.C. 96, 2000 CarswellBC 414, 73 B.C.L.R. (3d) 236, 16 C.B.R. (4th) 141, [2000] 5 W.W.R. 178 (B.C. C.A.) — referred to

Cases considered by *Fish J.*:

Ottawa Senators Hockey Club Corp., Re (2005), 2005 G.T.C. 1327 (Eng.), 6 C.B.R. (5th) 293, 2005 D.T.C. 5233 (Eng.), 2005 CarswellOnt 8, [2005] G.S.T.C. 1, 193 O.A.C. 95, 73 O.R. (3d) 737 (Ont. C.A.) — not followed

Cases considered by *Abella J.* (dissenting):

Canada (Attorney General) v. Canada (Public Service Staff Relations Board) (1977), [1977] 2 F.C. 663, 14 N.R. 257, 74 D.L.R. (3d) 307, 1977 CarswellNat 62, 1977 CarswellNat 62F (Fed. C.A.) — referred to *Doré c. Verdun (Municipalité)* (1997), (sub nom. *Doré v. Verdun (City)*) [1997] 2 S.C.R. 862, (sub nom. *Doré v. Verdun (Ville)*) 215 N.R. 81, (sub nom. *Doré v. Verdun (City)*) 150 D.L.R. (4th) 385, 1997 CarswellQue 159, 1997 CarswellQue 850 (S.C.C.) — referred to *Ottawa Senators Hockey Club Corp., Re* (2005), 2005 G.T.C. 1327 (Eng.), 6 C.B.R. (5th) 293, 2005 D.T.C. 5233 (Eng.), 2005 CarswellOnt 8, [2005] G.S.T.C. 1, 193 O.A.C. 95, 73 O.R. (3d) 737 (Ont. C.A.) — considered

R. v. Tele-Mobile Co. (2008), 2008 CarswellOnt 1588, 2008 CarswellOnt 1589, 2008 SCC 12, (sub nom. *Tele-Mobile Co. v. Ontario*) 372 N.R. 157, 55 C.R. (6th) 1, (sub nom. *Ontario v. Tele-Mobile Co.*) 229 C.C.C. (3d) 417, (sub nom. *Tele-Mobile Co. v. Ontario*) 235 O.A.C. 369, (sub nom. *Tele-Mobile Co. v. Ontario*) [2008] 1 S.C.R. 305, (sub nom. *R. v. Tele-Mobile Company (Telus Mobility)*) 92 O.R. (3d) 478 (note), (sub nom. *Ontario v. Tele-Mobile Co.*) 291 D.L.R. (4th) 193 (S.C.C.) — considered

Statutes considered by Deschamps J.:

Bank Act, S.C. 1991, c. 46

Generally — referred to

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

Generally — referred to

s. 67(2) — referred to

s. 67(3) — referred to

s. 81.1 [en. 1992, c. 27, s. 38(1)] — considered

s. 81.2 [en. 1992, c. 27, s. 38(1)] — considered

s. 86(1) — considered

s. 86(3) — referred to

Bankruptcy Act and to amend the Income Tax Act in consequence thereof, Act to amend the, S.C. 1992, c. 27

Generally — referred to

s. 39 — referred to

Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act, the Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act and the Income Tax Act, Act to amend the, S.C. 1997, c. 12

s. 73 — referred to

s. 125 — referred to

s. 126 — referred to

Canada Pension Plan, R.S.C. 1985, c. C-8

Generally — referred to

s. 23(3) — referred to

s. 23(4) — referred to

Cités et villes, Loi sur les, L.R.Q., c. C-19

en général — referred to

Code civil du Québec, L.Q. 1991, c. 64

en général — referred to

art. 2930 — referred to

Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act, Act to Amend, S.C. 1952-53, c. 3

Generally — referred to

Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act, 1933, S.C. 1932-33, c. 36

Generally — referred to

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

Generally — referred to

s. 11 — considered

s. 11(1) — considered

s. 11(3) — referred to

s. 11(4) — referred to

s. 11(6) — referred to

s. 11.02 [en. 2005, c. 47, s. 128] — referred to

s. 11.09 [en. 2005, c. 47, s. 128] — considered

s. 11.4 [en. 1997, c. 12, s. 124] — referred to

s. 18.3 [en. 1997, c. 12, s. 125] — considered

s. 18.3(1) [en. 1997, c. 12, s. 125] — considered

s. 18.3(2) [en. 1997, c. 12, s. 125] — considered

s. 18.4 [en. 1997, c. 12, s. 125] — referred to

s. 18.4(1) [en. 1997, c. 12, s. 125] — considered

s. 18.4(3) [en. 1997, c. 12, s. 125] — considered

s. 20 — considered

s. 21 — considered

s. 37 — considered

s. 37(1) — referred to

Employment Insurance Act, S.C. 1996, c. 23

Generally — referred to

s. 86(2) — referred to

s. 86(2.1) [en. 1998, c. 19, s. 266(1)] — referred to

Excise Tax Act, R.S.C. 1985, c. E-15

Generally — referred to

s. 222(1) [en. 1990, c. 45, s. 12(1)] — referred to

s. 222(3) [en. 1990, c. 45, s. 12(1)] — considered

Fairness for the Self-Employed Act, S.C. 2009, c. 33

Generally — referred to

Income Tax Act, R.S.C. 1985, c. 1 (5th Supp.)

s. 227(4) — referred to

s. 227(4.1) [en. 1998, c. 19, s. 226(1)] — referred to

Interpretation Act, R.S.C. 1985, c. I-21

s. 44(f) — considered

Personal Property Security Act, S.A. 1988, c. P-4.05

Generally — referred to

Sales Tax and Excise Tax Amendments Act, 1999, S.C. 2000, c. 30

Generally — referred to

Wage Earner Protection Program Act, S.C. 2005, c. 47, s. 1

Generally — referred to

s. 69 — referred to

s. 128 — referred to

s. 131 — referred to

Statutes considered *Fish J.*:

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

Generally — referred to

s. 67(2) — considered

s. 67(3) — considered

Canada Pension Plan, R.S.C. 1985, c. C-8

Generally — referred to

s. 23 — considered

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

Generally — referred to

s. 11 — considered

s. 18.3(1) [en. 1997, c. 12, s. 125] — considered

s. 18.3(2) [en. 1997, c. 12, s. 125] — considered

s. 37(1) — considered

Employment Insurance Act, S.C. 1996, c. 23

Generally — referred to

s. 86(2) — referred to

s. 86(2.1) [en. 1998, c. 19, s. 266(1)] — referred to

Excise Tax Act, R.S.C. 1985, c. E-15

Generally — referred to

s. 222 [en. 1990, c. 45, s. 12(1)] — considered

s. 222(1) [en. 1990, c. 45, s. 12(1)] — considered

s. 222(3) [en. 1990, c. 45, s. 12(1)] — considered

s. 222(3)(a) [en. 1990, c. 45, s. 12(1)] — considered

Income Tax Act, R.S.C. 1985, c. 1 (5th Supp.)

Generally — referred to

s. 227(4) — considered

s. 227(4.1) [en. 1998, c. 19, s. 226(1)] — considered

s. 227(4.1)(a) [en. 1998, c. 19, s. 226(1)] — considered

Statutes considered *Abella J. (dissenting)*:

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

Generally — referred to

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

Generally — referred to

s. 11 — considered

s. 11(1) — considered

s. 11(3) — considered

s. 18.3(1) [en. 1997, c. 12, s. 125] — considered

s. 37(1) — considered

Excise Tax Act, R.S.C. 1985, c. E-15

Generally — referred to

s. 222 [en. 1990, c. 45, s. 12(1)] — considered

s. 222(3) [en. 1990, c. 45, s. 12(1)] — considered

Interpretation Act, R.S.C. 1985, c. I-21

s. 2(1)"enactment" — considered

s. 44(f) — considered

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

Generally — referred to

Deschamps J.:

1 For the first time this Court is called upon to directly interpret the provisions of the *Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act*, R.S.C. 1985, c. C-36 ("*CCAA*"). In that respect, two questions are raised. The first requires reconciliation of provisions of the *CCAA* and the *Excise Tax Act*, R.S.C. 1985, c. E-15 ("*ETA*"), which lower courts have held to be in conflict with one another. The second concerns the scope of a court's discretion when supervising reorganization. The relevant statutory provisions are reproduced in the Appendix. On the first question, having considered the evolution of Crown priorities in the context of insolvency and the wording of the various statutes creating Crown priorities, I conclude that it is the *CCAA* and not the *ETA* that provides the rule. On the second question, I conclude that the broad discretionary jurisdiction conferred on the supervising judge must be interpreted having regard to the remedial nature of the *CCAA* and insolvency legislation generally. Consequently, the court had the discretion to partially lift a stay of proceedings to allow the debtor to make an assignment under the *Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act*, R.S.C. 1985, c. B-3 ("*BIA*"). I would allow the appeal.

1. Facts and Decisions of the Courts Below

2 Ted LeRoy Trucking Ltd. ("LeRoy Trucking") commenced proceedings under the *CCAA* in the Supreme Court of British Columbia on December 13, 2007, obtaining a stay of proceedings with a view to reorganizing its financial affairs. LeRoy Trucking sold certain redundant assets as authorized by the order.

3 Amongst the debts owed by LeRoy Trucking was an amount for Goods and Services Tax ("GST") collected but unremitted to the Crown. The *ETA* creates a deemed trust in favour of the Crown for amounts collected in respect of GST. The deemed trust extends to any property or proceeds held by the person collecting GST and any property of that person held by a secured creditor, requiring that property to be paid to the Crown in priority to all security interests. The *ETA* provides that the deemed trust operates

despite any other enactment of Canada except the *BIA*. However, the *CCAA* also provides that subject to certain exceptions, none of which mentions GST, deemed trusts in favour of the Crown do not operate under the *CCAA*. Accordingly, under the *CCAA* the Crown ranks as an unsecured creditor in respect of GST. Nonetheless, at the time LeRoy Trucking commenced *CCAA* proceedings the leading line of jurisprudence held that the *ETA* took precedence over the *CCAA* such that the Crown enjoyed priority for GST claims under the *CCAA*, even though it would have lost that same priority under the *BIA*. The *CCAA* underwent substantial amendments in 2005 in which some of the provisions at issue in this appeal were renumbered and reformulated (S.C. 2005, c. 47). However, these amendments only came into force on September 18, 2009. I will refer to the amended provisions only where relevant.

4 On April 29, 2008, Brenner C.J.S.C., in the context of the *CCAA* proceedings, approved a payment not exceeding \$5 million, the proceeds of redundant asset sales, to Century Services, the debtor's major secured creditor. LeRoy Trucking proposed to hold back an amount equal to the GST monies collected but unremitted to the Crown and place it in the Monitor's trust account until the outcome of the reorganization was known. In order to maintain the *status quo* while the success of the reorganization was uncertain, Brenner C.J.S.C. agreed to the proposal and ordered that an amount of \$305,202.30 be held by the Monitor in its trust account.

5 On September 3, 2008, having concluded that reorganization was not possible, LeRoy Trucking sought leave to make an assignment in bankruptcy under the *BIA*. The Crown sought an order that the GST monies held by the Monitor be paid to the Receiver General of Canada. Brenner C.J.S.C. dismissed the latter application. Reasoning that the purpose of segregating the funds with the Monitor was "to facilitate an ultimate payment of the GST monies which were owed pre-filing, but only if a viable plan emerged", the failure of such a reorganization, followed by an assignment in bankruptcy, meant the Crown would lose priority under the *BIA* (2008 BCSC 1805, [2008] G.S.T.C. 221 (B.C. S.C. [In Chambers])).

6 The Crown's appeal was allowed by the British Columbia Court of Appeal (2009 BCCA 205, [2009] G.S.T.C. 79, 270 B.C.A.C. 167 (B.C. C.A.)). Tysoe J.A. for a unanimous court found two independent bases for allowing the Crown's appeal.

7 First, the court's authority under s. 11 of the *CCAA* was held not to extend to staying the Crown's application for immediate payment of the GST funds subject to the deemed trust after it was clear that reorganization efforts had failed and that bankruptcy was inevitable. As restructuring was no longer a possibility, staying the Crown's claim to the GST funds no longer served a purpose under the *CCAA* and the court was bound under the priority scheme provided by the *ETA* to allow payment to the Crown. In so holding, Tysoe J.A. adopted the reasoning in *Ottawa Senators Hockey Club Corp. (Re)*, [2005] G.S.T.C. 1, 73 O.R. (3d) 737 (Ont. C.A.), which found that the *ETA* deemed trust for GST established Crown priority over secured creditors under the *CCAA*.

8 Second, Tysoe J.A. concluded that by ordering the GST funds segregated in the Monitor's trust account on April 29, 2008, the judge had created an express trust in favour of the Crown from which the monies in question could not be diverted for any other purposes. The Court of Appeal therefore ordered that the money held by the Monitor in trust be paid to the Receiver General.

2. Issues

9 This appeal raises three broad issues which are addressed in turn:

- (1) Did s. 222(3) of the *ETA* displace s. 18.3(1) of the *CCAA* and give priority to the Crown's *ETA* deemed trust during *CCAA* proceedings as held in *Ottawa Senators*?
- (2) Did the court exceed its *CCAA* authority by lifting the stay to allow the debtor to make an assignment in bankruptcy?
- (3) Did the court's order of April 29, 2008 requiring segregation of the Crown's GST claim in the Monitor's trust account create an express trust in favour of the Crown in respect of those funds?

3. Analysis

10 The first issue concerns Crown priorities in the context of insolvency. As will be seen, the *ETA* provides for a deemed trust in favour of the Crown in respect of GST owed by a debtor "[d]espite ... any other enactment of Canada (except the *Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act*)" (s. 222(3)), while the *CCAA* stated at the relevant time that "notwithstanding any provision in federal or provincial legislation that has the effect of deeming property to be held in trust for Her Majesty, property of a debtor company shall not be [so] regarded" (s. 18.3(1)). It is difficult to imagine two statutory provisions more apparently in conflict. However, as is often the case, the apparent conflict can be resolved through interpretation.

11 In order to properly interpret the provisions, it is necessary to examine the history of the *CCAA*, its function amidst the body of insolvency legislation enacted by Parliament, and the principles that have been recognized in the jurisprudence. It will be seen that Crown priorities in the insolvency context have been significantly pared down. The resolution of the second issue is also rooted in the context of the *CCAA*, but its purpose and the manner in which it has been interpreted in the case law are also key. After examining the first two issues in this case, I will address Tysoe J.A.'s conclusion that an express trust in favour of the Crown was created by the court's order of April 29, 2008.

3.1 Purpose and Scope of Insolvency Law

12 Insolvency is the factual situation that arises when a debtor is unable to pay creditors (see generally, R. J. Wood, *Bankruptcy and Insolvency Law* (2009), at p. 16). Certain legal proceedings become available upon insolvency, which typically allow a debtor to obtain a court order staying its creditors' enforcement actions and attempt to obtain a binding compromise with creditors to adjust the payment conditions to something more realistic. Alternatively, the debtor's assets may be liquidated and debts paid from the proceeds according to statutory priority rules. The former is usually referred to as reorganization or restructuring while the latter is termed liquidation.

13 Canadian commercial insolvency law is not codified in one exhaustive statute. Instead, Parliament has enacted multiple insolvency statutes, the main one being the *BIA*. The *BIA* offers a self-contained legal regime providing for both reorganization and liquidation. Although bankruptcy legislation has a long history, the *BIA* itself is a fairly recent statute — it was enacted in 1992. It is characterized by a rules-based approach to proceedings. The *BIA* is available to insolvent debtors owing \$1000 or more, regardless of whether they are natural or legal persons. It contains mechanisms for debtors to make proposals to their creditors for the adjustment of debts. If a proposal fails, the *BIA* contains a bridge to bankruptcy whereby the debtor's assets are liquidated and the proceeds paid to creditors in accordance with the statutory scheme of distribution.

14 Access to the *CCAA* is more restrictive. A debtor must be a company with liabilities in excess of \$5 million. Unlike the *BIA*, the *CCAA* contains no provisions for liquidation of a debtor's assets if reorganization fails. There are three ways of exiting *CCAA* proceedings. The best outcome is achieved when the stay of proceedings provides the debtor with some breathing space during which solvency is restored and the *CCAA* process terminates without reorganization being needed. The second most desirable outcome occurs when the debtor's compromise or arrangement is accepted by its creditors and the reorganized company emerges from the *CCAA* proceedings as a going concern. Lastly, if the compromise or arrangement fails, either the company or its creditors usually seek to have the debtor's assets liquidated under the applicable provisions of the *BIA* or to place the debtor into receivership. As discussed in greater detail below, the key difference between the reorganization regimes under the *BIA* and the *CCAA* is that the latter offers a more flexible mechanism with greater judicial discretion, making it more responsive to complex reorganizations.

15 As I will discuss at greater length below, the purpose of the *CCAA* — Canada's first reorganization statute — is to permit the debtor to continue to carry on business and, where possible, avoid the social and economic costs of liquidating its assets. Proposals to creditors under the *BIA* serve the same remedial purpose, though this is achieved through a rules-based mechanism that offers less flexibility. Where reorganization is impossible, the *BIA* may be employed to provide an orderly mechanism for the distribution of a debtor's assets to satisfy creditor claims according to predetermined priority rules.

16 Prior to the enactment of the *CCAA* in 1933 (S.C. 1932-33, c. 36), practice under existing commercial insolvency legislation tended heavily towards the liquidation of a debtor company (J. Sarra, *Creditor Rights and the Public Interest: Restructuring*

Insolvent Corporations (2003), at p. 12). The battering visited upon Canadian businesses by the Great Depression and the absence of an effective mechanism for reaching a compromise between debtors and creditors to avoid liquidation required a legislative response. The *CCAA* was innovative as it allowed the insolvent debtor to attempt reorganization under judicial supervision outside the existing insolvency legislation which, once engaged, almost invariably resulted in liquidation (*Reference re Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act (Canada)*, [1934] S.C.R. 659 (S.C.C.), at pp. 660-61; Sarra, *Creditor Rights*, at pp. 12-13).

17 Parliament understood when adopting the *CCAA* that liquidation of an insolvent company was harmful for most of those it affected — notably creditors and employees — and that a workout which allowed the company to survive was optimal (Sarra, *Creditor Rights*, at pp. 13-15).

18 Early commentary and jurisprudence also endorsed the *CCAA*'s remedial objectives. It recognized that companies retain more value as going concerns while underscoring that intangible losses, such as the evaporation of the companies' goodwill, result from liquidation (S. E. Edwards, "Reorganizations Under the Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act" (1947), 25 *Can. Bar Rev.* 587, at p. 592). Reorganization serves the public interest by facilitating the survival of companies supplying goods or services crucial to the health of the economy or saving large numbers of jobs (*ibid.*, at p. 593). Insolvency could be so widely felt as to impact stakeholders other than creditors and employees. Variants of these views resonate today, with reorganization justified in terms of rehabilitating companies that are key elements in a complex web of interdependent economic relationships in order to avoid the negative consequences of liquidation.

19 The *CCAA* fell into disuse during the next several decades, likely because amendments to the Act in 1953 restricted its use to companies issuing bonds (S.C. 1952-53, c. 3). During the economic downturn of the early 1980s, insolvency lawyers and courts adapting to the resulting wave of insolvencies resurrected the statute and deployed it in response to new economic challenges. Participants in insolvency proceedings grew to recognize and appreciate the statute's distinguishing feature: a grant of broad and flexible authority to the supervising court to make the orders necessary to facilitate the reorganization of the debtor and achieve the *CCAA*'s objectives. The manner in which courts have used *CCAA* jurisdiction in increasingly creative and flexible ways is explored in greater detail below.

20 Efforts to evolve insolvency law were not restricted to the courts during this period. In 1970, a government-commissioned panel produced an extensive study recommending sweeping reform but Parliament failed to act (see *Bankruptcy and Insolvency: Report of the Study Committee on Bankruptcy and Insolvency Legislation* (1970)). Another panel of experts produced more limited recommendations in 1986 which eventually resulted in enactment of the *Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act* of 1992 (S.C. 1992, c. 27) (see *Proposed Bankruptcy Act Amendments: Report of the Advisory Committee on Bankruptcy and Insolvency* (1986)). Broader provisions for reorganizing insolvent debtors were then included in Canada's bankruptcy statute. Although the 1970 and 1986 reports made no specific recommendations with respect to the *CCAA*, the House of Commons committee studying the *BIA*'s predecessor bill, C-22, seemed to accept expert testimony that the *BIA*'s new reorganization scheme would shortly supplant the *CCAA*, which could then be repealed, with commercial insolvency and bankruptcy being governed by a single statute (*Minutes of Proceedings and Evidence of the Standing Committee on Consumer and Corporate Affairs and Government Operations*, Issue No. 15, October 3, 1991, at pp. 15:15-15:16).

21 In retrospect, this conclusion by the House of Commons committee was out of step with reality. It overlooked the renewed vitality the *CCAA* enjoyed in contemporary practice and the advantage that a flexible judicially supervised reorganization process presented in the face of increasingly complex reorganizations, when compared to the stricter rules-based scheme contained in the *BIA*. The "flexibility of the *CCAA* [was seen as] a great benefit, allowing for creative and effective decisions" (Industry Canada, Marketplace Framework Policy Branch, *Report on the Operation and Administration of the Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act and the Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act* (2002), at p. 41). Over the past three decades, resurrection of the *CCAA* has thus been the mainspring of a process through which, one author concludes, "the legal setting for Canadian insolvency restructuring has evolved from a rather blunt instrument to one of the most sophisticated systems in the developed world" (R. B. Jones, "The Evolution of Canadian Restructuring: Challenges for the Rule of Law", in J. P. Sarra, ed., *Annual Review of Insolvency Law 2005* (2006), 481, at p. 481).

22 While insolvency proceedings may be governed by different statutory schemes, they share some commonalities. The most prominent of these is the single proceeding model. The nature and purpose of the single proceeding model are described by Professor Wood in *Bankruptcy and Insolvency Law*:

They all provide a collective proceeding that supersedes the usual civil process available to creditors to enforce their claims. The creditors' remedies are collectivized in order to prevent the free-for-all that would otherwise prevail if creditors were permitted to exercise their remedies. In the absence of a collective process, each creditor is armed with the knowledge that if they do not strike hard and swift to seize the debtor's assets, they will be beat out by other creditors. [pp. 2-3]

The single proceeding model avoids the inefficiency and chaos that would attend insolvency if each creditor initiated proceedings to recover its debt. Grouping all possible actions against the debtor into a single proceeding controlled in a single forum facilitates negotiation with creditors because it places them all on an equal footing, rather than exposing them to the risk that a more aggressive creditor will realize its claims against the debtor's limited assets while the other creditors attempt a compromise. With a view to achieving that purpose, both the *CCAA* and the *BIA* allow a court to order all actions against a debtor to be stayed while a compromise is sought.

23 Another point of convergence of the *CCAA* and the *BIA* relates to priorities. Because the *CCAA* is silent about what happens if reorganization fails, the *BIA* scheme of liquidation and distribution necessarily supplies the backdrop for what will happen if a *CCAA* reorganization is ultimately unsuccessful. In addition, one of the important features of legislative reform of both statutes since the enactment of the *BIA* in 1992 has been a cutback in Crown priorities (S.C. 1992, c. 27, s. 39; S.C. 1997, c. 12, ss. 73 and 125; S.C. 2000, c. 30, s. 148; S.C. 2005, c. 47, ss. 69 and 131; S.C. 2009, c. 33, ss. 25 and 29; see also *Alternative granite & marbre inc., Re*, 2009 SCC 49, [2009] 3 S.C.R. 286, [2009] G.S.T.C. 154 (S.C.C.); *Quebec (Deputy Minister of Revenue) c. Rainville* (1979), [1980] 1 S.C.R. 35 (S.C.C.); *Proposed Bankruptcy Act Amendments: Report of the Advisory Committee on Bankruptcy and Insolvency* (1986)).

24 With parallel *CCAA* and *BIA* restructuring schemes now an accepted feature of the insolvency law landscape, the contemporary thrust of legislative reform has been towards harmonizing aspects of insolvency law common to the two statutory schemes to the extent possible and encouraging reorganization over liquidation (see *An Act to establish the Wage Earner Protection Program Act, to amend the Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act and the Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act and to make consequential amendments to other Acts*, S.C. 2005, c. 47; *Gauntlet Energy Corp., Re*, 2003 ABQB 894, [2003] G.S.T.C. 193, 30 Alta. L.R. (4th) 192 (Alta. Q.B.), at para. 19).

25 Mindful of the historical background of the *CCAA* and *BIA*, I now turn to the first question at issue.

3.2 GST Deemed Trust Under the CCAA

26 The Court of Appeal proceeded on the basis that the *ETA* precluded the court from staying the Crown's enforcement of the GST deemed trust when partially lifting the stay to allow the debtor to enter bankruptcy. In so doing, it adopted the reasoning in a line of cases culminating in *Ottawa Senators*, which held that an *ETA* deemed trust remains enforceable during *CCAA* reorganization despite language in the *CCAA* that suggests otherwise.

27 The Crown relies heavily on the decision of the Ontario Court of Appeal in *Ottawa Senators* and argues that the later in time provision of the *ETA* creating the GST deemed trust trumps the provision of the *CCAA* purporting to nullify most statutory deemed trusts. The Court of Appeal in this case accepted this reasoning but not all provincial courts follow it (see, e.g., *Komunik Corp., Re*, 2009 QCCS 6332 (C.S. Que.), leave to appeal granted, 2010 QCCA 183 (C.A. Que.)). Century Services relied, in its written submissions to this Court, on the argument that the court had authority under the *CCAA* to continue the stay against the Crown's claim for unremitted GST. In oral argument, the question of whether *Ottawa Senators* was correctly decided nonetheless arose. After the hearing, the parties were asked to make further written submissions on this point. As appears evident from the reasons of my colleague Abella J., this issue has become prominent before this Court. In those circumstances, this Court needs to determine the correctness of the reasoning in *Ottawa Senators*.

28 The policy backdrop to this question involves the Crown's priority as a creditor in insolvency situations which, as I mentioned above, has evolved considerably. Prior to the 1990s, Crown claims largely enjoyed priority in insolvency. This was widely seen as unsatisfactory as shown by both the 1970 and 1986 insolvency reform proposals, which recommended that Crown claims receive no preferential treatment. A closely related matter was whether the *CCAA* was binding at all upon the Crown. Amendments to the *CCAA* in 1997 confirmed that it did indeed bind the Crown (see *CCAA*, s. 21, as am. by S.C. 1997, c. 12, s. 126).

29 Claims of priority by the state in insolvency situations receive different treatment across jurisdictions worldwide. For example, in Germany and Australia, the state is given no priority at all, while the state enjoys wide priority in the United States and France (see B. K. Morgan, "Should the Sovereign be Paid First? A Comparative International Analysis of the Priority for Tax Claims in Bankruptcy" (2000), 74 *Am. Bank. L.J.* 461, at p. 500). Canada adopted a middle course through legislative reform of Crown priority initiated in 1992. The Crown retained priority for source deductions of income tax, Employment Insurance ("EI") and Canada Pension Plan ("CPP") premiums, but ranks as an ordinary unsecured creditor for most other claims.

30 Parliament has frequently enacted statutory mechanisms to secure Crown claims and permit their enforcement. The two most common are statutory deemed trusts and powers to garnish funds third parties owe the debtor (see F. L. Lamer, *Priority of Crown Claims in Insolvency* (loose-leaf), at § 2).

31 With respect to GST collected, Parliament has enacted a deemed trust. The *ETA* states that every person who collects an amount on account of GST is deemed to hold that amount in trust for the Crown (s. 222(1)). The deemed trust extends to other property of the person collecting the tax equal in value to the amount deemed to be in trust if that amount has not been remitted in accordance with the *ETA*. The deemed trust also extends to property held by a secured creditor that, but for the security interest, would be property of the person collecting the tax (s. 222(3)).

32 Parliament has created similar deemed trusts using almost identical language in respect of source deductions of income tax, EI premiums and CPP premiums (see s. 227(4) of the *Income Tax Act*, R.S.C. 1985, c. 1 (5th Supp.) ("*ITA*"), ss. 86(2) and (2.1) of the *Employment Insurance Act*, S.C. 1996, c. 23, and ss. 23(3) and (4) of the *Canada Pension Plan*, R.S.C. 1985, c. C-8). I will refer to income tax, EI and CPP deductions as "source deductions".

33 In *Royal Bank v. Sparrow Electric Corp.*, [1997] 1 S.C.R. 411 (S.C.C.), this Court addressed a priority dispute between a deemed trust for source deductions under the *ITA* and security interests taken under both the *Bank Act*, S.C. 1991, c. 46, and the *Alberta Personal Property Security Act*, S.A. 1988, c. P-4.05 ("*PPSA*"). As then worded, an *ITA* deemed trust over the debtor's property equivalent to the amount owing in respect of income tax became effective at the time of liquidation, receivership, or assignment in bankruptcy. *Sparrow Electric* held that the *ITA* deemed trust could not prevail over the security interests because, being fixed charges, the latter attached as soon as the debtor acquired rights in the property such that the *ITA* deemed trust had no property on which to attach when it subsequently arose. Later, in *First Vancouver Finance v. Minister of National Revenue*, 2002 SCC 49, [2002] G.S.T.C. 23, [2002] 2 S.C.R. 720 (S.C.C.), this Court observed that Parliament had legislated to strengthen the statutory deemed trust in the *ITA* by deeming it to operate from the moment the deductions were not paid to the Crown as required by the *ITA*, and by granting the Crown priority over all security interests (paras. 27-29) (the "*Sparrow Electric* amendment").

34 The amended text of s. 227(4.1) of the *ITA* and concordant source deductions deemed trusts in the *Canada Pension Plan* and the *Employment Insurance Act* state that the deemed trust operates notwithstanding any other enactment of Canada, except ss. 81.1 and 81.2 of the *BIA*. The *ETA* deemed trust at issue in this case is similarly worded, but it excepts the *BIA* in its entirety. The provision reads as follows:

222. (3) Despite any other provision of this Act (except subsection (4)), any other enactment of Canada (except the *Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act*), any enactment of a province or any other law, if at any time an amount deemed by subsection (1) to be held by a person in trust for Her Majesty is not remitted to the Receiver General or withdrawn in the manner and at the time provided under this Part, property of the person and property held by any secured creditor of

the person that, but for a security interest, would be property of the person, equal in value to the amount so deemed to be held in trust, is deemed

35 The Crown submits that the *Sparrow Electric* amendment, added by Parliament to the *ETA* in 2000, was intended to preserve the Crown's priority over collected GST under the *CCAA* while subordinating the Crown to the status of an unsecured creditor in respect of GST only under the *BIA*. This is because the *ETA* provides that the GST deemed trust is effective "despite" any other enactment except the *BIA*.

36 The language used in the *ETA* for the GST deemed trust creates an apparent conflict with the *CCAA*, which provides that subject to certain exceptions, property deemed by statute to be held in trust for the Crown shall not be so regarded.

37 Through a 1997 amendment to the *CCAA* (S.C. 1997, c. 12, s. 125), Parliament appears to have, subject to specific exceptions, nullified deemed trusts in favour of the Crown once reorganization proceedings are commenced under the Act. The relevant provision reads:

18.3 (1) Subject to subsection (2), notwithstanding any provision in federal or provincial legislation that has the effect of deeming property to be held in trust for Her Majesty, property of a debtor company shall not be regarded as held in trust for Her Majesty unless it would be so regarded in the absence of that statutory provision.

This nullification of deemed trusts was continued in further amendments to the *CCAA* (S.C. 2005, c. 47), where s. 18.3(1) was renumbered and reformulated as s. 37(1):

37. (1) Subject to subsection (2), despite any provision in federal or provincial legislation that has the effect of deeming property to be held in trust for Her Majesty, property of a debtor company shall not be regarded as being held in trust for Her Majesty unless it would be so regarded in the absence of that statutory provision.

38 An analogous provision exists in the *BIA*, which, subject to the same specific exceptions, nullifies statutory deemed trusts and makes property of the bankrupt that would otherwise be subject to a deemed trust part of the debtor's estate and available to creditors (S.C. 1992, c. 27, s. 39; S.C. 1997, c. 12, s. 73; *BIA*, s. 67(2)). It is noteworthy that in both the *CCAA* and the *BIA*, the exceptions concern source deductions (*CCAA*, s. 18.3(2); *BIA*, s. 67(3)). The relevant provision of the *CCAA* reads:

18.3 (2) Subsection (1) does not apply in respect of amounts deemed to be held in trust under subsection 227(4) or (4.1) of the *Income Tax Act*, subsection 23(3) or (4) of the *Canada Pension Plan* or subsection 86(2) or (2.1) of the *Employment Insurance Act*....

Thus, the Crown's deemed trust and corresponding priority in source deductions remain effective both in reorganization and in bankruptcy.

39 Meanwhile, in both s. 18.4(1) of the *CCAA* and s. 86(1) of the *BIA*, other Crown claims are treated as unsecured. These provisions, establishing the Crown's status as an unsecured creditor, explicitly exempt statutory deemed trusts in source deductions (*CCAA*, s. 18.4(3); *BIA*, s. 86(3)). The *CCAA* provision reads as follows:

18.4 (3) Subsection (1) [Crown ranking as unsecured creditor] does not affect the operation of

(a) subsections 224(1.2) and (1.3) of the *Income Tax Act*,

(b) any provision of the *Canada Pension Plan* or of the *Employment Insurance Act* that refers to subsection 224(1.2) of the *Income Tax Act* and provides for the collection of a contribution

Therefore, not only does the *CCAA* provide that Crown claims do not enjoy priority over the claims of other creditors (s. 18.3(1)), but the exceptions to this rule (i.e., that Crown priority is maintained for source deductions) are repeatedly stated in the statute.

40 The apparent conflict in this case is whether the rule in the *CCAA* first enacted as s. 18.3 in 1997, which provides that subject to certain explicit exceptions, statutory deemed trusts are ineffective under the *CCAA*, is overridden by the one in the *ETA* enacted in 2000 stating that GST deemed trusts operate despite any enactment of Canada except the *BIA*. With respect for my colleague Fish J., I do not think the apparent conflict can be resolved by denying it and creating a rule requiring both a statutory provision enacting the deemed trust, and a second statutory provision confirming it. Such a rule is unknown to the law. Courts must recognize conflicts, apparent or real, and resolve them when possible.

41 A line of jurisprudence across Canada has resolved the apparent conflict in favour of the *ETA*, thereby maintaining GST deemed trusts under the *CCAA*. *Ottawa Senators*, the leading case, decided the matter by invoking the doctrine of implied repeal to hold that the later in time provision of the *ETA* should take precedence over the *CCAA* (see also *Solid Resources Ltd., Re* (2002), 40 C.B.R. (4th) 219, [2003] G.S.T.C. 21 (Alta. Q.B.); *Gauntlett*

42 The Ontario Court of Appeal in *Ottawa Senators* rested its conclusion on two considerations. First, it was persuaded that by explicitly mentioning the *BIA* in *ETA* s. 222(3), but not the *CCAA*, Parliament made a deliberate choice. In the words of MacPherson J.A.:

The *BIA* and the *CCAA* are closely related federal statutes. I cannot conceive that Parliament would specifically identify the *BIA* as an exception, but accidentally fail to consider the *CCAA* as a possible second exception. In my view, the omission of the *CCAA* from s. 222(3) of the *ETA* was almost certainly a considered omission. [para. 43]

43 Second, the Ontario Court of Appeal compared the conflict between the *ETA* and the *CCAA* to that before this Court in *Doré c. Verdun (Municipalité)*, [1997] 2 S.C.R. 862 (S.C.C.), and found them to be "identical" (para. 46). It therefore considered *Doré* binding (para. 49). In *Doré*, a limitations provision in the more general and recently enacted *Civil Code of Québec*, S.Q. 1991, c. 64 ("*C.C.Q.*"), was held to have repealed a more specific provision of the earlier *Quebec Cities and Towns Act*, R.S.Q., c. C-19, with which it conflicted. By analogy, the Ontario Court of Appeal held that the later in time and more general provision, s. 222(3) of the *ETA*, impliedly repealed the more specific and earlier in time provision, s. 18.3(1) of the *CCAA* (paras. 47-49).

44 Viewing this issue in its entire context, several considerations lead me to conclude that neither the reasoning nor the result in *Ottawa Senators* can stand. While a conflict may exist at the level of the statutes' wording, a purposive and contextual analysis to determine Parliament's true intent yields the conclusion that Parliament could not have intended to restore the Crown's deemed trust priority in GST claims under the *CCAA* when it amended the *ETA* in 2000 with the *Sparrow Electric* amendment.

45 I begin by recalling that Parliament has shown its willingness to move away from asserting priority for Crown claims in insolvency law. Section 18.3(1) of the *CCAA* (subject to the s. 18.3(2) exceptions) provides that the Crown's deemed trusts have no effect under the *CCAA*. Where Parliament has sought to protect certain Crown claims through statutory deemed trusts and intended that these deemed trusts continue in insolvency, it has legislated so explicitly and elaborately. For example, s. 18.3(2) of the *CCAA* and s. 67(3) of the *BIA* expressly provide that deemed trusts for source deductions remain effective in insolvency. Parliament has, therefore, clearly carved out exceptions from the general rule that deemed trusts are ineffective in insolvency. The *CCAA* and *BIA* are in harmony, preserving deemed trusts and asserting Crown priority only in respect of source deductions. Meanwhile, there is no express statutory basis for concluding that GST claims enjoy a preferred treatment under the *CCAA* or the *BIA*. Unlike source deductions, which are clearly and expressly dealt with under both these insolvency statutes, no such clear and express language exists in those Acts carving out an exception for GST claims.

46 The internal logic of the *CCAA* also militates against upholding the *ETA* deemed trust for GST. The *CCAA* imposes limits on a suspension by the court of the Crown's rights in respect of source deductions but does not mention the *ETA* (s. 11.4). Since source deductions deemed trusts are granted explicit protection under the *CCAA*, it would be inconsistent to afford a better protection to the *ETA* deemed trust absent explicit language in the *CCAA*. Thus, the logic of the *CCAA* appears to subject the *ETA* deemed trust to the waiver by Parliament of its priority (s. 18.4).

47 Moreover, a strange asymmetry would arise if the interpretation giving the *ETA* priority over the *CCAA* urged by the Crown is adopted here: the Crown would retain priority over GST claims during *CCAA* proceedings but not in bankruptcy. As courts

have reflected, this can only encourage statute shopping by secured creditors in cases such as this one where the debtor's assets cannot satisfy both the secured creditors' and the Crown's claims (*Gauntlet*, at para. 21). If creditors' claims were better protected by liquidation under the *BIA*, creditors' incentives would lie overwhelmingly with avoiding proceedings under the *CCAA* and not risking a failed reorganization. Giving a key player in any insolvency such skewed incentives against reorganizing under the *CCAA* can only undermine that statute's remedial objectives and risk inviting the very social ills that it was enacted to avert.

48 Arguably, the effect of *Ottawa Senators* is mitigated if restructuring is attempted under the *BIA* instead of the *CCAA*, but it is not cured. If *Ottawa Senators* were to be followed, Crown priority over GST would differ depending on whether restructuring took place under the *CCAA* or the *BIA*. The anomaly of this result is made manifest by the fact that it would deprive companies of the option to restructure under the more flexible and responsive *CCAA* regime, which has been the statute of choice for complex reorganizations.

49 Evidence that Parliament intended different treatments for GST claims in reorganization and bankruptcy is scant, if it exists at all. Section 222(3) of the *ETA* was enacted as part of a wide-ranging budget implementation bill in 2000. The summary accompanying that bill does not indicate that Parliament intended to elevate Crown priority over GST claims under the *CCAA* to the same or a higher level than source deductions claims. Indeed, the summary for deemed trusts states only that amendments to existing provisions are aimed at "ensuring that employment insurance premiums and Canada Pension Plan contributions that are required to be remitted by an employer are fully recoverable by the Crown in the case of the bankruptcy of the employer" (Summary to S.C. 2000, c. 30, at p. 4a). The wording of GST deemed trusts resembles that of statutory deemed trusts for source deductions and incorporates the same overriding language and reference to the *BIA*. However, as noted above, Parliament's express intent is that only source deductions deemed trusts remain operative. An exception for the *BIA* in the statutory language establishing the source deductions deemed trusts accomplishes very little, because the explicit language of the *BIA* itself (and the *CCAA*) carves out these source deductions deemed trusts and maintains their effect. It is however noteworthy that no equivalent language maintaining GST deemed trusts exists under either the *BIA* or the *CCAA*.

50 It seems more likely that by adopting the same language for creating GST deemed trusts in the *ETA* as it did for deemed trusts for source deductions, and by overlooking the inclusion of an exception for the *CCAA* alongside the *BIA* in s. 222(3) of the *ETA*, Parliament may have inadvertently succumbed to a drafting anomaly. Because of a statutory lacuna in the *ETA*, the GST deemed trust could be seen as remaining effective in the *CCAA*, while ceasing to have any effect under the *BIA*, thus creating an apparent conflict with the wording of the *CCAA*. However, it should be seen for what it is: a facial conflict only, capable of resolution by looking at the broader approach taken to Crown priorities and by giving precedence to the statutory language of s. 18.3 of the *CCAA* in a manner that does not produce an anomalous outcome.

51 Section 222(3) of the *ETA* evinces no explicit intention of Parliament to repeal *CCAA* s. 18.3. It merely creates an apparent conflict that must be resolved by statutory interpretation. Parliament's intent when it enacted *ETA* s. 222(3) was therefore far from unambiguous. Had it sought to give the Crown a priority for GST claims, it could have done so explicitly as it did for source deductions. Instead, one is left to infer from the language of *ETA* s. 222(3) that the GST deemed trust was intended to be effective under the *CCAA*.

52 I am not persuaded that the reasoning in *Doré* requires the application of the doctrine of implied repeal in the circumstances of this case. The main issue in *Doré* concerned the impact of the adoption of the *C.C.Q.* on the administrative law rules with respect to municipalities. While Gonthier J. concluded in that case that the limitation provision in art. 2930 *C.C.Q.* had repealed by implication a limitation provision in the *Cities and Towns Act*, he did so on the basis of more than a textual analysis. The conclusion in *Doré* was reached after thorough contextual analysis of both pieces of legislation, including an extensive review of the relevant legislative history (paras. 31-41). Consequently, the circumstances before this Court in *Doré* are far from "identical" to those in the present case, in terms of text, context and legislative history. Accordingly, *Doré* cannot be said to require the automatic application of the rule of repeal by implication.

53 A noteworthy indicator of Parliament's overall intent is the fact that in subsequent amendments it has not displaced the rule set out in the *CCAA*. Indeed, as indicated above, the recent amendments to the *CCAA* in 2005 resulted in the rule previously found in s. 18.3 being renumbered and reformulated as s. 37. Thus, to the extent the interpretation allowing the GST deemed

trust to remain effective under the *CCAA* depends on *ETA* s. 222(3) having impliedly repealed *CCAA* s. 18.3(1) because it is later in time, we have come full circle. Parliament has renumbered and reformulated the provision of the *CCAA* stating that, subject to exceptions for source deductions, deemed trusts do not survive the *CCAA* proceedings and thus the *CCAA* is now the later in time statute. This confirms that Parliament's intent with respect to GST deemed trusts is to be found in the *CCAA*.

54 I do not agree with my colleague Abella J. that s. 44(f) of the *Interpretation Act*, R.S.C. 1985, c. I-21, can be used to interpret the 2005 amendments as having no effect. The new statute can hardly be said to be a mere re-enactment of the former statute. Indeed, the *CCAA* underwent a substantial review in 2005. Notably, acting consistently with its goal of treating both the *BIA* and the *CCAA* as sharing the same approach to insolvency, Parliament made parallel amendments to both statutes with respect to corporate proposals. In addition, new provisions were introduced regarding the treatment of contracts, collective agreements, interim financing and governance agreements. The appointment and role of the Monitor was also clarified. Noteworthy are the limits imposed by *CCAA* s. 11.09 on the court's discretion to make an order staying the Crown's source deductions deemed trusts, which were formerly found in s. 11.4. No mention whatsoever is made of GST deemed trusts (see Summary to S.C. 2005, c. 47). The review went as far as looking at the very expression used to describe the statutory override of deemed trusts. The comments cited by my colleague only emphasize the clear intent of Parliament to maintain its policy that only source deductions deemed trusts survive in *CCAA* proceedings.

55 In the case at bar, the legislative context informs the determination of Parliament's legislative intent and supports the conclusion that *ETA* s. 222(3) was not intended to narrow the scope of the *CCAA*'s override provision. Viewed in its entire context, the conflict between the *ETA* and the *CCAA* is more apparent than real. I would therefore not follow the reasoning in *Ottawa Senators* and affirm that *CCAA* s. 18.3 remained effective.

56 My conclusion is reinforced by the purpose of the *CCAA* as part of Canadian remedial insolvency legislation. As this aspect is particularly relevant to the second issue, I will now discuss how courts have interpreted the scope of their discretionary powers in supervising a *CCAA* reorganization and how Parliament has largely endorsed this interpretation. Indeed, the interpretation courts have given to the *CCAA* helps in understanding how the *CCAA* grew to occupy such a prominent role in Canadian insolvency law.

3.3 Discretionary Power of a Court Supervising a *CCAA* Reorganization

57 Courts frequently observe that "[t]he *CCAA* is skeletal in nature" and does not "contain a comprehensive code that lays out all that is permitted or barred" (*ATB Financial v. Metcalfe & Mansfield Alternative Investments II Corp.*, 2008 ONCA 587, 92 O.R. (3d) 513 (Ont. C.A.), at para. 44, *per* Blair J.A.). Accordingly, "[t]he history of *CCAA* law has been an evolution of judicial interpretation" (*Dylex Ltd., Re* (1995), 31 C.B.R. (3d) 106 (Ont. Gen. Div. [Commercial List])), at para. 10, *per* Farley J.).

58 *CCAA* decisions are often based on discretionary grants of jurisdiction. The incremental exercise of judicial discretion in commercial courts under conditions one practitioner aptly describes as "the hothouse of real-time litigation" has been the primary method by which the *CCAA* has been adapted and has evolved to meet contemporary business and social needs (see Jones, at p. 484).

59 Judicial discretion must of course be exercised in furtherance of the *CCAA*'s purposes. The remedial purpose I referred to in the historical overview of the Act is recognized over and over again in the jurisprudence. To cite one early example:

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

(*Nova Metal Products Inc. v. Comiskey (Trustee of)* (1990), 41 O.A.C. 282 (Ont. C.A.), at para. 57, *per* Doherty J.A., dissenting)

60 Judicial decision making under the *CCAA* takes many forms. A court must first of all provide the conditions under which the debtor can attempt to reorganize. This can be achieved by staying enforcement actions by creditors to allow the

debtor's business to continue, preserving the *status quo* while the debtor plans the compromise or arrangement to be presented to creditors, and supervising the process and advancing it to the point where it can be determined whether it will succeed (see, e.g., *Hongkong Bank of Canada v. Chef Ready Foods Ltd.* (1990), 51 B.C.L.R. (2d) 84 (B.C. C.A.), at pp. 88-89; *Pacific National Lease Holding Corp., Re* (1992), 19 B.C.A.C. 134 (B.C. C.A. [In Chambers]), at para. 27). In doing so, the court must often be cognizant of the various interests at stake in the reorganization, which can extend beyond those of the debtor and creditors to include employees, directors, shareholders, and even other parties doing business with the insolvent company (see, e.g., *Canadian Airlines Corp., Re*, 2000 ABQB 442, 84 Alta. L.R. (3d) 9 (Alta. Q.B.), at para. 144, *per* Paperny J. (as she then was); *Air Canada, Re* (2003), 42 C.B.R. (4th) 173 (Ont. S.C.J. [Commercial List]), at para. 3; *Air Canada, Re* [2003 CarswellOnt 4967 (Ont. S.C.J. [Commercial List])], 2003 CanLII 49366, at para. 13, *per* Farley J.; Sarra, *Creditor Rights*, at pp. 181-92 and 217-26). In addition, courts must recognize that on occasion the broader public interest will be engaged by aspects of the reorganization and may be a factor against which the decision of whether to allow a particular action will be weighed (see, e.g., *Canadian Red Cross Society / Société Canadienne de la Croix Rouge, Re* (2000), 19 C.B.R. (4th) 158 (Ont. S.C.J.), at para. 2, *per* Blair J. (as he then was); Sarra, *Creditor Rights*, at pp. 195-214).

61 When large companies encounter difficulty, reorganizations become increasingly complex. *CCAA* courts have been called upon to innovate accordingly in exercising their jurisdiction beyond merely staying proceedings against the debtor to allow breathing room for reorganization. They have been asked to sanction measures for which there is no explicit authority in the *CCAA*. Without exhaustively cataloguing the various measures taken under the authority of the *CCAA*, it is useful to refer briefly to a few examples to illustrate the flexibility the statute affords supervising courts.

62 Perhaps the most creative use of *CCAA* authority has been the increasing willingness of courts to authorize post-filing security for debtor in possession financing or super-priority charges on the debtor's assets when necessary for the continuation of the debtor's business during the reorganization (see, e.g., *Skydome Corp., Re* (1998), 16 C.B.R. (4th) 118 (Ont. Gen. Div. [Commercial List]); *United Used Auto & Truck Parts Ltd., Re*, 2000 BCCA 146, 135 B.C.A.C. 96 (B.C. C.A.), *affg* (1999), 12 C.B.R. (4th) 144 (B.C. S.C. [In Chambers]); and generally, J. P. Sarra, *Rescue! The Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act* (2007), at pp. 93-115). The *CCAA* has also been used to release claims against third parties as part of approving a comprehensive plan of arrangement and compromise, even over the objections of some dissenting creditors (see Metcalfe & Mansfield). As well, the appointment of a Monitor to oversee the reorganization was originally a measure taken pursuant to the *CCAA*'s supervisory authority; Parliament responded, making the mechanism mandatory by legislative amendment.

63 Judicial innovation during *CCAA* proceedings has not been without controversy. At least two questions it raises are directly relevant to the case at bar: (1) what are the sources of a court's authority during *CCAA* proceedings? (2) what are the limits of this authority?

64 The first question concerns the boundary between a court's statutory authority under the *CCAA* and a court's residual authority under its inherent and equitable jurisdiction when supervising a reorganization. In authorizing measures during *CCAA* proceedings, courts have on occasion purported to rely upon their equitable jurisdiction to advance the purposes of the Act or their inherent jurisdiction to fill gaps in the statute. Recent appellate decisions have counselled against purporting to rely on inherent jurisdiction, holding that the better view is that courts are in most cases simply construing the authority supplied by the *CCAA* itself (see, e.g., *Skeena Cellulose Inc., Re*, 2003 BCCA 344, 13 B.C.L.R. (4th) 236 (B.C. C.A.), at paras. 45-47, *per* Newbury J.A.; *Stelco Inc. (Re)* (2005), 75 O.R. (3d) 5 (Ont. C.A.), paras. 31-33, *per* Blair J.A.).

65 I agree with Justice Georgina R. Jackson and Professor Janis Sarra that the most appropriate approach is a hierarchical one in which courts rely first on an interpretation of the provisions of the *CCAA* text before turning to inherent or equitable jurisdiction to anchor measures taken in a *CCAA* proceeding (see G. R. Jackson and J. Sarra, "Selecting the Judicial Tool to get the Job Done: An Examination of Statutory Interpretation, Discretionary Power and Inherent Jurisdiction in Insolvency Matters", in J. P. Sarra, ed., *Annual Review of Insolvency Law 2007* (2008), 41, at p. 42). The authors conclude that when given an appropriately purposive and liberal interpretation, the *CCAA* will be sufficient in most instances to ground measures necessary to achieve its objectives (p. 94).

66 Having examined the pertinent parts of the *CCAA* and the recent history of the legislation, I accept that in most instances the issuance of an order during *CCAA* proceedings should be considered an exercise in statutory interpretation. Particularly noteworthy in this regard is the expansive interpretation the language of the statute at issue is capable of supporting.

67 The initial grant of authority under the *CCAA* empowered a court "where an application is made under this Act in respect of a company ... on the application of any person interested in the matter ..., subject to this Act, [to] make an order under this section" (*CCAA*, s. 11(1)). The plain language of the statute was very broad.

68 In this regard, though not strictly applicable to the case at bar, I note that Parliament has in recent amendments changed the wording contained in s. 11(1), making explicit the discretionary authority of the court under the *CCAA*. Thus in s. 11 of the *CCAA* as currently enacted, a court may, "subject to the restrictions set out in this Act, ... make any order that it considers appropriate in the circumstances" (S.C. 2005, c. 47, s. 128). Parliament appears to have endorsed the broad reading of *CCAA* authority developed by the jurisprudence.

69 The *CCAA* also explicitly provides for certain orders. Both an order made on an initial application and an order on subsequent applications may stay, restrain, or prohibit existing or new proceedings against the debtor. The burden is on the applicant to satisfy the court that the order is appropriate in the circumstances and that the applicant has been acting in good faith and with due diligence (*CCAA*, ss. 11(3), (4) and (6)).

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.

71 It is well-established that efforts to reorganize under the *CCAA* can be terminated and the stay of proceedings against the debtor lifted if the reorganization is "doomed to failure" (see *Chef Ready*, at p. 88; *Philip's Manufacturing Ltd., Re* (1992), 9 C.B.R. (3d) 25 (B.C. C.A.), at paras. 6-7). However, when an order is sought that does realistically advance the *CCAA*'s purposes, the ability to make it is within the discretion of a *CCAA* court.

72 The preceding discussion assists in determining whether the court had authority under the *CCAA* to continue the stay of proceedings against the Crown once it was apparent that reorganization would fail and bankruptcy was the inevitable next step.

73 In the Court of Appeal, Tysoe J.A. held that no authority existed under the *CCAA* to continue staying the Crown's enforcement of the GST deemed trust once efforts at reorganization had come to an end. The appellant submits that in so holding, Tysoe J.A. failed to consider the underlying purpose of the *CCAA* and give the statute an appropriately purposive and liberal interpretation under which the order was permissible. The Crown submits that Tysoe J.A. correctly held that the mandatory language of the *ETA* gave the court no option but to permit enforcement of the GST deemed trust when lifting the *CCAA* stay to permit the debtor to make an assignment under the *BIA*. Whether the *ETA* has a mandatory effect in the context of a *CCAA* proceeding has already been discussed. I will now address the question of whether the order was authorized by the *CCAA*.

74 It is beyond dispute that the *CCAA* imposes no explicit temporal limitations upon proceedings commenced under the Act that would prohibit ordering a continuation of the stay of the Crown's GST claims while lifting the general stay of proceedings temporarily to allow the debtor to make an assignment in bankruptcy.

75 The question remains whether the order advanced the underlying purpose of the *CCAA*. The Court of Appeal held that it did not because the reorganization efforts had come to an end and the *CCAA* was accordingly spent. I disagree.

76 There is no doubt that had reorganization been commenced under the *BIA* instead of the *CCAA*, the Crown's deemed trust priority for the GST funds would have been lost. Similarly, the Crown does not dispute that under the scheme of distribution in bankruptcy under the *BIA*, the deemed trust for GST ceases to have effect. Thus, after reorganization under the *CCAA* failed, creditors would have had a strong incentive to seek immediate bankruptcy and distribution of the debtor's assets under the *BIA*. In order to conclude that the discretion does not extend to partially lifting the stay in order to allow for an assignment in bankruptcy, one would have to assume a gap between the *CCAA* and the *BIA* proceedings. Brenner C.J.S.C.'s order staying Crown enforcement of the GST claim ensured that creditors would not be disadvantaged by the attempted reorganization under the *CCAA*. The effect of his order was to blunt any impulse of creditors to interfere in an orderly liquidation. His order was thus in furtherance of the *CCAA*'s objectives to the extent that it allowed a bridge between the *CCAA* and *BIA* proceedings. This interpretation of the tribunal's discretionary power is buttressed by s. 20 of the *CCAA*. That section provides that the *CCAA* "may be applied together with the provisions of any Act of Parliament... that authorizes or makes provision for the sanction of compromises or arrangements between a company and its shareholders or any class of them", such as the *BIA*. Section 20 clearly indicates the intention of Parliament for the *CCAA* to operate *in tandem* with other insolvency legislation, such as the *BIA*.

77 The *CCAA* creates conditions for preserving the *status quo* while attempts are made to find common ground amongst stakeholders for a reorganization that is fair to all. Because the alternative to reorganization is often bankruptcy, participants will measure the impact of a reorganization against the position they would enjoy in liquidation. In the case at bar, the order fostered a harmonious transition between reorganization and liquidation while meeting the objective of a single collective proceeding that is common to both statutes.

78 Tysoe J.A. therefore erred in my view by treating the *CCAA* and the *BIA* as distinct regimes subject to a temporal gap between the two, rather than as forming part of an integrated body of insolvency law. Parliament's decision to maintain two statutory schemes for reorganization, the *BIA* and the *CCAA*, reflects the reality that reorganizations of differing complexity require different legal mechanisms. By contrast, only one statutory scheme has been found to be needed to liquidate a bankrupt debtor's estate. The transition from the *CCAA* to the *BIA* may require the partial lifting of a stay of proceedings under the *CCAA* to allow commencement of the *BIA* proceedings. However, as Laskin J.A. for the Ontario Court of Appeal noted in a similar competition between secured creditors and the Ontario Superintendent of Financial Services seeking to enforce a deemed trust, "[t]he two statutes are related" and no "gap" exists between the two statutes which would allow the enforcement of property interests at the conclusion of *CCAA* proceedings that would be lost in bankruptcy *Ivaco Inc. (Re)* (2006), 83 O.R. (3d) 108 (Ont. C.A.), at paras. 62-63).

79 The Crown's priority in claims pursuant to source deductions deemed trusts does not undermine this conclusion. Source deductions deemed trusts survive under both the *CCAA* and the *BIA*. Accordingly, creditors' incentives to prefer one Act over another will not be affected. While a court has a broad discretion to stay source deductions deemed trusts in the *CCAA* context, this discretion is nevertheless subject to specific limitations applicable only to source deductions deemed trusts (*CCAA*, s. 11.4). Thus, if *CCAA* reorganization fails (e.g., either the creditors or the court refuse a proposed reorganization), the Crown can immediately assert its claim in unremitted source deductions. But this should not be understood to affect a seamless transition into bankruptcy or create any "gap" between the *CCAA* and the *BIA* for the simple reason that, regardless of what statute the reorganization had been commenced under, creditors' claims in both instances would have been subject to the priority of the Crown's source deductions deemed trust.

80 Source deductions deemed trusts aside, the comprehensive and exhaustive mechanism under the *BIA* must control the distribution of the debtor's assets once liquidation is inevitable. Indeed, an orderly transition to liquidation is mandatory under the *BIA* where a proposal is rejected by creditors. The *CCAA* is silent on the transition into liquidation but the breadth of the court's discretion under the Act is sufficient to construct a bridge to liquidation under the *BIA*. The court must do so in a manner that does not subvert the scheme of distribution under the *BIA*. Transition to liquidation requires partially lifting the *CCAA* stay to commence proceedings under the *BIA*. This necessary partial lifting of the stay should not trigger a race to the courthouse in an effort to obtain priority unavailable under the *BIA*.

81 I therefore conclude that Brenner C.J.S.C. had the authority under the *CCAA* to lift the stay to allow entry into liquidation.

3.4 Express Trust

82 The last issue in this case is whether Brenner C.J.S.C. created an express trust in favour of the Crown when he ordered on April 29, 2008, that proceeds from the sale of LeRoy Trucking's assets equal to the amount of unremitted GST be held back in the Monitor's trust account until the results of the reorganization were known. Tysoe J.A. in the Court of Appeal concluded as an alternative ground for allowing the Crown's appeal that it was the beneficiary of an express trust. I disagree.

83 Creation of an express trust requires the presence of three certainties: intention, subject matter, and object. Express or "true trusts" arise from the acts and intentions of the settlor and are distinguishable from other trusts arising by operation of law (see D. W. M. Waters, M. R. Gillen and L. D. Smith, eds., *Waters' Law of Trusts in Canada* (3rd ed. 2005), at pp. 28-29 especially fn. 42).

84 Here, there is no certainty to the object (i.e. the beneficiary) inferable from the court's order of April 29, 2008, sufficient to support an express trust.

85 At the time of the order, there was a dispute between Century Services and the Crown over part of the proceeds from the sale of the debtor's assets. The court's solution was to accept LeRoy Trucking's proposal to segregate those monies until that dispute could be resolved. Thus there was no certainty that the Crown would actually be the beneficiary, or object, of the trust.

86 The fact that the location chosen to segregate those monies was the Monitor's trust account has no independent effect such that it would overcome the lack of a clear beneficiary. In any event, under the interpretation of *CCAA* s. 18.3(1) established above, no such priority dispute would even arise because the Crown's deemed trust priority over GST claims would be lost under the *CCAA* and the Crown would rank as an unsecured creditor for this amount. However, Brenner C.J.S.C. may well have been proceeding on the basis that, in accordance with *Ottawa Senators*, the Crown's GST claim would remain effective if reorganization was successful, which would not be the case if transition to the liquidation process of the *BIA* was allowed. An amount equivalent to that claim would accordingly be set aside pending the outcome of reorganization.

87 Thus, uncertainty surrounding the outcome of the *CCAA* restructuring eliminates the existence of any certainty to permanently vest in the Crown a beneficial interest in the funds. That much is clear from the oral reasons of Brenner C.J.S.C. on April 29, 2008, when he said: "Given the fact that [*CCAA* proceedings] are known to fail and filings in bankruptcy result, it seems to me that maintaining the status quo in the case at bar supports the proposal to have the monitor hold these funds in trust." Exactly who might take the money in the final result was therefore evidently in doubt. Brenner C.J.S.C.'s subsequent order of September 3, 2008, denying the Crown's application to enforce the trust once it was clear that bankruptcy was inevitable, confirms the absence of a clear beneficiary required to ground an express trust.

4. Conclusion

88 I conclude that Brenner C.J.S.C. had the discretion under the *CCAA* to continue the stay of the Crown's claim for enforcement of the GST deemed trust while otherwise lifting it to permit LeRoy Trucking to make an assignment in bankruptcy. My conclusion that s. 18.3(1) of the *CCAA* nullified the GST deemed trust while proceedings under that Act were pending confirms that the discretionary jurisdiction under s. 11 utilized by the court was not limited by the Crown's asserted GST priority, because there is no such priority under the *CCAA*.

89 For these reasons, I would allow the appeal and declare that the \$305,202.30 collected by LeRoy Trucking in respect of GST but not yet remitted to the Receiver General of Canada is not subject to deemed trust or priority in favour of the Crown. Nor is this amount subject to an express trust. Costs are awarded for this appeal and the appeal in the court below.

Fish J. (concurring):

I

90 I am in general agreement with the reasons of Justice Deschamps and would dispose of the appeal as she suggests.

91 More particularly, I share my colleague's interpretation of the scope of the judge's discretion under s. 11 of the *Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act*, R.S.C. 1985, c. C-36 ("*CCAA*"). And I share my colleague's conclusion that Brenner C.J.S.C. did not create an express trust in favour of the Crown when he segregated GST funds into the Monitor's trust account (2008 BCSC 1805, [2008] G.S.T.C. 221 (B.C. S.C. [In Chambers])).

92 I nonetheless feel bound to add brief reasons of my own regarding the interaction between the *CCAA* and the *Excise Tax Act*, R.S.C. 1985, c. E-15 ("*ETA*").

93 In upholding deemed trusts created by the *ETA* notwithstanding insolvency proceedings, *Ottawa Senators Hockey Club Corp. (Re)* (2005), 73 O.R. (3d) 737, [2005] G.S.T.C. 1 (Ont. C.A.), and its progeny have been unduly protective of Crown interests which Parliament itself has chosen to subordinate to competing prioritized claims. In my respectful view, a clearly marked departure from that jurisprudential approach is warranted in this case.

94 Justice Deschamps develops important historical and policy reasons in support of this position and I have nothing to add in that regard. I do wish, however, to explain why a comparative analysis of related statutory provisions adds support to our shared conclusion.

95 Parliament has in recent years given detailed consideration to the Canadian insolvency scheme. It has declined to amend the provisions at issue in this case. Ours is not to wonder why, but rather to treat Parliament's preservation of the relevant provisions as a deliberate exercise of the legislative discretion that is Parliament's alone. With respect, I reject any suggestion that we should instead characterize the apparent conflict between s. 18.3(1) (now s. 37(1)) of the *CCAA* and s. 222 of the *ETA* as a drafting anomaly or statutory lacuna properly subject to judicial correction or repair.

II

96 In the context of the Canadian insolvency regime, a deemed trust will be found to exist only where two complementary elements co-exist: first, a statutory provision *creating* the trust; and second, a *CCAA* or *Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act*, R.S.C. 1985, c. B-3 ("*BIA*") provision *confirming* — or explicitly preserving — its effective operation.

97 This interpretation is reflected in three federal statutes. Each contains a deemed trust provision framed in terms strikingly similar to the wording of s. 222 of the *ETA*.

98 The first is the *Income Tax Act*, R.S.C. 1985, c. 1 (5th Supp.) ("*ITA*") where s. 227(4) *creates* a deemed trust:

227 (4) Trust for moneys deducted — Every person who deducts or withholds an amount under this Act is deemed, notwithstanding any security interest (as defined in subsection 224(1.3)) in the amount so deducted or withheld, to hold the amount separate and apart from the property of the person and from property held by any secured creditor (as defined in subsection 224(1.3)) of that person that but for the security interest would be property of the person, in trust for Her Majesty and for payment to Her Majesty in the manner and at the time provided under this Act. [Here and below, the emphasis is of course my own.]

99 In the next subsection, Parliament has taken care to make clear that this trust is unaffected by federal or provincial legislation to the contrary:

(4.1) Extension of trust — Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, the *Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act* (except sections 81.1 and 81.2 of that Act), any other enactment of Canada, any enactment of a province or any other law, where at any time an amount deemed by subsection 227(4) to be held by a person in trust for Her Majesty is not paid to Her Majesty in the manner and at the time provided under this Act, property of the person ... equal in value to the amount so deemed to be held in trust is deemed

(a) to be held, from the time the amount was deducted or withheld by the person, separate and apart from the property of the person, in trust for Her Majesty whether or not the property is subject to such a security interest, ...

...

... and the proceeds of such property shall be paid to the Receiver General in priority to all such security interests.

100 The continued operation of this deemed trust is expressly *confirmed* in s. 18.3 of the *CCAA*:

18.3 (1) Subject to subsection (2), notwithstanding any provision in federal or provincial legislation that has the effect of deeming property to be held in trust for Her Majesty, property of a debtor company shall not be regarded as being held in trust for Her Majesty unless it would be so regarded in the absence of that statutory provision.

(2) Subsection (1) does not apply in respect of amounts deemed to be held in trust under subsection 227(4) or (4.1) of the *Income Tax Act*, subsection 23(3) or (4) of the *Canada Pension Plan* or subsection 86(2) or (2.1) of the *Employment Insurance Act*....

101 The operation of the *ITA* deemed trust is also confirmed in s. 67 of the *BIA*:

67 (2) Subject to subsection (3), notwithstanding any provision in federal or provincial legislation that has the effect of deeming property to be held in trust for Her Majesty, property of a bankrupt shall not be regarded as held in trust for Her Majesty for the purpose of paragraph (1)(a) unless it would be so regarded in the absence of that statutory provision.

(3) Subsection (2) does not apply in respect of amounts deemed to be held in trust under subsection 227(4) or (4.1) of the *Income Tax Act*, subsection 23(3) or (4) of the *Canada Pension Plan* or subsection 86(2) or (2.1) of the *Employment Insurance Act*....

102 Thus, Parliament has first *created* and then *confirmed the continued operation of* the Crown's *ITA* deemed trust under both the *CCAA* and the *BIA* regimes.

103 The second federal statute for which this scheme holds true is the *Canada Pension Plan*, R.S.C. 1985, c. C-8 ("*CPP*"). At s. 23, Parliament creates a deemed trust in favour of the Crown and specifies that it exists despite all contrary provisions in any other Canadian statute. Finally, and in almost identical terms, the *Employment Insurance Act*, S.C. 1996, c. 23 ("*EIA*"), creates a deemed trust in favour of the Crown: see ss. 86(2) and (2.1).

104 As we have seen, the survival of the deemed trusts created under these provisions of the *ITA*, the *CPP* and the *EIA* is confirmed in s. 18.3(2) the *CCAA* and in s. 67(3) the *BIA*. In all three cases, Parliament's intent to enforce the Crown's deemed trust through insolvency proceedings is expressed in clear and unmistakable terms.

105 The same is not true with regard to the deemed trust created under the *ETA*. Although Parliament creates a deemed trust in favour of the Crown to hold unremitted GST monies, and although it purports to maintain this trust notwithstanding any contrary federal or provincial legislation, it does not *confirm* the trust — or expressly provide for its continued operation — in either the *BIA* or the *CCAA*. The second of the two mandatory elements I have mentioned is thus absent reflecting Parliament's intention to allow the deemed trust to lapse with the commencement of insolvency proceedings.

106 The language of the relevant *ETA* provisions is identical in substance to that of the *ITA*, *CPP*, and *EIA* provisions:

222. (1) [Deemed] Trust for amounts collected — Subject to subsection (1.1), every person who collects an amount as or on account of tax under Division II is deemed, for all purposes and despite any security interest in the amount, to hold the amount in trust for Her Majesty in right of Canada, separate and apart from the property of the person and from property held by any secured creditor of the person that, but for a security interest, would be property of the person, until the amount is remitted to the Receiver General or withdrawn under subsection (2).

...

(3) Extension of trust — Despite any other provision of this Act (except subsection (4)), any other enactment of Canada (except the *Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act*), any enactment of a province or any other law, if at any time an amount deemed by subsection (1) to be held by a person in trust for Her Majesty is not remitted to the Receiver General or withdrawn in the manner and at the time provided under this Part, property of the person and property held by any secured creditor of the person that, but for a security interest, would be property of the person, equal in value to the amount so deemed to be held in trust, is deemed

(a) to be held, from the time the amount was collected by the person, in trust for Her Majesty, separate and apart from the property of the person, whether or not the property is subject to a security interest, ...

...

... and the proceeds of the property shall be paid to the Receiver General in priority to all security interests.

107 Yet no provision of the *CCAA* provides for the continuation of this deemed trust after the *CCAA* is brought into play.

108 In short, Parliament has imposed *two* explicit conditions, or "building blocks", for survival under the *CCAA* of deemed trusts created by the *ITA*, *CPP*, and *EIA*. Had Parliament intended to likewise preserve under the *CCAA* deemed trusts created by the *ETA*, it would have included in the *CCAA* the sort of confirmatory provision that explicitly preserves other deemed trusts.

109 With respect, unlike Tysoe J.A., I do not find it "inconceivable that Parliament would specifically identify the *BIA* as an exception when enacting the current version of s. 222(3) of the *ETA* without considering the *CCAA* as a possible second exception" (2009 BCCA 205, 98 B.C.L.R. (4th) 242, [2009] G.S.T.C. 79 (B.C. C.A.), at para. 37). *All* of the deemed trust provisions excerpted above make explicit reference to the *BIA*. Section 222 of the *ETA* does not break the pattern. Given the near-identical wording of the four deemed trust provisions, it would have been surprising indeed had Parliament not addressed the *BIA* at all in the *ETA*.

110 Parliament's evident intent was to render GST deemed trusts inoperative upon the institution of insolvency proceedings. Accordingly, s. 222 mentions the *BIA* so as to *exclude* it from its ambit — rather than to *include* it, as do the *ITA*, the *CPP*, and the *EIA*.

111 Conversely, I note that *none* of these statutes mentions the *CCAA* expressly. Their specific reference to the *BIA* has no bearing on their interaction with the *CCAA*. Again, it is the confirmatory provisions *in the insolvency statutes* that determine whether a given deemed trust will subsist during insolvency proceedings.

112 Finally, I believe that chambers judges should not segregate GST monies into the Monitor's trust account during *CCAA* proceedings, as was done in this case. The result of Justice Deschamps's reasoning is that GST claims become unsecured under the *CCAA*. Parliament has deliberately chosen to nullify certain Crown super-priorities during insolvency; this is one such instance.

III

113 For these reasons, like Justice Deschamps, I would allow the appeal with costs in this Court and in the courts below and order that the \$305,202.30 collected by LeRoy Trucking in respect of GST but not yet remitted to the Receiver General of Canada be subject to no deemed trust or priority in favour of the Crown.

Abella J. (dissenting):

114 The central issue in this appeal is whether s. 222 of the *Excise Tax Act*, R.S.C. 1985, c. E-15 ("*EIA*"), and specifically s. 222(3), gives priority during *Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act*, R.S.C. 1985, c. C-36 ("*CCAA*"), proceedings to the Crown's deemed trust in unremitted GST. I agree with Tysoe J.A. that it does. It follows, in my respectful view, that a court's discretion under s. 11 of the *CCAA* is circumscribed accordingly.

115 Section 11¹ of the *CCAA* stated:

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

To decide the scope of the court's discretion under s. 11, it is necessary to first determine the priority issue. Section 222(3), the provision of the *ETA* at issue in this case, states:

222 (3) Extension of trust — Despite any other provision of this Act (except subsection (4)), any other enactment of Canada (except the *Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act*), any enactment of a province or any other law, if at any time an amount deemed by subsection (1) to be held by a person in trust for Her Majesty is not remitted to the Receiver General or withdrawn in the manner and at the time provided under this Part, property of the person and property held by any secured creditor of the person that, but for a security interest, would be property of the person, equal in value to the amount so deemed to be held in trust, is deemed

(a) to be held, from the time the amount was collected by the person, in trust for Her Majesty, separate and apart from the property of the person, whether or not the property is subject to a security interest, and

(b) to form no part of the estate or property of the person from the time the amount was collected, whether or not the property has in fact been kept separate and apart from the estate or property of the person and whether or not the property is subject to a security interest

and is property beneficially owned by Her Majesty in right of Canada despite any security interest in the property or in the proceeds thereof and the proceeds of the property shall be paid to the Receiver General in priority to all security interests.

116 Century Services argued that the *CCAA*'s general override provision, s. 18.3(1), prevailed, and that the deeming provisions in s. 222 of the *ETA* were, accordingly, inapplicable during *CCAA* proceedings. Section 18.3(1) states:

18.3 (1) ... [N]otwithstanding any provision in federal or provincial legislation that has the effect of deeming property to be held in trust for Her Majesty, property of a debtor company shall not be regarded as held in trust for Her Majesty unless it would be so regarded in the absence of that statutory provision.

117 As MacPherson J.A. correctly observed in *Ottawa Senators Hockey Club Corp. (Re)* (2005), 73 O.R. (3d) 737, [2005] G.S.T.C. 1 (Ont. C.A.), s. 222(3) of the *ETA* is in "clear conflict" with s. 18.3(1) of the *CCAA* (para. 31). Resolving the conflict between the two provisions is, essentially, what seems to me to be a relatively uncomplicated exercise in statutory interpretation: does the language reflect a clear legislative intention? In my view it does. The deemed trust provision, s. 222(3) of the *ETA*, has unambiguous language stating that it operates notwithstanding any law except the *Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act*, R.S.C. 1985, c. B-3 ("*BIA*").

118 By expressly excluding only one statute from its legislative grasp, and by unequivocally stating that it applies despite any other law anywhere in Canada *except* the *BIA*, s. 222(3) has defined its boundaries in the clearest possible terms. I am in complete agreement with the following comments of MacPherson J.A. in *Ottawa Senators*:

The legislative intent of s. 222(3) of the *ETA* is clear. If there is a conflict with "any other enactment of Canada (except the *Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act*)", s. 222(3) prevails. In these words Parliament did two things: it decided that s. 222(3) should trump all other federal laws and, importantly, it addressed the topic of exceptions to its trumping decision and identified a single exception, the *Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act* The *BIA* and the *CCAA* are closely related federal statutes. I cannot conceive that Parliament would specifically identify the *BIA* as an exception, but accidentally fail to consider the *CCAA* as a possible second exception. In my view, the omission of the *CCAA* from s. 222(3) of the *ETA* was almost certainly a considered omission. [para. 43]

119 MacPherson J.A.'s view that the failure to exempt the *CCAA* from the operation of the *ETA* is a reflection of a clear legislative intention, is borne out by how the *CCAA* was subsequently changed after s. 18.3(1) was enacted in 1997. In 2000, when s. 222(3) of the *ETA* came into force, amendments were also introduced to the *CCAA*. Section 18.3(1) was not amended.

120 The failure to amend s. 18.3(1) is notable because its effect was to protect the legislative *status quo*, notwithstanding repeated requests from various constituencies that s. 18.3(1) be amended to make the priorities in the *CCAA* consistent with those in the *BIA*. In 2002, for example, when Industry Canada conducted a review of the *BIA* and the *CCAA*, the Insolvency Institute of Canada and the Canadian Association of Insolvency and Restructuring Professionals recommended that the priority regime under the *BIA* be extended to the *CCAA* (Joint Task Force on Business Insolvency Law Reform, *Report* (March 15, 2002), Sch. B, proposal 71, at pp. 37-38). The same recommendations were made by the Standing Senate Committee on Banking, Trade and Commerce in its 2003 report, *Debtors and Creditors Sharing the Burden: A Review of the Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act and the Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act*; by the Legislative Review Task Force (Commercial) of the Insolvency Institute of Canada and the Canadian Association of Insolvency and Restructuring Professionals in its 2005 *Report on the Commercial Provisions of Bill C-55*; and in 2007 by the Insolvency Institute of Canada in a submission to the Standing Senate Committee on Banking, Trade and Commerce commenting on reforms then under consideration.

121 Yet the *BIA* remains the only exempted statute under s. 222(3) of the *ETA*. Even after the 2005 decision in *Ottawa Senators* which confirmed that the *ETA* took precedence over the *CCAA*, there was no responsive legislative revision. I see this lack of response as relevant in this case, as it was in *R. v. Tele-Mobile Co.*, 2008 SCC 12, [2008] 1 S.C.R. 305 (S.C.C.), where this Court stated:

While it cannot be said that legislative silence is necessarily determinative of legislative intention, in this case the silence is Parliament's answer to the consistent urging of Telus and other affected businesses and organizations that there be express language in the legislation to ensure that businesses can be reimbursed for the reasonable costs of complying with evidence-gathering orders. I see the legislative history as reflecting Parliament's intention that compensation not be paid for compliance with production orders. [para. 42]

122 All this leads to a clear inference of a deliberate legislative choice to protect the deemed trust in s. 222(3) from the reach of s. 18.3(1) of the *CCAA*.

123 Nor do I see any "policy" justification for interfering, through interpretation, with this clarity of legislative intention. I can do no better by way of explaining why I think the policy argument cannot succeed in this case, than to repeat the words of Tysoe J.A. who said:

I do not dispute that there are valid policy reasons for encouraging insolvent companies to attempt to restructure their affairs so that their business can continue with as little disruption to employees and other stakeholders as possible. It is appropriate for the courts to take such policy considerations into account, but only if it is in connection with a matter that has not been considered by Parliament. Here, Parliament must be taken to have weighed policy considerations when it enacted the amendments to the *CCAA* and *ETA* described above. As Mr. Justice MacPherson observed at para. 43 of *Ottawa Senators*, it is inconceivable that Parliament would specifically identify the *BIA* as an exception when enacting the current version of s. 222(3) of the *ETA* without considering the *CCAA* as a possible second exception. I also make the observation that the 1992 set of amendments to the *BIA* enabled proposals to be binding on secured creditors and, while there is more flexibility under the *CCAA*, it is possible for an insolvent company to attempt to restructure under the auspices of the *BIA*. [para. 37]

124 Despite my view that the clarity of the language in s. 222(3) is dispositive, it is also my view that even the application of other principles of interpretation reinforces this conclusion. In their submissions, the parties raised the following as being particularly relevant: the Crown relied on the principle that the statute which is "later in time" prevails; and Century Services based its argument on the principle that the general provision gives way to the specific (*generalalia specialibus non derogant*).

125 The "later in time" principle gives priority to a more recent statute, based on the theory that the legislature is presumed to be aware of the content of existing legislation. If a new enactment is inconsistent with a prior one, therefore, the legislature

is presumed to have intended to derogate from the earlier provisions (Ruth Sullivan, *Sullivan on the Construction of Statutes* (5th ed. 2008), at pp. 346-47; Pierre-André Côté, *The Interpretation of Legislation in Canada* (3rd ed. 2000), at p. 358).

126 The exception to this presumptive displacement of pre-existing inconsistent legislation, is the *generalia specialibus non derogant* principle that "[a] more recent, general provision will not be construed as affecting an earlier, special provision" (Côté, at p. 359). Like a Russian Doll, there is also an exception within this exception, namely, that an earlier, specific provision may in fact be "overruled" by a subsequent general statute if the legislature indicates, through its language, an intention that the general provision prevails (*Doré c. Verdun (Municipalité)*, [1997] 2 S.C.R. 862 (S.C.C.)).

127 The primary purpose of these interpretive principles is to assist in the performance of the task of determining the intention of the legislature. This was confirmed by MacPherson J.A. in *Ottawa Senators*, at para. 42:

[T]he overarching rule of statutory interpretation is that statutory provisions should be interpreted to give effect to the intention of the legislature in enacting the law. This primary rule takes precedence over all maxims or canons or aids relating to statutory interpretation, including the maxim that the specific prevails over the general (*generalia specialibus non derogant*). As expressed by Hudson J. in *Canada v. Williams*, [1944] S.C.R. 226, ... at p. 239 ...:

The maxim *generalia specialibus non derogant* is relied on as a rule which should dispose of the question, but the maxim is not a rule of law but a rule of construction and bows to the intention of the legislature, if such intention can reasonably be gathered from all of the relevant legislation.

(See also Côté, at p. 358, and Pierre-André Côté, with the collaboration of S. Beaulac and M. Devinat, *Interprétation des lois* (4th ed. 2009), at para. 1335.)

128 I accept the Crown's argument that the "later in time" principle is conclusive in this case. Since s. 222(3) of the *ETA* was enacted in 2000 and s. 18.3(1) of the *CCAA* was introduced in 1997, s. 222(3) is, on its face, the later provision. This chronological victory can be displaced, as Century Services argues, if it is shown that the more recent provision, s. 222(3) of the *ETA*, is a general one, in which case the earlier, specific provision, s. 18.3(1), prevails (*generalia specialibus non derogant*). But, as previously explained, the prior specific provision does not take precedence if the subsequent general provision appears to "overrule" it. This, it seems to me, is precisely what s. 222(3) achieves through the use of language stating that it prevails despite any law of Canada, of a province, or "any other law" *other than the BIA*. Section 18.3(1) of the *CCAA*, is thereby rendered inoperative for purposes of s. 222(3).

129 It is true that when the *CCAA* was amended in 2005,² s. 18.3(1) was re-enacted as s. 37(1) (S.C. 2005, c. 47, s. 131). Deschamps J. suggests that this makes s. 37(1) the new, "later in time" provision. With respect, her observation is refuted by the operation of s. 44(f) of the *Interpretation Act*, R.S.C. 1985, c. I-21, which expressly deals with the (non) effect of re-enacting, without significant substantive changes, a repealed provision (see *Canada (Attorney General) v. Canada (Public Service Staff Relations Board)*, [1977] 2 F.C. 663 (Fed. C.A.), dealing with the predecessor provision to s. 44(f)). It directs that new enactments not be construed as "new law" unless they differ in substance from the repealed provision:

44. Where an enactment, in this section called the "former enactment", is repealed and another enactment, in this section called the "new enactment", is substituted therefor,

...

(f) except to the extent that the provisions of the new enactment are not in substance the same as those of the former enactment, the new enactment shall not be held to operate as new law, but shall be construed and have effect as a consolidation and as declaratory of the law as contained in the former enactment;

Section 2 of the *Interpretation Act* defines an enactment as "an Act or regulation or *any portion of an Act or regulation*".

130 Section 37(1) of the current *CCAA* is almost identical to s. 18.3(1). These provisions are set out for ease of comparison, with the differences between them underlined:

37.(1) Subject to subsection (2), despite any provision in federal or provincial legislation that has the effect of deeming property to be held in trust for Her Majesty, property of a debtor company shall not be regarded as being held in trust for Her Majesty unless it would be so regarded in the absence of that statutory provision.

18.3 (1) Subject to subsection (2), notwithstanding any provision in federal or provincial legislation that has the effect of deeming property to be held in trust for Her Majesty, property of a debtor company shall not be regarded as held in trust for Her Majesty unless it would be so regarded in the absence of that statutory provision.

131 The application of s. 44(f) of the *Interpretation Act* simply confirms the government's clearly expressed intent, found in Industry Canada's clause-by-clause review of Bill C-55, where s. 37(1) was identified as "a technical amendment to reorder the provisions of this Act". During second reading, the Hon. Bill Rompkey, then the Deputy Leader of the Government in the Senate, confirmed that s. 37(1) represented only a technical change:

On a technical note relating to the treatment of deemed trusts for taxes, the bill [*sic*] makes no changes to the underlying policy intent, despite the fact that in the case of a restructuring under the *CCAA*, sections of the act [*sic*] were repealed and substituted with renumbered versions due to the extensive reworking of the *CCAA*.

(*Debates of the Senate*, vol. 142, 1st Sess., 38th Parl., November 23, 2005, at p. 2147)

132 Had the substance of s. 18.3(1) altered in any material way when it was replaced by s. 37(1), I would share Deschamps J.'s view that it should be considered a new provision. But since s. 18.3(1) and s. 37(1) are the same in substance, the transformation of s. 18.3(1) into s. 37(1) has no effect on the interpretive queue, and s. 222(3) of the *ETA* remains the "later in time" provision (Sullivan, at p. 347).

133 This means that the deemed trust provision in s. 222(3) of the *ETA* takes precedence over s. 18.3(1) during *CCAA* proceedings. The question then is how that priority affects the discretion of a court under s. 11 of the *CCAA*.

134 While s. 11 gives a court discretion to make orders notwithstanding the *BIA* and the *Winding-up Act*, R.S.C. 1985, c. W-11, that discretion is not liberated from the operation of any other federal statute. Any exercise of discretion is therefore circumscribed by whatever limits are imposed by statutes *other* than the *BIA* and the *Winding-up Act*. That includes the *ETA*. The chambers judge in this case was, therefore, required to respect the priority regime set out in s. 222(3) of the *ETA*. Neither s. 18.3(1) nor s. 11 of the *CCAA* gave him the authority to ignore it. He could not, as a result, deny the Crown's request for payment of the GST funds during the *CCAA* proceedings.

135 Given this conclusion, it is unnecessary to consider whether there was an express trust.

136 I would dismiss the appeal.

Appeal allowed.

Pourvoi accueilli.

Appendix

Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act, R.S.C. 1985, c. C-36 (as at December 13, 2007)

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

...

(3) Initial application court orders — A court may, on an initial application in respect of a company, make an order on such terms as it may impose, effective for such period as the court deems necessary not exceeding thirty days,

- (a) staying, until otherwise ordered by the court, all proceedings taken or that might be taken in respect of the company under an Act referred to in subsection (i);
- (b) restraining, until otherwise ordered by the court, further proceedings in any action, suit or proceeding against the company; and
- (c) prohibiting, until otherwise ordered by the court, the commencement of or proceeding with any other action, suit or proceeding against the company.

(4) Other than initial application court orders — A court may, on an application in respect of a company other than an initial application, make an order on such terms as it may impose,

- (a) staying, until otherwise ordered by the court, for such period as the court deems necessary, all proceedings taken or that might be taken in respect of the company under an Act referred to in subsection (1);
- (b) restraining, until otherwise ordered by the court, further proceedings in any action, suit or proceeding against the company; and
- (c) prohibiting, until otherwise ordered by the court, the commencement of or proceeding with any other action, suit or proceeding against the company.

...

(6) Burden of proof on application — The court shall not make an order under subsection (3) or (4) unless

- (a) the applicant satisfies the court that circumstances exist that make such an order appropriate; and
- (b) in the case of an order under subsection (4), the applicant also satisfies the court that the applicant has acted, and is acting, in good faith and with due diligence.

11.4 (1) Her Majesty affected — An order made under section 11 may provide that

(a) Her Majesty in right of Canada may not exercise rights under subsection 224(1.2) of the *Income Tax Act* or any provision of the *Canada Pension Plan* or of the *Employment Insurance Act* that refers to subsection 224(1.2) of the *Income Tax Act* and provides for the collection of a contribution, as defined in the *Canada Pension Plan*, or an employee's premium, or employer's premium, as defined in the *Employment Insurance Act*, and of any related interest, penalties or other amounts, in respect of the company if the company is a tax debtor under that subsection or provision, for such period as the court considers appropriate but ending not later than

- (i) the expiration of the order,
- (ii) the refusal of a proposed compromise by the creditors or the court,
- (iii) six months following the court sanction of a compromise or arrangement,
- (iv) the default by the company on any term of a compromise or arrangement, or
- (v) the performance of a compromise or arrangement in respect of the company; and\

(b) Her Majesty in right of a province may not exercise rights under any provision of provincial legislation in respect of the company where the company is a debtor under that legislation and the provision has a similar purpose to subsection 224(1.2) of the *Income Tax Act*, or refers to that subsection, to the extent that it provides for the collection of a sum, and of any related interest, penalties or other amounts, where the sum

(i) has been withheld or deducted by a person from a payment to another person and is in respect of a tax similar in nature to the income tax imposed on individuals under the *Income Tax Act*, or

(ii) is of the same nature as a contribution under the *Canada Pension Plan* if the province is a "province providing a comprehensive pension plan" as defined in subsection 3(1) of the *Canada Pension Plan* and the provincial legislation establishes a "provincial pension plan" as defined in that subsection,

for such period as the court considers appropriate but ending not later than the occurrence or time referred to in whichever of subparagraphs (a)(i) to (v) may apply.

(2) When order ceases to be in effect — An order referred to in subsection (1) ceases to be in effect if

(a) the company defaults on payment of any amount that becomes due to Her Majesty after the order is made and could be subject to a demand under

(i) subsection 224(1.2) of the *Income Tax Act*,

(ii) any provision of the *Canada Pension Plan* or of the *Employment Insurance Act* that refers to subsection 224(1.2) of the *Income Tax Act* and provides for the collection of a contribution, as defined in the *Canada Pension Plan*, or an employee's premium, or employer's premium, as defined in the *Employment Insurance Act*, and of any related interest, penalties or other amounts, or

(iii) under any provision of provincial legislation that has a similar purpose to subsection 224(1.2) of the *Income Tax Act*, or that refers to that subsection, to the extent that it provides for the collection of a sum, and of any related interest, penalties or other amounts, where the sum

(A) has been withheld or deducted by a person from a payment to another person and is in respect of a tax similar in nature to the income tax imposed on individuals under the *Income Tax Act*, or

(B) is of the same nature as a contribution under the *Canada Pension Plan* if the province is a "province providing a comprehensive pension plan" as defined in subsection 3(1) of the *Canada Pension Plan* and the provincial legislation establishes a "provincial pension plan" as defined in that subsection; or

(b) any other creditor is or becomes entitled to realize a security on any property that could be claimed by Her Majesty in exercising rights under

(i) subsection 224(1.2) of the *Income Tax Act*,

(ii) any provision of the *Canada Pension Plan* or of the *Employment Insurance Act* that refers to subsection 224(1.2) of the *Income Tax Act* and provides for the collection of a contribution, as defined in the *Canada Pension Plan*, or an employee's premium, or employer's premium, as defined in the *Employment Insurance Act*, and of any related interest, penalties or other amounts, or

(iii) any provision of provincial legislation that has a similar purpose to subsection 224(1.2) of the *Income Tax Act*, or that refers to that subsection, to the extent that it provides for the collection of a sum, and of any related interest, penalties or other amounts, where the sum

(A) has been withheld or deducted by a person from a payment to another person and is in respect of a tax similar in nature to the income tax imposed on individuals under the *Income Tax Act*, or

(B) is of the same nature as a contribution under the *Canada Pension Plan* if the province is a "province providing a comprehensive pension plan" as defined in subsection 3(1) of the *Canada Pension Plan* and the provincial legislation establishes a "provincial pension plan" as defined in that subsection.

(3) Operation of similar legislation — An order made under section 11, other than an order referred to in subsection (1) of this section, does not affect the operation of

(a) subsections 224(1.2) and (1.3) of the *Income Tax Act*,

(b) any provision of the *Canada Pension Plan* or of the *Employment Insurance Act* that refers to subsection 224(1.2) of the *Income Tax Act* and provides for the collection of a contribution, as defined in the *Canada Pension Plan*, or an employee's premium, or employer's premium, as defined in the *Employment Insurance Act*, and of any related interest, penalties or other amounts, or

(c) any provision of provincial legislation that has a similar purpose to subsection 224(1.2) of the *Income Tax Act*, or that refers to that subsection, to the extent that it provides for the collection of a sum, and of any related interest, penalties or other amounts, where the sum

(i) has been withheld or deducted by a person from a payment to another person and is in respect of a tax similar in nature to the income tax imposed on individuals under the *Income Tax Act*, or

(ii) is of the same nature as a contribution under the *Canada Pension Plan* if the province is a "province providing a comprehensive pension plan" as defined in subsection 3(1) of the *Canada Pension Plan* and the provincial legislation establishes a "provincial pension plan" as defined in that subsection,

and for the purpose of paragraph (c), the provision of provincial legislation is, despite any Act of Canada or of a province or any other law, deemed to have the same effect and scope against any creditor, however secured, as subsection 224(1.2) of the *Income Tax Act* in respect of a sum referred to in subparagraph (c)(i), or as subsection 23(2) of the *Canada Pension Plan* in respect of a sum referred to in subparagraph (c)(ii), and in respect of any related interest, penalties or other amounts.

18.3 (1) Deemed trusts — Subject to subsection (2), notwithstanding any provision in federal or provincial legislation that has the effect of deeming property to be held in trust for Her Majesty, property of a debtor company shall not be regarded as held in trust for Her Majesty unless it would be so regarded in the absence of that statutory provision.

(2) Exceptions — Subsection (1) does not apply in respect of amounts deemed to be held in trust under subsection 227(4) or (4.1) of the *Income Tax Act*, subsection 23(3) or (4) of the *Canada Pension Plan* or subsection 86(2) or (2.1) of the *Employment Insurance Act* (each of which is in this subsection referred to as a "federal provision") nor in respect of amounts deemed to be held in trust under any law of a province that creates a deemed trust the sole purpose of which is to ensure remittance to Her Majesty in right of the province of amounts deducted or withheld under a law of the province where

(a) that law of the province imposes a tax similar in nature to the tax imposed under the *Income Tax Act* and the amounts deducted or withheld under that law of the province are of the same nature as the amounts referred to in subsection 227(4) or (4.1) of the *Income Tax Act*, or

(b) the province is a "province providing a comprehensive pension plan" as defined in subsection 3(1) of the *Canada Pension Plan*, that law of the province establishes a "provincial pension plan" as defined in that subsection and the amounts deducted or withheld under that law of the province are of the same nature as amounts referred to in subsection 23(3) or (4) of the *Canada Pension Plan*,

and for the purpose of this subsection, any provision of a law of a province that creates a deemed trust is, notwithstanding any Act of Canada or of a province or any other law, deemed to have the same effect and scope against any creditor, however secured, as the corresponding federal provision.

18.4 (1) Status of Crown claims — In relation to a proceeding under this Act, all claims, including secured claims, of Her Majesty in right of Canada or a province or any body under an enactment respecting workers' compensation, in this section and in section 18.5 called a "workers' compensation body", rank as unsecured claims.

...

(3) Operation of similar legislation — Subsection (1) does not affect the operation of

(a) subsections 224(1.2) and (1.3) of the *Income Tax Act*,

(b) any provision of the *Canada Pension Plan* or of the *Employment Insurance Act* that refers to subsection 224(1.2) of the *Income Tax Act* and provides for the collection of a contribution, as defined in the *Canada Pension Plan*, or an employee's premium, or employer's premium, as defined in the *Employment Insurance Act*, and of any related interest, penalties or other amounts, or

(c) any provision of provincial legislation that has a similar purpose to subsection 224(1.2) of the *Income Tax Act*, or that refers to that subsection, to the extent that it provides for the collection of a sum, and of any related interest, penalties or other amounts, where the sum

(i) has been withheld or deducted by a person from a payment to another person and is in respect of a tax similar in nature to the income tax imposed on individuals under the *Income Tax Act*, or

(ii) is of the same nature as a contribution under the *Canada Pension Plan* if the province is a "province providing a comprehensive pension plan" as defined in subsection 3(1) of the *Canada Pension Plan* and the provincial legislation establishes a "provincial pension plan" as defined in that subsection,

and for the purpose of paragraph (c), the provision of provincial legislation is, despite any Act of Canada or of a province or any other law, deemed to have the same effect and scope against any creditor, however secured, as subsection 224(1.2) of the *Income Tax Act* in respect of a sum referred to in subparagraph (c)(i), or as subsection 23(2) of the *Canada Pension Plan* in respect of a sum referred to in subparagraph (c)(ii), and in respect of any related interest, penalties or other amounts.

...

20. [Act to be applied conjointly with other Acts] — The provisions of this Act may be applied together with the provisions of any Act of Parliament or of the legislature of any province, that authorizes or makes provision for the sanction of compromises or arrangements between a company and its shareholders or any class of them.

Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act, R.S.C. 1985, c. C-36 (as at September 18, 2009)

11. General power of court — Despite anything in the *Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act* or the *Winding-up and Restructuring Act*, if an application is made under this Act in respect of a debtor company, the court, on the application of any person interested in the matter, may, subject to the restrictions set out in this Act, on notice to any other person or without notice as it may see fit, make any order that it considers appropriate in the circumstances.

...

11.02 (1) Stays, etc. — initial application — A court may, on an initial application in respect of a debtor company, make an order on any terms that it may impose, effective for the period that the court considers necessary, which period may not be more than 30 days,

(a) staying, until otherwise ordered by the court, all proceedings taken or that might be taken in respect of the company under the *Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act* or the *Winding-up and Restructuring Act*;

(b) restraining, until otherwise ordered by the court, further proceedings in any action, suit or proceeding against the company; and

(c) prohibiting, until otherwise ordered by the court, the commencement of any action, suit or proceeding against the company.

(2) Stays, etc. — other than initial application — A court may, on an application in respect of a debtor company other than an initial application, make an order, on any terms that it may impose,

(a) staying, until otherwise ordered by the court, for any period that the court considers necessary, all proceedings taken or that might be taken in respect of the company under an Act referred to in paragraph (1)(a);

(b) restraining, until otherwise ordered by the court, further proceedings in any action, suit or proceeding against the company; and

(c) prohibiting, until otherwise ordered by the court, the commencement of any action, suit or proceeding against the company.

(3) Burden of proof on application — The court shall not make the order unless

(a) the applicant satisfies the court that circumstances exist that make the order appropriate; and

(b) in the case of an order under subsection (2), the applicant also satisfies the court that the applicant has acted, and is acting, in good faith and with due diligence.

...

11.09 (1) Stay — Her Majesty — An order made under section 11.02 may provide that

(a) Her Majesty in right of Canada may not exercise rights under subsection 224(1.2) of the *Income Tax Act* or any provision of the *Canada Pension Plan* or of the *Employment Insurance Act* that refers to subsection 224(1.2) of the *Income Tax Act* and provides for the collection of a contribution, as defined in the *Canada Pension Plan*, or an employee's premium, or employer's premium, as defined in the *Employment Insurance Act*, and of any related interest, penalties or other amounts, in respect of the company if the company is a tax debtor under that subsection or provision, for the period that the court considers appropriate but ending not later than

(i) the expiry of the order,

(ii) the refusal of a proposed compromise by the creditors or the court,

(iii) six months following the court sanction of a compromise or an arrangement,

(iv) the default by the company on any term of a compromise or an arrangement, or

(v) the performance of a compromise or an arrangement in respect of the company; and

(b) Her Majesty in right of a province may not exercise rights under any provision of provincial legislation in respect of the company if the company is a debtor under that legislation and the provision has a purpose similar to subsection 224(1.2) of the *Income Tax Act*, or refers to that subsection, to the extent that it provides for the collection of a sum, and of any related interest, penalties or other amounts, and the sum

(i) has been withheld or deducted by a person from a payment to another person and is in respect of a tax similar in nature to the income tax imposed on individuals under the *Income Tax Act*, or

(ii) is of the same nature as a contribution under the *Canada Pension Plan* if the province is a "province providing a comprehensive pension plan" as defined in subsection 3(1) of the *Canada Pension Plan* and the provincial legislation establishes a "provincial pension plan" as defined in that subsection,

for the period that the court considers appropriate but ending not later than the occurrence or time referred to in whichever of subparagraphs (a)(i) to (v) that may apply.

(2) When order ceases to be in effect — The portions of an order made under section 11.02 that affect the exercise of rights of Her Majesty referred to in paragraph (1)(a) or (b) cease to be in effect if

(a) the company defaults on the payment of any amount that becomes due to Her Majesty after the order is made and could be subject to a demand under

(i) subsection 224(1.2) of the *Income Tax Act*,

(ii) any provision of the *Canada Pension Plan* or of the *Employment Insurance Act* that refers to subsection 224(1.2) of the *Income Tax Act* and provides for the collection of a contribution, as defined in the *Canada Pension Plan*, or an employee's premium, or employer's premium, as defined in the *Employment Insurance Act*, and of any related interest, penalties or other amounts, or

(iii) any provision of provincial legislation that has a purpose similar to subsection 224(1.2) of the *Income Tax Act*, or that refers to that subsection, to the extent that it provides for the collection of a sum, and of any related interest, penalties or other amounts, and the sum

(A) has been withheld or deducted by a person from a payment to another person and is in respect of a tax similar in nature to the income tax imposed on individuals under the *Income Tax Act*, or

(B) is of the same nature as a contribution under the *Canada Pension Plan* if the province is a "province providing a comprehensive pension plan" as defined in subsection 3(1) of the *Canada Pension Plan* and the provincial legislation establishes a "provincial pension plan" as defined in that subsection; or

(b) any other creditor is or becomes entitled to realize a security on any property that could be claimed by Her Majesty in exercising rights under

(i) subsection 224(1.2) of the *Income Tax Act*,

(ii) any provision of the *Canada Pension Plan* or of the *Employment Insurance Act* that refers to subsection 224(1.2) of the *Income Tax Act* and provides for the collection of a contribution, as defined in the *Canada Pension Plan*, or an employee's premium, or employer's premium, as defined in the *Employment Insurance Act*, and of any related interest, penalties or other amounts, or

(iii) any provision of provincial legislation that has a purpose similar to subsection 224(1.2) of the *Income Tax Act*, or that refers to that subsection, to the extent that it provides for the collection of a sum, and of any related interest, penalties or other amounts, and the sum

(A) has been withheld or deducted by a person from a payment to another person and is in respect of a tax similar in nature to the income tax imposed on individuals under the *Income Tax Act*, or

(B) is of the same nature as a contribution under the *Canada Pension Plan* if the province is a "province providing a comprehensive pension plan" as defined in subsection 3(1) of the *Canada Pension Plan* and the provincial legislation establishes a "provincial pension plan" as defined in that subsection.

(3) Operation of similar legislation — An order made under section 11.02, other than the portions of that order that affect the exercise of rights of Her Majesty referred to in paragraph (1)(a) or (b), does not affect the operation of

(a) subsections 224(1.2) and (1.3) of the *Income Tax Act*,

(b) any provision of the *Canada Pension Plan* or of the *Employment Insurance Act* that refers to subsection 224(1.2) of the *Income Tax Act* and provides for the collection of a contribution, as defined in the *Canada Pension Plan*, or an employee's premium, or employer's premium, as defined in the *Employment Insurance Act*, and of any related interest, penalties or other amounts, or

(c) any provision of provincial legislation that has a purpose similar to subsection 224(1.2) of the *Income Tax Act*, or that refers to that subsection, to the extent that it provides for the collection of a sum, and of any related interest, penalties or other amounts, and the sum

(i) has been withheld or deducted by a person from a payment to another person and is in respect of a tax similar in nature to the income tax imposed on individuals under the *Income Tax Act*, or

(ii) is of the same nature as a contribution under the *Canada Pension Plan* if the province is a "province providing a comprehensive pension plan" as defined in subsection 3(1) of the *Canada Pension Plan* and the provincial legislation establishes a "provincial pension plan" as defined in that subsection,

and for the purpose of paragraph (c), the provision of provincial legislation is, despite any Act of Canada or of a province or any other law, deemed to have the same effect and scope against any creditor, however secured, as subsection 224(1.2) of the *Income Tax Act* in respect of a sum referred to in subparagraph (c)(i), or as subsection 23(2) of the *Canada Pension Plan* in respect of a sum referred to in subparagraph (c)(ii), and in respect of any related interest, penalties or other amounts.

37. (1) Deemed trusts — Subject to subsection (2), despite any provision in federal or provincial legislation that has the effect of deeming property to be held in trust for Her Majesty, property of a debtor company shall not be regarded as being held in trust for Her Majesty unless it would be so regarded in the absence of that statutory provision.

(2) Exceptions — Subsection (1) does not apply in respect of amounts deemed to be held in trust under subsection 227(4) or (4.1) of the *Income Tax Act*, subsection 23(3) or (4) of the *Canada Pension Plan* or subsection 86(2) or (2.1) of the *Employment Insurance Act* (each of which is in this subsection referred to as a "federal provision"), nor does it apply in respect of amounts deemed to be held in trust under any law of a province that creates a deemed trust the sole purpose of which is to ensure remittance to Her Majesty in right of the province of amounts deducted or withheld under a law of the province if

(a) that law of the province imposes a tax similar in nature to the tax imposed under the *Income Tax Act* and the amounts deducted or withheld under that law of the province are of the same nature as the amounts referred to in subsection 227(4) or (4.1) of the *Income Tax Act*, or

(b) the province is a "province providing a comprehensive pension plan" as defined in subsection 3(1) of the *Canada Pension Plan*, that law of the province establishes a "provincial pension plan" as defined in that subsection and the amounts deducted or withheld under that law of the province are of the same nature as amounts referred to in subsection 23(3) or (4) of the *Canada Pension Plan*,

and for the purpose of this subsection, any provision of a law of a province that creates a deemed trust is, despite any Act of Canada or of a province or any other law, deemed to have the same effect and scope against any creditor, however secured, as the corresponding federal provision.

Excise Tax Act, R.S.C. 1985, c. E-15 (as at December 13, 2007)

222. (1) [Deemed] Trust for amounts collected — Subject to subsection (1.1), every person who collects an amount as or on account of tax under Division II is deemed, for all purposes and despite any security interest in the amount, to hold the amount in trust for Her Majesty in right of Canada, separate and apart from the property of the person and from property held by any secured creditor of the person that, but for a security interest, would be property of the person, until the amount is remitted to the Receiver General or withdrawn under subsection (2).

(1.1) Amounts collected before bankruptcy — Subsection (1) does not apply, at or after the time a person becomes a bankrupt (within the meaning of the *Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act*), to any amounts that, before that time, were collected or became collectible by the person as or on account of tax under Division II.

...

(3) Extension of trust — Despite any other provision of this Act (except subsection (4)), any other enactment of Canada (except the *Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act*), any enactment of a province or any other law, if at any time an amount deemed by subsection (1) to be held by a person in trust for Her Majesty is not remitted to the Receiver General or withdrawn in the manner and at the time provided under this Part, property of the person and property held by any secured creditor of the person that, but for a security interest, would be property of the person, equal in value to the amount so deemed to be held in trust, is deemed

- (a) to be held, from the time the amount was collected by the person, in trust for Her Majesty, separate and apart from the property of the person, whether or not the property is subject to a security interest, and
- (b) to form no part of the estate or property of the person from the time the amount was collected, whether or not the property has in fact been kept separate and apart from the estate or property of the person and whether or not the property is subject to a security interest

and is property beneficially owned by Her Majesty in right of Canada despite any security interest in the property or in the proceeds thereof and the proceeds of the property shall be paid to the Receiver General in priority to all security interests.

Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act, R.S.C. 1985, c. B-3 (as at December 13, 2007)

67. (1) Property of bankrupt — The property of a bankrupt divisible among his creditors shall not comprise

- (a) property held by the bankrupt in trust for any other person,
- (b) any property that as against the bankrupt is exempt from execution or seizure under any laws applicable in the province within which the property is situated and within which the bankrupt resides, or
- (b.1) such goods and services tax credit payments and prescribed payments relating to the essential needs of an individual as are made in prescribed circumstances and are not property referred to in paragraph (a) or (b),

but it shall comprise

- (c) all property wherever situated of the bankrupt at the date of his bankruptcy or that may be acquired by or devolve on him before his discharge, and
- (d) such powers in or over or in respect of the property as might have been exercised by the bankrupt for his own benefit.

(2) Deemed trusts — Subject to subsection (3), notwithstanding any provision in federal or provincial legislation that has the effect of deeming property to be held in trust for Her Majesty, property of a bankrupt shall not be regarded as held in trust for Her Majesty for the purpose of paragraph (1)(a) unless it would be so regarded in the absence of that statutory provision.

(3) Exceptions — Subsection (2) does not apply in respect of amounts deemed to be held in trust under subsection 227(4) or (4.1) of the *Income Tax Act*, subsection 23(3) or (4) of the *Canada Pension Plan* or subsection 86(2) or (2.1) of the *Employment Insurance Act* (each of which is in this subsection referred to as a "federal provision") nor in respect of amounts deemed to be held in trust under any law of a province that creates a deemed trust the sole purpose of which is to ensure remittance to Her Majesty in right of the province of amounts deducted or withheld under a law of the province where

(a) that law of the province imposes a tax similar in nature to the tax imposed under the *Income Tax Act* and the amounts deducted or withheld under that law of the province are of the same nature as the amounts referred to in subsection 227(4) or (4.1) of the *Income Tax Act*, or

(b) the province is a "province providing a comprehensive pension plan" as defined in subsection 3(1) of the *Canada Pension Plan*, that law of the province establishes a "provincial pension plan" as defined in that subsection and the amounts deducted or withheld under that law of the province are of the same nature as amounts referred to in subsection 23(3) or (4) of the *Canada Pension Plan*,

and for the purpose of this subsection, any provision of a law of a province that creates a deemed trust is, notwithstanding any Act of Canada or of a province or any other law, deemed to have the same effect and scope against any creditor, however secured, as the corresponding federal provision.

86. (1) Status of Crown claims — In relation to a bankruptcy or proposal, all provable claims, including secured claims, of Her Majesty in right of Canada or a province or of any body under an Act respecting workers' compensation, in this section and in section 87 called a "workers' compensation body", rank as unsecured claims.

...

(3) Exceptions — Subsection (1) does not affect the operation of

(a) subsections 224(1.2) and (1.3) of the *Income Tax Act*;

(b) any provision of the *Canada Pension Plan* or of the *Employment Insurance Act* that refers to subsection 224(1.2) of the *Income Tax Act* and provides for the collection of a contribution, as defined in the *Canada Pension Plan*, or an employee's premium, or employer's premium, as defined in the *Employment Insurance Act*, and of any related interest, penalties or other amounts; or

(c) any provision of provincial legislation that has a similar purpose to subsection 224(1.2) of the *Income Tax Act*, or that refers to that subsection, to the extent that it provides for the collection of a sum, and of any related interest, penalties or other amounts, where the sum

(i) has been withheld or deducted by a person from a payment to another person and is in respect of a tax similar in nature to the income tax imposed on individuals under the *Income Tax Act*, or

(ii) is of the same nature as a contribution under the *Canada Pension Plan* if the province is a "province providing a comprehensive pension plan" as defined in subsection 3(1) of the *Canada Pension Plan* and the provincial legislation establishes a "provincial pension plan" as defined in that subsection,

and for the purpose of paragraph (c), the provision of provincial legislation is, despite any Act of Canada or of a province or any other law, deemed to have the same effect and scope against any creditor, however secured, as subsection 224(1.2)

of the *Income Tax Act* in respect of a sum referred to in subparagraph (c)(i), or as subsection 23(2) of the *Canada Pension Plan* in respect of a sum referred to in subparagraph (c)(ii), and in respect of any related interest, penalties or other amounts.

Footnotes

- 1 Section 11 was amended, effective September 18, 2009, and now states:
11. Despite anything in the *Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act* or the *Winding-up and Restructuring Act*, if an application is made under this Act in respect of a debtor company, the court, on the application of any person interested in the matter, may, subject to the restrictions set out in this Act, on notice to any other person or without notice as it may see fit, make any order that it considers appropriate in the circumstances.
- 2 The amendments did not come into force until September 18, 2009.

TAB 8

2006 CarswellOnt 6292
Ontario Court of Appeal

Ivaco Inc., Re

2006 CarswellOnt 6292, 2006 C.E.B. & P.G.R. 8218 (headnote only), [2006] W.D.F.L. 3681, [2006] O.J. No. 4152, 151 A.C.W.S. (3d) 1004, 25 C.B.R. (5th) 176, 26 B.L.R. (4th) 43, 275 D.L.R. (4th) 132, 56 C.C.P.B. 1, 83 O.R. (3d) 108

IN THE MATTER OF the Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act, R.S.C. 1985, c. C-36.

AND IN THE MATTER OF A Plan or Plans of Compromise or
Arrangement of Ivaco Inc. and the Applicants listed in Schedule "A"

J. Laskin, M. Rosenberg, J. Simmons JJ.A.

Heard: February 22, 2006
Judgment: October 17, 2006
Docket: CA C44455

Proceedings: affirming *Ivaco Inc., Re* (2005), 2005 CarswellOnt 3445, 47 C.C.P.B. 62, 12 C.B.R. (5th) 213 (Ont. S.C.J. [Commercial List])

Counsel: Frederick L. Myers, Jason Wadden for Appellant, Superintendent of Finance Services (Ontario)
Andrew Hatnay for Respondent, Quebec Pension Committee of Ivaco Inc.
Jeffrey S. Leon, Richard B. Swan for Respondent, National Bank of Canada
Dan V. MacDonald for Respondent, Bank of Nova Scotia
Geoff R. Hall for Respondent, QIT-Fer et Titane Inc.
Robert W. Staley, Evangelia Kriaris for Respondent, Informal Committee of Noteholders
Peter F.C. Howard for Monitor, Ernst & Young Inc.

Headnote

Bankruptcy and insolvency --- Property of bankrupt — Trust property — General principles

Pension funds — I Inc. and related companies, collectively I Group, had established various registered pension plans for their employees — I Group became insolvent in 2003, and obtained protection under Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act ("CCAA") — To facilitate restructuring of I Group, order was issued suspending unpaid past-service payments and special contributions I Group had been making to certain underfunded pension plans — Restructuring was unsuccessful — I Group's assets were sold — Superintendent brought unsuccessful motion for order directing that portions of sale proceeds be used to satisfy unpaid pension obligations, which companies are deemed to hold in trust for beneficiaries of pension plans under Pension Benefits Act ("PBA") or, alternatively, for order segregating this amount in separate account — Some of I Group's financial creditors brought partially successful motions for order lifting stay under CCAA and petitioning I Group into bankruptcy — Stay was lifted, and bankruptcy petitions were allowed to proceed — Superintendent appealed from dismissal of its motion — Appeal dismissed — Motions judge did not err in law in refusing to order immediate payment of amount of deemed trusts under PBA or in refusing to segregate that amount — Combination of wording of s. 57 of PBA, paragraph 4 of pension stay order, and limited role of Monitor refuted Superintendent's argument that funds should have been segregated — CCAA itself did not require motions judge to execute deemed trusts — Because Federal legislative regime under CCAA and Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act determines claims of creditors of insolvent company, if rights of pension claimants are to be given greater priority, Parliament, not courts, must do so.

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

I Inc. and related companies, collectively I Group, had established various registered pension plans for their employees — I Group became insolvent in 2003, and obtained protection under Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act ("CCAA") — To

facilitate restructuring of I Group, order was issued suspending unpaid past-service payments and special contributions I Group had been making to certain underfunded pension plans — Restructuring was unsuccessful — I Group's assets were sold — Superintendent brought unsuccessful motion for order directing that portions of sale proceeds be used to satisfy unpaid pension obligations, which companies are deemed to hold in trust for beneficiaries of pension plans under Pension Benefits Act ("PBA") or, alternatively, for order segregating this amount in separate account — Some of I Group's financial creditors brought partially successful motions for order lifting stay under CCAA and petitioning I Group into bankruptcy — Stay was lifted, and bankruptcy petitions were allowed to proceed — Superintendent appealed from dismissal of its motion — Appeal dismissed — Motions judge did not err in law in refusing to order immediate payment of amount of deemed trusts under PBA or in refusing to segregate that amount — Combination of wording of s. 57 of PBA, paragraph 4 of pension stay order, and limited role of Monitor refuted Superintendent's argument that funds should have been segregated — Because Federal legislative regime under CCAA and Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act determines claims of creditors of insolvent company, if rights of pension claimants are to be given greater priority, Parliament, not courts, must do so — Motions judge did not err in exercising his discretion to lift stay under CCAA and permit bankruptcy petition to proceed — Superintendent's unfairness argument was not accepted.

Bankruptcy and insolvency --- Bankruptcy petitions for receiving orders — Stay of petition — General principles

I Inc. and related companies, collectively I Group, had established various registered pension plans for their employees — I Group became insolvent in 2003, and obtained protection under Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act ("CCAA") — To facilitate restructuring of I Group, order was issued suspending unpaid past-service payments and special contributions I Group had been making to certain underfunded pension plans — Restructuring was unsuccessful — I Group's assets were sold — Superintendent brought unsuccessful motion for order directing that portions of sale proceeds be used to satisfy unpaid pension obligations, which companies are deemed to hold in trust for beneficiaries of pension plans under Pension Benefits Act ("PBA") or, alternatively, for order segregating this amount in separate account — Some of I Group's financial creditors brought partially successful motions for order lifting stay under CCAA and petitioning I Group into bankruptcy — Stay was lifted, and bankruptcy petitions were allowed to proceed — Superintendent appealed from dismissal of its motion — Appeal dismissed — Motions judge did not err in exercising his discretion to lift stay under CCAA and permit bankruptcy petition to proceed — Motion judge's order lifting stay was discretionary order, and appellate review of discretionary order under CCAA is justified only for error in principle or unreasonable exercise of discretion — Superintendent's unfairness argument was not accepted — Numerous conditions supported motions judge's decision to lift stay and permit bankruptcy petitions to proceed — Motions judge would have gone beyond his role as referee in CCAA proceedings if he had given effect to Superintendent's claim.

Bankruptcy and insolvency --- Practice and procedure in courts — Orders — Miscellaneous issues

I Inc. and related companies, collectively I Group, had established various registered pension plans for their employees — I Group became insolvent in 2003, and obtained protection under Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act ("CCAA") — To facilitate restructuring of I Group, order was issued suspending unpaid past-service payments and special contributions I Group had been making to certain underfunded pension plans — Restructuring was unsuccessful and I Group's assets were sold — Superintendent brought unsuccessful motion for order directing that portions of sale proceeds be used to satisfy unpaid pension obligations, which companies are deemed to hold in trust for beneficiaries of pension plans under Pension Benefits Act ("PBA") or, alternatively, for order segregating this amount in separate account — Some of I Group's financial creditors brought partially successful motions for order lifting stay under CCAA and petitioning I Group into bankruptcy — Stay was lifted, and bankruptcy petitions were allowed to proceed — Motions judge made ancillary order to facilitate bankruptcy petitions, which ordered that head offices of two I Group companies be transferred from cities in Quebec to Toronto — Superintendent appealed from ancillary order on basis that motions judge lacked jurisdiction under CCAA to make such order or, alternatively, improperly exercised his discretion in doing so — Appeal dismissed — Motions judge did not err in ordering that head offices of companies in question be transferred from Quebec to Toronto — Argument that CCAA did not give motions judge jurisdiction to order transfer was accepted, but it was also accepted that transfer was not made to facilitate CCAA restructuring; instead, it was made to facilitate future bankruptcy proceedings — Nonetheless, motions judge did not need to resort to CCAA because he had express authority to order transfer under Canada Business Corporations Act ("CBCA") — Section 191 of CBCA gives court express authority to order transfer of head office of company that is subject to order under CCAA — Motions judge properly exercised his discretion in ordering transfer.

Table of Authorities

Cases considered by J. Laskin J.A.:

Abraham v. Canadian Admiral Corp. (Receiver of) (1998), 2 C.B.R. (4th) 243, 1998 CarswellOnt 1475, 158 D.L.R. (4th) 65, (sub nom. *Abraham v. Canadian Admiral Corp. (Receivership)*) 109 O.A.C. 36, 39 O.R. (3d) 176, 37 C.C.E.L. (2d) 276, 19 C.C.P.B. 1, 13 P.P.S.A.C. (2d) 334 (Ont. C.A.) — referred to

Air Canada, Re (2003), 43 C.B.R. (4th) 1, 66 O.R. (3d) 257, 229 D.L.R. (4th) 687, 174 O.A.C. 201, 2003 CarswellOnt 2925 (Ont. C.A.) — referred to

Algoma Steel Inc. v. Union Gas Ltd. (2003), 169 O.A.C. 89, 39 C.B.R. (4th) 5, 2003 CarswellOnt 115, 63 O.R. (3d) 78 (Ont. C.A.) — referred to

Bank of Montreal v. Scott Road Enterprises Ltd. (1989), 36 B.C.L.R. (2d) 118, 73 C.B.R. (N.S.) 273, [1989] 4 W.W.R. 566, 57 D.L.R. (4th) 623, 1989 CarswellBC 337 (B.C. C.A.) — referred to

Beatrice Foods Inc., Re (1996), 43 C.B.R. (4th) 10, 1996 CarswellOnt 5598 (Ont. Gen. Div. [Commercial List]) — referred to

British Columbia v. Henfrey Samson Belair Ltd. (1989), 1989 CarswellBC 711, [1989] 1 T.S.T. 2164, 75 C.B.R. (N.S.) 1, [1989] 2 S.C.R. 24, 34 E.T.R. 1, [1989] 5 W.W.R. 577, 59 D.L.R. (4th) 726, 97 N.R. 61, 38 B.C.L.R. (2d) 145, 2 T.C.T. 4263, 1989 CarswellBC 351 (S.C.C.) — considered

Dallas/North Group Inc., Re (1999), 17 C.B.R. (4th) 56, 1999 CarswellOnt 4720, 46 O.R. (3d) 602 (Ont. Gen. Div.) — referred to

General Chemical Canada Ltd., Re (2005), 51 C.C.P.B. 297, 2005 CarswellOnt 7306, C.E.B. & P.G.R. 8179 (Ont. S.C.J.) — considered

GMAC Commercial Credit Corp. - Canada v. TCT Logistics Inc. (2005), (sub nom. *TCT Logistics Inc. (Bankrupt), Re*) 194 O.A.C. 360, 2005 CarswellOnt 636, 7 C.B.R. (5th) 202, 74 O.R. (3d) 382 (Ont. C.A.) — distinguished

Harrop of Milton Inc., Re (1979), 1979 CarswellOnt 185, 92 D.L.R. (3d) 535, 29 C.B.R. (N.S.) 289, 22 O.R. (2d) 239 (Ont. Bkcy.) — referred to

Husky Oil Operations Ltd. v. Minister of National Revenue (1995), 1995 CarswellSask 739, 1995 CarswellSask 740, 188 N.R. 1, 24 C.L.R. (2d) 131, 35 C.B.R. (3d) 1, 128 D.L.R. (4th) 1, 137 Sask. R. 81, 107 W.A.C. 81, [1995] 3 S.C.R. 453, [1995] 10 W.W.R. 161 (S.C.C.) — referred to

Ivaco Inc., Re (2004), 2004 CarswellOnt 3561 (Ont. S.C.J. [Commercial List]) — referred to

Lambert, Re (2002), (sub nom. *Lambert (Bankrupt), Re*) 162 O.A.C. 132, 216 D.L.R. (4th) 330, 2002 CarswellOnt 2659, 36 C.B.R. (4th) 256, (sub nom. *Buth-na-bodhiaga Inc. v. Lambert*) 60 O.R. (3d) 787 (Ont. C.A.) — referred to

Royal Crest Lifecare Group Inc., Re (2004), 2004 CarswellOnt 190, 181 O.A.C. 115, 46 C.B.R. (4th) 126, (sub nom. *Canadian Union of Public Employees, Locals 1712, 3009, 2225-05, 2225-06 & 2225-12 v. Ernst & Young Inc. (as trustee for Royal Crest Lifecare Group Inc.)*) 2004 C.L.L.C. 220-014, (sub nom. *C.U.P.E., Locals 1712, 3009, 2225-05, 2225-06, 22512 v. Royal Crest Lifecare Group Inc. (Trustee of)*) 98 C.L.R.B.R. (2d) 210 (Ont. C.A.) — referred to

Stelco Inc., Re (2005), 253 D.L.R. (4th) 109, 75 O.R. (3d) 5, 2 B.L.R. (4th) 238, 9 C.B.R. (5th) 135, 2005 CarswellOnt 1188, 196 O.A.C. 142 (Ont. C.A.) — distinguished

Toronto Dominion Bank v. Usarco Ltd. (1991), 42 E.T.R. 235, 1991 CarswellOnt 540 (Ont. Gen. Div.) — distinguished

United Maritime Fishermen Co-op., Re (1988), 68 C.B.R. (N.S.) 170, 1988 CarswellNB 20, 87 N.B.R. (2d) 333, 221 A.P.R. 333 (N.B. Q.B.) — referred to

Statutes considered:

Bank Act, S.C. 1991, c. 46

s. 427 — referred to

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

Generally — referred to

s. 11(3) — referred to

s. 11(4) — referred to

s. 43(5) — referred to

s. 43(7) — referred to

s. 67(1)(a) — referred to
Canada Business Corporations Act, R.S.C. 1985, c. C-44

s. 109(1) — referred to

s. 173 — referred to

s. 173(1)(b) — considered

s. 191 — considered

s. 191(1) — considered

s. 191(1)(c) — considered

s. 191(2) — considered
Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act, R.S.C. 1985, c. C-36

Generally — considered

s. 2 "debtor company" — referred to

s. 11 — referred to

s. 11.7(1) [en. 1997, c. 12, s. 124] — referred to

s. 11.7(3) [en. 1997, c. 12, s. 124] — referred to

s. 13 — referred to
Pension Benefits Act, 1987, S.O. 1987, c. 35

Generally — referred to
Pension Benefits Act, R.S.O. 1990, c. P.8

Generally — referred to

s. 57 — referred to

s. 57(3) — considered

s. 57(4) — considered

s. 57(5) — considered
Wage Earner Protection Program Act, S.C. 2005, c. 47

Generally — referred to

Regulations considered:
Truck Transportation Act, R.S.O. 1990, c. T.22

Load Brokers, O. Reg. 556/92

s. 15 — referred to

s. 15(2) — referred to

J. Laskin J.A.:

A. Introduction

1 This appeal arises out of a priorities dispute between two groups of creditors of an insolvent company, Ivaco Inc., and its related group of companies. The dispute is over the sale proceeds of the assets of Ivaco. On one side of the dispute are the employees and retirees in Ivaco's underfunded non-union pension plans. They claim under the deemed trust and lien provisions of Ontario's *Pension Benefits Act*, R.S.O. 1990, c. P.8, ss. 57(3), (4) ("PBA"), and seek to recover unpaid contributions to the plans outside of bankruptcy. On the other side of the dispute are Ivaco's financial and trade creditors. They wish to put Ivaco into bankruptcy in order to take advantage of the scheme of distribution under the federal *Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act*, R.S.C. 1985, c. B-3 ("BIA"). The dispute arises because provincial deemed trusts do not, by virtue of that legislative designation, enjoy priority under the federal bankruptcy statute.

2 Ivaco and its related group of companies (collectively "the Companies") became insolvent in 2003. In September 2003, the Companies sought and obtained court-ordered protection under the *Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act*, R.S.C. 1985, c. C-36 ("CCAA"). All claims of creditors were stayed. A later order stayed the Companies' obligation to pay the outstanding past service contributions and special payments to the non-union pension plans. (Past service contributions are monies due to fund benefits or benefit enhancements for pension members' past service; special payments are extraordinary payments made because a pension plan is underfunded).

3 The main purpose of CCAA proceedings is to facilitate the restructuring of an insolvent company so that it may stay in business. The Companies, however, were unable to restructure. In late 2004, virtually all of their assets were sold. All that remains is a pool of money: the proceeds of sale. All that remains to be done is to distribute this pool of money among the creditors.

4 The Superintendent of Financial Services, representing the employees and retirees, brought a motion for an order that part of the sale proceeds be used to satisfy the unpaid past service and special contributions, which the Companies are deemed to hold in trust for the beneficiaries of the pension plans under the PBA. Alternatively, the Superintendent sought an order segregating this amount in a separate account. The Quebec Pension Committee ("QPC"), the administrator of the largest non-union plan, supported the Superintendent's motion. Two of the Companies' lenders, the Bank of Nova Scotia and the National Bank, brought motions for an order lifting the stay under the CCAA and petitioning the Companies into bankruptcy.

5 Farley J., who had supervised these CCAA proceedings for over two and a half years, heard all three motions. By order dated July 18, 2005 he dismissed the Superintendent's motion and partly granted the banks' motions. He lifted the stay and permitted the bankruptcy petitions to proceed, but he did not put the Companies into bankruptcy.

6 The Superintendent appeals. She argues that the motions judge erred either in law or in the exercise of his discretion. The Superintendent submits that the motions judge erred in law by failing to order immediate payment of the amount of the deemed trusts or in failing to segregate this amount. The Superintendent contends that the PBA legally required that the deemed trusts for unpaid past service contributions and special payments be executed or protected before bankruptcy.

7 Alternatively, the Superintendent submits that the motions judge erred by exercising his discretion to lift the stay under the CCAA and permit the bankruptcy petitions to proceed without first protecting the claims of the pension beneficiaries. The Superintendent contends that the motions judge exercised his discretion on a wrong principle because he ignored the unfairness and prejudice to the Companies' most vulnerable creditors.

8 The Superintendent also appeals an ancillary order made by the motions judge. To facilitate the bankruptcy petitions, the motions judge ordered that the head offices of two of the Companies be transferred from cities in Quebec to Toronto. The Superintendent and the QPC submit that the motions judge had no jurisdiction under the CCAA to do so, or alternatively, improperly exercised his discretion in doing so.

9 This court granted leave to appeal under s. 13 of the CCAA. The court also stayed the two orders in favour of the banks pending the disposition of the appeal.

B. Relevant Facts and Chronology

a) The Companies

10 Six related corporations were granted protection under the CCAA: Ivaco Inc., Ivaco Rolling Mills Ltd. ("IRM"), Ifastgroupe Inc., Docap (1985) Corporation, Florida Sub One Holdings Inc. and 3632610 Canada Inc. Four of these corporations — Ivaco, IRM, Ifastgroupe and Docap — established the non-union pension plans in issue on this appeal.

11 Ivaco, IRM and Ifastgroupe ceased operations after their assets were sold. Only Docap now has any operating assets. Its assets consist mainly of inventory and accounts receivable that have not yet been sold. Docap is a small entity. Neither restructuring it nor selling it as a going concern seems a viable option. The National Bank, Docap's principal secured creditor, wishes to put the company into bankruptcy and liquidate its assets.

b) The non-union pension plans

12 The Companies had both a unionized and non-unionized workforce. They established various registered pension plans for their employees. These included four non-union plans: the Ivaco Salaried Plan, which is registered in Quebec and has both Quebec and Ontario members, the Designated Employees Plan, the Ingersoll Plan and the Docap Plan, all registered in Ontario.

13 The QPC administers the Ivaco Salaried Plan, which is the largest of the four plans. Ivaco formerly administered the other three plans. However, the Superintendent appointed PricewaterhouseCoopers Inc. as administrator of the Designated Employees Plan and the Ingersoll Plan. A former Ivaco employee administers the Docap Plan for Ivaco.

c) The initial stay under the CCAA

14 After their operations became financially troubled, the Companies sought and were granted protection from their creditors under the CCAA. On September 16, the motions judge granted a comprehensive stay of all creditor claims up to that time. He appointed Ernst & Young Inc. as Monitor. As a result of the stay, debts of the Companies existing on the date of the initial stay order have not been paid.

15 During the CCAA proceedings the Companies continued to pay the wages and benefits of all active employees. The Companies also continued to pay their current contributions to their various pension plans.

d) The pension stay order

16 When the Companies began CCAA proceedings, the non-union pension plans were underfunded. Before the initial stay order the Companies had been making both special payments and past services contributions to rectify this underfunding. Under the PBA, past service contributions accrue daily and are to be paid monthly.

17 Early in the CCAA proceedings, the Monitor concluded that the Companies would jeopardize their ability to restructure if they were required to continue making past service contributions and special payments. Because of the magnitude of these payments, the creditors would not agree to permit the DIP (debtor in possession) loan to be used for funding the pension plans. In their view, and in the view of the Monitor, doing so would imperil the possibility of restructuring. Relying on the Monitor's opinion, the Companies sought, and on November 28, 2003, were granted a pension stay order.

18 The motions judge relieved the Companies from making past service contributions or special payments to the underfunded non-union pension plans during the CCAA stay. No interested party, including both the Superintendent and the QPC, opposed the order. All parties thought that relieving the Companies from making these payments would assist their restructuring efforts. The Companies still remained obligated to make current contributions to the non-union plans.

19 Paragraph 4 of the pension stay order stipulated that none of the Companies would incur any obligation because of the failure to make these past service contributions and special payments during the stay period:

THIS COURT ORDERS that none of the Applicants or Partnerships, or their respective officers or directors shall incur any obligation, whether by way of debt, damages for breach of any duty, whether statutory, fiduciary, common law or otherwise, or for breach of trust, nor shall any trust be recognized, whether express, implied, constructive, resulting, deemed or otherwise, as a result of the failure of any person to make any contribution or payments other than current cost contribution obligations ("Current Contributions") during the Stay Period that they might otherwise have become required to make to any pension plans maintained by an Applicant or Partnership.

20 Paragraph 5 of the pension stay order expressly recognized that statutory deemed trust, liens or other charges may arise because the Companies were relieved from paying past service contributions but that they would not have priority over the charges in the initial stay order:

THIS COURT ORDERS that if any claim, lien, charge or trust arises as a result of the failure of any Person to make any contribution or payment (other than Current Contributions) during the Stay Period that such Person might otherwise have become required to make to any pension plans maintained by an Applicant or Partnership but for the stay provided for herein, no such claim, lien, charge or trust shall be recognized in this proceeding or in any subsequent receivership, interim receivership or bankruptcy of any of the Applicants or Partnerships as having priority over the claims of the Charges as set out in the Amended and Restated order.

21 Paragraph 6 of the order recognized that the pension stay did not compromise the Companies' obligations under their non-union pension plans:

Nothing in this Order shall be taken to extinguish or compromise the obligations of the Applicants and Partnerships, if any, regarding payments under the Pension Plans.

e) The sale to Heico

22 As the Companies were unable to restructure, they began to pursue a second option: selling their assets in a going concern sale. On August 18, 2004, the motions judge approved the sale of the assets of Ivaco, Ifastgroupe and IRM to the Heico Companies. As part of the transaction, the purchaser hired the Companies' unionized workforce and assumed the Companies' obligations to their unionized pension plans. The purchaser also hired almost all of the Companies' non-unionized workforce, but it was unwilling to assume the Companies' obligations to the four non-union pension plans. These obligations remained with the Companies.

23 Nonetheless, the Monitor supported the sale. In the Monitor's view, the sale gave the creditors and workers greater recovery and benefits than they would obtain in either a bankruptcy or a liquidation. Again, no party, including both the Superintendent and the QPC, opposed the sale.

24 The motions judge made two orders — on August 18, 2004 [2004 CarswellOnt 3561 (Ont. S.C.J. [Commercial List])] and November 30, 2004 — vesting the assets in the purchaser. These orders expressly preserved all claims that might have been made against the assets by providing that these claims could be made against the sale proceeds. In accordance with these orders, the Monitor is holding the sale proceeds in various trust accounts.

25 In December 2004, Ivaco, IRM and Ifastgroupe wound-up their non-union pension plans. Under the PBA, they are obligated to fund the wind-up liabilities of these plans.

f) The pension claims

26 The Companies' non-union pension plans have been severely underfunded and the deficit has increased during the stay period. At the beginning of the CCAA proceedings in September 2003, unpaid past service contributions to the non-union plans totalled about \$1.4 million and the solvency deficiency amounted to approximately \$11.1 million. By December 2004 these figures had grown to approximately \$11.6 million and \$29.1 million respectively. They continued to grow while the pension stay order remained in place.

27 The potential loss of benefits for each pensioner is significant. Counsel for the Superintendent advised the court that the average pensioner in the non-union plans is sixty-seven years old and earns a pension of \$14,000 per year. These pensioners will receive their full pension only if the full wind-up deficit is paid. For example, if the plans do not recover the past service contributions suspended by the pension stay order, the average monthly pension will be reduced by 26 per cent from approximately \$1,200 to \$888. If only unpaid contributions are recovered, and not the full solvency deficiency, the average pension will be reduced by 17 per cent to \$996 monthly.

g) The claims of the financial creditors

28 The outstanding claims of the financial creditors of the Companies are also significant. We were told that the sale proceeds of the Companies' assets are insufficient to satisfy all claims, and are certainly insufficient to satisfy the unsecured claims.

29 The Bank of Nova Scotia was the lender to IRM. By October 2003, IRM owed the Bank about \$40 million. IRM had ceased to meet its liabilities generally as they became due, and had given notice to its creditors that it had suspended payment of its debts. On October 3, 2003 the Bank issued a petition for a receiving order against IRM. The issuance of the petition was permitted by the initial stay order, but that proceeding was otherwise stayed. The order under appeal lifted the stay and permitted the Bank of Nova Scotia to proceed with its petition.

30 The National Bank lent money to Ivaco, Ifastgroupe and Docap. As of March 2005 it had a secured claim against Ivaco for \$17 million,¹ and against Docap for \$55,622 U.S. and \$4.2 million Canadian. It also had an unsecured claim against Ifastgroupe for \$45.5 million Canadian. Ifastgroupe is also indebted to La Caisse for \$14.9 million.

31 A large number of other creditors also have claims against the Companies: Ivaco has 792 creditors with claims totalling \$554.9 million; Docap has 82 creditors with claims totalling \$111.1 million; and Ifastgroupe has 645 creditors with claims totalling \$253.3 million.

C. Analysis

a) What is in issue on this appeal

32 The scope of this appeal is quite narrow. There are three issues:

- 1) Did the motions judge err in law in failing to order immediate payment of the amount of the deemed trusts under the PBA or in failing to segregate this amount in a separate account?
- 2) Did the motions judge err in the exercise of his discretion by lifting the stay and permitting the bankruptcy petitions to proceed, without protecting the claims of the pension beneficiaries?
- 3) Did the motions judge err in law or in the exercise of his discretion by ordering the transfer of Ivaco's and Ifastgroupe's head offices from Quebec to Toronto?

b) What is not in issue on this appeal

33 There are also three issues raised by the parties that do not need to be decided on this appeal: (1) whether, outside of bankruptcy, the deemed trusts under the PBA have priority over the Bank of Nova Scotia's security under s. 427 of the *Bank Act*, S.C. 1991, c.46; (2) whether the Superintendent can show "sufficient cause" under s. 43(7) of the BIA to deny the application for a bankruptcy order; and, (3) whether the deemed trusts under the PBA also meet the requirements for a common law trust and thus on bankruptcy should be excluded from the property of the Companies under s. 67(1)(a) of the BIA.

34 On my view of the appeal, the first of these issues does not have to be resolved. It may become relevant at the bankruptcy hearing, and, if so, should be dealt with by the bankruptcy judge. See *Abraham v. Canadian Admiral Corp. (Receiver of)* (1998), 39 O.R. (3d) 176 (Ont. C.A.). The second and third issues, I assume, will be dealt with at the hearing of the bankruptcy petitions.

Admittedly, the motions judge made some observations on these two issues. However, he also said, at para. 20 of his reasons, that he was not deciding either one:

However, in the circumstances, I do not find it appropriate to allow (indeed direct) that there be an assignment in bankruptcy on a "voluntary basis" as there is the s. 43(7) issue to be determined. Similarly with respect to the balance of declarations requested by the National Bank, while I have made some general observations as to reversing priorities, it would not be appropriate to determine with finality the priorities of various claims on the record before me at this time.

35 In their written and oral submissions, the Superintendent and the QPC argued that some of the motions judge's general observations on these issues were wrong. I do not propose to consider these arguments because, as the motions judge recognized, they should be addressed at the hearing of the bankruptcy petitions. Instead, I will make a few brief observations of my own.

36 In my view, the motions judge appropriately considered what would likely happen at the bankruptcy hearing. He did so because the likely implications of lifting the stay were relevant considerations to the exercise of his discretion.

37 The motions judge observed, at para. 14, that the discretion to refuse to make a bankruptcy order under s. 43(7) typically is exercised in two categories of cases: where the petitioner has an ulterior motive in seeking the order, or where the order would not serve any meaningful purpose. This observation reflects the current state of the case law under s. 43(7). See for example *Dallas/North Group Inc., Re* (1999), 46 O.R. (3d) 602 (Ont. Gen. Div.); *Lambert, Re* (2002), 60 O.R. (3d) 787 (Ont. C.A.). Although the motions judge added that the Superintendent's claim does not appear to come within either category, he left the final determination of that question for the bankruptcy judge.

38 The motions judge also observed, at para. 11 of his reasons, that a provincially created deemed trust does not by that fact alone enjoy priority under the BIA. This is not a contentious proposition. In a series of cases, the Supreme Court of Canada has repeatedly said that a province cannot, by legislating a deemed trust, alter the scheme of priorities under the federal statute. See for example *British Columbia v. Henfrey Samson Belair Ltd.*, [1989] 2 S.C.R. 24 (S.C.C.); *Husky Oil Operations Ltd. v. Minister of National Revenue*, [1995] 3 S.C.R. 453 (S.C.C.). Indeed, it is this jurisprudence that undoubtedly prompted the Superintendent's original motion and appeal to this court.

39 The motions judge also correctly observed, at para. 11 of his reasons, that a provincial deemed trust will retain its priority in bankruptcy only if it also meets the three attributes — the three certainties — of a common law trust: certainty of intent; certainty of subject matter; and certainty of object. Only a trust that has these three attributes is a "true trust" that will be exempt from the bankrupt's estate under s. 67(1)(a) of the BIA. See for example *Henfrey Sampson, supra*. Whether the Superintendent can establish a true trust for unpaid past service contributions, even though the proceeds of the Heico sale have been commingled, will be decided at the bankruptcy hearing.

40 I now turn to the issues that do arise on this appeal.

c) Did the motions judge err in law in failing to order immediate payment of the amount of the deemed trusts or in failing to segregate this amount?

41 The Superintendent's principal submission is that the motions judge erred in law in failing to order payment of the amount of the deemed trusts before bankruptcy or in failing to order the Monitor to segregate this amount during the CCAA proceedings. The submission that the motions judge was legally required to order payment or segregation of the amount of the deemed trusts was not advanced before him. The Superintendent advanced this submission for the first time in this court. I do not agree with it.

42 I will deal first with whether the motions judge should have required the Monitor, Ernst & Young, to segregate the amount of the deemed trusts. The Superintendent contends that the Companies, and in their place the Monitor, had a statutory and fiduciary obligation to segregate. As the Monitor was an officer of the court, the motions judge should have compelled it to fulfill these duties. This contention faces three obstacles: the language of the PBA; the terms of the pension stay order; and the status and role of the Monitor.

43 The deemed trusts for unpaid past service and special contributions are found in ss. 57(3) and (4) of the PBA. Subsection (3) is the basic provision that creates a deemed trust for unpaid employer contributions. Subsection (4) stipulates that on the wind up of a pension plan, employer contributions accrued but not yet due because of the timing of the wind up are also deemed to be held in trust:

s. 57(3) An employer who is required to pay contributions to a pension fund shall be deemed to hold in trust for the beneficiaries of the pension plan an amount of money equal to the employer contributions due and not paid into the pension fund.

s. 57(4) Where a pension plan is wound up in whole or in part, an employer who is required to pay contributions to the pension fund shall be deemed to hold in trust for the beneficiaries of the pension plan an amount of money equal to employer contributions accrued to the date of the wind up but not yet due under the plan or regulations.

44 At para. 11 of his decision, the motions judge said that both unpaid contributions and wind-up liabilities are deemed to be held in trust under s. 57(3). In his earlier decision in *Toronto Dominion Bank v. Usarco Ltd.* (1991), 42 E.T.R. 235 (Ont. Gen. Div.), Farley J. said, at para. 25, that the equivalent legislation then in force under the *Pension Benefits Act, 1987*, S.O. 1987, c.35 referred only to unpaid contributions, not to wind-up liabilities. I think that the statement in *Usarco Ltd.* is correct, but I do not need to resolve the issue on this appeal.

45 Under s. 57(5) of the PBA the plan administrator has a lien and charge on the assets of the employer for the amount of any deemed trust. The lien and charge permit the administrator to enforce the deemed trust.

s. 57(5) The administrator of the pension plan has a lien and charge on the assets of the employer in an amount equal to the amounts deemed to be held in trust under subsections (1), (3) and (4).

46 The Superintendent argues that these provisions required the Companies, and in their place the Monitor, to keep the unpaid contributions in a separate account. However, the language of s. 57 does not require the employer to hold the contributions separately. A "deemed trust" is, in a sense, a legal fiction. Outside of bankruptcy it does create a priority for pension contributions, a priority that would not exist but for the designation. Yet, as I have already said, this legislative designation by itself does not create a true trust. If the province wants to require an employer to keep its unpaid contributions to a pension plan in a separate account it must legislate that separation. It has not done so.

47 The Superintendent argues that the pension stay order supports her position because para. 5 the order, *supra*, recognized that a deemed trust for unpaid contributions may arise during the stay period and that para. 6 of the stay order, *supra*, did not compromise the Companies' obligation to make these contributions. This argument fails to take account of para. 4 of the pension stay order. Paragraph 4 stipulates that during the stay the Companies will not incur any obligation — statutory, fiduciary or otherwise — for failing to make contributions to the plan. In my view, the Superintendent's argument amounts to an impermissible collateral attack on para. 4 of the pension stay order.

48 The Superintendent also tries to buttress her position by arguing that the Monitor stands in the shoes of the Companies, and like the Companies, has a fiduciary duty to the pension beneficiaries. I disagree.

49 The Monitor was appointed under s. 11.7(1) of the CCAA to "monitor the business and financial affairs" of the Companies, and was given the functions set out in s. 11.7(3) of that statute: to examine the Companies' property, report to the court on the Companies' business and financial affairs and keep the creditors informed. Although the motions judge gave the Monitor additional powers, they were limited. The Monitor was given authority to deal with day-to-day administrative matters, to finalize the sale to Heico and to receive and control the proceeds of sale. I do not think it can be fairly said that the Monitor "stands in the shoes of the Companies".

50 Equally important, the Monitor does not owe a fiduciary duty to the pension beneficiaries. The Superintendent's attempt to impose an obligation on the Monitor to segregate the contributions to the non-union plans depends at least on establishing

that the Monitor acts as a fiduciary of the employees in those plans. Both the role of the Monitor and the initial stay order preclude the Superintendent's assertion.

51 Pension plan administrators do owe a fiduciary duty to plan members. See E.E. Gillese, *The Fiduciary Liability of the Employer as Pension Plan Administrator* (Toronto: The Canadian Institute, November 18, 1996, pp. 1-25). But the Monitor was not given that role. It is not an administrator of any of the four non-union plans. Indeed, the Superintendent never asked the court to give the Monitor responsibility for administering these plans.

52 Moreover, para. 59 of the initial stay order expressly states that the Monitor is not to be considered either a successor or related employer.

THIS COURT ORDERS that nothing in this Order shall result in the Monitor being or being deemed or considered to be a successor or related employer, sponsor or payor with respect to any Applicant or any employees or former employees of any Applicant under any legislation, including ... the *Pension Benefits Act* (Ontario) ... or under any other provincial or federal legislation, regulation or rule of law or equity applicable to employees or pensions, or otherwise.

[Emphasis added].

As the Monitor was neither a plan administrator nor a successor employer, it can owe no fiduciary duty to the members of the four plans.

53 Therefore, the combination of the wording of s. 57 of the PBA, para. 4 of the pension stay order and the limited role of the Monitor, refute the Superintendent's segregation argument. The Superintendent, however, submits that two cases, the decision of this court in *GMAC Commercial Credit Corp. - Canada v. TCT Logistics Inc.* (2005), 74 O.R. (3d) 382 (Ont. C.A.) [hereinafter *TCT Logistics*] and an earlier decision of the motions judge in *Usarco Ltd.*, *supra*, support the argument for segregation. In my view, both cases are distinguishable.

54 In *TCT Logistics*, this court held that an interim receiver, who was both an officer of the court and stood in the shoes of the debtor, had a statutory duty under the legislation then in force, s. 15 of the *Load Brokers Regulation*, O.Reg. 556/92 (passed under the *Truck Transportation Act*, R.S.O. 1990, c. T-22) to hold carriers' fees that it had collected in a separate trust account. *TCT Logistics* and this case differ in three critical ways.

55 First, the interim receiver in *TCT Logistics*, was not just an officer of the court, it stood in the place of the debtor company. Here, although the Monitor is an officer of the court, it does not stand in the place of the Companies. For the reasons outlined in para. 49 its role is far more limited.

56 Second, in *TCT Logistics* the court order authorized the interim receiver to hold the carriers' fees in a separate bank account until entitlement to that money was decided. Here, the pension stay order prohibited the Companies from making any past service or special contributions during the stay period.

57 Third, and perhaps most important, the applicable legislation in *TCT Logistics*, s. 15(2) of the *Load Brokers Regulation* required the debtor company to maintain a separate trust account and to keep the fees it collected for the carriers in that account. Here, s. 57 of the PBA does not similarly require an employer to keep its unpaid contributions in a separate trust account. Moreover, in *TCT Logistics*, despite s. 15(2) of the Regulation, this court held that the carrier fees previously collected by the debtor company lost their character as trust money because they had been commingled with other funds. *TCT Logistics* thus does not support the Superintendent's position.

58 In *Usarco Ltd.*, *supra*, at para. 16, Farley J. commented that the deemed trust provisions of the PBA "implied a fiduciary obligation on the part of Usarco", and that "a trustee in bankruptcy stepping into the shoes of Usarco must deal with that fiduciary obligation". These comments do not apply to this case. The Monitor here, unlike the trustee in bankruptcy in *Usarco Ltd.*, did not step into the shoes of the debtor. Thus, *Usarco Ltd.* does not assist the Superintendent.

59 For these reasons, I reject the Superintendent's argument that the motions judge was required in law to order the segregation of the amount of the deemed trusts during the CCAA proceeding. I now turn to the Superintendent's other submission: that the motions judge was required in law to order that the amount of the deemed trust be paid at the end of the CCAA proceedings, but before bankruptcy.

60 The CCAA itself did not require the motions judge to execute the deemed trusts. The Superintendent cannot point to any section of the statute where a legal obligation to order payment of the past service contributions can be found. Moreover, in my view, absent an agreement, I doubt that the CCAA even authorized the motions judge to order this payment. Once restructuring was not possible and the CCAA proceedings were spent, as the motions judge found and all parties acknowledged, I question whether the court had any authority to order a distribution of the sale proceeds. See for example *United Maritime Fishermen Co-op., Re* (1988), 68 C.B.R. (N.S.) 170 (N.B. Q.B.), at 173.

61 The Superintendent's submission that the motions judge was required to order payment of the outstanding contributions rests on the proposition that a gap exists between the CCAA and the BIA in which the provincial deemed trusts can be executed. This proposition runs contrary to the federal bankruptcy and insolvency regime and to the principle that the province cannot reorder priorities in bankruptcy.

62 The federal insolvency regime includes the CCAA and the BIA. The two statutes are related. A debtor company under the CCAA is defined in s. 2 by the company's bankruptcy or insolvency. Section 11(3) authorizes a thirty-day stay of any current or prospective proceedings under the BIA, and s. 11(4) authorizes an extension of the initial thirty-day period. During the stay period, creditor claims and bankruptcy proceedings are suspended. Once the stay is lifted by court order or terminates by its own terms, simultaneously the creditor claims and bankruptcy proceedings are revived and may go forward.

63 For the Superintendent's position to be correct, there would have to be a gap between the end of the CCAA period and bankruptcy proceedings, in which the pension beneficiaries' rights under the deemed trusts crystallize before the rights of all other creditors, including their right to bring a bankruptcy petition. That position is illogical. All rights must crystallize simultaneously at the end of the CCAA period. There is simply no gap in the federal insolvency regime in which the provincial deemed trusts alone can operate. That is obviously so on the facts in this case because the Bank of Nova Scotia had already commenced a petition for bankruptcy, which was stayed by the initial order under the CCAA. Once the motions judge lifted the stay, the petition was revived. In my view, however, the situation would be the same even if no bankruptcy petition was pending.

64 Where a creditor seeks to petition a debtor company into bankruptcy at the end of CCAA proceedings, any claim under a provincial deemed trust must be dealt with in bankruptcy proceedings. The CCAA and the BIA create a complementary and interrelated scheme for dealing with the property of insolvent companies, a scheme that occupies the field and ousts the application of provincial legislation. Were it otherwise, creditors might be tempted to forgo efforts to restructure a debtor company and instead put the company immediately into bankruptcy. That would not be a desirable result.

65 Also, giving effect to the Superintendent's position, in substance, would allow a province to do indirectly what it is precluded from doing directly. Just as a province cannot directly create its own priorities or alter the scheme of distribution of property under the BIA, neither can it do so indirectly. See *Husky Oil, supra*, at paras. 32 and 39. At bottom the Superintendent seeks to alter the scheme for distributing an insolvent company's assets under the BIA. It cannot do so.

66 The Superintendent relies on one authority in support of its position: the decision of the motions judge in *Usarco Ltd., supra*. In that case, although a bankruptcy petition had been brought, Farley J. nonetheless ordered the receiver to pay to the pension plan administrator the amount of the deemed trusts under the PBA. However, the facts in *Usarco Ltd.* differed materially from the facts in this case.

67 In *Usarco Ltd.*, CCAA proceedings did not precede the bankruptcy petition. Moreover, in *Usarco Ltd.* the petitioning creditor was not proceeding with its bankruptcy petition because its principal had died, and no other creditor took steps to advance the petition. Thus, unlike in this case, in *Usarco Ltd.* it was unclear whether bankruptcy proceedings would ever take place.

68 Recently in *General Chemical Canada Ltd., Re* (Ont. S.C.J.), Campbell J. relied on this distinction, followed the motions judge's decision in the present case and refused to order payment of the amount of the deemed trusts under the PBA. He wrote at para. 35:

To conclude otherwise (absent improper motive on the part of Company or a major creditor) would be to negate both CCAA proceedings and bankruptcy proceedings by preventing creditors from pursuing a process of equitable distribution of the debtor's property as they believe it to be when making their decisions.

I agree. The factual differences between *General Chemical Canada Ltd.* and this case on the one hand, and *Usarco Ltd.* on the other, render *Usarco Ltd.* of no assistance to the Superintendent on this appeal.

69 Because the federal legislative regime under the CCAA and the BIA determines the claims of creditors of an insolvent company, if the rights of pension claimants are to be given greater priority, Parliament, not the courts, must do so. And Parliament has at least signalled its intention to do so. Last year it passed the *Wage Earner Protection Program Act*, S.C. 2005 c.47. That Act would amend the BIA and give special priority to unpaid pension contributions of a bankrupt employer. This statute, however, has not been proclaimed in force. That it was passed perhaps shows that under the existing legislative regime, claims like that of the Superintendent must fail. I would reject this ground of appeal.

d) Did the motions judge err in the exercise of his discretion by lifting the stay and permitting the bankruptcy petitions to proceed?

70 In my view, the motions judge's order lifting the stay was a discretionary order. He summarized his reasons for rejecting the Superintendent's position and exercising his discretion to allow the bankruptcy petitions to proceed at para. 18 of his decision:

In the end result I do not see that the Superintendent has made a compelling case to the effect that the petitions in bankruptcy should not be allowed to proceed in the ordinary course. I have reached that conclusion by weighing the factors pro and con as discussed above, including the relative benefits to all stakeholders (including workers and pensioners) to maintaining the CCAA proceedings (with the benefit of the suspension of past contributions as per the unopposed and un-reconsidered order of November 28, 2003), the fact that no reorganization is now possible as all Ivaco Companies (except Docap) have ceased operations and are without operational assets and that the Ivaco Companies are now essentially in a distribution of proceeds mode.

71 Appellate review of a discretionary order under the CCAA is limited. See *Air Canada, Re* (2003), 66 O.R. (3d) 257 (Ont. C.A.) at para. 25; *Royal Crest Lifecare Group Inc., Re* (2004), 46 C.B.R. (4th) 126 (Ont. C.A.) at para. 23; *Algoma Steel Inc. v. Union Gas Ltd.* (2003), 63 O.R. (3d) 78 (Ont. C.A.) at para. 16. Appellate intervention is justified only for an error in principle or the unreasonable exercise of discretion. The Superintendent submits that the motions judge exercised his discretion improperly — on a wrong principle — because he ignored the "unfair and prejudicial" effects of his order on the Companies' most vulnerable class of creditors: the pension beneficiaries. I disagree.

72 The Superintendent argues that the motions judge's order was unfair to the pension beneficiaries in three related ways. First, she points out that the pension beneficiaries agreed to a stay of the past service contributions to keep the Companies afloat, which in turn permitted the going concern sale to Heico. That sale greatly enhanced the return to the creditors. The Superintendent contends that now permitting the bankruptcy petitions to proceed, which would potentially deprive the pension beneficiaries of their rights, produces an unfair outcome.

73 Undoubtedly, and regrettably, the pension beneficiaries stand to suffer from the insolvency of the Companies. However, the Superintendent's argument implicitly assumes that the pension beneficiaries alone made sacrifices to maximize the recovery for all creditors. The motions judge rejected this assumption, which he said at para. 2 of his reasons, "somewhat overstates the situation". The motions judge accurately concluded:

[O]ther stakeholders (such as the financial and trade creditors) as a result of the stay also contributed to the financial stability of the Ivaco Companies, fragile as their financial situation was, by not being paid interest as such became due nor for pre-filing indebtedness which was due.

In short, all creditors gave up something to permit the Companies to stay in business so that they could either reorganize or sell their assets in a going concern sale.

74 Second, the Superintendent contends that the motions judge's order undermined his earlier pension stay order, which had expressly preserved the pension beneficiaries' deemed trust rights. I do not accept this contention. Although the pension stay order did not take away these deemed trust rights, it did not provide that the deemed trusts would be paid out of any sale proceeds. Instead, para. 4 of the pension stay order provided that the Companies would not incur any obligation because of their failure to pay past service contributions during the stay period. Moreover, even though the Superintendent and the QPC knew that a petition for bankruptcy (by the Bank of Nova Scotia) was pending when they agreed to the pension stay order, they did not ask that the order be conditional on payment of the amount of the deemed trusts when the stay was lifted.

75 The third aspect of unfairness on which the Superintendent relies is that the motions judge's order fails to take account of the law's "special solicitude" for pensioners. Certainly provincial pension legislation has shown this solicitude. It has recognized the importance of ensuring that retirees have income security. Thus, it has legislated statutory trusts and liens to protect their pension claims. But federal insolvency law has not shown the same solicitude. It does not accord the claims of "sympathetic" creditors more weight than the claims of "unsympathetic" ones. Subject to specified exceptions, the BIA aims to distribute a bankrupt debtor's estate equitably among all of the estate's creditors. There are undoubtedly compelling policy reasons to protect pension rights in an insolvency. But, as I have said, it is for Parliament, not the courts, to do so.

76 Therefore, I do not accept the Superintendent's unfairness argument. Also, in my view, numerous considerations supported the motions judge's decision to lift the stay and permit the bankruptcy petitions to proceed. These considerations include the following:

- The CCAA proceedings are spent. There are no entities to reorganize and no further compromises can be negotiated between the Companies and their creditors. There remains only a pool of money to distribute. The BIA is the regime Parliament has chosen to effect this distribution.
- The petitioning creditors have met the technical requirements for bankruptcy. And their desire to use the BIA to alter priorities is a legitimate reason to seek a bankruptcy order. See for example *Bank of Montreal v. Scott Road Enterprises Ltd.* (1989), 57 D.L.R. (4th) 623 (B.C. C.A.), at 627, 630-631; *Harrop of Milton Inc., Re* (1979), 22 O.R. (2d) 239 (Ont. Bkcty.), at 244-245.
- The Superintendent and the QPC agreed to the CCAA process. They recognized that it benefitted the pension claimants. Thus, they did not oppose either the pension stay order or the sale to Heico. They did not ask to have the deemed trusts satisfied or an amount to satisfy them set aside, though they knew that bankruptcy was pending. They likely recognized that if they had insisted on a segregation order, the other creditors may not have agreed to the sale. It is now too late for the Superintendent and the QPC to ask for relief that they never sought during the entire CCAA process.
- The motions judge would have gone beyond his role as a referee in the CCAA proceedings if he had given effect to the Superintendent's claim. The Superintendent wants to jump ahead of all the other creditors by obtaining an extraordinary payment at the end of a long CCAA process. If the motions judge had ordered this payment, he would have upset the ground rules that all stakeholders agreed to and that he supervised for over two years.

77 The motions judge took into account the likely result of the Superintendent's claims if the Companies are put into bankruptcy. He recognized that bankruptcy would potentially reverse the priority accorded to the pension claims outside bankruptcy. Nonetheless, having weighed all the competing considerations, he exercised his discretion to lift the stay and permit

the bankruptcy petitions to proceed. In my view, he exercised his discretion properly. I would not give effect to this ground of appeal.

e) Did the motions judge err by ordering the transfer of Ivaco and Ifastgroupe's head offices from Quebec to Toronto?

78 Ivaco's head office was in Montreal; Ifastgroupe's head office was in Marieville, Quebec. The motions judge ordered that these head offices be transferred to Toronto. He did so in the light of s. 43(5) of the BIA, which states that an application for a bankruptcy petition shall be filed in the court having jurisdiction in the judicial district of the locality of the debtor. The Superintendent, supported by the QPC, submits that the motions judge had no jurisdiction to make this order, or that he improperly exercised his discretion in doing so. I disagree with both submissions.

79 The Superintendent and the QPC contend that the CCAA does not expressly authorize a judge to transfer the location of the head office of a debtor company. And, although a judge in CCAA proceedings has inherent jurisdiction to control the court's processes, the judge does not have a similar jurisdiction to do what the motions judge did here: control the debtor Companies' or the creditors' processes. See *Stelco Inc., Re* (2005), 75 O.R. (3d) 5 (Ont. C.A.) at para. 38.

80 I accept the Superintendent's and the QPC's contention that the CCAA did not give the motions judge jurisdiction to order the transfer. I also accept that the transfer was not made to facilitate a restructuring under the CCAA. Instead it was made to facilitate future bankruptcy proceedings. Nonetheless, in my view, the motions judge did not need to resort to the CCAA because he had express authority to order the transfer in s. 191 of the *Canada Business Corporations Act*, R.S.C. 1985, c. C-44. Sections 191(1) and (2) provide:

s. 191(1) In this section, "reorganization" means a court order made under;

(a) section 241;

(b) the *Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act* approving a proposal; or

(c) any other Act of Parliament that affects the rights among the corporation, its shareholders and creditors.

s. 191(2) If a corporation is subject to an order referred to in subsection (1), its articles may be amended by such order to effect any change that might be lawfully be made by an amendment under section 173.

81 The applicable section here is section 191(1)(c). The stay order is an order under an Act of Parliament, the CCAA, that affects the rights among the Companies, its shareholders and its creditors. See *Beatrice Foods Inc., Re* (1996), 43 C.B.R. (4th) 10 (Ont. Gen. Div. [Commercial List]). Therefore, as both Ivaco and Ifastgroupe were subject to an order under s. 191(1)(c) of the CBCA, under s. 191(2) each of its articles may be amended to effect any change that might be made by an amendment under s. 173. Section 173(1)(b) of the statute permits a corporation to change the location of its head office:

s. 173(1) Subject to sections 176 and 177, the articles of a corporation may by special resolution be amended to

.....

(b) change the province in which its registered office is situated;

82 On my reading of the statute, s. 191 is a stand-alone section that gave the motions judge authority to order the transfer. Provided a corporation is subject to an order under s. 191(1), its articles may be amended. The amending order under s. 191(2) need not serve the purpose of the triggering statute in s. 191(1), in this case the CCAA. If Parliament had wanted to limit amendments to those that would facilitate a reorganization, it could have said so. Thus, the combination of ss. 191(1)(c), 191(2) and 173(1)(b) gave the motions judge the jurisdiction to order the transfer of Ivaco and Ifastgroupe's head offices from Quebec to Toronto. Resort to the CCAA was unnecessary.

83 The Superintendent and the QPC rely on this court's decision in *Stelco Inc., Re* in support of their argument. However, that case differs from the present case in a material way. In *Stelco Inc., Re* the issue was whether a motions judge in CCAA

proceedings could order the removal of two members of the company's board of directors under s. 109(1) of the CBCA. The power to remove directors is vested in the shareholders. Blair J.A. held that the motions judge could not rely on the court's discretion under s. 11 of the CCAA to override or supplant the specific power in s. 109(1) of the CBCA. The discretion under s. 11 must be used to control the court's processes, not the company's processes.

84 By contrast, in the present case, s. 191 of the CBCA gives the court express authority to order the transfer of the head office of a company that is subject to an order under the CCAA. Thus, to make a transfer order, the court need not rely on its discretion under s. 11 of the CCAA.

85 However, the jurisdiction in s. 191(2) is discretionary, as evidenced by the use of the word "may". Therefore, the remaining question on this ground of appeal is whether the motions judge properly exercised his discretion in ordering the transfer. I think that he did.

86 Ivaco and Ifastgroupe had not actively carried on business since the sale of their assets to Heico was completed in December 2004. The Monitor holds the proceeds of the sales in bank accounts in Toronto. Because of the lengthy and complex CCAA proceedings, the Ontario Superior Court — Commercial List is familiar with the affairs of Ivaco and Ifastgroupe. Having all the issues common to all the Companies administered at the same time before the court familiar with these issues will facilitate the most efficient, consistent and just administration and distribution of their estates.

87 The QPC, in particular, objects to these head office transfers. It argues that the motions judge's order will enable the creditors to defeat a future motion to transfer to the Quebec Superior Court the question whether the Companies participating in the Ivaco Salaried Plan are "solidarily liable", that is jointly and severally liable, under Quebec law for satisfying the obligation to fund the plan.

88 The underpinning of the QPC's argument is as follows: the "solidarily liable" provision is unique to Quebec law and therefore should be decided by a Quebec court. Whether the Quebec or the Ontario Superior Court presides over this future motion will turn on the application of the *forum conveniens* principle. One relevant factor in assessing the *forum conveniens* is the residence or place of business of the parties. According to the QPC, transferring Ivaco's and Ifastgroupe's head offices to Toronto will tip the scales in favour of the Ontario Superior Court hearing the "solidarily liable" motion.

89 It seems to me that this is a weak argument. The QPC has not yet brought this motion. When it does, the Ontario Superior Court can assess the relevant considerations affecting the appropriate forum. Now, however, the motions judge's transfer order just makes good sense. He, therefore, exercised his discretion properly. I would not give effect to this ground of appeal.

D. Conclusion

90 The motions judge did not err in law in refusing to order the immediate payment of the amount of the deemed trusts under the *Pension Benefits Act* or in refusing to segregate that amount. Nor did he err in exercising his discretion to lift the stay under the CCAA and permit the bankruptcy petitions to proceed. Finally, the motions judge did not err in ordering that the head offices of Ivaco and Ifastgroupe be transferred from Quebec to Toronto. Accordingly, I would dismiss the Superintendent's appeal.

91 If the parties cannot agree on the costs of the appeal, they may make written submissions to the court. These submissions should be delivered within 30 days of the release of these reasons.

M. Rosenberg J.A.:

I agree.

J. Simmons J.A.:

I agree.

Appeal dismissed.

Footnotes

- 1 Taking into account a \$12 million distribution to the National Bank permitted by the motions judge in December 2004.