

COURT FILE NO.

COURT

COURT OF KING'S BENCH OF ALBERTA

JUDICIAL CENTRE

CALGARY

MATTER

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

AND IN THE MATTER OF THE COMPROMISE OR
ARRANGEMENT OF ROYAL HELIUM LTD.,
IMPERIAL HELIUM CORP., AND ROYAL HELIUM
EXPLORATION LIMITED.

APPLICANTS

ROYAL HELIUM LTD., IMPERIAL HELIUM CORP.,
AND ROYAL HELIUM EXPLORATION LIMITED.

DOCUMENT

**BOOK OF AUTHORITIES FOR BENCH BRIEF OF
THE APPLICANTS
TO BE HEARD ON FEBRUARY 19, 2025 AT 3:00
P.M.**

ADDRESS FOR
SERVICE AND
CONTACT
INFORMATION OF
PARTY FILING THIS
DOCUMENT

RECONSTRUCT LLP

80 Richmond Street West
Suite 1700
Toronto, ON M5H 2A4

Caitlin Fell / Sharon Kour

E-mail: cfell@reconllp.com / skour@reconllp.com

Tel: 416.613.8282 / 416.613.8283

Fax: 416.613.8290

Lawyers for the Applicants

LIST OF AUTHORITIES

EXHIBITS

1. Exhibit “H” to the Affidavit of David Young sworn February 10, 2025, being the financial statements of the Applicants for the year ending December 31, 2023;
2. Exhibit “I” to the Affidavit of David Young sworn February 10, 2025, being the unaudited financial statements of the Applicants for the period ending September 30, 2024;

STATUTES

3. *Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act*, RSC 1985, c C-36, sections 2(1), 3, 9(1), 10(2), 11, 11.001, 11.02, 11.52 and 11.6;
4. *Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act*, RSC 1985, c B-3, section 2;

CASE LAW

5. *Stelco Inc (Re)*, 2004 CanLII 24933 (ONSC);
6. *Re Target Canada Co.*, 2015 ONSC 303;
7. *Laurentian University of Sudbury*, 2021 ONSC 659;
8. *Century Services Inc. v. Canada (Attorney General)*, 2010 SCC 60;
9. *Mantle Materials Group, Ltd (Re)*, 2024 ABKB 19;
10. *(Re) Clothing for Modern Times Ltd.*, 2011 ONSC 7522;
11. *The Body Shop Canada Limited et al.*, Endorsement of Osborne J. dated July 5, 2024 (ONSC, Commercial List);
12. *In the Matter of the Compromise or Arrangement of 420 Investments Ltd., 420 Premium Markets Ltd., Green Rock Cannabis (EC 1) Limited and 420 Dispensaries Ltd*, Initial Order dated September 19, 2024;
13. *In the Matter of the Compromise or Arrangement of 420 Investments Ltd., 420 Premium Markets Ltd., Green Rock Cannabis (EC 1) Limited and 420 Dispensaries Ltd*, Amended and Restated Initial Order dated September 19, 2024;
14. *In the Matter of the Compromise or Arrangement of 420 Investments Ltd., 420 Premium Markets Ltd., Green Rock Cannabis (EC 1) Limited and 420 Dispensaries Ltd*, SISP Approval Order dated September 19, 2024; and
15. *Canwest Publishing Inc / Publications Canwest Inc Re*, 2010 ONSC 222.

TAB 1



ROYAL HELIUM LTD.

CONSOLIDATED FINANCIAL STATEMENTS

December 31, 2023



KPMG LLP
205 5th Avenue SW
Suite 3100
Calgary AB T2P 4B9
Tel 403-691-8000
Fax 403-691-8008
www.kpmg.ca

INDEPENDENT AUDITOR'S REPORT

To the Shareholders of Royal Helium Ltd.

Opinion

We have audited the consolidated financial statements of Royal Helium Ltd. (the "Company"), which comprise:

- the consolidated statements of financial position as at December 31, 2023 and December 31, 2022
- the consolidated statements of loss and comprehensive loss for the years then ended
- the consolidated statements of changes in shareholders' equity for the years then ended
- the consolidated statements of cash flows for the years then ended
- and notes to the consolidated financial statements, including a summary of material accounting policy information

(Hereinafter referred to as the "financial statements").

In our opinion, the accompanying financial statements present fairly, in all material respects, the financial position of the Company as at December 31, 2023 and December 31, 2022, and its financial performance and its cash flows for the years then ended in accordance with IFRS Accounting Standards as issued by the International Accounting Standards Board.

Basis for Opinion

We conducted our audit in accordance with Canadian generally accepted auditing standards. Our responsibilities under those standards are further described in the "*Auditor's Responsibilities for the Audit of the Financial Statements*" section of our auditor's report.

We are independent of the Company in accordance with the ethical requirements that are relevant to our audit of the financial statements in Canada and we have fulfilled our other ethical responsibilities in accordance with these requirements.

We believe that the audit evidence we have obtained is sufficient and appropriate to provide a basis for our opinion.



Key Audit Matters

Key audit matters are those matters that, in our professional judgment, were of most significance in our audit of the financial statements for the year ended December 31, 2023. These matters were addressed in the context of our audit of the financial statements as a whole, and in forming our opinion thereon, and we do not provide a separate opinion on these matters.

Evaluation of indicators of impairment for exploration and evaluation assets

Description of the matter

We draw attention to note 3, note 4, and note 7 to the financial statements. The application of the Company's accounting policy for exploration and evaluation assets requires management to make certain judgments as to future events and circumstances as to whether economic quantities of helium resources have been found in assessing economic and technical feasibility. The Company assesses its exploration and evaluation assets to determine whether any indication of impairment exists at the end of each reporting period. Significant judgment is required in determining whether indicators of impairment exist, including factors and considerations such as the remaining period for which the Company has the right to explore, whether expenditures on further exploration and evaluation of helium properties are planned, whether commercially viable quantities of helium resources have been discovered or whether data exists to suggest the carrying amount is unlikely to be recovered.

At December 31, 2023, the Company determined that no indicators of impairment existed on its exploration and evaluation assets.

Why the matter is a key audit matter

We identified the evaluation of indicators of impairment for exploration and evaluation assets as a key audit matter. Significant auditor judgment was required in evaluating the results of the Company's indicators of impairment assessment.

How the matter was addressed in the audit

The primary procedures we performed to address this key audit matter included the following:

We evaluated the Company's indicators of impairment assessment by:

- Assessing the remaining period and right to explore for a selection of helium permits
- Assessing whether further expenditures for exploration and evaluation of helium properties are planned by examining the Company's internal documents and certain minutes of the meetings of the Board of Directors.
- Assessing whether data exists to suggest the carrying amount of exploration and evaluation assets is unlikely to be recovered by examining external market and industry data, the Company's press releases and certain minutes of the meetings of the Board of Directors to assess if the Company has decided to continue or discontinue exploration for and evaluation of mineral resources in the specific areas.



Other Information

Management is responsible for the other information. Other information comprises:

- the information included in Management's Discussion and Analysis filed with the relevant Canadian Securities Commissions.

Our opinion on the financial statements does not cover the other information and we do not and will not express any form of assurance conclusion thereon.

In connection with our audit of the financial statements, our responsibility is to read the other information identified above and, in doing so, consider whether the other information is materially inconsistent with the financial statements or our knowledge obtained in the audit and remain alert for indications that the other information appears to be materially misstated.

We obtained the information included in Management's Discussion and Analysis filed with the relevant Canadian Securities Commissions as at the date of this auditor's report. If, based on the work we have performed on this other information, we conclude that there is a material misstatement of this other information, we are required to report that fact in the auditor's report.

We have nothing to report in this regard.

Responsibilities of Management and Those Charged with Governance for the Financial Statements

Management is responsible for the preparation and fair presentation of the financial statements in accordance with IFRS Accounting Standards as issued by the International Accounting Standards Board, and for such internal control as management determines is necessary to enable the preparation of financial statements that are free from material misstatement, whether due to fraud or error.

In preparing the financial statements, management is responsible for assessing the Company's ability to continue as a going concern, disclosing as applicable, matters related to going concern and using the going concern basis of accounting unless management either intends to liquidate the Company or to cease operations, or has no realistic alternative but to do so.

Those charged with governance are responsible for overseeing the Company's financial reporting process.

Auditor's Responsibilities for the Audit of the Financial Statements

Our objectives are to obtain reasonable assurance about whether the financial statements as a whole are free from material misstatement, whether due to fraud or error, and to issue an auditor's report that includes our opinion.

Reasonable assurance is a high level of assurance, but is not a guarantee that an audit conducted in accordance with Canadian generally accepted auditing standards will always detect a material misstatement when it exists.



Misstatements can arise from fraud or error and are considered material if, individually or in the aggregate, they could reasonably be expected to influence the economic decisions of users taken on the basis of the financial statements.

As part of an audit in accordance with Canadian generally accepted auditing standards, we exercise professional judgment and maintain professional skepticism throughout the audit.

We also:

- Identify and assess the risks of material misstatement of the financial statements, whether due to fraud or error, design and perform audit procedures responsive to those risks, and obtain audit evidence that is sufficient and appropriate to provide a basis for our opinion.

The risk of not detecting a material misstatement resulting from fraud is higher than for one resulting from error, as fraud may involve collusion, forgery, intentional omissions, misrepresentations, or the override of internal control.

- Obtain an understanding of internal control relevant to the audit in order to design audit procedures that are appropriate in the circumstances, but not for the purpose of expressing an opinion on the effectiveness of the Company's internal control.
- Evaluate the appropriateness of accounting policies used and the reasonableness of accounting estimates and related disclosures made by management.
- Conclude on the appropriateness of management's use of the going concern basis of accounting and, based on the audit evidence obtained, whether a material uncertainty exists related to events or conditions that may cast significant doubt on the Company's ability to continue as a going concern. If we conclude that a material uncertainty exists, we are required to draw attention in our auditor's report to the related disclosures in the financial statements or, if such disclosures are inadequate, to modify our opinion. Our conclusions are based on the audit evidence obtained up to the date of our auditor's report. However, future events or conditions may cause the Company to cease to continue as a going concern.
- Evaluate the overall presentation, structure, and content of the financial statements, including the disclosures, and whether the financial statements represent the underlying transactions and events in a manner that achieves fair presentation.
- Communicate with those charged with governance regarding, among other matters, the planned scope and timing of the audit and significant audit findings, including any significant deficiencies in internal control that we identify during our audit.
- Provide those charged with governance with a statement that we have complied with relevant ethical requirements regarding independence and communicate with them all relationships and other matters that may reasonably be thought to bear on our independence, and where applicable, related safeguards.



- Determine, from the matters communicated with those charged with governance, those matters that were of most significance in the audit of the financial statements of the current period and are therefore the key audit matters. We describe these matters in our auditor's report unless law or regulation precludes public disclosure about the matter or when, in extremely rare circumstances, we determine that a matter should not be communicated in our auditor's report because the adverse consequences of doing so would reasonably be expected to outweigh the public interest benefits of such communication.

The engagement partner on the audit resulting in this auditor's report is Timothy Arthur Richards.

KPMG LLP

Chartered Professional Accountants

Calgary, Canada
April 24, 2024

Royal Helium Ltd.**Consolidated Statements of Financial Position**

(Expressed in Canadian dollars)

| As at December 31, | 2023 | 2022 |
|--|---------------|---------------|
| ASSETS | | |
| Current | | |
| Cash and cash equivalents (note 6) | \$ 2,611,794 | \$ 1,002,973 |
| Restricted cash (note 6) | 233,831 | - |
| Accounts receivable | 412,224 | 751,363 |
| Prepaid and inventory | 1,243,144 | 1,119,450 |
| Total current assets | 4,500,993 | 2,873,786 |
| Non-current | | |
| Environmental deposit (note 11) | 101,550 | 101,550 |
| Exploration and evaluation assets (note 7) | 46,022,893 | 45,626,613 |
| Property, plant and equipment (note 8) | 36,686,239 | 11,147,975 |
| Right of use assets (note 9) | 4,503,123 | - |
| Total assets | \$ 91,814,798 | \$ 59,749,924 |
| LIABILITIES AND SHAREHOLDERS' EQUITY | | |
| Current | | |
| Accounts payable and accrued liabilities (note 10) | \$ 6,028,376 | \$ 8,780,986 |
| Current portion of lease obligation (note 9) | 926,871 | - |
| Current portion of rent to own obligation (note 12) | 742,188 | - |
| Current portion of term debt (note 14) | 3,212,091 | - |
| Total current liabilities | 10,909,526 | 8,780,986 |
| Non-current | | |
| Decommissioning liability (note 11) | 663,563 | 375,994 |
| Lease obligation (note 9) | 3,713,634 | - |
| Rent to own obligation (note 12) | 1,293,447 | - |
| Convertible debentures (note 13) | 10,237,060 | - |
| Term debt (note 14) | 15,387,909 | - |
| Total liabilities | \$ 42,205,139 | \$ 9,156,980 |
| Shareholders' Equity | | |
| Share capital (note 15) | \$ 83,116,371 | \$ 75,574,713 |
| Equity portion of convertible debentures (note 13) | 732,285 | - |
| Contributed surplus | 11,963,251 | 10,176,855 |
| Deficit | (46,202,248) | (35,158,624) |
| Total shareholders' equity | 49,609,659 | 50,592,944 |
| Total liabilities and shareholders' equity | \$ 91,814,798 | \$ 59,749,924 |
| Contingencies and Commitments (notes 7, 8 and 22) | | |
| Subsequent Events (notes 8, 13 and 26) | | |

Approved by the Board of Directors on April 24, 2024

"Andrew Davidson"
 Andrew Davidson, President and Director

"John Pringle"
 John Pringle, Director

The accompanying notes are an integral part of these consolidated financial statements.

Royal Helium Ltd.**Consolidated Statements of Loss and Comprehensive Loss**

(Expressed in Canadian dollars)

| | December 31, 2023 | December 31, 2022 |
|--|------------------------------|------------------------------|
| Helium sales | \$ 98,162 | \$ - |
| Royalties | (5,644) | - |
| | 92,518 | - |
| Operating costs and expenses | | |
| Operating costs | 2,120,866 | - |
| General and administrative (notes 19) | 4,191,062 | 2,782,665 |
| Depreciation (notes 8 and 9) | 941,325 | - |
| Exploration and evaluation expense (note 7) | 289,781 | - |
| Finance expenses, net (note 20) | 2,544,464 | 9,549 |
| Share-based compensation | 596,750 | 1,406,790 |
| Loss on shares for debt | 31,264 | - |
| Loss on sale of royalty credits (note 7) | - | 190,000 |
| Other loss (note 24) | 420,630 | - |
| Net loss and comprehensive loss for the year | \$ (11,043,624) | \$ (4,389,004) |
| Basic and diluted loss per share (note 18) | \$ (0.04) | \$ (0.02) |
| Weighted average number of shares outstanding – basic and diluted (note 18) | 246,645,084 | 177,991,367 |

The accompanying notes are an integral part of these consolidated financial statements.

Royal Helium Ltd.Consolidated Statements of Cash Flows
(Expressed in Canadian dollars)

| | December 31, 2023 | December 31, 2022 |
|---|----------------------|----------------------|
| CASH FLOWS FROM OPERATING ACTIVITIES | | |
| Loss for the year | \$ (11,043,624) | \$ (4,389,004) |
| Items not affecting cash: | | |
| Share-based payments (note 16) | 596,750 | 1,406,790 |
| Accretion – finance obligations (notes 9 and 12) | 414,121 | - |
| Accretion – decommissioning liability (note 11) | 9,040 | 9,549 |
| Accretion – convertible debentures (note 13) | 652,032 | - |
| Accrued interest – convertible debentures (note 13) | 1,132,125 | - |
| Depreciation (notes 8 and 9) | 941,325 | - |
| Loss on sale of royalty credits (note 7) | - | 190,000 |
| Loss on settlement of accounts payable | 31,264 | - |
| Exploration and evaluation expense (note 7) | 289,781 | - |
| Changes in non-cash working capital (note 25) | 1,591,449 | (505,987) |
| Net cash used in operating activities | (5,385,737) | (3,288,652) |
| CASH FLOWS FROM FINANCING ACTIVITIES | | |
| Proceeds – warrant exercise (note 15) | 1,061,600 | - |
| Proceeds – broker warrant exercise (note 15) | 18,114 | 282,975 |
| Proceeds – stock option exercise (note 15) | - | 142,100 |
| Issuance of common shares (note 15) | 5,175,000 | 8,050,575 |
| Share issuance costs (note 15) | (650,746) | (899,509) |
| Issuance of convertible debentures (note 13) | 12,800,000 | - |
| Convertible debenture issuance costs (note 13) | (1,145,898) | - |
| Issuance of term debt (note 14) | 18,600,000 | - |
| Lease payments (note 9) | (677,057) | - |
| Rent to own payments (note 12) | (873,862) | - |
| Net cash provided by financing activities | 34,307,151 | 7,576,141 |
| CASH FLOWS FROM INVESTING ACTIVITIES | | |
| Cash acquired in asset acquisition (note 5) | - | 31,364 |
| Additions to exploration and evaluation assets (note 7) | (1,049,636) | (4,290,438) |
| Additions to property, plant and equipment (note 8) | (22,365,934) | (11,110,970) |
| Environmental deposit | - | (101,550) |
| Transfer to restricted cash (note 6) | (233,831) | - |
| Change in non-cash working capital (note 25) | (3,663,192) | 1,773,525 |
| Net cash used in investing activities | (27,312,593) | (13,698,069) |
| Change in cash | 1,608,821 | (9,410,580) |
| Cash, beginning of year | 1,002,973 | 10,413,553 |
| Cash, end of year | \$ 2,611,794 | \$ 1,002,973 |

The accompanying notes are an integral part of these consolidated financial statements.

Royal Helium Ltd.

Consolidated Statements of Changes in Shareholders' Equity

(Expressed in Canadian dollars)

| | Share Capital | Contributed Surplus | Deficit | Equity portion of Convertible Debentures | Total Shareholders' Equity |
|---|----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|---|----------------------------------|
| Balance as at December 31, 2021 | \$ 47,415,565 | \$ 7,970,545 | \$ (30,769,620) | \$ - | \$ 24,616,490 |
| Share issuance – acquisition (note 5) | 20,437,509 | - | - | - | 20,437,509 |
| Share issuance – financing (note 15) | 8,050,575 | - | - | - | 8,050,575 |
| Share issuance – broker warrants exercise (note 15) | 541,980 | (259,006) | - | - | 282,974 |
| Share issuance – stock option exercise (note 15) | 205,086 | (62,986) | - | - | 142,100 |
| Share issuance costs (note 15) | (899,509) | - | - | - | (899,509) |
| Broker warrants issued (note 17) | (176,493) | 176,493 | - | - | - |
| Stock option issuance – acquisition (note 16) | - | 26,771 | - | - | 26,771 |
| Warrant issuance – acquisition (note 17) | - | 400,318 | - | - | 400,318 |
| Broker warrant issuance – acquisition (note 17) | - | 517,930 | - | - | 517,930 |
| Share based compensation (note 16) | - | 1,406,790 | - | - | 1,406,790 |
| Net loss for the year | - | - | (4,389,004) | - | (4,389,004) |
| Balance as at December 31, 2022 | \$ 75,574,713 | \$ 10,176,855 | \$ (35,158,624) | \$ - | \$ 50,592,944 |
| Share issuance – financing (note 15) | 5,175,000 | - | - | - | 5,175,000 |
| Broker warrants issued (note 17) | (136,575) | 136,575 | - | - | - |
| Share issuance – broker warrants exercise (note 15) | 24,733 | (6,619) | - | - | 18,114 |
| Share issuance – warrants exercise (note 15) | 1,061,600 | - | - | - | 1,061,600 |
| Share issuance – interest payment (note 15) | 283,605 | - | - | - | 283,605 |
| Share issuance – shares for debt (note 15) | 496,686 | - | - | - | 496,686 |
| Share issuance – shares for property (note 15) | 161,735 | - | - | - | 161,735 |
| Share issuance costs (note 15) | (650,746) | - | - | - | (650,746) |
| Debt issuance – convertible debentures (note 13) | - | 1,059,690 | - | 854,310 | 1,914,000 |
| Conversions – convertible debentures (note 13) | 1,125,620 | - | - | (122,025) | 1,003,595 |
| Share based compensation (note 16) | - | 596,750 | - | - | 596,750 |
| Net loss for the year | - | - | (11,043,624) | - | (11,043,624) |
| Balance as at December 31, 2023 | \$ 83,116,371 | \$ 11,963,251 | \$ (46,202,248) | \$ 732,285 | \$ 49,609,659 |

The accompanying notes are an integral part of these consolidated financial statements.

Royal Helium Ltd.

Notes to the Consolidated Financial Statements

Years Ended December 31, 2023 and 2022

(Expressed in Canadian dollars)

1. NATURE AND CONTINUANCE OF OPERATIONS

Royal Helium Ltd. (the "Company" or "RHL") (formerly RHC Capital Corporation) is focused on primary helium production from its helium leases and permits in Saskatchewan and Alberta, Canada. On February 27, 2017, the Company began trading on the NEX board of the TSX Venture Exchange ("TSX-V") under the trading symbol "RHC.H". On July 25, 2017, the Company resumed trading on the TSX-V under the trading symbol "RHC". The address of its registered office is 224 4th Avenue South, Suite 602, Saskatoon, Saskatchewan, S7K 5M5.

The Company was incorporated under the laws of the Province of Ontario on August 15, 2008 and continued into the Province of Saskatchewan on May 1, 2019.

2. BASIS OF PREPARATION

The consolidated financial statements of the Company have been prepared in accordance with the IFRS Accounting Standard ("IFRS") issued by the International Accounting Standard Board ("IASB") and interpretations from the IFRS Interpretations Committee ("IFRIC").

These consolidated financial statements have been prepared on a historical basis, except for those financial instruments carried at fair value. In addition, these consolidated financial statements have been prepared using the accrual basis of accounting.

Capital management

The Company defines the capital that it manages as its working capital. The Company's objectives when managing capital are to manage its business in an effective manner with the goal of increasing the value of its assets. The Company regularly monitors its available capital and, as necessary, adjusts to changing economic circumstances and the risk characteristics of the underlying assets. In order to maintain or adjust capital requirements, the Company may consider the issuance of new shares, the entry into joint venture arrangements or farm-out agreements, or engage in debt financing.

There were no changes in the Company's approach to capital management during the years ended December 31, 2023 and 2022.

The Company is not subject to any capital requirements imposed by a lending institution or regulatory body, other than Policy 2.5 of the TSX-V which requires adequate working capital or financial resources of the greater of (i) \$50,000 and (ii) an amount required in order to maintain operations and cover general and administrative expenses for a period of 6 months. As of December 31, 2023, the Company was not in compliance with Policy 2.5. Capital requirements imposed by lending institutions will begin December 31, 2024.

For the year ended December 31, 2023, the Company used cash in operating activities of \$5,385,737 and had a working capital deficit of \$6,408,533 as at December 31, 2023. Although, management has available \$2,500,000 of undrawn demand operating loan for working capital purposes (note 14) and subsequent to year end received a \$3,000,000 repayable contribution from Western Economic Diversification Canada, the Company will need additional cash resources to meet liquidity requirements while the Steeveville helium plant is brought up to capacity in efforts to generate positive cash flow from operations. The Company to address its liquidity requirements has entered into a bought deal equity financing for gross proceeds of \$6,000,000 (note 26).

Royal Helium Ltd.

Notes to the Consolidated Financial Statements

Years Ended December 31, 2023 and 2022

(Expressed in Canadian dollars)

2. BASIS OF PREPARATION (continued)

The Company has also historically received support from various lenders (note 14 and note 26) and will require this ongoing support. To that end, the Company is required under its current lending arrangements to maintain a cash flow coverage ratio of not less than 1.10:1, a tangible net working capital ratio of not greater than 1.25:1 and a fixed charge coverage ratio of not less than 1.10:1 beginning December 31, 2024 (note 14). Based on current forecasts management is projecting potential non-compliance with the above noted covenants as at December 31, 2024. There can be no assurance that the Company will be able to obtain a waiver for the potential covenant default or an amendment to the covenants, if necessary, prior to December 31, 2024. This potential covenant default may result in the term debt being due on demand and would trigger other cross-covenant defaults.

The continuance of the Company remains dependent upon the discovery of economically recoverable resources in the underlying helium claims and the ability of the Company to increase the current output of the Steeveville helium plant to planned capacity in efforts to generate positive cash flows from operations, in addition to obtaining waivers for potential covenant defaults or amendments to the covenant. Although, there remains considerable risk around the Company's ability to address these substantial uncertainties the Company believes the bought deal equity financing will generate cash to address current projected liquidity requirements and that the continued support of the lender will be available to manage lending covenant requirements before December 31, 2024.

Use of estimates

The Company makes estimates and assumptions about the future that affect the reported amounts of assets and liabilities. Estimates and judgments are continually evaluated based on historical experience and other factors, including expectations of future events that are believed to be reasonable under the circumstances. In the future, actual results may differ from these estimates and assumptions.

These consolidated financial statements were approved and authorized for issuance by the board of directors on April 22, 2024.

3. MATERIAL ACCOUNTING POLICIES

The accounting policies set out below have been applied consistently to all periods presented in these statements.

Basis of consolidation

These consolidated financial statements include the accounts of RHL together with its wholly owned subsidiaries, Royal Helium Exploration Limited ("RHEL") and Imperial Helium Corp. ("IHC"). Subsidiaries consist of entities over which the Company is exposed to, or has right to, variable returns as well as the ability to affect these returns through the power to direct the relevant activities of the entities. All intercompany balances and transactions have been eliminated on consolidation.

Decommissioning Obligations

The Company's activities give rise to dismantling, decommissioning and site disturbance remediation activities. Provision is made for the estimated cost of site restoration and capitalized in the relevant asset category unless it arises from the normal course of production activities, in which case it is recognized in profit or loss.

Decommissioning obligations are measured at the present value of management's best estimate of expenditure required to settle the present obligation at the statement of financial position date.

3. MATERIAL ACCOUNTING POLICIES (continued)

Subsequent to the initial measurement, the obligation is adjusted at the end of each period to reflect the passage of time and changes in the estimated future cash flows underlying the obligation. The increase in the provision due to the passage of time is recognized as finance costs, whereas increases/decreases due to changes in the estimated future cash flows are capitalized. Actual costs incurred upon settlement of the asset retirement obligations are charged against the provision to the extent the provision was established.

Exploration and evaluation assets

Exploration and Evaluation Expenditures

Pre-license costs are recognized in the statement of loss as incurred.

Exploration and evaluation costs, including the costs of acquiring licenses and directly attributable general and administrative costs, initially are capitalized as exploration and evaluation assets according to the nature of the assets acquired. The costs are accumulated in cost centres by well, field or exploration area, pending determination of technical feasibility and commercial viability.

The Company assesses the recoverability of exploration and evaluation assets, before and at the moment of reclassification, to property, plant and equipment. Exploration and evaluation assets are assessed for impairment if facts and circumstances suggest that the carrying amount exceeds the recoverable amount. The impairment of exploration and evaluation assets, and any eventual reversal thereof, is recognized in the statement of profit or loss.

The technical feasibility and commercial viability of extracting a mineral resource is considered to be determinable when wells have been deemed commercially viable and resources are determined to exist. A review of each exploration license or field is carried out, at least annually, to ascertain whether commercially viable resources have been discovered. Upon determination of commercially viable resources, exploration and evaluation assets attributable to those resources are first tested for impairment and then reclassified from exploration and evaluation assets to property, plant and equipment. The cost of undeveloped land that expires is recognized in profit or loss.

Development and Production Costs

Items of property, plant and equipment, which include helium development and production assets, are measured at cost less accumulated depletion and depreciation and accumulated impairment losses. Development and production assets are grouped into CGUs for impairment testing. The Company has grouped its development and production assets into the Southern Sask CGU and the Alberta CGU. When significant parts of an item of property, plant and equipment, including helium interests, have different useful lives, they are accounted for as separate items (major components).

Gains and losses on disposal of an item of property, plant and equipment, including helium interests, are determined by comparing the proceeds from disposal with the carrying amount of property, plant and equipment and are recognized in profit or loss.

Subsequent Costs

Costs incurred subsequent to the determination of technical feasibility and commercial viability and the costs of replacing parts of property, plant and equipment are recognized as property, plant and equipment only when they increase the future economic benefits embodied in the specific asset to which they relate. All other expenditures are recognized in profit or loss as incurred. Such capitalized helium interests generally represent costs incurred in developing resources and bringing in or enhancing production from such resources and are accumulated on a field or geotechnical area basis. The carrying amount of any replaced or sold component is

Royal Helium Ltd.

Notes to the Consolidated Financial Statements

Years Ended December 31, 2023 and 2022

(Expressed in Canadian dollars)

3. MATERIAL ACCOUNTING POLICIES (continued)

derecognized. The costs of the day-to-day servicing of property, plant and equipment are recognized in profit or loss as incurred.

Depletion and Depreciation

The net carrying value of development or production assets is depleted using the unit-of-production method by reference to the ratio of production in the year to the related best estimate resources, taking into account estimated future development costs necessary to bring those resources into production. Future development costs are estimated taking into account the level of development required to produce the resources. These estimates are reviewed by Company at least quarterly.

For other assets, depreciation is recognized in profit or loss on a declining balance basis over the estimated useful lives of each part of an item of property, plant and equipment. Leased assets are depreciated over the shorter of the lease term and their useful lives unless it is reasonably certain that the Company will obtain ownership by the end of the lease term. Land is not depreciated.

The estimated useful lives for other assets for the current and comparative years are as follows:

- | | |
|----------------------------------|-----------------------------|
| • Office equipment and fixtures | 30% declining basis |
| • Computer hardware and software | 30% declining basis |
| • Property, plant and equipment | 20% declining basis |
| • Facility | 25 year straight line basis |

Depreciation methods, useful lives and residual values are reviewed at each reporting date.

Impairment**Non-Financial Assets**

The carrying amounts of the Company's non-financial assets, other than exploration and evaluation assets and deferred tax assets, are reviewed at each reporting date to determine whether there is any indication of impairment. If any such indication exists, then the asset's recoverable amount is estimated.

For the purpose of impairment testing, assets are grouped together into the smallest group of assets that generates cash inflows from continuing use that are largely independent of the cash inflows of other assets or groups of assets (the CGUs). The recoverable amount of an asset or a CGU is the greater of its value in use and its fair value less cost to sell.

In assessing value in use, the estimated future cash flows are discounted to their present value using a pre-tax discount rate that reflects current market assessments of the time value of money and the risks specific to the asset. Value in use is generally computed by reference to the present value of the future cash flows expected to be derived from production of best case helium resources.

Fair value less cost to sell is determined as the amount that would be obtained from the sale of a CGU in an arm's length transaction between knowledgeable and willing parties. The fair value less cost to sell helium assets is generally determined as the net present value of the estimated future cash flows expected to arise from the continued use of the CGU, including any expansion prospects, and its eventual disposal, using assumptions that an independent market participant may take into account. These cash flows are discounted by an appropriate discount rate, which would be applied by such a market participant to arrive at a net present value of the CGU. Consideration is given to acquisition metrics of recent transactions completed on similar assets to those contained within the relevant CGU.

Royal Helium Ltd.

Notes to the Consolidated Financial Statements

Years Ended December 31, 2023 and 2022

(Expressed in Canadian dollars)

3. MATERIAL ACCOUNTING POLICIES (continued)

An impairment loss is recognized if the carrying amount of an asset or its CGU exceeds its estimated recoverable amount. Impairment losses are recognized in profit or loss.

Exploration and evaluation assets are assessed for impairment if facts and circumstances suggest that the carrying amount exceeds the recoverable amount and when sufficient data exists to determine technical feasibility and commercial viability. For purposes of impairment testing, E&E assets are allocated to CGUs or groups of CGUs.

Impairment losses, for non-financial assets other than goodwill, recognized in prior years are assessed at each reporting date for any indications that the loss has decreased or no longer exists. An impairment loss is reversed if there has been a change in the estimates used to determine the recoverable amount. An impairment loss is reversed only to the extent that the asset's carrying amount does not exceed the carrying amount that would have been determined, net of depletion and depreciation or amortization, if no impairment loss had been recognized.

Income taxes

Income taxes comprise current and deferred income taxes. Income taxes are recognized in the consolidated statements of loss, except to the extent that they relate to items recognized directly in other comprehensive income (OCI) or directly in shareholders' equity, in which case, the income taxes are also recognized directly in OCI or shareholders' equity, respectively. Current income taxes are the expected taxes payable on the taxable income for the year, using tax rates enacted or substantively enacted, at the end of the reporting period, and any adjustment to tax payable in respect of previous years.

In general, deferred income taxes are recognized in respect of temporary differences arising between the tax bases of assets and liabilities and their carrying amounts in the consolidated financial statements. However, deferred income taxes are not recognized if they arise from the initial recognition of goodwill or the initial recognition of an asset or liability in a transaction other than a business combination that, at the time of the transaction, affects neither accounting nor taxable income nor loss. Deferred income taxes are provided on temporary differences arising on investments in subsidiaries and associates, except, in the case of subsidiaries, where the timing of the reversal of the temporary difference is controlled by the Company and it is probable that the temporary difference will not reverse in the foreseeable future.

Deferred income taxes are determined on a non-discounted basis using tax rates and laws that have been enacted or substantively enacted at the consolidated statement of financial position dates and are expected to apply when the deferred income tax asset is realized or liability is settled. Deferred income tax assets are recognized to the extent that it is probable that future taxable income will be available against which the deductible temporary differences can be utilized. Deferred income tax assets and liabilities are presented as non-current.

Share-based payments and warrants

RHL grants stock options to certain employees, directors, consultants and contractors of the Company. Equity-settled share-based payments to employees and others providing similar services are measured at the fair value of the equity instruments at the grant date as the fair value of services received cannot be reliably estimated. Details regarding the determination of the fair value of equity-settled share-based transactions are set out in the share-based payment note.

The fair value is measured at grant date and each tranche is recognized on a graded-vesting basis over the period in which options vest. At the end of each reporting period, the Company revises its estimate of the

Royal Helium Ltd.

Notes to the Consolidated Financial Statements

Years Ended December 31, 2023 and 2022

(Expressed in Canadian dollars)

3. MATERIAL ACCOUNTING POLICIES (continued)

number of equity instruments expected to vest. The impact of the revision of the original estimates, if any, is recognized in profit or loss such that the cumulative expense reflects the revised estimate, with a corresponding adjustment to share-based payment reserve.

Stock-based compensation expense is recognized over the tranche's vesting period by increasing contributed surplus based on the number of awards expected to vest. This number is reviewed at least annually, with any change in estimate recognized immediately in stock-based compensation expense with a corresponding adjustment to contributed surplus.

Equity-settled share-based payment transactions with parties other than employees are measured at the fair value of the goods or services received, except where that fair value cannot be estimated reliably, in which case they are measured at the fair value of the equity instruments granted, measured at the date the entity obtains the goods or the counterparty renders the service. Each tranche in an award is considered a separate award with its own vesting period and grant date fair value. The fair value of each tranche is measured at the date of grant using the Black-Scholes option pricing model. For share based payment arrangements with cash alternatives, these are structured so that the fair value of one settlement alternative is the same as the other. In such cases, the fair value of the equity component will be zero, and hence the fair value of the compound instrument will be the same as the fair value of the debt component.

The consideration received from private placement units and the issuance of warrants is allocated to share capital.

Loss per share

Loss per share is based on the weighted average number of common shares of the Company outstanding during the period. The diluted loss per share reflects the potential dilution of common share equivalents, such as outstanding share options and warrants, in the weighted average number of common shares outstanding during the period, if dilutive.

Related parties

Parties are considered to be related if one party has the ability, directly or indirectly, to control the other party or exercise significant influence over the other party in making financial and operating decisions. Parties are also considered to be related if they are subject to common control. Related parties may be individuals or corporate entities. A transaction is considered to be a related party transaction when there is a transfer of resources or obligations between related parties.

Revenue

Revenue from the sale of helium is recognized when control of the product is transferred to the buyer based on the consideration specified in the contracts with customers. This usually occurs when the product is physically transferred at the delivery point agreed upon in the contract and legal title to the product passes to the customer.

The Company evaluates its arrangements with third parties to determine if the Company acts as the principal or as an agent. In making this evaluation, the Company considers if it obtains control of the product delivered or services provided, which is indicated by the Company having the primary responsibility for the delivery of the product or rendering of the service, having the ability to establish prices or having inventory risk. If the Company acts in the capacity of an agent rather than as a principal in a transaction, then the revenue is recognized on a net-basis, only reflecting the fee, if any, realized by the Company.

4. MANAGEMENT'S CRITICAL ACCOUNTING ESTIMATES AND JUDGMENTS

Convertible debentures

The Debentures are a non-derivative financial instrument that creates a financial liability of the entity and grants an option to the holder of the instrument to convert it into common shares of the Company. The liability component of the Debentures is initially recorded at the fair value of a similar liability that does not have a conversion option. The equity component is recognized initially, net of deferred income taxes, as the difference between gross proceeds and the fair value of the liability component. Transaction costs are allocated to the liability and equity components in proportion to the allocation of proceeds. Subsequent to initial recognition, the liability component of the Debentures is measured at amortized cost using the effective interest method and is accreted each period, such that the carrying value will equal the principal amount outstanding at maturity. The equity component is not re-measured. The carrying amounts of the liability and equity components of the Debentures are reclassified to shareholders' capital on conversion to common shares.

The preparation of consolidated financial statements requires management to use judgment in applying its accounting policies and estimates and assumptions about the future. Estimates and other judgments are continuously evaluated and are based on management's experience and other factors, including expectations about future events that are believed to be reasonable under the circumstances. The following discusses the most significant accounting judgments and estimates that the Company has made in the preparation of the consolidated financial statements:

Significant Estimates

Decommissioning liabilities

The Company is required to provide for decommissioning liabilities. The Company must estimate these costs in accordance with existing laws, contracts and other policies. The estimate of future costs involves a number of estimates relating to timing, type of costs and associated contract negotiations, and review of potential methods and technical advancements. Furthermore, due to uncertainties concerning environmental remediation, the ultimate cost of the Company's decommissioning liability could differ from amounts provided. The estimate of the Company's obligation is subject to change due to amendments to applicable laws and regulations and as new information concerning the Company's operations become available.

The Company is not able to determine the impact on its financial position, if any, of environmental laws and regulations that may be enacted in the future.

Share-based payments

The Company has a variety of share-based payments to employees, directors, consultants and contractors as well as share-based payments issued as consideration for acquisitions. When share-based awards are granted, the Company measures the fair value of each award and recognizes the amount as expense over the vesting period. Management makes a variety of assumptions in calculating the fair value of share-based payments. Management uses the Black-Scholes option pricing model in determining the fair value of its share-based payments. Application of the option pricing model requires estimates in expected dividend yields, expected volatility of the underlying assets based on past volatility experienced and the expected life of the award granted. These estimates may ultimately be different from the estimates initially made, resulting in an overstatement or understatement of net loss.

Convertible debentures

The liability component of the Debentures is initially recorded at the fair value of a similar liability that does not have a conversion option. Management makes a variety of assumptions in calculating the fair value on the initial recognition of the liability component based on the interest rates similar liability that do not have a conversion option would be.

Royal Helium Ltd.

Notes to the Consolidated Financial Statements

Years Ended December 31, 2023 and 2022

(Expressed in Canadian dollars)

4. MANAGEMENT'S CRITICAL ACCOUNTING ESTIMATES AND JUDGMENTS (continued)**Significant Judgments***Impairment of non-financial assets*

The Company's fair value measurement with respect to the carrying amount of non-financial assets is based on numerous assumptions and may differ significantly from actual fair values. The fair values are based, in part, on certain factors that may be partially or totally outside of the Company's control. This evaluation involves a comparison of the estimated fair values of non-financial assets to their carrying values. The Company's fair value estimates are based on numerous assumptions. The fair value estimates may differ from actual fair values and these differences may be significant and could have a material impact on the Company's financial position and result of operations. Assets are reviewed for an indication of impairment at each reporting date. This determination requires significant judgment. Factors which could trigger an impairment review include, but are not limited to, significant negative industry or economic trends, interruptions in exploration and evaluation activities and a significant drop in helium prices.

Exploration and evaluation ("E&E") assets

The application of the Company's accounting policy for E&E requires management to make certain judgments as to future events and circumstances as to whether economic quantities of helium resources have been found in assessing economic and technical feasibility. The Company assesses its exploration and evaluation assets to determine whether any indication of impairment exists at the end of each reporting period. Significant judgment is required in determining whether indicators of impairment exist, including factors and considerations such as the remaining period for which the Company has the right to explore, whether expenditures on further exploration and evaluation of helium properties are planned, whether commercially viable quantities of helium resources have been discovered or whether data exists to suggest the carrying amount is unlikely to be recovered.

5. STEVEVILLE ACQUISITION

On July 22, 2022, the Company completed an acquisition of Imperial Helium Corp. ("the Acquisition") of certain helium properties located in Southern Alberta (the "Steveville Assets"). The Acquisition was completed for total non-cash consideration of \$21,382,528 as further outlined below. The common shares have been ascribed a fair value of \$0.32 per common share issued, as determined based on the Company's closing share price on July 22, 2022.

The Company incurred transaction costs of \$408,827 in fees and commissions, which were capitalized to exploration and evaluation assets.

The transaction has been accounted for as an asset acquisition.

Royal Helium Ltd.

Notes to the Consolidated Financial Statements

Years Ended December 31, 2023 and 2022

(Expressed in Canadian dollars)

5. STEVEVILLE ACQUISITION (continued)

The purchase price, based on management's estimates of fair values, is as follows:

| Net assets acquired: | Steveville Acquisition | |
|---|-------------------------------|-------------------|
| Cash and cash equivalents | \$ | 31,364 |
| Accounts receivables | | 122,196 |
| Prepaid | | 42,176 |
| Exploration and evaluation assets | | 23,538,631 |
| Property, plant and equipment | | 37,005 |
| Accounts payables and accrued liabilities | | (1,801,500) |
| Decommissioning liability | | (178,517) |
| Net assets acquired | \$ | 21,791,355 |

| | | |
|--|-----------|-------------------|
| Consideration | | |
| Common shares (63,867,217 at \$0.32 per share) | \$ | 20,437,509 |
| Replacement stock options (note 16) | | 26,771 |
| Replacement warrants (note 17) | | 400,318 |
| Replacement broker options (note 17) | | 517,930 |
| Transaction costs - cash | | 408,827 |
| Total consideration paid | \$ | 21,791,355 |

6. CASH AND CASH EQUIVALENTS

| | December 31, 2023 | December 31, 2022 |
|--|------------------------------|------------------------------|
| Cash at bank and on hand | \$ 2,611,794 | \$ 1,002,973 |
| Total cash and cash equivalents | \$ 2,611,794 | \$ 1,002,973 |

| | | |
|------------------------------|-------------------|-------------|
| GIC's held as collateral | \$ 42,000 | \$ - |
| Interest reserve | 191,831 | - |
| Total restricted cash | \$ 233,831 | \$ - |

Royal Helium Ltd.

Notes to the Consolidated Financial Statements

Years Ended December 31, 2023 and 2022

(Expressed in Canadian dollars)

7. EXPLORATION AND EVALUATION ASSETS

| | Balance as at January 1, 2022 | Acquisition / Renewals | Consultants and Geophysics | Drilling | Expiry and transfers | Other Exploration | Balance as at December 31, 2022 |
|-----------------|-------------------------------------|---------------------------|----------------------------------|--------------|-------------------------|----------------------|---------------------------------------|
| Bengough/ Ogema | \$ 6,411,022 | \$ - | \$ 23,134 | \$ 542,749 | \$ - | \$ 53,614 | \$ 7,030,519 |
| Cadillac | 77,931 | 3,151 | 200,658 | - | - | 30,813 | 312,553 |
| Climax | 11,614,138 | 7,313 | 1,209,884 | 237,439 | - | (1,740,898) | 11,327,876 |
| Coronach | 25,000 | - | - | - | - | 952 | 25,952 |
| Creelman | 25,000 | 4,203 | 9,000 | - | - | - | 38,203 |
| Francis | 2,446 | 5,871 | - | - | - | 33,491 | 41,808 |
| Midale | 20,135 | - | - | - | - | 10,989 | 31,124 |
| Minton | - | 1,214 | 6,000 | - | - | - | 7,214 |
| Steveville | - | 23,538,631 | - | - | - | (18,618) | 23,520,013 |
| Swift current | - | - | 42,665 | - | - | - | 42,665 |
| Val Marie | 109,405 | 1,334 | 490,086 | 2,355,856 | - | 26,539 | 2,983,220 |
| Weyburn | 127,886 | - | - | - | - | 37,525 | 165,411 |
| 40 Mile | - | - | 99,875 | - | - | - | 99,875 |
| | \$ 18,412,963 | \$ 23,561,717 | \$ 2,081,302 | \$ 3,136,044 | \$ - | \$ (1,565,593) | \$ 45,626,433 |

On September 28, 2022, the Saskatchewan government issued \$1,791,187 royalty credits to the Company, of which \$1,790,000 were sold on September 29, 2022 for \$1,600,000 to a third party Saskatchewan oil company. The credits were received in relation to the Climax Hydraulic stimulation program as previously approved under the Saskatchewan Petroleum Innovation Incentive ("SPII") program. The Company has reduced other exploration costs for the Climax project for the \$1,791,187 royalty credits received and recorded \$190,000 loss on sale of royalty credits. At December 31, 2022 the remaining \$1,187 royalty tax credits are recorded in accounts receivable.

| | Balance as at January 1, 2023 | Acquisition / Renewals | Consultants and Geophysics | Drilling | Expiry and transfers | Other Exploration | Balance as at December 31, 2023 |
|-----------------|-------------------------------------|---------------------------|----------------------------------|-----------|-------------------------|----------------------|---------------------------------------|
| Bengough/ Ogema | \$ 7,030,519 | \$ 30,405 | \$ 866 | \$ 17,784 | \$ - | \$ (4,673) | \$ 7,074,901 |
| Cadillac | 312,553 | 81,691 | 131,564 | - | - | - | 525,808 |
| Climax | 11,327,876 | (43,499) | - | - | - | (6,956) | 11,277,421 |
| Coronach | 25,952 | - | - | - | - | 10,352 | 36,304 |
| Creelman | 38,203 | 6,763 | - | - | (38,527) | 651 | 7,090 |
| Francis | 41,808 | 6,818 | - | - | (73,821) | 33,491 | 8,296 |
| Midale | 31,124 | 4,360 | - | - | - | - | 35,484 |
| Minton | 7,214 | - | - | - | - | - | 7,214 |
| Steveville | 23,520,013 | 352,615 | 23,212 | - | (501,746) | (3,165) | 23,390,929 |
| Swift current | 42,665 | - | 39,269 | - | - | - | 81,934 |
| Val Marie | 2,983,400 | 3,798 | 21,116 | - | - | (2,271) | 3,006,043 |
| Weyburn | 165,411 | 9,876 | - | - | (177,433) | 31,565 | 29,419 |
| 40 Mile | 99,875 | 401,735 | 40,440 | - | - | - | 542,050 |
| | \$ 45,626,613 | \$ 854,562 | \$ 256,467 | \$ 17,784 | \$ (791,527) | \$ 58,994 | \$ 46,022,893 |

Royal Helium Ltd.

Notes to the Consolidated Financial Statements

Years Ended December 31, 2023 and 2022

(Expressed in Canadian dollars)

7. EXPLORATION AND EVALUATION ASSETS (continued)

Included in other exploration costs for the Climax project is a reduction of \$6,956 (December 31, 2022 – reduction of \$11,021) and for the Ogema project is a reduction of \$5,976 (December 31, 2022 – reduction of \$9,468) and for the Val Marie project is a reduction of \$2,319 (December 31, 2022 – increase of \$26,539) and for the Steveville project is a reduction of \$8,313 (December 31, 2022 – \$nil) which is related to the estimated decommissioning liability (note 11).

The Company holds helium exploration permits and helium leases over land in Saskatchewan and Alberta. The Company has annual lease expenditure commitments of approximately \$228,878 and annual permit expenditure commitments as follows 2024 - \$85,000, 2025 - \$65,000, 2026 - \$75,000 and 2027 - \$nil.

During the year, the Company allowed certain claims to expire as it was determined that future work would be focused on other properties.

In addition, the Company completed its helium processing facility and determined that \$501,746 should be transferred from exploration and evaluation assets to helium producing properties included in property, plant and equipment (note 8). There were no impairment on the transfer of exploration and evaluation to helium producing properties.

There were no impairment indicators for the exploration and evaluation assets as of December 31, 2023 and 2022.

8. PROPERTY, PLANT AND EQUIPMENT

| | Computer Hardware | Helium Producing Properties | Facility | Rent to Own | Total |
|---|----------------------|-----------------------------------|----------------------|---------------------|----------------------|
| <u>Cost</u> | | | | | |
| Balance, December 31, 2021 | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - |
| Additions – Steveville acquisition (note 5) | 37,005 | - | - | - | 37,005 |
| Additions | 3,074 | - | 11,107,896 | - | 11,110,970 |
| Balance, December 31, 2022 | 40,079 | - | 11,107,896 | - | 11,147,975 |
| Additions | 2,541 | - | 22,363,393 | 2,775,390 | 25,141,324 |
| Decommissioning | - | - | 302,093 | - | 302,093 |
| Transfers (note 7) | - | 501,746 | - | - | 501,746 |
| Balance, December 31, 2023 | \$ 42,620 | \$ 501,746 | \$ 33,773,382 | \$ 2,775,390 | \$ 37,093,138 |
| <u>Accumulated amortization</u> | | | | | |
| Balance, December 31, 2021 and 2022 | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - |
| Depreciation | 11,101 | - | - | 395,798 | 406,899 |
| Balance, December 31, 2023 | \$ 11,101 | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 395,798 | \$ 406,899 |
| <u>Carrying Value</u> | | | | | |
| Balance, December 31, 2022 | \$ 40,079 | \$ - | \$ 11,107,896 | \$ - | \$ 11,147,975 |
| Balance, December 31, 2023 | \$ 31,519 | \$ 501,746 | \$ 33,773,382 | \$ 2,379,592 | \$ 36,686,239 |

Royal Helium Ltd.

Notes to the Consolidated Financial Statements

Years Ended December 31, 2023 and 2022

(Expressed in Canadian dollars)

8. PROPERTY, PLANT AND EQUIPMENT (continued)

Property plant and equipment additions in the period relate to the helium processing facility, which is under construction. Since the facility is under construction, it is not available for use and is not being depreciated. Near the end of the year, the facility became available for use and \$501,746 was transferred from exploration and evaluation assets to property, plant and equipment (note 7).

9. RIGHT OF USE ASSET

The Company has a lease agreement for the helium transport trailers.

The continuity of the right of use asset ("ROU") and lease liability for the years ended December 31, 2023 and 2022 is as follows:

| | | |
|--|-----------|--------------------|
| Right of use asset | | |
| Value of ROU as at December 31, 2022 | \$ | - |
| Initial recognition of ROU | | 5,037,548 |
| Depreciation | | (534,525) |
| Value of ROU as at December 31, 2023 | \$ | 4,503,123 |
| Lease liability | | |
| Lease liability as at December 31, 2022 | \$ | - |
| Initial recognition of lease liability | | 5,037,548 |
| Lease payments | | (677,057) |
| Lease accretion | | 280,014 |
| Lease liability as at December 31, 2023 | \$ | 4,640,505 |
| Current portion | \$ | 926,871 |
| Long-term portion | | 3,713,634 |
| | | \$4,640,505 |

Lease obligation

The Company's total undiscounted amount of cash flow required to settle its lease obligation is approximately \$5,800,000 at December 31, 2023 and is expected to settle in 2027. The Company applied a discount rate of 12% to calculate the discounted value of the lease obligation at initial recognition.

10. ACCOUNTS PAYABLE AND ACCRUED LIABILITIES

| | December 31, 2023 | December 31, 2022 |
|---------------------|------------------------------|------------------------------|
| Accounts payable | \$ 5,891,044 | \$ 8,633,796 |
| Accruals and others | 137,332 | 147,190 |
| | \$ 6,028,376 | \$ 8,780,986 |

Royal Helium Ltd.

Notes to the Consolidated Financial Statements

Years Ended December 31, 2023 and 2022

(Expressed in Canadian dollars)

11. DECOMMISSIONING LIABILITIES

| | December 31, 2023 | December 31, 2022 |
|---|----------------------|----------------------|
| Balance, beginning of year | \$ 375,994 | \$ 203,333 |
| Additions – Steveville acquisition (note 5) | - | 178,517 |
| Additions | 302,093 | 26,137 |
| Change in inflation and discount rate | (23,564) | (41,542) |
| Accretion | 9,040 | 9,549 |
| Balance, end of year | \$ 663,563 | \$ 375,994 |

The total of the decommissioning liabilities are estimated based on the Company's net ownership interest in all the wells, the estimated costs to reclaim and abandon the wells and facilities and the estimated timing of the costs to be incurred in future periods. Management of the Company has estimated that based on their net ownership interest, the total undiscounted cash flows required to settle the obligations will be \$852,586. The obligations have been discounted using a risk free rate of 3.02% (December 31, 2022 - 3.28%) and an inflation rate of 1.62% (December 31, 2022 - 2.09%) per year. Most of these obligations are not expected to be settled until approximately 10 years in the future and will be funded from general Company resources at that time.

As December 31, 2023, the Company has a \$101,550 (December 31, 2022 - \$101,550) deposit held by the Saskatchewan government for future site reclamation.

12. RENT TO OWN DEBT OBLIGATION**Rent to own liability**

| | |
|--|---------------------|
| Rent to own liability as at December 31, 2022 | \$ - |
| Initial recognition of debt | 2,775,390 |
| Payments | (873,862) |
| Rent to own accretion | 134,107 |
| Rent to own liability as at December 31, 2023 | \$ 2,035,635 |
| Current portion | \$ 742,188 |
| Long-term portion | 1,293,447 |
| | \$ 2,035,635 |

Rent to own obligation

The Company's total undiscounted amount of cash flow required to settle its rent to own obligation is approximately \$2,366,310 at December 31, 2023 and is expected to settle in 2026. The Company applied a discount rate of 12% to calculate the discounted value of the rent to own obligation at initial recognition and the asset is held as collateral on the debt obligation.

Royal Helium Ltd.

Notes to the Consolidated Financial Statements

Years Ended December 31, 2023 and 2022

(Expressed in Canadian dollars)

13. CONVERTIBLE DEBENTURES

a) On February 8, 2023, the Company closed a bought deal financing and issued 5,500 units for gross proceeds of \$5,500,000. Each unit consists of \$1,000 convertible debenture principal amount and 3,846 common share purchase warrants. The convertible debenture bears interest at 14% per annum, is paid semi annually in arrears and matures on December 31, 2025. Each warrant is exercisable at \$0.32 for a period of 36 months and the Company may elect to accelerate the expiry date in the event the volume weighted average trading price exceeds \$0.65 per share for 20 consecutive trading days.

The convertible debentures are convertible at the holder's option into common shares at a fixed conversion price of \$0.26 per share.

As the debenture has a conversion feature, the equity and debt components must be bifurcated with value assigned to each as well as to the warrants issued as part of the offering. The value assigned to the liability on the date of issuance was the present value of the contractually determined stream of future cash flows discounted at 26.99%, being the estimated rate that the market would apply to an instrument with comparable credit status and provide substantially the same cash flows, on the same terms, but without the conversion option. From the date of issuance, the liability component accretes up to its principal value using the effective interest method, with the charge recorded in the consolidated statement of loss. The fair value assigned to the warrants and the conversion feature, on the date of issuance, was based on the Black-Scholes option pricing model for each and assigned on a relative fair value basis. This resulted in an initial amount of \$4,568,000 being allocated to the liability portion and \$475,520 being allocated to the equity portion and \$456,480 to the warrant.

During the year, \$1,280,000 of principal was converted into common shares. As at December 31, 2023, the principal amount owing was \$4,220,000.

b) On June 12, 2023, the Company closed a bought deal financing and issued 7,300 units for gross proceeds of \$7,300,000. Each unit consists of \$1,000 convertible debenture principal amount and 2,703 common share purchase warrants. The convertible debenture bears interest at 12% per annum, is paid semi annually in arrears and matures on June 30, 2025. Each warrant is exercisable at \$0.40 for a period of 36 months and the Company.

The convertible debentures are convertible at the holder's option into common shares at a fixed conversion price of \$0.37 per share.

As the debenture has a conversion feature, the equity and debt components must be bifurcated with value assigned to each as well as to the warrants issued as part of the offering. The value assigned to the liability on the date of issuance was the present value of the contractually determined stream of future cash flows discounted at 25.63%, being the estimated rate that the market would apply to an instrument with comparable credit status and provide substantially the same cash flows, on the same terms, but without the conversion option. From the date of issuance, the liability component accretes up to its principal value using the effective interest method, with the charge recorded in the consolidated statement of loss. The fair value assigned to the warrants and the conversion feature, on the date of issuance, was based on the Black-Scholes option pricing model for each and assigned on a relative fair value basis. This resulted in an initial amount of \$6,318,000 being allocated to the liability portion and \$378,790 being allocated to the equity portion and \$603,210 to the warrant.

As at December 31, 2023, the principal amount owing was \$7,300,000. After the reporting period, \$2,500,000 principal amount was converted to common shares.

Royal Helium Ltd.

Notes to the Consolidated Financial Statements

Years Ended December 31, 2023 and 2022

(Expressed in Canadian dollars)

13. CONVERTIBLE DEBENTURES (continued)

| | Liability Component | | Equity Component |
|-----------------------------------|----------------------|----------------------|-------------------|
| | Face Value | Carrying Value | Carrying Value |
| Balance, December 31, 2022 | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - |
| Issuance - initial recognition | 12,800,000 | 10,886,000 | 854,310 |
| Less: issuance costs | - | (1,145,899) | - |
| Interest | - | 848,521 | - |
| Accretion - interest | - | 652,032 | - |
| Conversion | (1,280,000) | (1,003,594) | (122,025) |
| Balance, December 31, 2023 | \$ 11,520,000 | \$ 10,237,060 | \$ 732,285 |

On June 30, 2023, the Company paid accrued debenture interest by issuing 822,044 common shares, valued at \$283,605. The interest accrued at the time of the issuance was \$299,562, and the \$8,246 difference was recorded against interest expense. In January 2, 2024, the Company paid accrued debenture interest by issuing 3,788,660 common shares, valued at \$784,253.

14. TERM DEBT

On April 24, 2023, the Company closed a term debt financing, and received its first draw, with Canadian Western bank ("CWB") and Business Development Bank of Canada ("BDC"), acting pari passu, for \$7,500,000 each, \$15,000,000 in total.

On December 21, 2023, Canadian Western bank ("CWB") and Business Development bank of Canada, acting pari passu, increased the term loans for \$1,800,000 each, and extended the first principal repayment date to February 1, 2024.

As of December 31, 2023, the Company has drawn the full debt facility. During the year ended December 31, 2023 the Company has paid \$697,210 interest related to the term debt, \$352,695 has been capitalized to property, plant and equipment and \$344,515 has been expensed.

| | CWB | BDC | Total |
|--|---------------------|---------------------|----------------------|
| Balance as at December 31, 2022 | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - |
| Debt advances | 9,300,000 | 9,300,000 | 18,600,000 |
| Rent to own liability as at December 31, 2023 | \$ 9,300,000 | \$ 9,300,000 | \$ 18,600,000 |
| Current portion | 1,617,391 | 1,594,700 | 3,212,091 |
| Long term portion | 7,682,609 | 7,705,300 | 15,387,909 |
| | \$ 9,300,000 | \$ 9,300,000 | \$ 18,600,000 |

CWB

Prime rate plus 3%, secured by all present and future assets, repayable in monthly blended payments of \$134,783 principal plus accrued interest, maturing on February 1, 2030. Repayable at any time without penalty.

Under the terms of the debt, the Company is required to maintain a cash flow coverage ratio of not less than 1.10 and a debt to tangible net work ratio not greater than 1.25, beginning December 31, 2024.

Royal Helium Ltd.

Notes to the Consolidated Financial Statements

Years Ended December 31, 2023 and 2022

(Expressed in Canadian dollars)

14. TERM DEBT (continued)BDC

BDC floating rate, secured by all present and future assets, repayable in monthly blended payments of \$132,850 principal plus accrued interest, maturing on February 1, 2030. Once in any 12 month period, the Company can prepay up to 15% of the outstanding principal without penalty.

Under the terms of the debt, the Company is required to maintain a fixed charge coverage ratio of 1.10, beginning December 31, 2024.

In addition, CWB has provided the Company with a \$2,500,000 demand operating loan for working capital purposes. At December 31, 2023, no funds have been drawn from the demand operating loan. The Company's access to the operating loan is limited to 75% of Canadian trade accounts and 90% of good earned United States trade accounts that are Economic Development Canada insured and do not exceed 90 days aging.

15. SHARE CAPITAL AND EQUITY RESERVES

Authorized share capital - the authorized share capital consists of an unlimited number of common shares.

Changes in issued share capital are as follows:

| | Number of common shares | Amount |
|--|------------------------------------|----------------------|
| Balance, December 31, 2021 | 142,621,726 | 47,415,565 |
| Share issuance – bought deal | 30,963,750 | 8,050,575 |
| Share issuance – Steeveville acquisition (note 5) | 63,867,217 | 20,437,509 |
| Share issuance – stock option exercise | 515,600 | 205,086 |
| Share issuance – broker warrant exercise | 1,286,250 | 541,980 |
| Fair value allocation – broker warrants | - | (176,493) |
| Share issue costs | - | (899,509) |
| Balance, December 31, 2022 | 239,254,543 | 75,574,713 |
| Share issuance – financing | 21,562,500 | 5,175,000 |
| Share issuance – warrant exercise | 3,317,500 | 1,061,600 |
| Share issuance – broker warrant exercise | 69,669 | 24,733 |
| Share issuance – shares for debt | 1,373,133 | 496,686 |
| Share issuance – conversion of debenture | 4,922,880 | 1,125,620 |
| Share issuance – Acquisition of exploration and evaluation asset | 468,796 | 161,735 |
| Shares issuance – payment of debenture interest | 822,044 | 283,605 |
| Fair value allocation – broker warrants | - | (136,575) |
| Share issue costs | - | (650,746) |
| Balance, December 31, 2023 | 271,791,065 | \$ 83,116,371 |

On July 22, 2022, the Company closed the Steeveville acquisition and issued 63,867,217 common shares valued at \$0.32 per common share (see note 5).

Royal Helium Ltd.

Notes to the Consolidated Financial Statements

Years Ended December 31, 2023 and 2022

(Expressed in Canadian dollars)

15. SHARE CAPITAL AND EQUITY RESERVES (continued)

On October 13, 2022, the Company completed a first close on a bought deal financing of 27,912,982 units at a price of \$0.26 per unit for gross proceeds of \$7,257,375. Each unit consisted of one common share and one common share purchase warrant, each whole warrant exercisable at \$0.32 for a 36 month period. The Company paid \$435,443 cash finder's fees and other expenses and issued 1,674,779 broker warrants. The broker warrants are exercisable into units at \$0.26 per unit, with each unit comprised of one common share and one common share purchase warrant, each whole warrant exercisable at \$0.32 for a 36 month period from the closing date of the financing (see note 17).

On October 19, 2022, the Company completed a final close on a bought deal financing of 3,050,768 units at a price of \$0.26 per unit for gross proceeds of \$793,200. Each unit consisted of one common share and one common share purchase warrant, each whole warrant exercisable at \$0.32 for a 36 month period. The Company paid \$47,592 cash finder's fees and other expenses and issued 183,046 broker warrants. The broker warrants are exercisable into units at \$0.26 per unit, with each unit comprised of one common share and one common share purchase warrant, each whole warrant exercisable at \$0.32 for a 36 month period from the closing date of the financing (see note 17).

On April 21, 2023, the Company completed issued 1,069,383 common shares as settlement of \$365,746 in accounts payable. At the date of issuance, the common shares were valued at \$0.37 per common share and the Company recorded a loss on settlement of \$52,603.

On June 30, 2023, the Company closed the 40 mile property acquisition and issued 468,796 common shares valued at \$0.345 per common share.

On July 19, 2023, the Company completed issued 303,750 common shares as settlement of \$118,539 in accounts payable. At the date of issuance, the common shares were valued at \$0.32 per common share and the Company recorded a gain on settlement \$21,339.

On November 14, 2023, the Company completed a first close on a bought deal financing of 18,750,000 units at a price of \$0.24 per unit for gross proceeds of \$4,500,000. Each unit consisted of one common share and one common share purchase warrant, each whole warrant exercisable at \$0.31 for a 36 month period. The Company paid \$472,191 cash finder's fees and other expenses and issued 1,050,000 broker warrants. The broker warrants are exercisable into units at \$0.24 per unit, with each unit comprised of one common share and one common share purchase warrant, each whole warrant exercisable at \$0.31 for a 36 month period from the closing date of the financing (see note 17).

On December 14, 2023, the Company completed a final close on a bought deal financing of 2,812,500 units at a price of \$0.24 per unit for gross proceeds of \$675,000. Each unit consisted of one common share and one common share purchase warrant, each whole warrant exercisable at \$0.31 for a 36 month period. The Company paid \$73,519 cash finder's fees and other expenses and issued 168,750 broker warrants. The broker warrants are exercisable into units at \$0.24 per unit, with each unit comprised of one common share and one common share purchase warrant, each whole warrant exercisable at \$0.31 for a 36 month period from the closing date of the financing (see note 17).

Royal Helium Ltd.

Notes to the Consolidated Financial Statements

Years Ended December 31, 2023 and 2022

(Expressed in Canadian dollars)

16. STOCK OPTIONS

On September 14, 2022, the shareholders of the Company approved a stock option plan, pursuant to which, the Company may issue up to a number of options that is 10% of the outstanding common shares of the Company to employees, directors and officers.

The following table reflects the continuity of stock options for the years presented:

| | Number of stock options | Weighted average exercise price |
|--|------------------------------------|--|
| Balance, December 31, 2021 | 10,250,000 | \$ 0.43 |
| Issued – Steveville acquisition (note 5) | 552,600 | 0.33 |
| Issued – Steveville acquisition (note 5) | 3,653,300 | 0.41 |
| Issued | 6,090,000 | 0.26 |
| Exercised | (245,600) | 0.33 |
| Exercised | (270,000) | 0.23 |
| Expired | (307,000) | 0.33 |
| Expired | (3,653,300) | 0.41 |
| Balance, December 31, 2022 | 16,070,000 | 0.37 |
| Issued | 1,250,000 | 0.38 |
| Issued | 500,000 | 0.40 |
| Exercisable, December 31, 2023 | 17,820,000 | \$ 0.37 |

As at December 31, 2023, 17,820,000 (December 31, 2022 – 16,070,000) options were issued and outstanding and exercisable with a weighted average remaining life of 2.91 years (December 31, 2022 – 3.75).

On July 22, 2022, the Company granted 552,600 replacement stock options as part of the consideration for the acquisition of Steveville Acquisition (see note 5). The options have an exercise price of \$0.33, expire August 21, 2022 and vest immediately. The grant date fair value of the options was estimated using the Black-Scholes pricing model with the following weighted average assumptions: share price of \$0.32, expected yield of 0%, expected volatility of 72% based on the historical volatility of the Company, risk free rate of 3.07% and an expected life of 30 days, which resulted in a fair value of \$0.022 per option. During the period, 245,600 options were exercised, the remaining 307,000 expired unexercised.

On July 22, 2022, the Company granted 3,653,300 replacement stock options as part of the consideration for the acquisition of Steveville Acquisition (see note 5). The options have an exercise price of \$0.41, expire August 21, 2022 and vest immediately. The grant date fair value of the options was estimated using the Black-Scholes pricing model with the following weighted average assumptions: share price of \$0.32, expected yield of 0%, expected volatility of 72% based on the historical volatility of the Company, risk free rate of 3.07% and an expected life of 30 days, which resulted in a fair value of \$0.004 per option. The options expired unexercised.

On December 1, 2022, the Company granted 6,090,000 stock options, of the total options granted 4,590,000 were granted to directors and officers with the balance issued to consultants of the Company. The options have an exercise price of \$0.26, expire December 1, 2027 and vest immediately. The grant date fair value of the options was estimated using the Black-Scholes pricing model with the following weighted average assumptions: share price of \$0.24, expected yield of 0%, expected volatility of 182% based on the historical volatility of the Company, risk free rate of 3.22% and an expected life of 5 years, which resulted in a fair value of \$0.231 per option.

Royal Helium Ltd.

Notes to the Consolidated Financial Statements

Years Ended December 31, 2023 and 2022

(Expressed in Canadian dollars)

16. STOCK OPTIONS (continued)

On March 28, 2023, the Company granted 500,000 stock options, of the total options granted 500,000 were granted to consultants of the Company. The options have an exercise price of \$0.38, expire March 28, 2028 and vest immediately. The grant date fair value of the options was estimated using the Black-Scholes pricing model with the following weighted average assumptions: share price of \$0.36, expected yield of 0%, expected volatility of 171% based on the historical volatility of the Company, risk free rate of 3.10% and an expected life of 5 years, which resulted in a fair value of \$0.341 per option.

On May 3, 2023, the Company granted 750,000 stock options, of the total options granted 750,000 were granted to consultants of the Company. 500,000 of the options have an exercise price of \$0.38, expire April 26, 2028 and 250,000 expire May 3, 2028, and vest immediately. The grant date fair value of the options was estimated using the Black-Scholes pricing model with the following weighted average assumptions: share price of \$0.365, expected yield of 0%, expected volatility of 170% based on the historical volatility of the Company, risk free rate of 2.98% and an expected life of 5 years, which resulted in a fair value of \$0.345 per option.

On May 25, 2023, the Company granted 500,000 stock options, of the total options granted 500,000 were granted to a director of the Company. The options have an exercise price of \$0.40, expire May 25, 2028 and vest immediately. The grant date fair value of the options was estimated using the Black-Scholes pricing model with the following weighted average assumptions: share price of \$0.355, expected yield of 0%, expected volatility of 170% based on the historical volatility of the Company, risk free rate of 3.63% and an expected life of 5 years, which resulted in a fair value of \$0.335 per option.

17. WARRANTS AND BROKER WARRANTS

The following table reflects the continuity of warrants for the years presented:

| | Number of warrants | Weighted Average Exercise Price |
|---|-------------------------------|--|
| Balance, December 31, 2021 | 28,019,511 | \$ 0.60 |
| Issued | 30,963,750 | 0.26 |
| Issued – Steeveville acquisition (note 5) | 546,460 | 0.41 |
| Issued – Steeveville acquisition (note 5) | 17,217,440 | 0.61 |
| Expired | (10,769,511) | 0.35 |
| Balance December 31, 2022 | 65,977,650 | 0.51 |
| Issued | 21,153,000 | 0.32 |
| Issued | 19,731,900 | 0.40 |
| Issued | 18,750,000 | 0.31 |
| Issued | 2,812,500 | 0.31 |
| Exercised | (3,317,500) | 0.32 |
| Expired | (17,217,440) | 0.61 |
| Expired | (17,250,000) | 0.75 |
| Expired | (546,460) | 0.41 |
| Balance, December 31, 2023 | 90,093,650 | \$ 0.34 |

As of December 31, 2023, 90,093,650 (December 31, 2022 – 65,977,650) warrants were issued and outstanding with a weighted average remaining life of 2.25 years (December 31, 2022 – 1.52).

Royal Helium Ltd.

Notes to the Consolidated Financial Statements

Years Ended December 31, 2023 and 2022

(Expressed in Canadian dollars)

17. WARRANTS AND BROKER WARRANTS (continued)

On July 22, 2022, the Company issued 546,460 replacement warrants. The warrants have an exercise price of \$0.41, expire with a range of January 18, 2023 to March 15, 2023. The issue date fair value of the warrants was estimated using the Black-Scholes pricing model with the following weighted average assumptions: share price of \$0.32, expected yield of 0%, expected volatility range of 65.43% to 72.29% based on the historical volatility of the Company, risk free rate of 3.07% and an expected life range of 0.49 to 0.65 years, which resulted in a fair value range of \$0.038 to \$0.041 per warrant (see note 5).

On July 22, 2022, the Company issued 17,217,440 replacement warrants as part of the consideration for the acquisition of Steveville Acquisition (see note 5). The warrants have an exercise price of \$0.61, expire with a range of May 18, 2023 to November 8, 2023. The issue date fair value of the warrants was estimated using the Black-Scholes pricing model with the following weighted average assumptions: share price of \$0.32, expected yield of 0%, expected volatility range of 67.51% to 73.21% based on the historical volatility of the Company, risk free rate of 3.07% and an expected life range of 0.82 to 1.30 years, which resulted in a fair value range of \$0.022 to \$0.047 per warrant.

On February 8, 2023, the Company issued 21,153,000 warrants as part of the convertible debt issuance. The warrants have an exercise price of \$0.32, expire January 10, 2026 (see note 13). The issue date fair value of the warrants was estimated using the Black-Scholes pricing model with the following weighted average assumptions: share price of \$0.28, expected yield of 0%, expected volatility of 116.69% based on the historical volatility of the Company, risk free rate of 3.95% and an expected life range of 3 years, which resulted in an ascribed value of \$456,480 in total.

On June 12, 2023, the Company issued 19,731,900 warrants as part of the convertible debt issuance. The warrants have an exercise price of \$0.40, expire June 9, 2026 (see note 13). The issue date fair value of the warrants was estimated using the Black-Scholes pricing model with the following weighted average assumptions: share price of \$0.35, expected yield of 0%, expected volatility of 95.54% based on the historical volatility of the Company, risk free rate of 4.40% and an expected life range of 3 years, which resulted in an ascribed value of \$603,210 in total.

On November 14, 2023, the Company issued 18,750,000 warrants as part of the unit issuance. The warrants have an exercise price of \$0.31, expire November 14, 2026 (see note 15) and has not been disclosed separate from share capital.

On December 14, 2023, the Company issued 2,812,500 warrants as part of the unit issuance. The warrants have an exercise price of \$0.31, expire December 14, 2026 (see note 15) and has not been disclosed separate from share capital.

Royal Helium Ltd.

Notes to the Consolidated Financial Statements

Years Ended December 31, 2023 and 2022

(Expressed in Canadian dollars)

17. WARRANTS AND BROKER WARRANTS (continued)

The following table reflects the continuity of broker warrants for the years presented:

| | Number of warrants | Weighted Average Exercise Price |
|--|-------------------------------|--|
| Balance, December 31, 2021 | 4,068,750 | \$ 0.39 |
| Issued | 1,857,825 | 0.26 |
| Issued – Steveville acquisition (note 5) | 1,752,724 | 0.41 |
| Exercised | (1,286,250) | 0.22 |
| Expired | (184,750) | 0.22 |
| Balance, December 31, 2022 | 6,208,299 | 0.39 |
| Issued | 1,050,000 | 0.24 |
| Issued | 168,750 | 0.24 |
| Exercised | (69,669) | 0.26 |
| Expired | (182,750) | 0.22 |
| Expired | (1,752,724) | 0.41 |
| Expired | (2,415,000) | 0.50 |
| Balance, December 31, 2023 | 3,006,906 | \$ 0.26 |

As of December 31, 2023, 3,006,906 (December 31, 2022 – 6,208,299) warrants were issued and outstanding with a weighted average remaining life of 1.64 years (December 31, 2022 – 0.82 years).

On July 22, 2022, the Company issued 1,752,724 replacement broker warrants as part of the consideration for the acquisition of Steveville Acquisition (see note 5). The broker warrants are exercisable into units at \$0.41 per unit, with each unit comprised on once common share and one half of one common share purchase warrant, each whole warrant exercisable at \$0.61 for a 24 month period, expire May 17, 2023. The issue date fair value of the warrants was estimated using the Black-Scholes pricing model with the following weighted average assumptions: share price of \$0.32, expected yield of 0%, expected volatility of 62.42% based on the historical volatility of the Company, risk free rate of 3.07% and an expected life of 0.82 years. The fair value of the broker units were \$517,930.

On October 13, 2022, the Company issued 1,674,779 broker warrants upon closing of a bought deal financing. The broker warrants are exercisable into units at \$0.26 per unit, with each unit comprised of one common share and one common share purchase warrant, each whole warrant exercisable at \$0.32 for a 36 month period. The fair value of the warrants was estimated using the Black-Scholes pricing model with the following weighted average assumptions: share price of \$0.235, expected yield of 0%, expected volatility of 76% based on the historical volatility of the Company, risk free rate of 4.07% and an expected life of 2 years. The fair value of the broker units were \$159,104.

On October 19, 2022, the Company issued 183,046 broker warrants upon closing of a bought deal financing. The broker warrants are exercisable into units at \$0.26 per unit, with each unit comprised of one common share and one common share purchase warrant, each whole warrant exercisable at \$0.32 for a 36 month period. The fair value of the warrants was estimated using the Black-Scholes pricing model with the following weighted average assumptions: share price of \$0.235, expected yield of 0%, expected volatility of 76% based on the historical volatility of the Company, risk free rate of 4.18% and an expected life of 2 years. The fair value of the broker units were \$17,389.

Royal Helium Ltd.

Notes to the Consolidated Financial Statements

Years Ended December 31, 2023 and 2022

(Expressed in Canadian dollars)

17. WARRANTS AND BROKER WARRANTS (continued)

On November 14, 2023, the Company issued 1,050,000 broker warrants upon closing of a bought deal financing. The broker warrants are exercisable into units at \$0.24 per unit, with each unit comprised of one common share and one common share purchase warrant, each whole warrant exercisable at \$0.31 for a 36 month period. The fair value of the warrants was estimated using the Black-Scholes pricing model with the following weighted average assumptions: share price of \$0.22, expected yield of 0%, expected volatility of 79% based on the historical volatility of the Company, risk free rate of 4.40% and an expected life of 3 years. The fair value of the broker units were \$119,700.

On December 14, 2023, the Company issued 168,750 broker warrants upon closing of a bought deal financing. The broker warrants are exercisable into units at \$0.24 per unit, with each unit comprised of one common share and one common share purchase warrant, each whole warrant exercisable at \$0.31 for a 36 month period. The fair value of the warrants was estimated using the Black-Scholes pricing model with the following weighted average assumptions: share price of \$0.215, expected yield of 0%, expected volatility of 73% based on the historical volatility of the Company, risk free rate of 3.93% and an expected life of 3 years. The fair value of the broker units were \$16,875.

18. NET LOSS PER COMMON SHARE

The calculation of basic and diluted loss per share for the year ended December 31, 2023, was based on the loss attributable to common shareholders of \$11,043,624 (December 31, 2022 - \$4,389,004) and the weighted average number of common shares outstanding of 246,645,084 for the year ended December 31, 2023 (December 31, 2022 – 177,991,367).

During the years ended December 31, 2023 and 2022, all outstanding options, warrants and broker warrants were anti-dilutive and were therefore excluded from the diluted loss per share calculation.

19. GENERAL AND ADMINISTRATIVE

| Years ended December 31, | 2023 | 2022 |
|---|---------------------|---------------------|
| Audit and accounting | \$ 72,104 | \$ 148,608 |
| General office and other | 2,587,234 | 1,346,324 |
| Investor relations and marketing | 820,035 | 975,975 |
| Legal and professional | 711,689 | 311,758 |
| Total general and administrative | \$ 4,191,062 | \$ 2,782,665 |

20. FINANCE EXPENSE

| Years ended December 31, | 2023 | 2022 |
|---------------------------------------|---------------------|-----------------|
| Accretion – debt obligations | \$ 393,624 | \$ - |
| Accretion – decommissioning liability | 9,040 | 9,549 |
| Accretion – convertible debentures | 652,032 | - |
| Interest – convertible debentures | 1,196,862 | - |
| Interest – term debt | 344,515 | - |
| Interest income | (51,609) | - |
| Total Finance expense, net | \$ 2,544,464 | \$ 9,549 |

Royal Helium Ltd.

Notes to the Consolidated Financial Statements

Years Ended December 31, 2023 and 2022

(Expressed in Canadian dollars)

21. INCOME TAXES

- a) The statutory tax rate for the year ended December 31, 2023 is 26.5% (year ended December 31, 2022 – 26.5%).

| | December 31, 2023 | December 31, 2022 |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| Loss for the year before income taxes | \$ (11,043,624) | \$ (4,389,004) |
| Expected income tax recovery based on statutory rate | (2,926,000) | (1,163,000) |
| Adjustment to expected income tax benefit: | | |
| Share based compensation | 158,000 | 373,000 |
| Other | 3,000 | 4,000 |
| Adjustments in respect of prior years | - | 86,000 |
| Change in unrecognized deferred tax asset | 2,765,000 | 700,000 |
| Income tax provision (recovery) | \$ - | \$ - |

The components of the deferred tax asset (liability) are as follows:

| | December 31, 2023 | December 31, 2022 |
|-----------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| Exploration and evaluation assets | \$ 7,122,000 | \$ 985,000 |
| PP&E assets | (7,122,000) | (985,000) |
| Deductible temporary differences | \$ - | \$ - |

At December 31, 2023 and 2022, the Company has an unrecognized deferred tax income asset as it is not considered probable that future taxable profits will be sufficient to realize the benefits of deferred tax assets at this time.

- b) Deferred income tax assets and (liabilities) recorded are as follows:

Deferred tax assets (liabilities) have not been recognized in respect of the following deductible (taxable) temporary differences:

| | December 31, 2023 | December 31, 2022 |
|-----------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| Exploration and evaluation assets | \$ - | \$ 473,000 |
| Asset retirement obligations | 664,000 | 397,000 |
| Capital loss carry-forwards | 18,123,000 | 18,808,000 |
| Non-capital loss carry-forwards | 16,933,000 | 16,933,000 |
| Share issue costs | 2,475,000 | 3,296,000 |
| Deductible temporary differences | \$ 38,195,000 | \$ 39,907,000 |

As at December 31, 2023 and 2022, the Company has a deferred tax asset in the amount of \$1,756,000 which has not been recognized in respect of the deductible temporary differences as these differences arose from the initial recognition of an asset in a transaction which was not a business combination and at the time of the transaction, affected neither accounting nor tax loss.

Non-capital losses available as at December 31, 2023 can be carried forward for twenty years, and begin to expire in 2029. As at December 31, 2023, the Company has estimated non-capital losses of approximately \$34.0 million.

Royal Helium Ltd.

Notes to the Consolidated Financial Statements

Years Ended December 31, 2023 and 2022

(Expressed in Canadian dollars)

22. CONTINGENCIES AND COMMITMENTS**Contracts**

The Company is party to certain management consulting contracts. Upon termination of these contracts, the Company will be required to make payments of \$564,000 pursuant to the terms of these contracts. As a triggering event has not taken place as at December 31, 2023, these amounts have not been recorded in these consolidated financial statements.

Environmental contingencies

The Company's exploration and evaluation activities are subject to various federal and provincial laws and regulations governing the protection of the environment. These laws and regulations are continually changing and generally becoming more restrictive. The Company conducts its operations so as to protect public health and the environment and believes its operations are materially in compliance with all applicable laws and regulations. The Company has made, and expects to make in the future, expenditures to comply with such laws and regulations.

Property expenditure commitments

See notes 7 and 19.

Legal matters

From time to time, the Company is named as a party to claims or involved in proceedings, including legal, regulatory and tax related, in the ordinary course of its business. While the outcome of these matters may not be estimable at period end, the Company makes provisions, where possible, for the estimated outcome of such claims or proceedings. Should a loss result from the resolution of any claims or proceedings that differs from these estimates, the difference will be accounted for as a charge to net loss in that period.

23. RELATED PARTY TRANSACTIONS

The following table summarizes transactions with key management personnel:

| Year ended December 31, | 2023 | 2022 |
|--------------------------------|---------------------|-------------------|
| Consulting fees – management | \$ 165,838 | \$ 500,000 |
| Wages | 600,000 | - |
| Director fees | 301,000 | 163,067 |
| Total | \$ 1,066,838 | \$ 663,067 |

| Year ended December 31, | 2023 | 2022 |
|--------------------------------|---------------------|---------------------|
| Short term benefits | \$ 1,066,838 | \$ 663,067 |
| Share based compensation | 340,000 | 1,060,290 |
| Total | \$ 1,406,838 | \$ 1,723,357 |

As at December 31, 2023, the Company had \$239,014 (December 31, 2022 – \$229,026), included in accounts payable and accrued liabilities, owing to its key management personnel and directors for salary and wages.

The Company has an agreement for office space and related services for a monthly fixed fee of \$4,000 (2022 - \$4,000), with another company that has common management and directors. The Company incurred \$48,000 in 2023 (2022 – \$48,000) in respect of this agreement and had \$26,750 (2022 – \$nil), included in accounts payable and accrued liabilities as at December 31, 2023. See notes 8, 10 and 23.

Royal Helium Ltd.

Notes to the Consolidated Financial Statements

Years Ended December 31, 2023 and 2022

(Expressed in Canadian dollars)

24. FINANCIAL INSTRUMENTS**Financial risks factors**

The Company's activities expose it to a variety of financial risks: market risk (including currency risk), credit risk and liquidity risk. Risk management is carried out by management under policies approved by the Board of Directors. The Company's overall risk management program seeks to minimize potential adverse effects on the Company's financial performance.

(a) Market risk

Foreign exchange risk

Foreign exchange risk arises when assets or liabilities are denominated in a currency that is not the entity's functional currency. The Company does not hedge foreign currency exposures. All of the operating assets were located in Canada and majority of the Company's liabilities were also settled in Canada, therefore the Company does not have any significant foreign currency risk.

(b) Credit risk

The maximum exposure to credit risk for deposits approximates the amount recognized as cash, accounts receivable, and environmental deposit in the consolidated statements of financial position. Bank deposits are held with reputable Banks, therefore credit risk is low. The Company does not hold any collateral as security. Accounts receivable are all considered current and primarily relate to GST.

(c) Liquidity risk

Liquidity risk is the risk that the Company will encounter difficulty in meeting obligations associated with financial liabilities. The Company's financial liabilities comprise accounts payable and accrued liabilities which are due within 30 days.

The Company mitigates liquidity risk by planning its project expenditures in advance of undertaking significant commitments. see note 2.

(d) Commodity price risk

The Company is exposed to price risk with respect to commodity prices. Commodity price risk is defined as the potential adverse impact on earnings and economic value due to commodity price movements and volatilities. The Company closely monitors commodity prices, as it relates to helium to determine the appropriate course of action to be taken by the Company.

During the period, the Company incurred a financial loss of \$420,630 related to a phishing attack. In response, the Company has filed police reports and adjusted all related internal controls. The Company continues to work with authorities and other parties to recover the loss, but there can be no assurance the loss will be recovered.

Royal Helium Ltd.

Notes to the Consolidated Financial Statements

Years Ended December 31, 2023 and 2022

(Expressed in Canadian dollars)

25. SUPPLEMENTAL CASH FLOW INFORMATION

| | December 31, 2023 | December 31, 2022 |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| Change in non-cash working capital: | | |
| Accounts receivable | \$ 339,139 | \$ (309,382) |
| Prepaid and inventory | (123,694) | (790,649) |
| Accounts payable and accrued liabilities | (2,287,188) | 2,367,568 |
| | \$ (2,071,743) | \$ 1,267,537 |
| Allocated to: | | |
| Operating | \$ 1,591,449 | \$ (505,988) |
| Investing | (3,663,192) | 1,773,525 |
| | \$ (2,071,743) | \$ 1,267,537 |

During the year ended December 31, 2023, the Company paid \$64,735 cash interest (December 31, 2022 - nil).

26. SUBSEQUENT EVENTS

On January 2, 2024, the Company paid accrued debenture interest by issuing 3,788,660 common shares, valued at \$784,253.

On January 19, 2024, the board of directors granted the aggregate of 909,070 deferred share units ("DSUs") to certain directors, 5,963,635 performance share units ("PSUs") to certain officers and 950,000 stock options to certain directors, employees and consultants of the Company. The stock options are exercisable at \$0.35 and expire January 19, 2029. The stock options vest immediately on the date of the grant, and the DSUs and PSUs vest one year from the date of grant.

On February 23, 2024, the Company received a \$3,000,000 repayable contribution from Western Economic Diversification Canada under the Aerospace Regional Recovery Initiative. The loan is non-interest bearing with repayment commencing April 1, 2025 and repayable in 60 monthly payments.

On March 12, 2024, the Company issued 380,804 common shares to a market awareness and liquidity consultant.

On April 2, 2024, \$2,500,000 principal amount of the June 12% series convertible debentures were converted to 6,757,500 common shares.

On April 24, 2024, the Company announced a bought deal financing for gross proceeds of \$6,000,030.

TAB 2



ROYAL HELIUM LTD.

CONDENSED INTERIM CONSOLIDATED FINANCIAL STATEMENTS

September 30, 2024

(Unaudited - Prepared by Management)

In accordance with National Instrument 51-102 released by the Canadian Securities Administrators, the Company discloses that its auditors have not reviewed the condensed consolidated interim financial statements for the period ended September 30, 2024.

The accompanying unaudited condensed interim consolidated financial statements have been prepared by management.

Royal Helium Ltd.

Interim Consolidated Statements of Financial Position

(Expressed in Canadian dollars)

| | September 30 2024 | December 31 2023 |
|--|----------------------|---------------------|
| ASSETS | | |
| Current | | |
| Cash and cash equivalents (note 3) | \$ - | \$ 2,611,794 |
| Restricted cash (note 3) | 42,000 | 233,831 |
| Accounts receivable | 869,207 | 412,224 |
| Prepaid and inventory | 1,537,135 | 1,243,144 |
| Total current assets | 2,448,342 | 4,500,993 |
| Non-current | | |
| Environmental deposit (note 8) | 101,550 | 101,550 |
| Exploration and evaluation assets (note 4) | 46,233,048 | 46,022,893 |
| Property, plant and equipment (note 5) | 35,096,568 | 36,686,239 |
| Right of use assets (note 6) | 3,683,559 | 4,503,123 |
| Total assets | \$ 87,563,067 | \$ 91,814,798 |
| LIABILITIES AND SHAREHOLDERS' EQUITY | | |
| Current | | |
| Bank indebtedness (note 3) | \$ 452,122 | \$ - |
| Accounts payable and accrued liabilities (note 7) | 4,869,845 | 6,028,376 |
| Current portion of lease obligation (note 6) | 1,013,705 | 926,871 |
| Current portion of rent to own obligation (note 9) | 875,090 | 742,188 |
| Current portion of convertible debentures (note 10) | 4,502,420 | - |
| Current portion of term debt (note 11) | 3,668,271 | 3,212,091 |
| Total current liabilities | 15,381,453 | 10,909,526 |
| Non-current | | |
| Decommissioning liability (note 8) | 703,227 | 663,563 |
| Lease obligation (note 6) | 2,942,123 | 3,713,634 |
| Rent to own obligation (note 9) | 675,662 | 1,293,447 |
| Convertible debentures (note 10) | 3,791,126 | 10,237,060 |
| Term debt (note 11) | 16,593,066 | 15,387,909 |
| Total liabilities | \$ 40,086,657 | \$ 42,205,139 |
| Shareholders' Equity | | |
| Share capital (note 12) | \$ 91,996,643 | \$ 83,116,371 |
| Equity portion of convertible debentures (note 10) | 602,562 | 732,285 |
| Contributed surplus | 12,501,483 | 11,963,251 |
| Deficit | (57,624,278) | (46,202,248) |
| Total shareholders' equity | 47,476,410 | 49,609,659 |
| Total liabilities and shareholders' equity | \$ 87,563,067 | \$ 91,814,798 |
| Contingencies and Commitments (notes 4, 5 and 18) | | |
| Subsequent Events (note 22) | | |

Approved by the Board of Directors on November 28, 2024

"David Young"

David Young, President, CEO and Director

"Campbell Becher"

Campbell Becher, Director

The accompanying notes are an integral part of these condensed interim consolidated financial statements.

RHC Capital Corporation

Condensed Consolidated Statements of Financial Position

(Expressed in Canadian dollars)

| | For the three months ended September 30, | | For the nine months ended September 30, | |
|--|---|----------------|--|----------------|
| | 2024 | 2023 | 2024 | 2023 |
| Resource Sales | \$ 674,666 | \$ - | \$ 2,276,996 | \$ - |
| Royalties | (38,306) | - | (130,050) | - |
| | 636,360 | - | 2,146,946 | - |
| Operating costs and expenses | | | | |
| Operating costs | 1,238,920 | - | 4,721,048 | - |
| General and administrative (note 16) | 785,060 | 548,953 | 2,619,436 | 3,448,106 |
| Depreciation (notes 5 and 6) | 814,289 | 358,899 | 2,444,295 | 411,917 |
| Finance (note 17) | 1,151,196 | 757,175 | 3,487,731 | 1,255,770 |
| Share-based compensation | 89,999 | 170,500 | 296,466 | 596,750 |
| Net loss and comprehensive loss for the period | \$ (3,443,104) | \$ (1,835,527) | \$ (11,422,030) | \$ (5,712,543) |
| Basic and diluted loss per share (note 15) | \$ (0.01) | \$ (0.01) | \$ (0.04) | \$ (0.02) |
| Weighted average number of shares outstanding (note 15) | 357,650,286 | 246,038,073 | 318,376,545 | 242,877,495 |

Royal Helium Ltd.
Interim Consolidated Statements of Cash Flows
(Expressed in Canadian dollars)

| For the nine months ended September 30, | 2024 | 2023 |
|---|---------------------|---------------------|
| CASH FLOWS FROM OPERATING ACTIVITIES | | |
| Loss for the period | \$ (11,422,030) | \$ (5,712,543) |
| Items not affecting cash: | | |
| Share-based payments (note 13) | 296,466 | 596,750 |
| Accretion – finance obligations (notes 6 and 9) | 536,845 | 166,068 |
| Accretion – decommissioning liability (note 8) | 16,391 | 9,040 |
| Accretion – convertible debentures (note 10) | 687,954 | 340,190 |
| Accrued interest – convertible debentures (note 10) | 950,692 | 757,644 |
| Depreciation (notes 5 and 6) | 2,444,295 | 411,917 |
| Loss on settlement of accounts payable | - | 51,294 |
| Changes in non-cash working capital (note 21) | 772,457 | 177,574 |
| Net cash used in operating activities | (5,716,930) | (3,202,066) |
| CASH FLOWS FROM FINANCING ACTIVITIES | | |
| Proceeds – private placement | 6,000,030 | - |
| Proceeds – warrant exercise (note 12) | - | 1,061,600 |
| Proceeds – broker warrant exercise (note 12) | - | 18,114 |
| Share issuance costs (note 12) | (654,612) | (105,036) |
| Issuance of convertible debentures (note 10) | - | 12,800,000 |
| Convertible debenture issuance costs (note 10) | - | (1,145,898) |
| Issuance of term debt (note 11) | 3,000,000 | 14,284,898 |
| Lease payments (note 6) | (1,075,389) | (260,000) |
| Rent to own payments (note 9) | (631,016) | (236,631) |
| Term debt payments (note 11) | (1,338,663) | - |
| Net cash provided by financing activities | 5,300,350 | 26,417,047 |
| CASH FLOWS FROM INVESTING ACTIVITIES | | |
| Additions to exploration and evaluation assets (note 4) | (186,882) | (948,457) |
| Additions to property, plant and equipment (note 5) | (35,060) | (17,739,621) |
| Transfer from (to) restricted cash (note 3) | 191,831 | (402,258) |
| Change in non-cash working capital (note 21) | (2,617,225) | (3,445,851) |
| Net cash used in investing activities | (2,647,336) | (22,536,187) |
| Change in cash | (3,063,916) | 678,794 |
| Cash, beginning of period | 2,611,794 | 1,002,973 |
| Cash, end of period | \$ (452,122) | \$ 1,681,767 |

The accompanying notes are an integral part of these consolidated financial statements.

Royal Helium Ltd.

Interim Consolidated Statements of Changes in Shareholders' Equity

(Expressed in Canadian dollars)

| | Share Capital | Contributed Surplus | Deficit | Equity portion of Convertible Debentures | Total Shareholders' Equity |
|---|----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|---|----------------------------------|
| Balance as at December 31, 2022 | \$ 75,574,713 | \$ 10,176,855 | \$ (35,158,624) | \$ - | \$ 50,592,944 |
| Share issuance – broker warrants exercise (note 12) | 24,733 | (6,619) | - | - | 18,114 |
| Share issuance – warrants exercise (note 12) | 1,061,600 | - | - | - | 1,061,600 |
| Share issuance – interest payment (note 12) | 283,605 | - | - | - | 283,605 |
| Share issuance – shares for debt (note 12) | 496,686 | - | - | - | 496,686 |
| Share issuance – shares for property (note 12) | 161,735 | - | - | - | 161,735 |
| Share issuance costs (note 12) | (105,036) | - | - | - | (105,036) |
| Debt issuance – convertible debentures (note 10) | - | 752,730 | - | 639,270 | 1,392,000 |
| Conversions – convertible debentures (note 10) | 178,430 | - | - | (16,013) | 162,417 |
| Share based compensation (note 13) | - | 596,750 | - | - | 596,750 |
| Net loss for the period | - | - | (5,712,543) | - | (5,712,543) |
| Balance as at September 30, 2023 | \$ 77,676,466 | \$ 11,519,716 | \$ (40,871,167) | \$ 623,257 | \$ 48,948,272 |
| Balance as at December 31, 2023 | \$ 83,116,371 | \$ 11,963,251 | \$ (46,202,248) | \$ 732,285 | \$ 49,609,659 |
| Share issuance – financing (note 12) | 6,000,030 | - | - | - | 6,000,030 |
| Broker warrants issued (note 14) | (241,766) | 241,766 | - | - | - |
| Share issuance – interest payment (note 12) | 1,443,269 | - | - | - | 1,443,269 |
| Share issuance – shares for service (note 12) | 64,737 | - | - | - | 64,737 |
| Share issuance costs (note 12) | (654,612) | - | - | - | (654,612) |
| Conversions – convertible debentures (note 10) | 2,268,614 | - | - | (129,723) | 2,138,891 |
| Share based compensation (note 13) | - | 296,466 | - | - | 296,466 |
| Net loss for the period | - | - | (11,422,030) | - | (11,422,030) |
| Balance as at September 30, 2024 | \$ 91,996,643 | \$ 12,501,483 | \$ (57,624,278) | \$ 602,562 | \$ 47,476,410 |

The accompanying notes are an integral part of these consolidated financial statements.

Royal Helium Ltd.

Notes to the Interim Consolidated Financial Statements

Three and Nine Months Ended September 30, 2024 and 2023

(Expressed in Canadian dollars)

1. NATURE AND CONTINUANCE OF OPERATIONS

Royal Helium Ltd. (the "Company" or "RHL") (formerly RHC Capital Corporation) is focused on primary helium production from its helium leases and permits in Saskatchewan and Alberta, Canada. On February 27, 2017, the Company began trading on the NEX board of the TSX Venture Exchange ("TSX-V") under the trading symbol "RHC.H". On July 25, 2017, the Company resumed trading on the TSX-V under the trading symbol "RHC". The address of its registered office is 224 4th Avenue South, Suite 602, Saskatoon, Saskatchewan, S7K 5M5.

The Company was incorporated under the laws of the Province of Ontario on August 15, 2008 and continued into the Province of Saskatchewan on May 1, 2019.

2. BASIS OF PREPARATION

These unaudited condensed interim consolidated financial statements have been prepared in conformity with International Accounting Standard ("IAS") 34, Interim Financial Reporting, and do not include all the information required for full annual financial statements in accordance with International Financial Reporting Standards ("IFRS"), as issued by the International Accounting Standards Board ("IASB") and interpretations of the International Financial Reporting Interpretations Committee ("IFRIC"). It is suggested that these financial statements be read in conjunction with the annual audited consolidated financial statements for the year ended December 31, 2023.

The unaudited condensed interim consolidated financial statements of the Corporation for the three and nine month periods ended September 30, 2024 were authorized for issuance by the Corporation's board of directors on November 28, 2024.

These unaudited condensed interim consolidated financial statements have been prepared on a historical basis, except for those financial instruments carried at fair value. In addition, these unaudited condensed interim consolidated financial statements have been prepared using the accrual basis of accounting.

Capital management

The Company defines the capital that it manages as its working capital. The Company's objectives when managing capital are to manage its business in an effective manner with the goal of increasing the value of its assets. The Company regularly monitors its available capital and, as necessary, adjusts to changing economic circumstances and the risk characteristics of the underlying assets. In order to maintain or adjust capital requirements, the Company may consider the issuance of new shares, the entry into joint venture arrangements or farm-out agreements, or engage in debt financing.

There were no changes in the Company's approach to capital management during the period ended September 30, 2024.

The Company is not subject to any capital requirements imposed by a lending institution or regulatory body, other than Policy 2.5 of the TSX-V which requires adequate working capital or financial resources of the greater of (i) \$50,000 and (ii) an amount required in order to maintain operations and cover general and administrative expenses for a period of 6 months. As of September 30, 2024, the Company was not in compliance with Policy 2.5. Capital requirements imposed by lending institutions will begin December 31, 2024.

Royal Helium Ltd.

Notes to the Interim Consolidated Financial Statements

Three and Nine Months Ended September 30, 2024 and 2023

(Expressed in Canadian dollars)

2. BASIS OF PREPARATION (continued)

For the nine months ended September 30, 2024, the Company used cash in operating activities of \$5,716,929 (December 31, 2023 - \$5,385,737) and had a working capital deficit of \$12,933,111 as at September 30, 2024 (December 31, 2023 - \$6,408,533). Although, management has available \$2,500,000 of undrawn demand operating loan for working capital purposes (note 11), the Company will need additional cash resources to meet liquidity requirements while the Steeveville helium plant is brought up to capacity in efforts to generate positive cash flow from operations. To address its liquidity requirements, the Company continues to seek and assess financing options.

The Company has also historically received support from various lenders (note 11) and will require this ongoing support. To that end, the Company is required under its current lending arrangements to maintain a cash flow coverage ratio of not less than 1.10:1, a tangible net working capital ratio of not greater than 1.25:1 and a fixed charge coverage ratio of not less than 1.10:1 beginning December 31, 2024 (note 11). Based on current forecasts management is projecting potential non-compliance with the above noted covenants as at December 31, 2024. There can be no assurance that the Company will be able to obtain a waiver for the potential covenant default or an amendment to the covenants, if necessary, prior to December 31, 2024. This potential covenant default may result in the term debt being due on demand and would trigger other cross-covenant defaults.

The continuance of the Company remains dependent upon the discovery of economically recoverable resources in the underlying helium claims and the ability of the Company to increase the current output of the Steeveville helium plant to planned capacity in efforts to generate positive cash flows from operations, in addition to obtaining waivers for potential covenant defaults or amendments to the covenant. Although, there remains considerable risk around the Company's ability to address these substantial uncertainties the Company believes future financing options and facility operations will generate sufficient cash to address current projected liquidity requirements and that the continued support of the lenders will be available to manage lending covenant requirements before December 31, 2024.

Use of estimates

The Company makes estimates and assumptions about the future that affect the reported amounts of assets and liabilities. Estimates and judgments are continually evaluated based on historical experience and other factors, including expectations of future events that are believed to be reasonable under the circumstances. In the future, actual results may differ from these estimates and assumptions.

These consolidated financial statements were approved and authorized for issuance by the board of directors on November 28, 2024.

3. CASH AND CASH EQUIVALENTS

| | September 30, 2024 | December 31, 2023 |
|--|-------------------------------|------------------------------|
| (Bank indebtedness) cash at bank and on hand | \$ (452,122) | \$ 2,611,794 |
| Total (bank indebtedness) cash and cash equivalents | \$ (452,122) | \$ 2,611,794 |
| GIC's held as collateral | \$ 42,000 | \$ 42,000 |
| Interest reserve | - | 191,831 |
| Total restricted cash | \$ 42,000 | \$ 233,831 |

Royal Helium Ltd.

Notes to the Interim Consolidated Financial Statements
Three and Nine Months Ended September 30, 2024 and 2023
(Expressed in Canadian dollars)

4. EXPLORATION AND EVALUATION ASSETS

| | Balance as at January 1, 2023 | Acquisition / Renewals | Consultants and Geophysics | Drilling | Expiry and transfers | Other Exploration | Balance as at December 31, 2023 |
|-----------------|-------------------------------------|---------------------------|----------------------------------|-----------|-------------------------|----------------------|---------------------------------------|
| Bengough/ Ogema | \$ 7,030,519 | \$ 30,405 | \$ 866 | \$ 17,784 | \$ - | \$ (4,673) | \$ 7,074,901 |
| Cadillac | 312,553 | 81,691 | 131,564 | - | - | - | 525,808 |
| Climax | 11,327,876 | (43,499) | - | - | - | (6,956) | 11,277,421 |
| Coronach | 25,952 | - | - | - | - | 10,352 | 36,304 |
| Creelman | 38,203 | 6,763 | - | - | (38,527) | 651 | 7,090 |
| Francis | 41,808 | 6,818 | - | - | (73,821) | 33,491 | 8,296 |
| Midale | 31,124 | 4,360 | - | - | - | - | 35,484 |
| Minton | 7,214 | - | - | - | - | - | 7,214 |
| Steveville | 23,520,013 | 352,615 | 23,212 | - | (501,746) | (3,165) | 23,390,929 |
| Swift current | 42,665 | - | 39,269 | - | - | - | 81,934 |
| Val Marie | 2,983,400 | 3,798 | 21,116 | - | - | (2,271) | 3,006,043 |
| Weyburn | 165,411 | 9,876 | - | - | (177,433) | 31,565 | 29,419 |
| 40 Mile | 99,875 | 401,735 | 40,440 | - | - | - | 542,050 |
| | \$ 45,626,613 | \$ 854,562 | \$ 256,467 | \$ 17,784 | \$ (791,527) | \$ 58,994 | \$ 46,022,893 |

| | Balance as at January 1, 2024 | Acquisition / Renewals | Consultants and Geophysics | Drilling | Expiry and transfers | Other Exploration | Balance as at September 30, 2024 |
|-----------------|-------------------------------------|---------------------------|----------------------------------|----------|-------------------------|----------------------|--|
| Bengough/ Ogema | \$ 7,074,901 | \$ 35,134 | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 4,240 | \$ 7,114,275 |
| Cadillac | 525,808 | 28,503 | - | - | - | - | 554,311 |
| Climax | 11,277,421 | 73,861 | - | - | - | 4,935 | 11,356,217 |
| Coronach | 36,304 | 844 | - | - | - | - | 37,148 |
| Creelman | 7,090 | 2,611 | - | - | - | - | 9,701 |
| Francis | 8,296 | 6,818 | - | - | - | - | 15,114 |
| Midale | 35,484 | 4,295 | - | - | - | - | 39,779 |
| Minton | 7,214 | 6,022 | - | - | - | - | 13,236 |
| Steveville | 23,390,929 | - | - | - | - | 12,452 | 23,403,381 |
| Swift current | 81,934 | 2,650 | - | - | - | - | 84,584 |
| Val Marie | 3,006,043 | 4,323 | - | - | - | 1,645 | 3,012,011 |
| Weyburn | 29,419 | 9,980 | - | - | - | - | 39,399 |
| 40 Mile | 542,050 | - | - | 9,600 | - | 2,242 | 553,892 |
| | \$ 46,022,893 | \$ 175,041 | \$ - | \$ 9,600 | \$ - | \$ 25,514 | \$ 46,233,048 |

Royal Helium Ltd.

Notes to the Interim Consolidated Financial Statements
Three and Nine Months Ended September 30, 2024 and 2023
(Expressed in Canadian dollars)

4. EXPLORATION AND EVALUATION ASSETS (continued)

Included in other exploration costs for the Climax project is an increase of \$4,935 (December 31, 2023 – reduction of \$6,956) and for the Ogema project is an increase of \$4,240 (December 31, 2023 – reduction of \$5,976) and for the Val Marie project is an increase of \$1,645 (December 31, 2023 – reduction of \$2,319) and for the Steveville project is an increase of \$12,452 (December 31, 2023 – reduction of \$8,313) which is related to the estimated decommissioning liability (note 8).

The Company holds helium exploration permits and helium leases over land in Saskatchewan and Alberta. The Company has annual lease expenditure commitments of approximately \$228,878 and annual permit expenditure commitments as follows 2024 - \$85,000, 2025 - \$65,000, 2026 - \$75,000 and 2027 - \$nil.

In the year ended December 31, 2023, the Company allowed certain claims to expire as it was determined that future work would be focused on other properties.

In the year ended December 31, 2023, the Company completed its helium processing facility and determined that \$501,746 should be transferred from exploration and evaluation assets to helium producing properties included in property, plant and equipment (note 8). There were no impairment on the transfer of exploration and evaluation to helium producing properties.

There were no impairment indicators for the exploration and evaluation assets as of September 30, 2024 and December 31, 2023.

5. PROPERTY, PLANT AND EQUIPMENT

| | Computer Hardware | Helium Producing Properties | Facility | Rent to Own | Total |
|------------------------------------|----------------------|-----------------------------------|----------------------|---------------------|----------------------|
| <u>Cost</u> | | | | | |
| Balance, December 31, 2022 | \$ 40,079 | \$ - | \$ 11,107,896 | \$ - | \$ 11,147,975 |
| Additions | 2,541 | - | 22,363,393 | 2,775,390 | 25,141,324 |
| Decommissioning | - | - | 302,093 | - | 302,093 |
| Transfers (note 4) | - | 501,746 | - | - | 501,746 |
| Balance, December 31, 2023 | 42,620 | 501,746 | 33,773,382 | 2,775,390 | 37,093,138 |
| Additions | 3,824 | - | 31,236 | - | 35,060 |
| Balance, September 30, 2024 | \$ 46,444 | \$ 501,746 | \$ 33,804,618 | \$ 2,775,390 | \$ 37,128,198 |
| <u>Accumulated amortization</u> | | | | | |
| Balance, December 31, 2022 | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - |
| Depreciation | 11,101 | - | - | 395,798 | 406,899 |
| Balance, December 31, 2023 | \$ 11,101 | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 395,798 | \$ 406,899 |
| Depreciation | 7,092 | 10,741 | 1,013,201 | 593,697 | 1,624,731 |
| Balance, September 30, 2024 | \$ 18,193 | \$ 10,741 | \$ 1,013,201 | \$ 989,495 | \$ 2,031,630 |
| <u>Carrying Value</u> | | | | | |
| Balance, December 31, 2023 | \$ 31,519 | \$ 501,746 | \$ 33,773,382 | \$ 2,379,592 | \$ 36,686,239 |
| Balance, September 30, 2024 | \$ 28,251 | \$ 491,005 | \$ 32,791,417 | \$ 1,785,895 | \$ 35,096,568 |

Royal Helium Ltd.

Notes to the Interim Consolidated Financial Statements
Three and Nine Months Ended September 30, 2024 and 2023
(Expressed in Canadian dollars)

5. PROPERTY, PLANT AND EQUIPMENT (continued)

Property plant and equipment additions in the prior period relate to the helium processing facility, which was under construction until the fourth quarter of 2023. While the facility was under construction, it was not available for use and was not being depreciated. When the facility became available for use the Company transferred \$501,746 from exploration and evaluation assets to property, plant and equipment (note 4), and commenced depreciation.

6. RIGHT OF USE ASSET

The Company has a lease agreement for the helium transport trailers.

The continuity of the right of use asset ("ROU") and lease liability for the periods ended September 30, 2024 and December 31, 2023 is as follows:

| | |
|---|---------------------|
| Right of use asset | |
| Value of ROU as at December 31, 2022 | \$ - |
| Initial recognition of ROU | 5,037,548 |
| Depreciation | (534,525) |
| Value of ROU as at December 31, 2023 | 4,503,123 |
| Depreciation | (819,564) |
| Value of ROU as at September 30, 2024 | \$ 3,683,559 |
| Lease liability | |
| Lease liability as at December 31, 2022 | \$ - |
| Initial recognition of lease liability | 5,037,548 |
| Lease payments | (677,057) |
| Lease accretion | 280,014 |
| Lease liability as at December 31, 2023 | 4,640,505 |
| Lease payments | (1,075,389) |
| Lease accretion | 390,712 |
| Lease liability as at September 30, 2024 | \$ 3,955,828 |
| Current portion | \$ 1,013,705 |
| Long-term portion | 2,942,123 |
| | \$3,955,828 |

Lease obligation

The Company's total undiscounted amount of cash flow required to settle its lease obligation is approximately \$4,910,285 at September 30, 2024 (December 31, 2023 - \$5,800,000) and is expected to settle in 2027. The Company applied a discount rate of 12% to calculate the discounted value of the lease obligation at initial recognition.

Royal Helium Ltd.

Notes to the Interim Consolidated Financial Statements
Three and Nine Months Ended September 30, 2024 and 2023
(Expressed in Canadian dollars)

7. ACCOUNTS PAYABLE AND ACCRUED LIABILITIES

| | September 30, 2024 | December 31, 2023 |
|---------------------|-----------------------|----------------------|
| Accounts payable | \$ 4,391,892 | \$ 5,891,044 |
| Accruals and others | 477,953 | 137,332 |
| | \$ 4,869,845 | \$ 6,028,376 |

8. DECOMMISSIONING LIABILITIES

| | September 30, 2024 | December 31, 2023 |
|---------------------------------------|-----------------------|----------------------|
| Balance, beginning of period | \$ 663,563 | \$ 375,994 |
| Additions | - | 302,093 |
| Change in inflation and discount rate | 23,273 | (23,564) |
| Accretion | 16,391 | 9,040 |
| Balance, end of period | \$ 703,227 | \$ 663,563 |

The total of the decommissioning liabilities are estimated based on the Company's net ownership interest in all the wells, the estimated costs to reclaim and abandon the wells and facilities and the estimated timing of the costs to be incurred in future periods. Management of the Company has estimated that based on their net ownership interest, the total undiscounted cash flows required to settle the obligations will be \$852,586. The obligations have been discounted using a risk free rate of 3.13% (December 31, 2023 - 3.02%) and an inflation rate of 1.49% (December 31, 2023 - 1.62%) per year. Most of these obligations are not expected to be settled until approximately 10 years in the future and will be funded from general Company resources at that time.

As September 30, 2024, the Company has a \$101,550 (December 31, 2023 - \$101,550) deposit held by the Saskatchewan government for future site reclamation.

9. RENT TO OWN DEBT OBLIGATION**Rent to own liability**

| | |
|---|---------------------|
| Rent to own liability as at December 31, 2022 | \$ - |
| Initial recognition of debt | 2,775,390 |
| Payments | (873,862) |
| Rent to own accretion | 134,107 |
| Rent to own liability as at December 31, 2023 | 2,035,635 |
| Payments | (631,016) |
| Rent to own accretion | 146,133 |
| Rent to own liability as at September 30, 2024 | \$ 1,550,752 |
| Current portion | \$ 875,090 |
| Long-term portion | 675,662 |
| | \$ 1,550,752 |

Royal Helium Ltd.

Notes to the Interim Consolidated Financial Statements
Three and Nine Months Ended September 30, 2024 and 2023
(Expressed in Canadian dollars)

9. RENT TO OWN DEBT OBLIGATION (continued)**Rent to own obligation**

The Company's total undiscounted amount of cash flow required to settle its rent to own obligation is approximately \$1,498,663 at September 30, 2024 (December 31, 2023 - \$2,366,310) and is expected to settle in 2026. The Company applied a discount rate of 12% to calculate the discounted value of the rent to own obligation at initial recognition and the asset is held as collateral on the debt obligation.

10. CONVERTIBLE DEBENTURES

a) On February 8, 2023, the Company closed a bought deal financing and issued 5,500 units for gross proceeds of \$5,500,000. Each unit consists of \$1,000 convertible debenture principal amount and 3,846 common share purchase warrants. The convertible debenture bears interest at 14% per annum, is paid semi annually in arears and matures on December 31, 2025. Each warrant is exercisable at \$0.32 for a period of 36 months and the Company may elect to accelerate the expiry date in the event the volume weighted average trading price exceeds \$0.65 per share for 20 consecutive trading days.

The convertible debentures are convertible at the holder's option into common shares at a fixed conversion price of \$0.26 per share.

As the debenture has a conversion feature, the equity and debt components must be bifurcated with value assigned to each as well as to the warrants issued as part of the offering. The value assigned to the liability on the date of issuance was the present value of the contractually determined stream of future cash flows discounted at 26.99%, being the estimated rate that the market would apply to an instrument with comparable credit status and provide substantially the same cash flows, on the same terms, but without the conversion option. From the date of issuance, the liability component accretes up to its principal value using the effective interest method, with the charge recorded in the consolidated statement of loss. The fair value assigned to the warrants and the conversion feature, on the date of issuance, was based on the Black-Scholes option pricing model for each and assigned on a relative fair value basis. This resulted in an initial amount of \$4,568,000 being allocated to the liability portion and \$475,520 being allocated to the equity portion and \$456,480 to the warrant.

In the period, \$nil (year ended December 31, 2023 - \$1,280,000) of principal was converted into common shares. As at September 30, 2024 and December 31, 2023, the principal amount owing was \$4,220,000.

b) On June 12, 2023, the Company closed a bought deal financing and issued 7,300 units for gross proceeds of \$7,300,000. Each unit consists of \$1,000 convertible debenture principal amount and 2,703 common share purchase warrants. The convertible debenture bears interest at 12% per annum, is paid semi annually in arears and matures on June 30, 2025. Each warrant is exercisable at \$0.40 for a period of 36 months and the Company.

The convertible debentures are convertible at the holder's option into common shares at a fixed conversion price of \$0.37 per share.

Royal Helium Ltd.

Notes to the Interim Consolidated Financial Statements
Three and Nine Months Ended September 30, 2024 and 2023
(Expressed in Canadian dollars)

10. CONVERTIBLE DEBENTURES (continued)

As the debenture has a conversion feature, the equity and debt components must be bifurcated with value assigned to each as well as to the warrants issued as part of the offering. The value assigned to the liability on the date of issuance was the present value of the contractually determined stream of future cash flows discounted at 25.63%, being the estimated rate that the market would apply to an instrument with comparable credit status and provide substantially the same cash flows, on the same terms, but without the conversion option. From the date of issuance, the liability component accretes up to its principal value using the effective interest method, with the charge recorded in the consolidated statement of loss. The fair value assigned to the warrants and the conversion feature, on the date of issuance, was based on the Black-Scholes option pricing model for each and assigned on a relative fair value basis. This resulted in an initial amount of \$6,318,000 being allocated to the liability portion and \$378,790 being allocated to the equity portion and \$603,210 to the warrant.

In the period, \$2,500,000 (year ended December 31, 2023 - \$nil) of principal was converted into common shares. As at September 30, 2024, the principal amount owing was \$4,800,000 (December 31, 2023 - \$7,300,000).

| | Liability Component | | Equity Component |
|------------------------------------|----------------------------|-----------------------|-------------------------|
| | Face Value | Carrying Value | Carrying Value |
| Balance, December 31, 2022 | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - |
| Issuance - initial recognition | 12,800,000 | 10,886,000 | 854,310 |
| Less: issuance costs | - | (1,145,899) | - |
| Interest | - | 848,521 | - |
| Accretion - interest | - | 652,032 | - |
| Conversion | (1,280,000) | (1,003,594) | (122,025) |
| Balance, December 31, 2023 | 11,520,000 | 10,237,060 | 732,285 |
| Accrued interest | - | 950,692 | - |
| Interest payments | - | (1,443,269) | - |
| Accretion - interest | - | 687,954 | - |
| Conversion | (2,500,000) | (2,138,891) | (129,723) |
| Balance, September 30, 2024 | \$ 9,020,000 | \$ 8,293,546 | \$ 602,562 |
| Current portion | 4,800,000 | 4,502,420 | |
| Long-term portion | 4,220,000 | 3,791,126 | |
| | \$ 9,020,000 | \$ 8,293,546 | |

On June 30, 2023, the Company paid accrued debenture interest by issuing 822,044 common shares, valued at \$283,605. The interest accrued at the time of the issuance was \$299,562, and the \$8,246 difference was recorded against interest expense.

On January 2, 2024, the Company paid accrued debenture interest by issuing 3,788,660 common shares, valued at \$784,253.

On July 2, 2024, the Company paid accrued debenture interest by issuing 8,448,929 common shares, valued at \$659,016.

Royal Helium Ltd.

Notes to the Interim Consolidated Financial Statements
Three and Nine Months Ended September 30, 2024 and 2023
(Expressed in Canadian dollars)

11. TERM DEBT

On April 24, 2023, the Company closed a term debt financing, and received its first draw, with Canadian Western bank (“CWB”) and Business Development Bank of Canada (“BDC”), acting pari passu, for \$7,500,000 each, \$15,000,000 in total.

On December 21, 2023, Canadian Western bank (“CWB”) and Business Development bank of Canada, acting pari passu, increased the term loans for \$1,800,000 each, and extended the first principal repayment date to February 1, 2024.

As of December 31, 2023, the Company has drawn the full debt facility. During the year ended December 31, 2023 the Company has paid \$697,210 interest related to the term debt, \$352,695 has been capitalized to property, plant and equipment and \$344,515 has been expensed.

On February 23, 2024, the Company received a \$3,000,000 repayable contribution from Western Economic Diversification Canada (“WEDC”) under the Aerospace Regional Recovery Initiative. The loan is unsecured, non-interest bearing with repayment commencing April 1, 2025 and repayable in 60 monthly payments.

On June 26, 2024, the Company received a 90 day principal repayment deferral from CWB and BDC. Effective July 1, 2024 to the end of September 30, 2024, the Company is only required to pay monthly interest. The amortization period is unchanged.

| | CWB | BDC | WEDC | Total |
|---|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|----------------------|
| Balance as at December 31, 2022 | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - |
| Debt advances | 9,300,000 | 9,300,000 | - | 18,600,000 |
| Balance as at December 31, 2023 | 9,300,000 | 9,300,000 | - | 18,600,000 |
| Debt advances | - | - | 3,000,000 | 3,000,000 |
| Repayments | (673,913) | (664,750) | - | (1,338,663) |
| Balance as at September 30, 2024 | \$ 8,626,087 | \$ 8,635,250 | \$ 3,000,000 | \$ 20,261,337 |
| Current portion | 1,696,935 | 1,671,336 | 300,000 | 3,668,271 |
| Long term portion | 6,929,152 | 6,963,914 | 2,700,000 | 16,593,066 |
| | \$ 8,626,087 | \$ 8,635,250 | \$ 3,000,000 | \$ 20,261,337 |

CWB

Prime rate plus 3%, secured by all present and future assets, repayable in monthly blended payments of \$134,783 principal plus accrued interest, maturing on February 1, 2030. Repayable at any time without penalty.

Under the terms of the debt, the Company is required to maintain a cash flow coverage ratio of not less than 1.10 and a debt to tangible net work ratio not greater than 1.25, beginning December 31, 2024.

BDC

BDC floating rate, secured by all present and future assets, repayable in monthly blended payments of \$132,850 principal plus accrued interest, maturing on February 1, 2030. Once in any 12 month period, the Company can prepay up to 15% of the outstanding principal without penalty.

Under the terms of the debt, the Company is required to maintain a fixed charge coverage ratio of 1.10, beginning December 31, 2024.

Royal Helium Ltd.

Notes to the Interim Consolidated Financial Statements
Three and Nine Months Ended September 30, 2024 and 2023
(Expressed in Canadian dollars)

11. TERM DEBT (continued)

In addition, CWB has provided the Company with a \$2,500,000 demand operating loan for working capital purposes. At September 30, 2024, \$474,051 has been drawn from the demand operating loan. The Company's access to the operating loan is limited to 75% of Canadian trade accounts and 90% of good earned United States trade accounts that are Economic Development Canada insured and do not exceed 90 days aging.

12. SHARE CAPITAL AND EQUITY RESERVES

Authorized share capital - the authorized share capital consists of an unlimited number of common shares.

Changes in issued share capital are as follows:

| | Number of common shares | Amount |
|---|------------------------------------|----------------------|
| Balance, December 31, 2022 | 239,254,543 | 75,574,713 |
| Share issuance – financing | 21,562,500 | 5,175,000 |
| Share issuance – warrant exercise | 3,317,500 | 1,061,600 |
| Share issuance – broker warrant exercise | 69,669 | 24,733 |
| Share issuance – shares for debt | 1,373,133 | 496,686 |
| Share issuance – conversion of debenture | 4,922,880 | 1,125,620 |
| Share issuance – Acquisition of exploration and evaluation asset | 468,796 | 161,735 |
| Shares issuance – payment of debenture interest | 822,044 | 283,605 |
| Fair value allocation – broker warrants | - | (136,575) |
| Share issue costs | - | (650,746) |
| Balance, December 31, 2023 | 271,791,065 | 83,116,371 |
| Share issuance – financing | 66,667,000 | 6,000,030 |
| Share issuance – payment of debenture interest | 12,237,589 | 1,443,269 |
| Share issuance – share for debt | 380,804 | 64,737 |
| Share issuance – conversion of debenture | 6,757,500 | 2,268,614 |
| Fair value allocation – broker warrants | - | (241,766) |
| Share issue costs | - | (654,612) |
| Balance, September 30, 2024 | 357,833,958 | \$ 91,996,643 |

On April 21, 2023, the Company issued 1,069,383 common shares as settlement of \$365,746 in accounts payable. At the date of issuance, the common shares were valued at \$0.37 per common share and the Company recorded a loss on settlement of \$52,603.

On June 30, 2023, the Company closed the 40 mile property acquisition and issued 468,796 common shares valued at \$0.345 per common share.

On July 19, 2023, the Company issued 303,750 common shares as settlement of \$118,539 in accounts payable. At the date of issuance, the common shares were valued at \$0.32 per common share and the Company recorded a gain on settlement \$21,339.

Royal Helium Ltd.

Notes to the Interim Consolidated Financial Statements
Three and Nine Months Ended September 30, 2024 and 2023
(Expressed in Canadian dollars)

12. SHARE CAPITAL AND EQUITY RESERVES (continued)

On November 14, 2023, the Company completed a first close on a bought deal financing of 18,750,000 units at a price of \$0.24 per unit for gross proceeds of \$4,500,000. Each unit consisted of one common share and one common share purchase warrant, each whole warrant exercisable at \$0.31 for a 36 month period. The Company paid \$472,191 cash finder's fees and other expenses and issued 1,050,000 broker warrants. The broker warrants are exercisable into units at \$0.24 per unit, with each unit comprised of one common share and one common share purchase warrant, each whole warrant exercisable at \$0.31 for a 36 month period from the closing date of the financing (see note 14).

On December 14, 2023, the Company completed a final close on a bought deal financing of 2,812,500 units at a price of \$0.24 per unit for gross proceeds of \$675,000. Each unit consisted of one common share and one common share purchase warrant, each whole warrant exercisable at \$0.31 for a 36 month period. The Company paid \$73,519 cash finder's fees and other expenses and issued 168,750 broker warrants. The broker warrants are exercisable into units at \$0.24 per unit, with each unit comprised of one common share and one common share purchase warrant, each whole warrant exercisable at \$0.31 for a 36 month period from the closing date of the financing (see note 14).

On March 12, 2024, the Company issued 380,804 common shares for service. At the date of issuance, the common shares were valued at \$0.17 per common share and the Company recorded an expense of \$64,737.

On April 2, 2024, \$2,500,000 principal amount of the June 12% series convertible debentures were converted to 6,757,500 common shares.

On May 8, 2024, the Company closed a bought deal financing of 66,667,000 units at a price of \$0.09 per unit for gross proceeds of \$6,000,030. Each unit consisted of one common share and one common share purchase warrant, each whole warrant exercisable at \$0.12 for a 36 month period. The Company paid \$434,666 cash finder's fees and other expenses and issued 3,899,458 broker warrants. The broker warrants are exercisable into units at \$0.09 per unit, with each unit comprised of one common share and one common share purchase warrant, each whole warrant exercisable at \$0.12 for a 36 month period from the closing date of the financing.

Royal Helium Ltd.

Notes to the Interim Consolidated Financial Statements
Three and Nine Months Ended September 30, 2024 and 2023
(Expressed in Canadian dollars)

13. STOCK OPTIONS

On September 14, 2022, the shareholders of the Company approved a stock option plan, pursuant to which, the Company may issue up to a number of options that is 10% of the outstanding common shares of the Company to employees, directors and officers.

The following table reflects the continuity of stock options for the periods presented:

| | Number of stock options | Weighted average exercise price |
|--|------------------------------------|--|
| Balance, December 31, 2022 | 16,070,000 | \$ 0.37 |
| Issued | 1,250,000 | 0.38 |
| Issued | 500,000 | 0.40 |
| Balance, December 31, 2023 | 17,820,000 | 0.37 |
| Issued | 950,000 | 0.35 |
| Issued | 2,499,999 | 0.085 |
| Forfeited | (200,000) | 0.26 |
| Forfeited | (530,000) | 0.23 |
| Forfeited | (1,300,000) | 0.44 |
| Forfeited | (750,000) | 0.66 |
| Forfeited | (2,405,000) | 0.26 |
| Forfeited | (300,000) | 0.38 |
| Forfeited | (150,000) | 0.35 |
| Exercisable, September 30, 2024 | 15,634,999 | \$ 0.33 |

As at September 30, 2024, 15,634,999 (December 31, 2023 – 17,820,000) options were issued and outstanding and exercisable with a weighted average remaining life of 2.30 years (December 31, 2023 – 2.91).

On March 28, 2023, the Company granted 500,000 stock options, of the total options granted 500,000 were granted to consultants of the Company. The options have an exercise price of \$0.38, expire March 28, 2028 and vest immediately. The grant date fair value of the options was estimated using the Black-Scholes pricing model with the following weighted average assumptions: share price of \$0.36, expected yield of 0%, expected volatility of 171% based on the historical volatility of the Company, risk free rate of 3.10% and an expected life of 5 years, which resulted in a fair value of \$0.341 per option.

On May 3, 2023, the Company granted 750,000 stock options, of the total options granted 750,000 were granted to consultants of the Company. 500,000 of the options have an exercise price of \$0.38, expire April 26, 2028 and 250,000 expire May 3, 2028, and vest immediately. The grant date fair value of the options was estimated using the Black-Scholes pricing model with the following weighted average assumptions: share price of \$0.365, expected yield of 0%, expected volatility of 170% based on the historical volatility of the Company, risk free rate of 2.98% and an expected life of 5 years, which resulted in a fair value of \$0.345 per option.

On May 25, 2023, the Company granted 500,000 stock options, of the total options granted 500,000 were granted to a director of the Company. The options have an exercise price of \$0.40, expire May 25, 2028 and vest immediately. The grant date fair value of the options was estimated using the Black-Scholes pricing model with the following weighted average assumptions: share price of \$0.355, expected yield of 0%, expected volatility of 170% based on the historical volatility of the Company, risk free rate of 3.63% and an expected life of 5 years, which resulted in a fair value of \$0.335 per option.

Royal Helium Ltd.

Notes to the Interim Consolidated Financial Statements
Three and Nine Months Ended September 30, 2024 and 2023
(Expressed in Canadian dollars)

13. STOCK OPTIONS (continued)

On January 19, 2024, the board of directors granted 950,000 stock options to certain directors, employees and consultants of the Company. The stock options are exercisable at \$0.35 and expire January 19, 2029. The stock options vest immediately. The grant date fair value of the options was estimated using the Black-Scholes pricing model with the following weighted average assumptions: share price of \$0.20, expected yield of 0%, expected volatility of 163% based on the historical volatility of the Company, risk free rate of 3.64% and an expected life of 5 years, which resulted in a fair value of \$0.184 per option.

On January 19, 2024, the board of directors granted the aggregate of 909,070 deferred share units (“DSUs”) to certain directors, 5,963,635 performance share units (“PSUs”) to certain officers and directors. The DSUs and PSUs vest one year from the grant.

On June 19, 2024, the board of directors granted 5,000,000 stock options to a consultant of the Company. The stock options are exercisable at \$0.085 and expire June 19, 2027. The stock options vest evenly over six months, with the first vesting period commencing immediately. The grant date fair value of the vested options was estimated using the Black-Scholes pricing model with the following weighted average assumptions: share price of \$0.08, expected yield of 0%, expected volatility of 70% based on the historical volatility of the Company, risk free rate of 3.88% and an expected life of 3 years, which resulted in a fair value of \$0.038 per option.

14. WARRANTS AND BROKER WARRANTS

The following table reflects the continuity of warrants for the periods presented:

| | Number of warrants | Weighted Average Exercise Price |
|------------------------------------|-------------------------------|--|
| Balance, December 31, 2022 | 65,977,650 | \$ 0.51 |
| Issued | 21,153,000 | 0.32 |
| Issued | 19,731,900 | 0.40 |
| Issued | 18,750,000 | 0.31 |
| Issued | 2,812,500 | 0.31 |
| Exercised | (3,317,500) | 0.32 |
| Expired | (17,217,440) | 0.61 |
| Expired | (17,250,000) | 0.75 |
| Expired | (546,460) | 0.41 |
| Balance, December 31, 2023 | 90,093,650 | \$ 0.34 |
| Issued | 66,667,000 | 0.12 |
| Balance, September 30, 2024 | 156,760,650 | \$ 0.24 |

As of September 30, 2024, 156,760,650 (December 31, 2023 – 90,093,650) warrants were issued and outstanding with a weighted average remaining life of 1.97 years (December 31, 2023 – 2.25).

On February 8, 2023, the Company issued 21,153,000 warrants as part of the convertible debt issuance. The warrants have an exercise price of \$0.32, expire January 10, 2026 (see note 10). The issue date fair value of the warrants was estimated using the Black-Scholes pricing model with the following weighted average assumptions: share price of \$0.28, expected yield of 0%, expected volatility of 116.69% based on the historical volatility of the Company, risk free rate of 3.95% and an expected life range of 3 years, which resulted in an ascribed value of \$456,480 in total.

Royal Helium Ltd.

Notes to the Interim Consolidated Financial Statements
Three and Nine Months Ended September 30, 2024 and 2023
(Expressed in Canadian dollars)

14. WARRANTS AND BROKER WARRANTS (continued)

On June 12, 2023, the Company issued 19,731,900 warrants as part of the convertible debt issuance. The warrants have an exercise price of \$0.40, expire June 9, 2026 (see note 10). The issue date fair value of the warrants was estimated using the Black-Scholes pricing model with the following weighted average assumptions: share price of \$0.35, expected yield of 0%, expected volatility of 95.54% based on the historical volatility of the Company, risk free rate of 4.40% and an expected life range of 3 years, which resulted in an ascribed value of \$603,210 in total.

On November 14, 2023, the Company issued 18,750,000 warrants as part of the unit issuance. The warrants have an exercise price of \$0.31, expire November 14, 2026 (see note 12) and has not been disclosed separate from share capital.

On December 14, 2023, the Company issued 2,812,500 warrants as part of the unit issuance. The warrants have an exercise price of \$0.31, expire December 14, 2026 (see note 12) and has not been disclosed separate from share capital.

On May 8, 2024, the Company issued 66,667,000 warrants as part of the unit issuance. The warrants have an exercise price of \$0.12, expire May 8, 2027 (see note 12) and has not been disclosed separate from share capital.

The following table reflects the continuity of broker warrants for the periods presented:

| | Number of warrants | Weighted Average Exercise Price |
|------------------------------------|-------------------------------|--|
| Balance, December 31, 2022 | 6,208,299 | \$ 0.39 |
| Issued | 1,050,000 | 0.24 |
| Issued | 168,750 | 0.24 |
| Exercised | (69,669) | 0.26 |
| Expired | (182,750) | 0.22 |
| Expired | (1,752,724) | 0.41 |
| Expired | (2,415,000) | 0.50 |
| Balance, December 31, 2023 | 3,006,906 | \$0.26 |
| Issued | 3,899,458 | 0.09 |
| Balance, September 30, 2024 | 6,906,364 | \$ 0.16 |

As of September 30, 2024, 6,906,364 (December 31, 2023 – 3,006,906) warrants were issued and outstanding with a weighted average remaining life of 1.86 years (December 31, 2023 – 1.64 years).

On November 14, 2023, the Company issued 1,050,000 broker warrants upon closing of a bought deal financing. The broker warrants are exercisable into units at \$0.24 per unit, with each unit comprised of one common share and one common share purchase warrant, each whole warrant exercisable at \$0.31 for a 36 month period. The fair value of the warrants was estimated using the Black-Scholes pricing model with the following weighted average assumptions: share price of \$0.22, expected yield of 0%, expected volatility of 79% based on the historical volatility of the Company, risk free rate of 4.40% and an expected life of 3 years. The fair value of the broker units were \$119,700.

Royal Helium Ltd.

Notes to the Interim Consolidated Financial Statements
Three and Nine Months Ended September 30, 2024 and 2023
(Expressed in Canadian dollars)

14. WARRANTS AND BROKER WARRANTS (continued)

On December 14, 2023, the Company issued 168,750 broker warrants upon closing of a bought deal financing. The broker warrants are exercisable into units at \$0.24 per unit, with each unit comprised of one common share and one common share purchase warrant, each whole warrant exercisable at \$0.31 for a 36 month period. The fair value of the warrants was estimated using the Black-Scholes pricing model with the following weighted average assumptions: share price of \$0.215, expected yield of 0%, expected volatility of 73% based on the historical volatility of the Company, risk free rate of 3.93% and an expected life of 3 years. The fair value of the broker units were \$16,875.

On May 8, 2024, the Company issued 3,899,458 broker warrants upon closing of a bought deal financing. The broker warrants are exercisable into units at \$0.09 per unit, with each unit comprised of one common share and one common share purchase warrant, each whole warrant exercisable at \$0.12 for a 36 month period. The fair value of the warrants was estimated using the Black-Scholes pricing model with the following weighted average assumptions: share price of \$0.075, expected yield of 0%, expected volatility of 71% based on the historical volatility of the Company, risk free rate of 4.27% and an expected life of 3 years. The fair value of the broker units were \$241,766.

15. NET LOSS PER COMMON SHARE

The calculation of basic and diluted loss per share for the three month periods ended September 30, 2024, was based on the loss attributable to common shareholders of \$3,443,104 (September 30, 2023 - \$1,835,527) and the weighted average number of common shares outstanding of 357,650,286 for the period ended September 30, 2024 (September 30, 2023 – 246,038,073).

The calculation of basic and diluted loss per share for the nine month periods ended September 30, 2024, was based on the loss attributable to common shareholders of \$11,422,030 (September 30, 2023 - \$5,712,543) and the weighted average number of common shares outstanding of 318,376,545 for the period ended September 30, 2024 (September 30, 2023 – 242,877,495).

During the periods ended September 30, 2024 and 2023, all outstanding options and warrants were anti-dilutive and were therefore excluded from the diluted loss per share calculation.

16. GENERAL AND ADMINISTRATIVE

| | Three months ended September 30, | | Nine months ended September 30, | |
|----------------------------------|---|-------------|--|--------------|
| | 2024 | 2023 | 2024 | 2023 |
| Audit and accounting | \$ 33,568 | \$ 26,517 | \$ 87,691 | \$ 57,104 |
| General office and other | 490,298 | 368,419 | 1,593,242 | 2,414,783 |
| Investor relations and marketing | 216,196 | 131,800 | 701,084 | 561,483 |
| Legal and professional | 44,998 | 22,217 | 237,419 | 414,736 |
| Total general and administrative | \$ 785,060 | \$ 548,953 | \$ 2,619,436 | \$ 3,448,106 |

Royal Helium Ltd.

Notes to the Interim Consolidated Financial Statements
Three and Nine Months Ended September 30, 2024 and 2023
(Expressed in Canadian dollars)

17. FINANCE EXPENSE

| | Three months ended September 30, | | Nine months ended September 30, | |
|------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|------------|------------------------------------|--------------|
| | 2024 | 2023 | 2024 | 2023 |
| Accretion – debt obligations | \$ 156,282 | \$ 143,284 | \$ 536,845 | \$ 166,068 |
| Accretion – decommissioning | 4,743 | 3,360 | 16,391 | 9,040 |
| Accretion – convertible debentures | 224,805 | 191,409 | 687,954 | 340,190 |
| Interest – convertible debentures | 294,098 | 414,882 | 950,692 | 757,644 |
| Interest – term debt | 471,268 | 4,240 | 1,295,849 | 4,240 |
| Interest income | - | - | - | (21,412) |
| Total Finance expense, net | \$ 1,151,196 | \$ 757,175 | \$ 3,487,731 | \$ 1,255,770 |

18. CONTINGENCIES AND COMMITMENTS**Contracts**

The Company is party to certain management consulting contracts. Upon termination of these contracts, the Company will be required to make payments of \$324,000 pursuant to the terms of these contracts. As a triggering event has not taken place as at September 30, 2024, these amounts have not been recorded in these consolidated financial statements.

Environmental contingencies

The Company's exploration and evaluation activities are subject to various federal and provincial laws and regulations governing the protection of the environment. These laws and regulations are continually changing and generally becoming more restrictive. The Company conducts its operations so as to protect public health and the environment and believes its operations are materially in compliance with all applicable laws and regulations. The Company has made, and expects to make in the future, expenditures to comply with such laws and regulations.

Property expenditure commitments

See notes 4.

Legal matters

From time to time, the Company is named as a party to claims or involved in proceedings, including legal, regulatory and tax related, in the ordinary course of its business. While the outcome of these matters may not be estimable at period end, the Company makes provisions, where possible, for the estimated outcome of such claims or proceedings. Should a loss result from the resolution of any claims or proceedings that differs from these estimates, the difference will be accounted for as a charge to net loss in that period.

Royal Helium Ltd.

Notes to the Interim Consolidated Financial Statements
Three and Nine Months Ended September 30, 2024 and 2023
(Expressed in Canadian dollars)

19. RELATED PARTY TRANSACTIONS

The following table summarizes transactions with key management personnel:

| Nine months ended September 30, | 2024 | 2023 |
|--|-------------------|-------------------|
| Consulting fees – management | \$ 186,689 | \$ - |
| Wages | 410,000 | 552,750 |
| Director fees | 202,800 | 223,000 |
| Total | \$ 799,489 | \$ 775,750 |

| Nine months ended September 30, | 2024 | 2023 |
|--|-------------------|---------------------|
| Short term benefits | \$ 799,489 | \$ 775,750 |
| Share based compensation | 73,600 | 340,000 |
| Total | \$ 873,089 | \$ 1,115,750 |

As at September 30, 2024, the Company had \$641,021 (December 31, 2023 – \$239,014), included in accounts payable and accrued liabilities, owing to its key management personnel and directors for salary and wages.

The Company has an agreement for office space and related services for a monthly fixed fee of \$4,000 (2023 - \$4,000), with another company that has common management and directors. The Company incurred \$36,000 in 2024 (2023 – \$36,000) in respect of this agreement and had \$25,200 (December 31, 2023 – \$26,750), included in accounts payable and accrued liabilities as at September 30, 2024. See notes 5, 7 and 18.

20. FINANCIAL INSTRUMENTS**Financial risks factors**

The Company's activities expose it to a variety of financial risks: market risk (including currency risk), credit risk and liquidity risk. Risk management is carried out by management under policies approved by the Board of Directors. The Company's overall risk management program seeks to minimize potential adverse effects on the Company's financial performance.

(a) Market risk

Foreign exchange risk

Foreign exchange risk arises when assets or liabilities are denominated in a currency that is not the entity's functional currency. The Company does not hedge foreign currency exposures. All of the operating assets were located in Canada and majority of the Company's liabilities were also settled in Canada, therefore the Company does not have any significant foreign currency risk.

(b) Credit risk

The maximum exposure to credit risk for deposits approximates the amount recognized as cash, accounts receivable, and environmental deposit in the consolidated statements of financial position. Bank deposits are held with reputable Banks, therefore credit risk is low. The Company does not hold any collateral as security. Accounts receivable are all considered current and primarily relate to GST.

Royal Helium Ltd.

Notes to the Interim Consolidated Financial Statements
Three and Nine Months Ended September 30, 2024 and 2023
(Expressed in Canadian dollars)

20. FINANCIAL INSTRUMENTS (continued)**(c) Liquidity risk**

Liquidity risk is the risk that the Company will encounter difficulty in meeting obligations associated with financial liabilities. The Company's financial liabilities comprise accounts payable and accrued liabilities which are due within 30 days.

The Company mitigates liquidity risk by planning its project expenditures in advance of undertaking significant commitments. see note 2.

(d) Commodity price risk

The Company is exposed to price risk with respect to commodity prices. Commodity price risk is defined as the potential adverse impact on earnings and economic value due to commodity price movements and volatilities. The Company closely monitors commodity prices, as it relates to helium to determine the appropriate course of action to be taken by the Company.

In the year ended December 31, 2023, the Company incurred a financial loss of \$420,630 related to a phishing attack. In response, the Company has filed police reports and adjusted all related internal controls.

21. SUPPLEMENTAL CASH FLOW INFORMATION

| | September 30, 2024 | September 30, 2023 |
|--|---------------------------|---------------------------|
| Change in non-cash working capital: | | |
| Accounts receivable | \$ (456,983) | \$ 339,310 |
| Prepaid and inventory | (293,991) | (1,982) |
| Accounts payable and accrued liabilities | (1,093,794) | (3,605,605) |
| | \$ (1,844,768) | \$ (3,268,277) |
| Allocated to: | | |
| Operating | \$ 772,457 | \$ 177,574 |
| Investing | (2,617,225) | (3,445,851) |
| | \$ (1,844,768) | \$ (3,268,277) |

During the period ended September 30, 2024, the Company paid \$1,249,942 cash interest (December 31, 2023 - \$64,735).

22. EVENTS AFTER THE REPORTING PERIOD

Prior to and after the reporting period, the Company has completed a substantive change in management and the board in support of an operational realignment initiative, supported by key shareholders, creditors and other stakeholders. The previous CEO agreed to step down, as have various legacy board members. New leadership, which includes Daivd Young, have significantly reduced general and administrative expenses through elimination of non-core business expenditures. In addition, Management and its active Board have immediately put to action a plan to re-commission the Steveville Facility allowing for higher volumes to be processed by the facility in an increasingly efficiency, stable, and cost effective manner, as designed.

TAB 3



CANADA

CONSOLIDATION

CODIFICATION

Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act

Loi sur les arrangements avec les créanciers des compagnies

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

L.R.C. (1985), ch. C-36

Current to December 23, 2024

À jour au 23 décembre 2024

Last amended on December 12, 2024

Dernière modification le 12 décembre 2024

OFFICIAL STATUS OF CONSOLIDATIONS

Subsections 31(1) and (2) of the *Legislation Revision and Consolidation Act*, in force on June 1, 2009, provide as follows:

Published consolidation is evidence

31 (1) Every copy of a consolidated statute or consolidated regulation published by the Minister under this Act in either print or electronic form is evidence of that statute or regulation and of its contents and every copy purporting to be published by the Minister is deemed to be so published, unless the contrary is shown.

Inconsistencies in Acts

(2) In the event of an inconsistency between a consolidated statute published by the Minister under this Act and the original statute or a subsequent amendment as certified by the Clerk of the Parliaments under the *Publication of Statutes Act*, the original statute or amendment prevails to the extent of the inconsistency.

LAYOUT

The notes that appeared in the left or right margins are now in boldface text directly above the provisions to which they relate. They form no part of the enactment, but are inserted for convenience of reference only.

NOTE

This consolidation is current to December 23, 2024. The last amendments came into force on December 12, 2024. Any amendments that were not in force as of December 23, 2024 are set out at the end of this document under the heading “Amendments Not in Force”.

CARACTÈRE OFFICIEL DES CODIFICATIONS

Les paragraphes 31(1) et (2) de la *Loi sur la révision et la codification des textes législatifs*, en vigueur le 1^{er} juin 2009, prévoient ce qui suit :

Codifications comme élément de preuve

31 (1) Tout exemplaire d'une loi codifiée ou d'un règlement codifié, publié par le ministre en vertu de la présente loi sur support papier ou sur support électronique, fait foi de cette loi ou de ce règlement et de son contenu. Tout exemplaire donné comme publié par le ministre est réputé avoir été ainsi publié, sauf preuve contraire.

Incompatibilité — lois

(2) Les dispositions de la loi d'origine avec ses modifications subséquentes par le greffier des Parlements en vertu de la *Loi sur la publication des lois* l'emportent sur les dispositions incompatibles de la loi codifiée publiée par le ministre en vertu de la présente loi.

MISE EN PAGE

Les notes apparaissant auparavant dans les marges de droite ou de gauche se retrouvent maintenant en caractères gras juste au-dessus de la disposition à laquelle elles se rattachent. Elles ne font pas partie du texte, n'y figurant qu'à titre de repère ou d'information.

NOTE

Cette codification est à jour au 23 décembre 2024. Les dernières modifications sont entrées en vigueur le 12 décembre 2024. Toutes modifications qui n'étaient pas en vigueur au 23 décembre 2024 sont énoncées à la fin de ce document sous le titre « Modifications non en vigueur ».



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

L.R.C., 1985, ch. C-36

An Act to facilitate compromises and arrangements between companies and their creditors

Short Title

Short title

1 This Act may be cited as the *Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act*.

R.S., c. C-25, s. 1.

Interpretation

Definitions

2 (1) In this Act,

aircraft objects [Repealed, 2012, c. 31, s. 419]

bargaining agent means any trade union that has entered into a collective agreement on behalf of the employees of a company; (*agent négociateur*)

bond includes a debenture, debenture stock or other evidences of indebtedness; (*obligation*)

cash-flow statement, in respect of a company, means the statement referred to in paragraph 10(2)(a) indicating the company's projected cash flow; (*état de l'évolution de l'encaisse*)

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

collective agreement, in relation to a debtor company, means a collective agreement within the meaning of the jurisdiction governing collective bargaining between the debtor company and a bargaining agent; (*convention collective*)

Loi facilitant les transactions et arrangements entre les compagnies et leurs créanciers

Titre abrégé

Titre abrégé

1 *Loi sur les arrangements avec les créanciers des compagnies.*

S.R., ch. C-25, art. 1.

Définitions et application

Définitions

2 (1) Les définitions qui suivent s'appliquent à la présente loi.

accord de transfert de titres pour obtention de crédit

Accord aux termes duquel une compagnie débitrice transfère la propriété d'un bien en vue de garantir le paiement d'une somme ou l'exécution d'une obligation relativement à un contrat financier admissible. (*title transfer credit support agreement*)

actionnaire S'agissant d'une compagnie ou d'une fiducie de revenu assujetties à la présente loi, est assimilée à l'actionnaire la personne ayant un intérêt dans cette compagnie ou détenant des parts de cette fiducie. (*shareholder*)

administrateur S'agissant d'une compagnie autre qu'une fiducie de revenu, toute personne exerçant les fonctions d'administrateur, indépendamment de son titre, et, s'agissant d'une fiducie de revenu, toute personne exerçant les fonctions de fiduciaire, indépendamment de son titre. (*director*)

agent négociateur Syndicat ayant conclu une convention collective pour le compte des employés d'une compagnie. (*bargaining agent*)

biens aéronautiques [Abrogée, 2012, ch. 31, art. 419]

company means any company, corporation or legal person incorporated by or under an Act of Parliament or of the legislature of a province, any incorporated company having assets or doing business in Canada, wherever incorporated, and any income trust, but does not include banks, authorized foreign banks within the meaning of section 2 of the *Bank Act*, telegraph companies, insurance companies and companies to which the *Trust and Loan Companies Act* applies; (*compagnie*)

court means

(a) in Nova Scotia, British Columbia and Prince Edward Island, the Supreme Court,

(a.1) in Ontario, the Superior Court of Justice,

(b) in Quebec, the Superior Court,

(c) in New Brunswick, Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta, the Court of Queen's Bench,

(c.1) in Newfoundland and Labrador, the Trial Division of the Supreme Court, and

(d) in Yukon and the Northwest Territories, the Supreme Court, and in Nunavut, the Nunavut Court of Justice; (*tribunal*)

debtor company means any company that

(a) is bankrupt or insolvent,

(b) has committed an act of bankruptcy within the meaning of the *Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act* or is deemed insolvent within the meaning of the *Winding-up and Restructuring Act*, whether or not proceedings in respect of the company have been taken under either of those Acts,

(c) has made an authorized assignment or against which a bankruptcy order has been made under the *Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act*, or

(d) is in the course of being wound up under the *Winding-up and Restructuring Act* because the company is insolvent; (*compagnie débitrice*)

director means, in the case of a company other than an income trust, a person occupying the position of director by whatever name called and, in the case of an income trust, a person occupying the position of trustee by whatever name called; (*administrateur*)

eligible financial contract means an agreement of a prescribed kind; (*contrat financier admissible*)

compagnie Toute personne morale constituée par une loi fédérale ou provinciale ou sous son régime et toute personne morale qui possède un actif ou exerce des activités au Canada, quel que soit l'endroit où elle a été constituée, ainsi que toute fiducie de revenu. La présente définition exclut les banques, les banques étrangères autorisées, au sens de l'article 2 de la *Loi sur les banques*, les compagnies de télégraphe, les compagnies d'assurances et les sociétés auxquelles s'applique la *Loi sur les sociétés de fiducie et de prêt*. (*company*)

compagnie débitrice Toute compagnie qui, selon le cas :

a) est en faillite ou est insolvable;

b) a commis un acte de faillite au sens de la *Loi sur la faillite et l'insolvabilité* ou est réputée insolvable au sens de la *Loi sur les liquidations et les restructurations*, que des procédures relatives à cette compagnie aient été intentées ou non sous le régime de l'une ou l'autre de ces lois;

c) a fait une cession autorisée ou à l'encontre de laquelle une ordonnance de faillite a été rendue en vertu de la *Loi sur la faillite et l'insolvabilité*;

d) est en voie de liquidation aux termes de la *Loi sur les liquidations et les restructurations* parce que la compagnie est insolvable. (*debtor company*)

contrat financier admissible Contrat d'une catégorie réglementaire. (*eligible financial contract*)

contrôleur S'agissant d'une compagnie, la personne nommée en application de l'article 11.7 pour agir à titre de contrôleur des affaires financières et autres de celle-ci. (*monitor*)

convention collective S'entend au sens donné à ce terme par les règles de droit applicables aux négociations collectives entre la compagnie débitrice et l'agent négociateur. (*collective agreement*)

créancier chirographaire Tout créancier d'une compagnie qui n'est pas un créancier garanti, qu'il réside ou soit domicilié au Canada ou à l'étranger. Un fiduciaire pour les détenteurs d'obligations non garanties, lesquelles sont émises en vertu d'un acte de fiducie ou autre acte fonctionnant en faveur du fiduciaire, est réputé un créancier chirographaire pour toutes les fins de la présente loi sauf la votation à une assemblée des créanciers relativement à ces obligations. (*unsecured creditor*)

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

- (a) a dividend or similar payment,
- (b) a return of capital,
- (c) a redemption or retraction obligation,
- (d) a monetary loss resulting from the ownership, purchase or sale of an equity interest or from the rescission, or, in Quebec, the annulment, of a purchase or sale of an equity interest, or
- (e) contribution or indemnity in respect of a claim referred to in any of paragraphs (a) to (d); (*réclamation relative à des capitaux propres*)

equity interest means

- (a) in the case of a company other than an income trust, a share in the company — or a warrant or option or another right to acquire a share in the company — other than one that is derived from a convertible debt, and
- (b) in the case of an income trust, a unit in the income trust — or a warrant or option or another right to acquire a unit in the income trust — other than one that is derived from a convertible debt; (*intérêt relatif à des capitaux propres*)

financial collateral means any of the following that is subject to an interest, or in the Province of Quebec a right, that secures payment or performance of an obligation in respect of an eligible financial contract or that is subject to a title transfer credit support agreement:

- (a) cash or cash equivalents, including negotiable instruments and demand deposits,
- (b) securities, a securities account, a securities entitlement or a right to acquire securities, or
- (c) a futures agreement or a futures account; (*garantie financière*)

income trust means a trust that has assets in Canada if

- (a) its units are listed on a prescribed stock exchange on the day on which proceedings commence under this Act, or
- (b) the majority of its units are held by a trust whose units are listed on a prescribed stock exchange on the day on which proceedings commence under this Act; (*fiducie de revenu*)

créancier garanti Détenteur d'hypothèque, de gage, charge, nantissement ou privilège sur ou contre l'ensemble ou une partie des biens d'une compagnie débitrice, ou tout transport, cession ou transfert de la totalité ou d'une partie de ces biens, à titre de garantie d'une dette de la compagnie débitrice, ou un détenteur de quelque obligation d'une compagnie débitrice garantie par hypothèque, gage, charge, nantissement ou privilège sur ou contre l'ensemble ou une partie des biens de la compagnie débitrice, ou un transport, une cession ou un transfert de tout ou partie de ces biens, ou une fiducie à leur égard, que ce détenteur ou bénéficiaire réside ou soit domicilié au Canada ou à l'étranger. Un fiduciaire en vertu de tout acte de fiducie ou autre instrument garantissant ces obligations est réputé un créancier garanti pour toutes les fins de la présente loi sauf la votation à une assemblée de créanciers relativement à ces obligations. (*secured creditor*)

demande initiale La demande faite pour la première fois en application de la présente loi relativement à une compagnie. (*initial application*)

état de l'évolution de l'encaisse Relativement à une compagnie, l'état visé à l'alinéa 10(2)a) portant, projections à l'appui, sur l'évolution de l'encaisse de celle-ci. (*cash-flow statement*)

fiducie de revenu Fiducie qui possède un actif au Canada et dont les parts sont inscrites à une bourse de valeurs mobilières visée par règlement à la date à laquelle des procédures sont intentées sous le régime de la présente loi, ou sont détenues en majorité par une fiducie dont les parts sont inscrites à une telle bourse à cette date. (*income trust*)

garantie financière S'il est assujéti soit à un intérêt ou, dans la province de Québec, à un droit garantissant le paiement d'une somme ou l'exécution d'une obligation relativement à un contrat financier admissible, soit à un accord de transfert de titres pour obtention de crédit, l'un ou l'autre des éléments suivants :

- a) les sommes en espèces et les équivalents de trésorerie — notamment les effets négociables et dépôts à vue;
- b) les titres, comptes de titres, droits intermédiés et droits d'acquérir des titres;
- c) les contrats à terme ou comptes de contrats à terme. (*financial collateral*)

intérêt relatif à des capitaux propres

initial application means the first application made under this Act in respect of a company; (*demande initiale*)

monitor, in respect of a company, means the person appointed under section 11.7 to monitor the business and financial affairs of the company; (*contrôleur*)

net termination value means the net amount obtained after netting or setting off or compensating the mutual obligations between the parties to an eligible financial contract in accordance with its provisions; (*valeurs nettes dues à la date de résiliation*)

prescribed means prescribed by regulation; (*Version anglaise seulement*)

secured creditor means a holder of a mortgage, hypothec, pledge, charge, lien or privilege on or against, or any assignment, cession or transfer of, all or any property of a debtor company as security for indebtedness of the debtor company, or a holder of any bond of a debtor company secured by a mortgage, hypothec, pledge, charge, lien or privilege on or against, or any assignment, cession or transfer of, or a trust in respect of, all or any property of the debtor company, whether the holder or beneficiary is resident or domiciled within or outside Canada, and a trustee under any trust deed or other instrument securing any of those bonds shall be deemed to be a secured creditor for all purposes of this Act except for the purpose of voting at a creditors' meeting in respect of any of those bonds; (*créancier garanti*)

shareholder includes a member of a company — and, in the case of an income trust, a holder of a unit in an income trust — to which this Act applies; (*actionnaire*)

Superintendent of Bankruptcy means the Superintendent of Bankruptcy appointed under subsection 5(1) of the *Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act*; (*surintendant des faillites*)

Superintendent of Financial Institutions means the Superintendent of Financial Institutions appointed under subsection 5(1) of the *Office of the Superintendent of Financial Institutions Act*; (*surintendant des institutions financières*)

title transfer credit support agreement means an agreement under which a debtor company has provided title to property for the purpose of securing the payment or performance of an obligation of the debtor company in respect of an eligible financial contract; (*accord de transfert de titres pour obtention de crédit*)

unsecured creditor means any creditor of a company who is not a secured creditor, whether resident or

a) S'agissant d'une compagnie autre qu'une fiducie de revenu, action de celle-ci ou bon de souscription, option ou autre droit permettant d'acquérir une telle action et ne provenant pas de la conversion d'une dette convertible;

b) s'agissant d'une fiducie de revenu, part de celle-ci ou bon de souscription, option ou autre droit permettant d'acquérir une telle part et ne provenant pas de la conversion d'une dette convertible. (*equity interest*)

obligation Sont assimilés aux obligations les débetures, stock-obligations et autres titres de créance. (*bond*)

réclamation S'entend de toute dette, de tout engagement ou de toute obligation de quelque nature que ce soit, qui constituerait une réclamation prouvable au sens de l'article 2 de la *Loi sur la faillite et l'insolvabilité*. (*claim*)

réclamation relative à des capitaux propres Réclamation portant sur un intérêt relatif à des capitaux propres et visant notamment :

a) un dividende ou un paiement similaire;

b) un remboursement de capital;

c) tout droit de rachat d'actions au gré de l'actionnaire ou de remboursement anticipé d'actions au gré de l'émetteur;

d) des pertes pécuniaires associées à la propriété, à l'achat ou à la vente d'un intérêt relatif à des capitaux propres ou à l'annulation de cet achat ou de cette vente;

e) une contribution ou une indemnité relative à toute réclamation visée à l'un des alinéas a) à d). (*equity claim*)

surintendant des faillites Le surintendant des faillites nommé au titre du paragraphe 5(1) de la *Loi sur la faillite et l'insolvabilité*. (*Superintendent of Bankruptcy*)

surintendant des institutions financières Le surintendant des institutions financières nommé en application du paragraphe 5(1) de la *Loi sur le Bureau du surintendant des institutions financières*. (*Superintendent of Financial Institutions*)

tribunal

domiciled within or outside Canada, and a trustee for the holders of any unsecured bonds issued under a trust deed or other instrument running in favour of the trustee shall be deemed to be an unsecured creditor for all purposes of this Act except for the purpose of voting at a creditors' meeting in respect of any of those bonds. (*créancier chirographaire*)

Meaning of related and dealing at arm's length

(2) For the purpose of this Act, section 4 of the *Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act* applies for the purpose of determining whether a person is related to or dealing at arm's length with a debtor company.

R.S., 1985, c. C-36, s. 2; R.S., 1985, c. 27 (2nd Supp.), s. 10; 1990, c. 17, s. 4; 1992, c. 27, s. 90; 1993, c. 34, s. 52; 1996, c. 6, s. 167; 1997, c. 12, s. 120(E); 1998, c. 30, s. 14; 1999, c. 3, s. 22, c. 28, s. 154; 2001, c. 9, s. 575; 2002, c. 7, s. 133; 2004, c. 25, s. 193; 2005, c. 3, s. 15, c. 47, s. 124; 2007, c. 29, s. 104, c. 36, ss. 61, 105; 2012, c. 31, s. 419; 2015, c. 3, s. 37; 2018, c. 10, s. 89.

Application

3 (1) This Act applies in respect of a debtor company or affiliated debtor companies if the total of claims against the debtor company or affiliated debtor companies, determined in accordance with section 20, is more than \$5,000,000 or any other amount that is prescribed.

Affiliated companies

(2) For the purposes of this Act,

(a) companies are affiliated companies if one of them is the subsidiary of the other or both are subsidiaries of the same company or each of them is controlled by the same person; and

(b) two companies affiliated with the same company at the same time are deemed to be affiliated with each other.

a) Dans les provinces de la Nouvelle-Écosse, de la Colombie-Britannique et de l'Île-du-Prince-Édouard, la Cour suprême;

a.1) dans la province d'Ontario, la Cour supérieure de justice;

b) dans la province de Québec, la Cour supérieure;

c) dans les provinces du Nouveau-Brunswick, du Manitoba, de la Saskatchewan et d'Alberta, la Cour du Banc de la Reine;

c.1) dans la province de Terre-Neuve-et-Labrador, la Section de première instance de la Cour suprême;

d) au Yukon et dans les Territoires du Nord-Ouest, la Cour suprême et, au Nunavut, la Cour de justice du Nunavut. (*court*)

valeurs nettes dues à la date de résiliation La somme nette obtenue après compensation des obligations mutuelles des parties à un contrat financier admissible effectuée conformément à ce contrat. (*net termination value*)

Définition de personnes liées

(2) Pour l'application de la présente loi, l'article 4 de la *Loi sur la faillite et l'insolvabilité* s'applique pour établir si une personne est liée à une compagnie débitrice ou agit sans lien de dépendance avec une telle compagnie.

L.R. (1985), ch. C-36, art. 2; L.R. (1985), ch. 27 (2^e suppl.), art. 10; 1990, ch. 17, art. 4; 1992, ch. 27, art. 90; 1993, ch. 34, art. 52; 1996, ch. 6, art. 167; 1997, ch. 12, art. 120(A); 1998, ch. 30, art. 14; 1999, ch. 3, art. 22, ch. 28, art. 154; 2001, ch. 9, art. 575; 2002, ch. 7, art. 133; 2004, ch. 25, art. 193; 2005, ch. 3, art. 15, ch. 47, art. 124; 2007, ch. 29, art. 104, ch. 36, art. 61 et 105; 2012, ch. 31, art. 419; 2015, ch. 3, art. 37; 2018, ch. 10, art. 89.

Application

3 (1) La présente loi ne s'applique à une compagnie débitrice ou aux compagnies débitrices qui appartiennent au même groupe qu'elle que si le montant des réclamations contre elle ou les compagnies appartenant au même groupe, établi conformément à l'article 20, est supérieur à cinq millions de dollars ou à toute autre somme prévue par les règlements.

Application

(2) Pour l'application de la présente loi :

a) appartiennent au même groupe deux compagnies dont l'une est la filiale de l'autre ou qui sont sous le contrôle de la même personne;

b) sont réputées appartenir au même groupe deux compagnies dont chacune appartient au groupe d'une même compagnie.

Company controlled

(3) For the purposes of this Act, a company is controlled by a person or by two or more companies if

(a) securities of the company to which are attached more than fifty per cent of the votes that may be cast to elect directors of the company are held, other than by way of security only, by or for the benefit of that person or by or for the benefit of those companies; and

(b) the votes attached to those securities are sufficient, if exercised, to elect a majority of the directors of the company.

Subsidiary

(4) For the purposes of this Act, a company is a subsidiary of another company if

(a) it is controlled by

(i) that other company,

(ii) that other company and one or more companies each of which is controlled by that other company, or

(iii) two or more companies each of which is controlled by that other company; or

(b) it is a subsidiary of a company that is a subsidiary of that other company.

R.S., 1985, c. C-36, s. 3; 1997, c. 12, s. 121; 2005, c. 47, s. 125.

PART I

Compromises and Arrangements

Compromise with unsecured creditors

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

R.S., c. C-25, s. 4.

Application

(3) Pour l'application de la présente loi, ont le contrôle d'une compagnie la personne ou les compagnies :

a) qui détiennent — ou en sont bénéficiaires —, autrement qu'à titre de garantie seulement, des valeurs mobilières conférant plus de cinquante pour cent du maximum possible des voix à l'élection des administrateurs de la compagnie;

b) dont lesdites valeurs mobilières confèrent un droit de vote dont l'exercice permet d'élire la majorité des administrateurs de la compagnie.

Application

(4) Pour l'application de la présente loi, une compagnie est la filiale d'une autre compagnie dans chacun des cas suivants :

a) elle est contrôlée :

(i) soit par l'autre compagnie,

(ii) soit par l'autre compagnie et une ou plusieurs compagnies elles-mêmes contrôlées par cette autre compagnie,

(iii) soit par des compagnies elles-mêmes contrôlées par l'autre compagnie;

b) elle est la filiale d'une filiale de l'autre compagnie.

L.R. (1985), ch. C-36, art. 3; 1997, ch. 12, art. 121; 2005, ch. 47, art. 125.

PARTIE I

Transactions et arrangements

Transaction avec les créanciers chirographaires

4 Lorsqu'une transaction ou un arrangement est proposé entre une compagnie débitrice et ses créanciers chirographaires ou toute catégorie de ces derniers, le tribunal peut, à la requête sommaire de la compagnie, d'un de ces créanciers ou du syndic en matière de faillite ou liquidateur de la compagnie, ordonner que soit convoquée, de la manière qu'il prescrit, une assemblée de ces créanciers ou catégorie de créanciers, et, si le tribunal en décide ainsi, des actionnaires de la compagnie.

S.R., ch. C-25, art. 4.

Compromise with secured creditors

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

R.S., c. C-25, s. 5.

Claims against directors — compromise

5.1 (1) A compromise or arrangement made in respect of a debtor company may include in its terms provision for the compromise of claims against directors of the company that arose before the commencement of proceedings under this Act and that relate to the obligations of the company where the directors are by law liable in their capacity as directors for the payment of such obligations.

Exception

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

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

Powers of court

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

Resignation or removal of directors

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

1997, c. 12, s. 122.

Compromises to be sanctioned by court

6 (1) If a majority in number representing two thirds in value of the creditors, or the class of creditors, as the case may be — other than, unless the court orders otherwise, a class of creditors having equity claims, — present and voting either in person or by proxy at the meeting or

Transaction avec les créanciers garantis

5 Lorsqu'une transaction ou un arrangement est proposé entre une compagnie débitrice et ses créanciers garantis ou toute catégorie de ces derniers, le tribunal peut, à la requête sommaire de la compagnie, d'un de ces créanciers ou du syndic en matière de faillite ou liquidateur de la compagnie, ordonner que soit convoquée, de la manière qu'il prescrit, une assemblée de ces créanciers ou catégorie de créanciers, et, si le tribunal en décide ainsi, des actionnaires de la compagnie.

S.R., ch. C-25, art. 5.

Transaction — réclamations contre les administrateurs

5.1 (1) La transaction ou l'arrangement visant une compagnie débitrice peut comporter, au profit de ses créanciers, des dispositions relativement à une transaction sur les réclamations contre ses administrateurs qui sont antérieures aux procédures intentées sous le régime de la présente loi et visent des obligations de celle-ci dont ils peuvent être, ès qualités, responsables en droit.

Restriction

(2) La transaction ne peut toutefois viser des réclamations portant sur des droits contractuels d'un ou de plusieurs créanciers ou fondées sur la fausse représentation ou la conduite injustifiée ou abusive des administrateurs.

Pouvoir du tribunal

(3) Le tribunal peut déclarer qu'une réclamation contre les administrateurs ne peut faire l'objet d'une transaction s'il est convaincu qu'elle ne serait ni juste ni équitable dans les circonstances.

Démission ou destitution des administrateurs

(4) Si tous les administrateurs démissionnent ou sont destitués par les actionnaires sans être remplacés, quiconque dirige ou supervise les activités commerciales et les affaires internes de la compagnie débitrice est réputé un administrateur pour l'application du présent article.

1997, ch. 12, art. 122.

Homologation par le tribunal

6 (1) Si une majorité en nombre représentant les deux tiers en valeur des créanciers ou d'une catégorie de créanciers, selon le cas, — mise à part, sauf ordonnance contraire du tribunal, toute catégorie de créanciers ayant des réclamations relatives à des capitaux propres —

meetings of creditors respectively held under sections 4 and 5, or either of those sections, agree to any compromise or arrangement either as proposed or as altered or modified at the meeting or meetings, the compromise or arrangement may be sanctioned by the court and, if so sanctioned, is binding

(a) on all the creditors or the class of creditors, as the case may be, and on any trustee for that class of creditors, whether secured or unsecured, as the case may be, and on the company; and

(b) in the case of a company that has made an authorized assignment or against which a bankruptcy order has been made under the *Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act* or is in the course of being wound up under the *Winding-up and Restructuring Act*, on the trustee in bankruptcy or liquidator and contributories of the company.

Court may order amendment

(2) If a court sanctions a compromise or arrangement, it may order that the debtor's constating instrument be amended in accordance with the compromise or arrangement to reflect any change that may lawfully be made under federal or provincial law.

Restriction — certain Crown claims

(3) Unless Her Majesty agrees otherwise, the court may sanction a compromise or arrangement only if the compromise or arrangement provides for the payment in full to Her Majesty in right of Canada or a province, within six months after court sanction of the compromise or arrangement, of all amounts that were outstanding at the time of the application for an order under section 11 or 11.02 and that are of a kind that could be subject to a demand under

(a) subsection 224(1.2) 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*, an employee's premium, or employer's premium, as defined in the *Employment Insurance Act*, or a premium under Part VII.1 of that 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

présents et votant soit en personne, soit par fondé de pouvoir à l'assemblée ou aux assemblées de créanciers respectivement tenues au titre des articles 4 et 5, acceptent une transaction ou un arrangement, proposé ou modifié à cette ou ces assemblées, la transaction ou l'arrangement peut être homologué par le tribunal et, le cas échéant, lie :

a) tous les créanciers ou la catégorie de créanciers, selon le cas, et tout fiduciaire pour cette catégorie de créanciers, qu'ils soient garantis ou chirographaires, selon le cas, ainsi que la compagnie;

b) dans le cas d'une compagnie qui a fait une cession autorisée ou à l'encontre de laquelle une ordonnance de faillite a été rendue en vertu de la *Loi sur la faillite et l'insolvabilité* ou qui est en voie de liquidation sous le régime de la *Loi sur les liquidations et les restructurations*, le syndic en matière de faillite ou liquidateur et les contributeurs de la compagnie.

Modification des statuts constitutifs

(2) Le tribunal qui homologue une transaction ou un arrangement peut ordonner la modification des statuts constitutifs de la compagnie conformément à ce qui est prévu dans la transaction ou l'arrangement, selon le cas, pourvu que la modification soit légale au regard du droit fédéral ou provincial.

Certaines réclamations de la Couronne

(3) Le tribunal ne peut, sans le consentement de Sa Majesté, homologuer la transaction ou l'arrangement qui ne prévoit pas le paiement intégral à Sa Majesté du chef du Canada ou d'une province, dans les six mois suivant l'homologation, de toutes les sommes qui étaient dues lors de la demande d'ordonnance visée aux articles 11 ou 11.02 et qui pourraient, de par leur nature, faire l'objet d'une demande aux termes d'une des dispositions suivantes :

a) le paragraphe 224(1.2) de la *Loi de l'impôt sur le revenu*;

b) toute disposition du *Régime de pensions du Canada* ou de la *Loi sur l'assurance-emploi* qui renvoie au paragraphe 224(1.2) de la *Loi de l'impôt sur le revenu* et qui prévoit la perception d'une cotisation, au sens du *Régime de pensions du Canada*, d'une cotisation ouvrière ou d'une cotisation patronale, au sens de la *Loi sur l'assurance-emploi*, ou d'une cotisation prévue par la partie VII.1 de cette loi ainsi que des intérêts, pénalités ou autres charges afférents;

c) toute disposition législative provinciale dont l'objet est semblable à celui du paragraphe 224(1.2) de la *Loi de l'impôt sur le revenu*, ou qui renvoie à ce paragraphe, et qui prévoit la perception d'une somme,

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.

Restriction — default of remittance to Crown

(4) If an order contains a provision authorized by section 11.09, no compromise or arrangement is to be sanctioned by the court if, at the time the court hears the application for sanction, Her Majesty in right of Canada or a province satisfies the court that the company is in default on any remittance of an amount referred to in subsection (3) that became due after the time of the application for an order under section 11.02.

Restriction — employees, etc.

(5) The court may sanction a compromise or an arrangement only if

(a) the compromise or arrangement provides for payment to the employees and former employees of the company, immediately after the court's sanction, of

(i) amounts at least equal to the amounts that they would have been qualified to receive under paragraph 136(1)(d) of the *Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act* if the company had become bankrupt on the day on which proceedings commenced under this Act, and

(ii) wages, salaries, commissions or compensation for services rendered after proceedings commence under this Act and before the court sanctions the compromise or arrangement, together with, in the case of travelling salespersons, disbursements properly incurred by them in and about the company's business during the same period; and

(b) the court is satisfied that the company can and will make the payments as required under paragraph (a).

ainsi que des intérêts, pénalités ou autres charges afférents, laquelle somme :

(i) soit a été retenue par une personne sur un paiement effectué à une autre personne, ou déduite d'un tel paiement, et se rapporte à un impôt semblable, de par sa nature, à l'impôt sur le revenu auquel les particuliers sont assujettis en vertu de la *Loi de l'impôt sur le revenu*,

(ii) soit est de même nature qu'une cotisation prévue par le *Régime de pensions du Canada*, si la province est une province instituant un régime général de pensions au sens du paragraphe 3(1) de cette loi et si la loi provinciale a institué un régime provincial de pensions au sens de ce paragraphe.

Défaut d'effectuer un versement

(4) Lorsqu'une ordonnance comporte une disposition autorisée par l'article 11.09, le tribunal ne peut homologuer la transaction ou l'arrangement si, lors de l'audition de la demande d'homologation, Sa Majesté du chef du Canada ou d'une province le convainc du défaut de la compagnie d'effectuer un versement portant sur une somme visée au paragraphe (3) et qui est devenue exigible après le dépôt de la demande d'ordonnance visée à l'article 11.02.

Restriction — employés, etc.

(5) Le tribunal ne peut homologuer la transaction ou l'arrangement que si, à la fois :

a) la transaction ou l'arrangement prévoit le paiement aux employés actuels et anciens de la compagnie, dès son homologation, de sommes égales ou supérieures, d'une part, à celles qu'ils seraient en droit de recevoir en application de l'alinéa 136(1)d) de la *Loi sur la faillite et l'insolvabilité* si la compagnie avait fait faillite à la date à laquelle des procédures ont été introduites sous le régime de la présente loi à son égard et, d'autre part, au montant des gages, salaires, commissions ou autre rémunération pour services fournis entre la date de l'introduction des procédures et celle de l'homologation, y compris les sommes que le voyageur de commerce a régulièrement déboursées dans le cadre de l'exploitation de la compagnie entre ces dates;

b) il est convaincu que la compagnie est en mesure d'effectuer et effectuera les paiements prévus à l'alinéa a).

Restriction — pension plan

(6) If the company participates in a prescribed pension plan for the benefit of its employees, the court may sanction a compromise or an arrangement in respect of the company only if

(a) the compromise or arrangement provides for payment of the following amounts that are unpaid to the fund established for the purpose of the pension plan:

(i) an amount equal to the sum of all amounts that were deducted from the employees' remuneration for payment to the fund,

(ii) if the prescribed pension plan is regulated by an Act of Parliament,

(A) an amount equal to the normal cost, within the meaning of subsection 2(1) of the *Pension Benefits Standards Regulations, 1985*, that was required to be paid by the employer to the fund, and

(A.1) an amount equal to the sum of all special payments, determined in accordance with section 9 of the *Pension Benefits Standards Regulations, 1985*, that were required to be paid by the employer to the fund referred to in sections 81.5 and 81.6 of the *Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act* to liquidate an unfunded liability or a solvency deficiency,

(A.2) any amount required to liquidate any other unfunded liability or solvency deficiency of the fund as determined on the day on which proceedings commence under this Act,

(B) an amount equal to the sum of all amounts that were required to be paid by the employer to the fund under a defined contribution provision, within the meaning of subsection 2(1) of the *Pension Benefits Standards Act, 1985*,

(C) an amount equal to the sum of all amounts that were required to be paid by the employer to the administrator of a pooled registered pension plan, as defined in subsection 2(1) of the *Pooled Registered Pension Plans Act*, and

(iii) in the case of any other prescribed pension plan,

(A) an amount equal to the amount that would be the normal cost, within the meaning of subsection 2(1) of the *Pension Benefits Standards Regulations, 1985*, that the employer would be

Restriction — régime de pension

(6) Si la compagnie participe à un régime de pension réglementaire institué pour ses employés, le tribunal ne peut homologuer la transaction ou l'arrangement que si, à la fois :

a) la transaction ou l'arrangement prévoit que seront effectués des paiements correspondant au total des sommes ci-après qui n'ont pas été versées au fonds établi dans le cadre du régime de pension :

(i) les sommes qui ont été déduites de la rémunération des employés pour versement au fonds,

(ii) dans le cas d'un régime de pension réglementaire régi par une loi fédérale :

(A) les coûts normaux, au sens du paragraphe 2(1) du *Règlement de 1985 sur les normes de prestation de pension*, que l'employeur est tenu de verser au fonds,

(A.1) la somme égale au total des paiements spéciaux, établis conformément à l'article 9 du *Règlement de 1985 sur les normes de prestation de pension*, que l'employeur est tenu de verser au fonds visé aux articles 81.5 et 81.6 de la *Loi sur la faillite et l'insolvabilité* pour la liquidation d'un passif non capitalisé ou d'un déficit de solvabilité,

(A.2) toute somme requise pour la liquidation de tout autre passif non capitalisé ou déficit de solvabilité du fonds établi à la date à laquelle des procédures sont intentées sous le régime de la présente loi,

(B) les sommes que l'employeur est tenu de verser au fonds au titre de toute disposition à cotisations déterminées au sens du paragraphe 2(1) de la *Loi de 1985 sur les normes de prestation de pension*,

(C) les sommes que l'employeur est tenu de verser à l'administrateur d'un régime de pension agréé collectif au sens du paragraphe 2(1) de la *Loi sur les régimes de pension agréés collectifs*,

(iii) dans le cas de tout autre régime de pension réglementaire :

(A) la somme égale aux coûts normaux, au sens du paragraphe 2(1) du *Règlement de 1985 sur les normes de prestation de pension*, que l'employeur serait tenu de verser au fonds si le régime était régi par une loi fédérale,

required to pay to the fund if the prescribed plan were regulated by an Act of Parliament, and

(A.1) an amount equal to the sum of all special payments, determined in accordance with section 9 of the *Pension Benefits Standards Regulations, 1985*, that would have been required to be paid by the employer to the fund referred to in sections 81.5 and 81.6 of the *Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act* to liquidate an unfunded liability or a solvency deficiency if the prescribed plan were regulated by an Act of Parliament,

(A.2) any amount required to liquidate any other unfunded liability or solvency deficiency of the fund as determined on the day on which proceedings commence under this Act,

(B) an amount equal to the sum of all amounts that would have been required to be paid by the employer to the fund under a defined contribution provision, within the meaning of subsection 2(1) of the *Pension Benefits Standards Act, 1985*, if the prescribed plan were regulated by an Act of Parliament,

(C) an amount equal to the sum of all amounts that would have been required to be paid by the employer in respect of a prescribed plan, if it were regulated by the *Pooled Registered Pension Plans Act*; and

(b) the court is satisfied that the company can and will make the payments as required under paragraph (a).

Non-application of subsection (6)

(7) Despite subsection (6), the court may sanction a compromise or arrangement that does not allow for the payment of the amounts referred to in that subsection if it is satisfied that the relevant parties have entered into an agreement, approved by the relevant pension regulator, respecting the payment of those amounts.

Payment — equity claims

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

R.S., 1985, c. C-36, s. 6; 1992, c. 27, s. 90; 1996, c. 6, s. 167; 1997, c. 12, s. 123; 2004, c. 25, s. 194; 2005, c. 47, s. 126, 2007, c. 36, s. 106; 2009, c. 33, s. 27; 2012, c. 16, s. 82; 2023, c. 6, s. 5.

(A.1) la somme égale au total des paiements spéciaux, établis conformément à l'article 9 du *Règlement de 1985 sur les normes de prestation de pension*, que l'employeur serait tenu de verser au fonds visé aux articles 81.5 et 81.6 de la *Loi sur la faillite et l'insolvabilité* pour la liquidation d'un passif non capitalisé ou d'un déficit de solvabilité si le régime était régi par une loi fédérale,

(A.2) toute somme requise pour la liquidation de tout autre passif non capitalisé ou déficit de solvabilité du fonds établi à la date à laquelle des procédures sont intentées sous le régime de la présente loi,

(B) les sommes que l'employeur serait tenu de verser au fonds au titre de toute disposition à cotisations déterminées au sens du paragraphe 2(1) de la *Loi de 1985 sur les normes de prestation de pension* si le régime était régi par une loi fédérale,

(C) les sommes que l'employeur serait tenu de verser à l'égard du régime s'il était régi par la *Loi sur les régimes de pension agréés collectifs*;

b) il est convaincu que la compagnie est en mesure d'effectuer et effectuera les paiements prévus à l'alinéa a).

Non-application du paragraphe (6)

(7) Par dérogation au paragraphe (6), le tribunal peut homologuer la transaction ou l'arrangement qui ne prévoit pas le versement des sommes mentionnées à ce paragraphe s'il est convaincu que les parties en cause ont conclu un accord sur les sommes à verser et que l'autorité administrative responsable du régime de pension a consenti à l'accord.

Paiement d'une réclamation relative à des capitaux propres

(8) Le tribunal ne peut homologuer la transaction ou l'arrangement qui prévoit le paiement d'une réclamation relative à des capitaux propres que si, selon les termes de celle-ci, le paiement intégral de toutes les autres réclamations sera effectué avant le paiement de la réclamation relative à des capitaux propres.

L.R. (1985), ch. C-36, art. 6; 1992, ch. 27, art. 90; 1996, ch. 6, art. 167; 1997, ch. 12, art. 123; 2004, ch. 25, art. 194; 2005, ch. 47, art. 126, 2007, ch. 36, art. 106; 2009, ch. 33, art. 27; 2012, ch. 16, art. 82; 2023, ch. 6, art. 5.

Court may give directions

7 Where an alteration or a modification of any compromise or arrangement is proposed at any time after the court has directed a meeting or meetings to be summoned, the meeting or meetings may be adjourned on such term as to notice and otherwise as the court may direct, and those directions may be given after as well as before adjournment of any meeting or meetings, and the court may in its discretion direct that it is not necessary to adjourn any meeting or to convene any further meeting of any class of creditors or shareholders that in the opinion of the court is not adversely affected by the alteration or modification proposed, and any compromise or arrangement so altered or modified may be sanctioned by the court and have effect under section 6.

R.S., c. C-25, s. 7.

Scope of Act

8 This Act extends and does not limit the provisions of any instrument now or hereafter existing that governs the rights of creditors or any class of them and has full force and effect notwithstanding anything to the contrary contained in that instrument.

R.S., c. C-25, s. 8.

Right of unpaid supplier of perishable fruits or vegetables

8.1 (1) Subject to this section, if a person (in this section referred to as the “supplier”) has sold to a debtor company (in this section referred to as the “purchaser”) perishable fruits or vegetables for use in relation to the purchaser’s business and the purchaser has not fully paid the supplier, the perishable fruits or vegetables, as well as any of the proceeds of sale, are deemed to be held in trust by the purchaser for the supplier, if

- (a) the supplier has included in their invoice a notice, or has otherwise given notice within 30 days of the receipt by the purchaser of the perishable fruits or vegetables, in the prescribed form and manner, informing the purchaser of their intention to avail themselves of their right as beneficial owner of the perishable fruits or vegetables and the proceeds of sale in case the purchaser applies to the court to sanction a compromise or an arrangement;
- (b) the purchaser has 30 days or less to pay the entire balance owing to the supplier; and
- (c) the purchaser does not pay to the supplier the entire balance owing when it becomes due as provided in the invoice.

Le tribunal peut donner des instructions

7 Si une modification d’une transaction ou d’un arrangement est proposée après que le tribunal a ordonné qu’une ou plusieurs assemblées soient convoquées, cette ou ces assemblées peuvent être ajournées aux conditions que peut prescrire le tribunal quant à l’avis et autrement, et ces instructions peuvent être données tant après qu’avant l’ajournement de toute ou toutes assemblées, et le tribunal peut, à sa discrétion, prescrire qu’il ne sera pas nécessaire d’ajourner quelque assemblée ou de convoquer une nouvelle assemblée de toute catégorie de créanciers ou actionnaires qui, selon l’opinion du tribunal, n’est pas défavorablement atteinte par la modification proposée, et une transaction ou un arrangement ainsi modifié peut être homologué par le tribunal et être exécutoire en vertu de l’article 6.

S.R., ch. C-25, art. 7.

Champ d’application de la loi

8 La présente loi n’a pas pour effet de limiter mais d’étendre les stipulations de tout instrument actuellement ou désormais existant relativement aux droits de créanciers ou de toute catégorie de ces derniers, et elle est pleinement exécutoire et effective nonobstant toute stipulation contraire de cet instrument.

S.R., ch. C-25, art. 8.

Droit du fournisseur impayé — fruits ou légumes périssables

8.1 (1) Sous réserve des autres dispositions du présent article, dans le cas où une compagnie débitrice — appelée « acheteur » au présent article — n’a pas payé au complet des fruits ou légumes périssables destinés à être utilisés dans le cadre de ses affaires à la personne — appelée « fournisseur » au présent article — qui les lui a vendus, les fruits ou légumes périssables, ainsi que tout produit de vente, sont réputés être détenus en fiducie par l’acheteur pour le fournisseur lorsque les conditions suivantes sont réunies :

- a) le fournisseur a donné avis à l’acheteur, en la forme et de la manière réglementaires — soit dans sa facture, soit autrement dans un délai de trente jours suivant la réception des fruits ou légumes périssables par l’acheteur — de son intention de se prévaloir de son droit à titre de véritable propriétaire des fruits ou légumes périssables et de tout produit de vente dans le cas où l’acheteur demande au tribunal d’homologuer une transaction ou un arrangement;
- b) l’acheteur disposait d’au plus trente jours pour acquitter le solde impayé;

Clarification

(2) For greater certainty, once the perishable fruits or vegetables, as well as any of the proceeds of sale, are deemed to be held in trust by the purchaser for the supplier in accordance with subsection (1), they are not included in the property of the purchaser.

Provincial law

(3) The laws of general application in relation to trusts and trustees in force in the province in which the purchaser resided or carried on business when the purchaser applied to the court to sanction a compromise or an arrangement apply to the trust, and in the event of any inconsistency or conflict between this section and the provisions of any of those laws, the provisions of those laws prevail to the extent of the inconsistency or conflict.

Definitions

(4) The following definitions apply in this section.

perishable fruits or vegetables includes perishable fruits and vegetables that have been repackaged or transformed by the purchaser to the extent that the nature of the fruits or vegetables remains unchanged. (*fruits ou légumes périssables*)

proceeds of sale means the proceeds from the sale by the purchaser of the perishable fruits or vegetables that are subject to the trust, whether or not those proceeds have been kept by the purchaser in a separate account or have been combined with other funds. (*produit de vente*)

2024, c. 31, s. 3.

PART II

Jurisdiction of Courts

Jurisdiction of court to receive applications

9 (1) Any application under this Act may be made to the court that has jurisdiction in the province within which the head office or chief place of business of the company in Canada is situated, or, if the company has no place of business in Canada, in any province within which any assets of the company are situated.

c) l'acheteur n'a pas acquitté le solde impayé lorsqu'il est devenu exigible conformément à ce qui était prévu dans la facture.

Précision

(2) Il est entendu que les fruits ou légumes périssables, ainsi que tout produit de vente, ne sont pas compris dans les biens de l'acheteur dès lors qu'ils sont réputés être détenus en fiducie par l'acheteur pour le fournisseur au titre du paragraphe (1).

Droit provincial

(3) La fiducie est assujettie aux lois d'application générale concernant les fiducies et les fiduciaires de la province où l'acheteur résidait ou exerçait des activités lorsqu'il a demandé au tribunal d'homologuer une transaction ou un arrangement, les dispositions de ces lois l'emportant sur les dispositions incompatibles du présent article.

Définitions

(4) Les définitions qui suivent s'appliquent au présent article.

fruits ou légumes périssables Sont compris parmi les fruits ou légumes périssables ceux qui sont réemballés ou transformés par l'acheteur sans qu'en soit changée leur nature. (*perishable fruits or vegetables*)

produit de vente Produit de la vente par l'acheteur des fruits ou légumes périssables assujettis à la fiducie, qu'il ait été gardé par l'acheteur dans un compte distinct ou combiné à d'autres fonds. (*proceeds of sale*)

2024, ch. 31, art. 3.

PARTIE II

Juridiction des tribunaux

Le tribunal a juridiction pour recevoir des demandes

9 (1) Toute demande prévue par la présente loi peut être faite au tribunal ayant juridiction dans la province où est situé le siège social ou le principal bureau d'affaires de la compagnie au Canada, ou, si la compagnie n'a pas de bureau d'affaires au Canada, dans la province où est situé quelque actif de la compagnie.

Single judge may exercise powers, subject to appeal

(2) The powers conferred by this Act on a court may, subject to appeal as provided for in this Act, be exercised by a single judge thereof, and those powers may be exercised in chambers during term or in vacation.

R.S., c. C-25, s. 9.

Form of applications

10 (1) Applications under this Act shall be made by petition or by way of originating summons or notice of motion in accordance with the practice of the court in which the application is made.

Documents that must accompany initial application

(2) An initial application must be accompanied by

- (a) a statement indicating, on a weekly basis, the projected cash flow of the debtor company;
- (b) a report containing the prescribed representations of the debtor company regarding the preparation of the cash-flow statement; and
- (c) copies of all financial statements, audited or unaudited, prepared during the year before the application or, if no such statements were prepared in that year, a copy of the most recent such statement.

Publication ban

(3) The court may make an order prohibiting the release to the public of any cash-flow statement, or any part of a cash-flow statement, if it is satisfied that the release would unduly prejudice the debtor company and the making of the order would not unduly prejudice the company's creditors, but the court may, in the order, direct that the cash-flow statement or any part of it be made available to any person specified in the order on any terms or conditions that the court considers appropriate.

R.S., 1985, c. C-36, s. 10; 2005, c. 47, s. 127.

General power of court

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.

R.S., 1985, c. C-36, s. 11; 1992, c. 27, s. 90; 1996, c. 6, s. 167; 1997, c. 12, s. 124; 2005, c. 47, s. 128.

Un seul juge peut exercer les pouvoirs, sous réserve d'appel

(2) Les pouvoirs conférés au tribunal par la présente loi peuvent être exercés par un seul de ses juges, sous réserve de l'appel prévu par la présente loi. Ces pouvoirs peuvent être exercés en chambre, soit durant une session du tribunal, soit pendant les vacances judiciaires.

S.R., ch. C-25, art. 9.

Forme des demandes

10 (1) Les demandes prévues par la présente loi peuvent être formulées par requête ou par voie d'assignation introductive d'instance ou d'avis de motion conformément à la pratique du tribunal auquel la demande est présentée.

Documents accompagnant la demande initiale

(2) La demande initiale doit être accompagnée :

- a) d'un état portant, projections à l'appui, sur l'évolution hebdomadaire de l'encaisse de la compagnie débitrice;
- b) d'un rapport contenant les observations réglementaires de la compagnie débitrice relativement à l'établissement de cet état;
- c) d'une copie des états financiers, vérifiés ou non, établis au cours de l'année précédant la demande ou, à défaut, d'une copie des états financiers les plus récents.

Interdiction de mettre l'état à la disposition du public

(3) Le tribunal peut, par ordonnance, interdire la communication au public de tout ou partie de l'état de l'évolution de l'encaisse de la compagnie débitrice s'il est convaincu que sa communication causerait un préjudice indu à celle-ci et que sa non-communication ne causerait pas de préjudice indu à ses créanciers. Il peut toutefois préciser dans l'ordonnance que tout ou partie de cet état peut être communiqué, aux conditions qu'il estime indiquées, à la personne qu'il nomme.

L.R. (1985), ch. C-36, art. 10; 2005, ch. 47, art. 127.

Pouvoir général du tribunal

11 Malgré toute disposition de la *Loi sur la faillite et l'insolvabilité* ou de la *Loi sur les liquidations et les restructurations*, le tribunal peut, dans le cas de toute demande sous le régime de la présente loi à l'égard d'une compagnie débitrice, rendre, sur demande d'un intéressé, mais sous réserve des restrictions prévues par la présente loi et avec ou sans avis, toute ordonnance qu'il estime indiquée.

L.R. (1985), ch. C-36, art. 11; 1992, ch. 27, art. 90; 1996, ch. 6, art. 167; 1997, ch. 12, art. 124; 2005, ch. 47, art. 128.

Relief reasonably necessary

11.001 An order made under section 11 at the same time as an order made under subsection 11.02(1) or during the period referred to in an order made under that subsection with respect to an initial application shall be limited to relief that is reasonably necessary for the continued operations of the debtor company in the ordinary course of business during that period.

2019, c. 29, s. 136.

Rights of suppliers

11.01 No order made under section 11 or 11.02 has the effect of

(a) prohibiting a person from requiring immediate payment for goods, services, use of leased or licensed property or other valuable consideration provided after the order is made; or

(b) requiring the further advance of money or credit.

2005, c. 47, s. 128.

Stays, etc. — initial application

11.02 (1) 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.

Stays, etc. — other than initial application

(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);

Redressements normalement nécessaires

11.001 L'ordonnance rendue au titre de l'article 11 en même temps que l'ordonnance rendue au titre du paragraphe 11.02(1) ou pendant la période visée dans l'ordonnance rendue au titre de ce paragraphe relativement à la demande initiale n'est limitée qu'aux redressements normalement nécessaires à la continuation de l'exploitation de la compagnie débitrice dans le cours ordinaire de ses affaires durant cette période.

2019, ch. 29, art. 136.

Droits des fournisseurs

11.01 L'ordonnance prévue aux articles 11 ou 11.02 ne peut avoir pour effet :

a) d'empêcher une personne d'exiger que soient effectués sans délai les paiements relatifs à la fourniture de marchandises ou de services, à l'utilisation de biens loués ou faisant l'objet d'une licence ou à la fourniture de toute autre contrepartie de valeur qui ont lieu après l'ordonnance;

b) d'exiger le versement de nouvelles avances de fonds ou de nouveaux crédits.

2005, ch. 47, art. 128.

Suspension : demande initiale

11.02 (1) Dans le cas d'une demande initiale visant une compagnie débitrice, le tribunal peut, par ordonnance, aux conditions qu'il peut imposer et pour la période maximale de dix jours qu'il estime nécessaire :

a) suspendre, jusqu'à nouvel ordre, toute procédure qui est ou pourrait être intentée contre la compagnie sous le régime de la *Loi sur la faillite et l'insolvabilité* ou de la *Loi sur les liquidations et les restructurations*;

b) surseoir, jusqu'à nouvel ordre, à la continuation de toute action, poursuite ou autre procédure contre la compagnie;

c) interdire, jusqu'à nouvel ordre, l'introduction de toute action, poursuite ou autre procédure contre la compagnie.

Suspension : demandes autres qu'initiales

(2) Dans le cas d'une demande, autre qu'une demande initiale, visant une compagnie débitrice, le tribunal peut, par ordonnance, aux conditions qu'il peut imposer et pour la période qu'il estime nécessaire :

a) suspendre, jusqu'à nouvel ordre, toute procédure qui est ou pourrait être intentée contre la compagnie sous le régime des lois mentionnées à l'alinéa (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.

Burden of proof on application

(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.

Restriction

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

2005, c. 47, s. 128, 2007, c. 36, s. 62(F); 2019, c. 29, s. 137.

Stays — directors

11.03 (1) An order made under section 11.02 may provide that no person may commence or continue any action against a director of the company on any claim against directors that arose before the commencement of proceedings under this Act and that relates to obligations of the company if directors are under any law liable in their capacity as directors for the payment of those obligations, until a compromise or an arrangement in respect of the company, if one is filed, is sanctioned by the court or is refused by the creditors or the court.

Exception

(2) Subsection (1) does not apply in respect of an action against a director on a guarantee given by the director relating to the company's obligations or an action seeking injunctive relief against a director in relation to the company.

Persons deemed to be directors

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

2005, c. 47, s. 128.

b) surseoir, jusqu'à nouvel ordre, à la continuation de toute action, poursuite ou autre procédure contre la compagnie;

c) interdire, jusqu'à nouvel ordre, l'introduction de toute action, poursuite ou autre procédure contre la compagnie.

Preuve

(3) Le tribunal ne rend l'ordonnance que si :

a) le demandeur le convainc que la mesure est opportune;

b) dans le cas de l'ordonnance visée au paragraphe (2), le demandeur le convainc en outre qu'il a agi et continue d'agir de bonne foi et avec la diligence voulue.

Restriction

(4) L'ordonnance qui prévoit l'une des mesures visées aux paragraphes (1) ou (2) ne peut être rendue qu'en vertu du présent article.

2005, ch. 47, art. 128, 2007, ch. 36, art. 62(F); 2019, ch. 29, art. 137.

Suspension — administrateurs

11.03 (1) L'ordonnance prévue à l'article 11.02 peut interdire l'introduction ou la continuation de toute action contre les administrateurs de la compagnie relativement aux réclamations qui sont antérieures aux procédures intentées sous le régime de la présente loi et visent des obligations de la compagnie dont ils peuvent être, es qualités, responsables en droit, tant que la transaction ou l'arrangement, le cas échéant, n'a pas été homologué par le tribunal ou rejeté par celui-ci ou les créanciers.

Exclusion

(2) La suspension ne s'applique toutefois pas aux actions contre les administrateurs pour les garanties qu'ils ont données relativement aux obligations de la compagnie ni aux mesures de la nature d'une injonction les visant au sujet de celle-ci.

Présomption : administrateurs

(3) Si tous les administrateurs démissionnent ou sont destitués par les actionnaires sans être remplacés, quiconque dirige ou supervise les activités commerciales et les affaires internes de la compagnie est réputé un administrateur pour l'application du présent article.

2005, ch. 47, art. 128.

Persons obligated under letter of credit or guarantee

11.04 No order made under section 11.02 has affect on any action, suit or proceeding against a person, other than the company in respect of whom the order is made, who is obligated under a letter of credit or guarantee in relation to the company.

2005, c. 47, s. 128.

11.05 [Repealed, 2007, c. 29, s. 105]

Member of the Canadian Payments Association

11.06 No order may be made under this Act that has the effect of preventing a member of the Canadian Payments Association from ceasing to act as a clearing agent or group clearer for a company in accordance with the *Canadian Payments Act* or the by-laws or rules of that Association.

2005, c. 47, s. 128, 2007, c. 36, s. 64.

11.07 [Repealed, 2012, c. 31, s. 420]

Restriction — certain powers, duties and functions

11.08 No order may be made under section 11.02 that affects

(a) the exercise or performance by the Minister of Finance or the Superintendent of Financial Institutions of any power, duty or function assigned to them by the *Bank Act*, the *Cooperative Credit Associations Act*, the *Insurance Companies Act* or the *Trust and Loan Companies Act*;

(b) the exercise or performance by the Governor in Council, the Minister of Finance or the Canada Deposit Insurance Corporation of any power, duty or function assigned to them by the *Canada Deposit Insurance Corporation Act*; or

(c) the exercise by the Attorney General of Canada of any power, assigned to him or her by the *Winding-up and Restructuring Act*.

2005, c. 47, s. 128.

Stay — Her Majesty

11.09 (1) 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*, an employee's premium, or employer's

Suspension — lettres de crédit ou garanties

11.04 L'ordonnance prévue à l'article 11.02 est sans effet sur toute action, poursuite ou autre procédure contre la personne — autre que la compagnie visée par l'ordonnance — qui a des obligations au titre de lettres de crédit ou de garanties se rapportant à la compagnie.

2005, ch. 47, art. 128.

11.05 [Abrogé, 2007, ch. 29, art. 105]

Membre de l'Association canadienne des paiements

11.06 Aucune ordonnance prévue par la présente loi ne peut avoir pour effet d'empêcher un membre de l'Association canadienne des paiements de cesser d'agir, pour une compagnie, à titre d'agent de compensation ou d'adhérent correspondant de groupe conformément à la *Loi canadienne sur les paiements* et aux règles et règlements administratifs de l'Association.

2005, ch. 47, art. 128; 2007, ch. 36, art. 64.

11.07 [Abrogé, 2012, ch. 31, art. 420]

Restrictions : exercice de certaines attributions

11.08 L'ordonnance prévue à l'article 11.02 ne peut avoir d'effet sur :

a) l'exercice par le ministre des Finances ou par le surintendant des institutions financières des attributions qui leur sont conférées par la *Loi sur les banques*, la *Loi sur les associations coopératives de crédit*, la *Loi sur les sociétés d'assurances* ou la *Loi sur les sociétés de fiducie et de prêt*;

b) l'exercice par le gouverneur en conseil, le ministre des Finances ou la Société d'assurance-dépôts du Canada des attributions qui leur sont conférées par la *Loi sur la Société d'assurance-dépôts du Canada*;

c) l'exercice par le procureur général du Canada des pouvoirs qui lui sont conférés par la *Loi sur les liquidations et les restructurations*.

2005, ch. 47, art. 128.

Suspension des procédures : Sa Majesté

11.09 (1) L'ordonnance prévue à l'article 11.02 peut avoir pour effet de suspendre :

a) l'exercice par Sa Majesté du chef du Canada des droits que lui confère le paragraphe 224(1.2) de la *Loi de l'impôt sur le revenu* ou toute disposition du *Régime de pensions du Canada* ou de la *Loi sur l'assurance-emploi* qui renvoie à ce paragraphe et qui prévoit la perception d'une cotisation, au sens du *Régime de pensions du Canada*, d'une cotisation ouvrière ou

premium, as defined in the *Employment Insurance Act*, or a premium under Part VII.1 of that 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.

When order ceases to be in effect

(2) 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

d'une cotisation patronale, au sens de la *Loi sur l'assurance-emploi*, ou d'une cotisation prévue par la partie VII.1 de cette loi ainsi que des intérêts, pénalités et autres charges afférents, à l'égard d'une compagnie qui est un débiteur fiscal visé à ce paragraphe ou à cette disposition, pour la période se terminant au plus tard :

- (i) à l'expiration de l'ordonnance,
- (ii) au moment du rejet, par le tribunal ou les créanciers, de la transaction proposée,
- (iii) six mois après que le tribunal a homologué la transaction ou l'arrangement,
- (iv) au moment de tout défaut d'exécution de la transaction ou de l'arrangement,
- (v) au moment de l'exécution intégrale de la transaction ou de l'arrangement;

b) l'exercice par Sa Majesté du chef d'une province, pour la période que le tribunal estime indiquée et se terminant au plus tard au moment visé à celui des sous-alinéas a)(i) à (v) qui, le cas échéant, est applicable, des droits que lui confère toute disposition législative de cette province à l'égard d'une compagnie qui est un débiteur visé par la loi provinciale, s'il s'agit d'une disposition dont l'objet est semblable à celui du paragraphe 224(1.2) de la *Loi de l'impôt sur le revenu*, ou qui renvoie à ce paragraphe, et qui prévoit la perception d'une somme, ainsi que des intérêts, pénalités et autres charges afférents, laquelle :

- (i) soit a été retenue par une personne sur un paiement effectué à une autre personne, ou déduite d'un tel paiement, et se rapporte à un impôt semblable, de par sa nature, à l'impôt sur le revenu auquel les particuliers sont assujettis en vertu de la *Loi de l'impôt sur le revenu*,
- (ii) soit est de même nature qu'une cotisation prévue par le *Régime de pensions du Canada*, si la province est une province instituant un régime général de pensions au sens du paragraphe 3(1) de cette loi et si la loi provinciale institue un régime provincial de pensions au sens de ce paragraphe.

Cessation d'effet

(2) Les passages de l'ordonnance qui suspendent l'exercice des droits de Sa Majesté visés aux alinéas (1)a) ou b) cessent d'avoir effet dans les cas suivants :

- a) la compagnie manque à ses obligations de paiement à l'égard de toute somme qui devient due à Sa

(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*, an employee's premium, or employer's premium, as defined in the *Employment Insurance Act*, or a premium under Part VII.1 of that 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*, an employee's premium, or employer's premium, as defined in the *Employment Insurance Act*, or a premium under Part VII.1 of that 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

Majesté après le prononcé de l'ordonnance et qui pourrait faire l'objet d'une demande aux termes d'une des dispositions suivantes :

(i) le paragraphe 224(1.2) de la *Loi de l'impôt sur le revenu*,

(ii) toute disposition du *Régime de pensions du Canada* ou de la *Loi sur l'assurance-emploi* qui renvoie au paragraphe 224(1.2) de la *Loi de l'impôt sur le revenu* et qui prévoit la perception d'une cotisation, au sens du *Régime de pensions du Canada*, d'une cotisation ouvrière ou d'une cotisation patronale, au sens de la *Loi sur l'assurance-emploi*, ou d'une cotisation prévue par la partie VII.1 de cette loi ainsi que des intérêts, pénalités et autres charges afférents,

(iii) toute disposition législative provinciale dont l'objet est semblable à celui du paragraphe 224(1.2) de la *Loi de l'impôt sur le revenu*, ou qui renvoie à ce paragraphe, et qui prévoit la perception d'une somme, ainsi que des intérêts, pénalités et autres charges afférents, laquelle :

(A) soit a été retenue par une personne sur un paiement effectué à une autre personne, ou déduite d'un tel paiement, et se rapporte à un impôt semblable, de par sa nature, à l'impôt sur le revenu auquel les particuliers sont assujettis en vertu de la *Loi de l'impôt sur le revenu*,

(B) soit est de même nature qu'une cotisation prévue par le *Régime de pensions du Canada*, si la province est une province instituant un régime général de pensions au sens du paragraphe 3(1) de cette loi et si la loi provinciale institue un régime provincial de pensions au sens de ce paragraphe;

b) un autre créancier a ou acquiert le droit de réaliser sa garantie sur un bien qui pourrait être réclamé par Sa Majesté dans l'exercice des droits que lui confère l'une des dispositions suivantes :

(i) le paragraphe 224(1.2) de la *Loi de l'impôt sur le revenu*,

(ii) toute disposition du *Régime de pensions du Canada* ou de la *Loi sur l'assurance-emploi* qui renvoie au paragraphe 224(1.2) de la *Loi de l'impôt sur le revenu* et qui prévoit la perception d'une cotisation, au sens du *Régime de pensions du Canada*, d'une cotisation ouvrière ou d'une cotisation patronale, au sens de la *Loi sur l'assurance-emploi*, ou d'une cotisation prévue par la partie VII.1 de cette

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.

Operation of similar legislation

(3) 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*, an employee's premium, or employer's premium, as defined in the *Employment Insurance Act*, or a premium under Part VII.1 of that 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

loi ainsi que des intérêts, pénalités et autres charges afférents,

(iii) toute disposition législative provinciale dont l'objet est semblable à celui du paragraphe 224(1.2) de la *Loi de l'impôt sur le revenu*, ou qui renvoie à ce paragraphe, et qui prévoit la perception d'une somme, ainsi que des intérêts, pénalités et autres charges afférents, laquelle :

(A) soit a été retenue par une personne sur un paiement effectué à une autre personne, ou déduite d'un tel paiement, et se rapporte à un impôt semblable, de par sa nature, à l'impôt sur le revenu auquel les particuliers sont assujettis en vertu de la *Loi de l'impôt sur le revenu*,

(B) soit est de même nature qu'une cotisation prévue par le *Régime de pensions du Canada*, si la province est une province instituant un régime général de pensions au sens du paragraphe 3(1) de cette loi et si la loi provinciale institue un régime provincial de pensions au sens de ce paragraphe.

Effet

(3) L'ordonnance prévue à l'article 11.02, à l'exception des passages de celle-ci qui suspendent l'exercice des droits de Sa Majesté visés aux alinéas (1)a) ou b), n'a pas pour effet de porter atteinte à l'application des dispositions suivantes :

a) les paragraphes 224(1.2) et (1.3) de la *Loi de l'impôt sur le revenu*;

b) toute disposition du *Régime de pensions du Canada* ou de la *Loi sur l'assurance-emploi* qui renvoie au paragraphe 224(1.2) de la *Loi de l'impôt sur le revenu* et qui prévoit la perception d'une cotisation, au sens du *Régime de pensions du Canada*, d'une cotisation ouvrière ou d'une cotisation patronale, au sens de la *Loi sur l'assurance-emploi*, ou d'une cotisation prévue par la partie VII.1 de cette loi ainsi que des intérêts, pénalités et autres charges afférents;

c) toute disposition législative provinciale dont l'objet est semblable à celui du paragraphe 224(1.2) de la *Loi de l'impôt sur le revenu*, ou qui renvoie à ce paragraphe, et qui prévoit la perception d'une somme, ainsi que des intérêts, pénalités et autres charges afférents, laquelle :

(i) soit a été retenue par une personne sur un paiement effectué à une autre personne, ou déduite d'un tel paiement, et se rapporte à un impôt semblable, de par sa nature, à l'impôt sur le revenu

(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.

2005, c. 47, s. 128; 2009, c. 33, s. 28.

Meaning of *regulatory body*

11.1 (1) In this section, *regulatory body* means a person or body that has powers, duties or functions relating to the enforcement or administration of an Act of Parliament or of the legislature of a province and includes a person or body that is prescribed to be a regulatory body for the purpose of this Act.

Regulatory bodies — order under section 11.02

(2) Subject to subsection (3), no order made under section 11.02 affects a regulatory body's investigation in respect of the debtor company or an action, suit or proceeding that is taken in respect of the company by or before the regulatory body, other than the enforcement of a payment ordered by the regulatory body or the court.

Exception

(3) On application by the company and on notice to the regulatory body and to the persons who are likely to be affected by the order, the court may order that subsection (2) not apply in respect of one or more of the actions, suits or proceedings taken by or before the regulatory body if in the court's opinion

(a) a viable compromise or arrangement could not be made in respect of the company if that subsection were to apply; and

(b) it is not contrary to the public interest that the regulatory body be affected by the order made under section 11.02.

auquel les particuliers sont assujettis en vertu de la *Loi de l'impôt sur le revenu*,

(ii) soit est de même nature qu'une cotisation prévue par le *Régime de pensions du Canada*, si la province est une province instituant un régime général de pensions au sens du paragraphe 3(1) de cette loi et si la loi provinciale institue un régime provincial de pensions au sens de ce paragraphe.

Pour l'application de l'alinéa c), la disposition législative provinciale en question est réputée avoir, à l'encontre de tout créancier et malgré tout texte législatif fédéral ou provincial et toute autre règle de droit, la même portée et le même effet que le paragraphe 224(1.2) de la *Loi de l'impôt sur le revenu* quant à la somme visée au sous-alinéa c)(i), ou que le paragraphe 23(2) du *Régime de pensions du Canada* quant à la somme visée au sous-alinéa c)(ii), et quant aux intérêts, pénalités et autres charges afférents, quelle que soit la garantie dont bénéficie le créancier.

2005, ch. 47, art. 128; 2009, ch. 33, art. 28.

Définition de *organisme administratif*

11.1 (1) Au présent article, *organisme administratif* s'entend de toute personne ou de tout organisme chargé de l'application d'une loi fédérale ou provinciale; y est assimilé toute personne ou tout organisme désigné à ce titre par règlement.

Organisme administratif — ordonnance rendue en vertu de l'article 11.02

(2) Sous réserve du paragraphe (3), l'ordonnance prévue à l'article 11.02 ne porte aucunement atteinte aux mesures — action, poursuite ou autre procédure — prises à l'égard de la compagnie débitrice par ou devant un organisme administratif, ni aux investigations auxquelles il procède à son sujet. Elles n'ont d'effet que sur l'exécution d'un paiement ordonné par lui ou le tribunal.

Exception

(3) Le tribunal peut par ordonnance, sur demande de la compagnie et sur préavis à l'organisme administratif et à toute personne qui sera vraisemblablement touchée par l'ordonnance, déclarer que le paragraphe (2) ne s'applique pas à l'une ou plusieurs des mesures prises par ou devant celui-ci, s'il est convaincu que, à la fois :

a) il ne pourrait être fait de transaction ou d'arrangement viable à l'égard de la compagnie si ce paragraphe s'appliquait;

b) l'ordonnance demandée au titre de l'article 11.02 n'est pas contraire à l'intérêt public.

Declaration — enforcement of a payment

(4) If there is a dispute as to whether a regulatory body is seeking to enforce its rights as a creditor, the court may, on application by the company and on notice to the regulatory body, make an order declaring both that the regulatory body is seeking to enforce its rights as a creditor and that the enforcement of those rights is stayed.

1997, c. 12, s. 124; 2001, c. 9, s. 576; 2005, c. 47, s. 128; 2007, c. 29, s. 106, c. 36, s. 65.

11.11 [Repealed, 2005, c. 47, s. 128]

Interim financing

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

Priority — secured creditors

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

Priority — other orders

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

Factors to be considered

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

- (a)** the period during which the company is expected to be subject to proceedings under this Act;
- (b)** how the company's business and financial affairs are to be managed during the proceedings;
- (c)** whether the company's management has the confidence of its major creditors;
- (d)** whether the loan would enhance the prospects of a viable compromise or arrangement being made in respect of the company;

Déclaration : organisme agissant à titre de créancier

(4) En cas de différend sur la question de savoir si l'organisme administratif cherche à faire valoir ses droits à titre de créancier dans le cadre de la mesure prise, le tribunal peut déclarer, par ordonnance, sur demande de la compagnie et sur préavis à l'organisme, que celui-ci agit effectivement à ce titre et que la mesure est suspendue.

1997, ch. 12, art. 124; 2001, ch. 9, art. 576; 2005, ch. 47, art. 128; 2007, ch. 29, art. 106, ch. 36, art. 65.

11.11 [Abrogé, 2005, ch. 47, art. 128]

Financement temporaire

11.2 (1) Sur demande de la compagnie débitrice, le tribunal peut par ordonnance, sur préavis de la demande aux créanciers garantis qui seront vraisemblablement touchés par la charge ou sûreté, déclarer que tout ou partie des biens de la compagnie sont grevés d'une charge ou sûreté — d'un montant qu'il estime indiqué — en faveur de la personne nommée dans l'ordonnance qui accepte de prêter à la compagnie la somme qu'il approuve compte tenu de l'état de l'évolution de l'encaisse et des besoins de celle-ci. La charge ou sûreté ne peut garantir qu'une obligation postérieure au prononcé de l'ordonnance.

Priorité — créanciers garantis

(2) Le tribunal peut préciser, dans l'ordonnance, que la charge ou sûreté a priorité sur toute réclamation des créanciers garantis de la compagnie.

Priorité — autres ordonnances

(3) Il peut également y préciser que la charge ou sûreté n'a priorité sur toute autre charge ou sûreté grevant les biens de la compagnie au titre d'une ordonnance déjà rendue en vertu du paragraphe (1) que sur consentement de la personne en faveur de qui cette ordonnance a été rendue.

Facteurs à prendre en considération

(4) Pour décider s'il rend l'ordonnance, le tribunal prend en considération, entre autres, les facteurs suivants :

- a)** la durée prévue des procédures intentées à l'égard de la compagnie sous le régime de la présente loi;
- b)** la façon dont les affaires financières et autres de la compagnie seront gérées au cours de ces procédures;
- c)** la question de savoir si ses dirigeants ont la confiance de ses créanciers les plus importants;
- d)** la question de savoir si le prêt favorisera la conclusion d'une transaction ou d'un arrangement viable à l'égard de la compagnie;

- (e) the nature and value of the company's property;
- (f) whether any creditor would be materially prejudiced as a result of the security or charge; and
- (g) the monitor's report referred to in paragraph 23(1)(b), if any.

Additional factor — initial application

(5) When an application is made under subsection (1) at the same time as an initial application referred to in subsection 11.02(1) or during the period referred to in an order made under that subsection, no order shall be made under subsection (1) unless the court is also satisfied that the terms of the loan are limited to what is reasonably necessary for the continued operations of the debtor company in the ordinary course of business during that period.

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

Assignment of agreements

11.3 (1) On application by a debtor company and on notice to every party to an agreement and the monitor, the court may make an order assigning the rights and obligations of the company under the agreement to any person who is specified by the court and agrees to the assignment.

Exceptions

(2) Subsection (1) does not apply in respect of rights and obligations that are not assignable by reason of their nature or that arise under

- (a) an agreement entered into on or after the day on which proceedings commence under this Act;
- (b) an eligible financial contract; or
- (c) a collective agreement.

Factors to be considered

(3) In deciding whether to make the order, the court is to consider, among other things,

- (a) whether the monitor approved the proposed assignment;
- (b) whether the person to whom the rights and obligations are to be assigned would be able to perform the obligations; and
- (c) whether it would be appropriate to assign the rights and obligations to that person.

- e) la nature et la valeur des biens de la compagnie;
- f) la question de savoir si la charge ou sûreté causera un préjudice sérieux à l'un ou l'autre des créanciers de la compagnie;
- g) le rapport du contrôleur visé à l'alinéa 23(1)b).

Facteur additionnel : demande initiale

(5) Lorsqu'une demande est faite au titre du paragraphe (1) en même temps que la demande initiale visée au paragraphe 11.02(1) ou durant la période visée dans l'ordonnance rendue au titre de ce paragraphe, le tribunal ne rend l'ordonnance visée au paragraphe (1) que s'il est également convaincu que les modalités du financement temporaire demandé sont limitées à ce qui est normalement nécessaire à la continuation de l'exploitation de la compagnie débitrice dans le cours ordinaire de ses affaires durant cette période.

1997, ch. 12, art. 124; 2005, ch. 47, art. 128; 2007, ch. 36, art. 65; 2019, ch. 29, art. 138.

Cessions

11.3 (1) Sur demande de la compagnie débitrice et sur préavis à toutes les parties au contrat et au contrôleur, le tribunal peut, par ordonnance, céder à toute personne qu'il précise et qui y a consenti les droits et obligations de la compagnie découlant du contrat.

Exceptions

(2) Le paragraphe (1) ne s'applique pas aux droits et obligations qui, de par leur nature, ne peuvent être cédés ou qui découlent soit d'un contrat conclu à la date à laquelle une procédure a été intentée sous le régime de la présente loi ou par la suite, soit d'un contrat financier admissible, soit d'une convention collective.

Facteurs à prendre en considération

(3) Pour décider s'il rend l'ordonnance, le tribunal prend en considération, entre autres, les facteurs suivants :

- a) l'acquiescement du contrôleur au projet de cession, le cas échéant;
- b) la capacité de la personne à qui les droits et obligations seraient cédés d'exécuter les obligations;
- c) l'opportunité de lui céder les droits et obligations.

Restriction

(4) The court may not make the order unless it is satisfied that all monetary defaults in relation to the agreement — other than those arising by reason only of the company's insolvency, the commencement of proceedings under this Act or the company's failure to perform a non-monetary obligation — will be remedied on or before the day fixed by the court.

Copy of order

(5) The applicant is to send a copy of the order to every party to the agreement.

1997, c. 12, s. 124; 2005, c. 47, s. 128; 2007, c. 29, s. 107, c. 36, ss. 65, 112.

11.31 [Repealed, 2005, c. 47, s. 128]

Critical supplier

11.4 (1) On application by a debtor company and on notice to the secured creditors who are likely to be affected by the security or charge, the court may make an order declaring a person to be a critical supplier to the company if the court is satisfied that the person is a supplier of goods or services to the company and that the goods or services that are supplied are critical to the company's continued operation.

Obligation to supply

(2) If the court declares a person to be a critical supplier, the court may make an order requiring the person to supply any goods or services specified by the court to the company on any terms and conditions that are consistent with the supply relationship or that the court considers appropriate.

Security or charge in favour of critical supplier

(3) If the court makes an order under subsection (2), the court shall, in the order, declare that all or part of the property of the company is subject to a security or charge in favour of the person declared to be a critical supplier, in an amount equal to the value of the goods or services supplied under the terms of the order.

Priority

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

1997, c. 12, s. 124; 2000, c. 30, s. 156; 2001, c. 34, s. 33(E); 2005, c. 47, s. 128; 2007, c. 36, s. 65.

Removal of directors

11.5 (1) The court may, on the application of any person interested in the matter, make an order removing from office any director of a debtor company in respect of which an order has been made under this Act if the court

Restriction

(4) Il ne peut rendre l'ordonnance que s'il est convaincu qu'il sera remédié, au plus tard à la date qu'il fixe, à tous les manquements d'ordre pécuniaire relatifs au contrat, autres que ceux découlant du seul fait que la compagnie est insolvable, est visée par une procédure intentée sous le régime de la présente loi ou ne s'est pas conformée à une obligation non pécuniaire.

Copie de l'ordonnance

(5) Le demandeur envoie une copie de l'ordonnance à toutes les parties au contrat.

1997, ch. 12, art. 124; 2005, ch. 47, art. 128; 2007, ch. 29, art. 107, ch. 36, art. 65 et 112.

11.31 [Abrogé, 2005, ch. 47, art. 128]

Fournisseurs essentiels

11.4 (1) Sur demande de la compagnie débitrice, le tribunal peut par ordonnance, sur préavis de la demande aux créanciers garantis qui seront vraisemblablement touchés par la charge ou sûreté, déclarer toute personne fournisseur essentiel de la compagnie s'il est convaincu que cette personne est un fournisseur de la compagnie et que les marchandises ou les services qu'elle lui fournit sont essentiels à la continuation de son exploitation.

Obligation de fourniture

(2) S'il fait une telle déclaration, le tribunal peut ordonner à la personne déclarée fournisseur essentiel de la compagnie de fournir à celle-ci les marchandises ou services qu'il précise, à des conditions compatibles avec les modalités qui régissaient antérieurement leur fourniture ou aux conditions qu'il estime indiquées.

Charge ou sûreté en faveur du fournisseur essentiel

(3) Le cas échéant, le tribunal déclare dans l'ordonnance que tout ou partie des biens de la compagnie sont grevés d'une charge ou sûreté, en faveur de la personne déclarée fournisseur essentiel, d'un montant correspondant à la valeur des marchandises ou services fournis en application de l'ordonnance.

Priorité

(4) Il peut préciser, dans l'ordonnance, que la charge ou sûreté a priorité sur toute réclamation des créanciers garantis de la compagnie.

1997, ch. 12, art. 124; 2000, ch. 30, art. 156; 2001, ch. 34, art. 33(A); 2005, ch. 47, art. 128; 2007, ch. 36, art. 65.

Révocation des administrateurs

11.5 (1) Sur demande d'un intéressé, le tribunal peut, par ordonnance, révoquer tout administrateur de la compagnie débitrice à l'égard de laquelle une ordonnance a été rendue sous le régime de la présente loi s'il est

is satisfied that the director is unreasonably impairing or is likely to unreasonably impair the possibility of a viable compromise or arrangement being made in respect of the company or is acting or is likely to act inappropriately as a director in the circumstances.

Filling vacancy

(2) The court may, by order, fill any vacancy created under subsection (1).

1997, c. 12, s. 124; 2005, c. 47, s. 128.

Security or charge relating to director's indemnification

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

Priority

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

Restriction — indemnification insurance

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

Negligence, misconduct or fault

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

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

Court may order security or charge to cover certain costs

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

convaincu que ce dernier, sans raisons valables, compromet ou compromettra vraisemblablement la possibilité de conclure une transaction ou un arrangement viable ou agit ou agira vraisemblablement de façon inacceptable dans les circonstances.

Vacance

(2) Le tribunal peut, par ordonnance, combler toute vacance découlant de la révocation.

1997, ch. 12, art. 124; 2005, ch. 47, art. 128.

Biens grevés d'une charge ou sûreté en faveur d'administrateurs ou de dirigeants

11.51 (1) Sur demande de la compagnie débitrice, le tribunal peut par ordonnance, sur préavis de la demande aux créanciers garantis qui seront vraisemblablement touchés par la charge ou sûreté, déclarer que tout ou partie des biens de celle-ci sont grevés d'une charge ou sûreté, d'un montant qu'il estime indiqué, en faveur d'un ou de plusieurs administrateurs ou dirigeants pour l'exécution des obligations qu'ils peuvent contracter en cette qualité après l'introduction d'une procédure sous le régime de la présente loi.

Priorité

(2) Il peut préciser, dans l'ordonnance, que la charge ou sûreté a priorité sur toute réclamation des créanciers garantis de la compagnie.

Restriction — assurance

(3) Il ne peut toutefois rendre une telle ordonnance s'il estime que la compagnie peut souscrire, à un coût qu'il estime juste, une assurance permettant d'indemniser adéquatement les administrateurs ou dirigeants.

Négligence, inconduite ou faute

(4) Il déclare, dans l'ordonnance, que la charge ou sûreté ne vise pas les obligations que l'administrateur ou le dirigeant assume, selon lui, par suite de sa négligence grave ou de son inconduite délibérée ou, au Québec, par sa faute lourde ou intentionnelle.

2005, ch. 47, art. 128; 2007, ch. 36, art. 66.

Biens grevés d'une charge ou sûreté pour couvrir certains frais

11.52 (1) Le tribunal peut par ordonnance, sur préavis aux créanciers garantis qui seront vraisemblablement touchés par la charge ou sûreté, déclarer que tout ou partie des biens de la compagnie débitrice sont grevés d'une charge ou sûreté, d'un montant qu'il estime indiqué, pour couvrir :

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

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

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

Priority

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

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

Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act matters

11.6 Notwithstanding the *Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act*,

(a) proceedings commenced under Part III of the *Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act* may be taken up and continued under this Act only if a proposal within the meaning of the *Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act* has not been filed under that Part; and

(b) an application under this Act by a bankrupt may only be made with the consent of inspectors referred to in section 116 of the *Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act* but no application may be made under this Act by a bankrupt whose bankruptcy has resulted from

(i) the operation of subsection 50.4(8) of the *Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act*, or

(ii) the refusal or deemed refusal by the creditors or the court, or the annulment, of a proposal under the *Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act*.

1997, c. 12, s. 124.

Court to appoint monitor

11.7 (1) When an order is made on the initial application in respect of a debtor company, the court shall at the same time appoint a person to monitor the business and financial affairs of the company. The person so appointed must be a trustee, within the meaning of subsection 2(1) of the *Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act*.

a) les débours et honoraires du contrôleur, ainsi que ceux des experts — notamment en finance et en droit — dont il retient les services dans le cadre de ses fonctions;

b) ceux des experts dont la compagnie retient les services dans le cadre de procédures intentées sous le régime de la présente loi;

c) ceux des experts dont tout autre intéressé retient les services, si, à son avis, la charge ou sûreté était nécessaire pour assurer sa participation efficace aux procédures intentées sous le régime de la présente loi.

Priorité

(2) Il peut préciser, dans l'ordonnance, que la charge ou sûreté a priorité sur toute réclamation des créanciers garantis de la compagnie.

2005, ch. 47, art. 128; 2007, ch. 36, art. 66.

Lien avec la *Loi sur la faillite et l'insolvabilité*

11.6 Par dérogation à la *Loi sur la faillite et l'insolvabilité* :

a) les procédures intentées sous le régime de la partie III de cette loi ne peuvent être traitées et continuées sous le régime de la présente loi que si une proposition au sens de la *Loi sur la faillite et l'insolvabilité* n'a pas été déposée au titre de cette même partie;

b) le failli ne peut faire une demande au titre de la présente loi qu'avec l'aval des inspecteurs visés à l'article 116 de la *Loi sur la faillite et l'insolvabilité*, aucune demande ne pouvant toutefois être faite si la faillite découle, selon le cas :

(i) de l'application du paragraphe 50.4(8) de la *Loi sur la faillite et l'insolvabilité*,

(ii) du rejet — effectif ou présumé — de sa proposition par les créanciers ou le tribunal ou de l'annulation de celle-ci au titre de cette loi.

1997, ch. 12, art. 124.

Nomination du contrôleur

11.7 (1) Le tribunal qui rend une ordonnance sur la demande initiale nomme une personne pour agir à titre de contrôleur des affaires financières ou autres de la compagnie débitrice visée par la demande. Seul un syndic au sens du paragraphe 2(1) de la *Loi sur la faillite et l'insolvabilité* peut être nommé pour agir à titre de contrôleur.

TAB 4



CANADA

CONSOLIDATION

CODIFICATION

Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act

Loi sur la faillite et l'insolvabilité

R.S.C., 1985, c. B-3

L.R.C. (1985), ch. B-3

Current to December 23, 2024

À jour au 23 décembre 2024

Last amended on December 12, 2024

Dernière modification le 12 décembre 2024

income trust means a trust that has assets in Canada if

- (a) its units are listed on a prescribed stock exchange on the date of the initial bankruptcy event, or
- (b) the majority of its units are held by a trust whose units are listed on a prescribed stock exchange on the date of the initial bankruptcy event; (*fiducie de revenu*)

insolvent person means a person who is not bankrupt and who resides, carries on business or has property in Canada, whose liabilities to creditors provable as claims under this Act amount to one thousand dollars, and

- (a) who is for any reason unable to meet his obligations as they generally become due,
- (b) who has ceased paying his current obligations in the ordinary course of business as they generally become due, or
- (c) the aggregate of whose property is not, at a fair valuation, sufficient, or, if disposed of at a fairly conducted sale under legal process, would not be sufficient to enable payment of all his obligations, due and accruing due; (*personne insolvable*)

legal counsel means any person qualified, in accordance with the laws of a province, to give legal advice; (*conseiller juridique*)

locality of a debtor means the principal place

- (a) where the debtor has carried on business during the year immediately preceding the date of the initial bankruptcy event,
- (b) where the debtor has resided during the year immediately preceding the date of the initial bankruptcy event, or
- (c) in cases not coming within paragraph (a) or (b), where the greater portion of the property of the debtor is situated; (*localité*)

Minister means the Minister of Industry; (*ministre*)

net termination value means the net amount obtained after netting or setting off or compensating the mutual obligations between the parties to an eligible financial contract in accordance with its provisions; (*valeurs nettes dues à la date de résiliation*)

official receiver means an officer appointed under subsection 12(2); (*séquestre officiel*)

(b) il a résidé au cours de l'année précédant l'ouverture de sa faillite;

(c) se trouve la plus grande partie de ses biens, dans les cas non visés aux alinéas a) ou b). (*locality of a debtor*)

localité d'un débiteur [Abrogée, 2005, ch. 47, art. 2(F)]

ministre Le ministre de l'Industrie. (*Minister*)

moment de la faillite S'agissant d'une personne, le moment :

- a) soit du prononcé de l'ordonnance de faillite la visant;
- b) soit du dépôt d'une cession de biens la visant;
- c) soit du fait sur la base duquel elle est réputée avoir fait une cession de biens. (*time of the bankruptcy*)

opération sous-évaluée Toute disposition de biens ou fourniture de services pour laquelle le débiteur ne reçoit aucune contrepartie ou en reçoit une qui est manifestement inférieure à la juste valeur marchande de celle qu'il a lui-même donnée. (*transfer at undervalue*)

ouverture de la faillite Relativement à une personne, le premier en date des événements suivants à survenir :

- a) le dépôt d'une cession de biens la visant;
- b) le dépôt d'une proposition la visant;
- c) le dépôt d'un avis d'intention par elle;
- d) le dépôt de la première requête en faillite :
 - (i) dans les cas visés aux alinéas 50.4(8) a) et 57 a) et au paragraphe 61(2),
 - (ii) dans le cas où la personne, alors qu'elle est visée par un avis d'intention déposé aux termes de l'article 50.4 ou une proposition déposée aux termes de l'article 62, fait une cession avant que le tribunal ait approuvé la proposition;
- e) dans les cas non visés à l'alinéa d), le dépôt de la requête à l'égard de laquelle une ordonnance de faillite est rendue;
- f) l'introduction d'une procédure sous le régime de la *Loi sur les arrangements avec les créanciers des compagnies*. (*date of the initial bankruptcy event*)

personne

TAB 5

**SUPERIOR COURT OF JUSTICE – ONTARIO
(Commercial List)**

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

AND IN THE MATTER OF A PROPOSED PLAN OF COMPROMISE OR
ARRANGEMENT WITH RESPECT TO STELCO INC. AND THE OTHER
APPLICANTS LISTED IN SCHEDULE "A"

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

BEFORE: FARLEY J.

COUNSEL: *Michael E. Barrack, James D. Gage and Geoff R. Hall*, for the Applicants
David Jacobs and Michael McCreary, for Locals 1005, 5328 and 8782 of the
United Steel Workers of America
Ken Rosenberg, Lily Harmer and Rob Centa, for United Steelworkers of America
Bob Thornton and Kyla Mahar, for Ernst & Young Inc., Monitor of the
Applicants
Kevin J. Zych, for the Informal Committee of Stelco Bondholders
David R. Byers, for CIT
Kevin McElcheran, for GE
Murray Gold and Andrew Hatnay, for Retired Salaried Beneficiaries
Lewis Gottheil, for CAW Canada and its Local 523
Virginie Gauthier, for Fleet
H. Whiteley, for CIBC
Gail Rubenstein, for FSCO
Kenneth D. Kraft, for EDS Canada Inc.

HEARD: March 5, 2004

ENDORSEMENT

[1] As argued this motion by Locals 1005, 5328 and 8782 United Steel Workers of America (collectively "Union") to rescind the initial order and dismiss the application of Stelco Inc. ("Stelco") and various of its subsidiaries (collectively "Sub Applicants") for access to the protection and process of the *Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act* ("CCAA") was that this access should be denied on the basis that Stelco was not a "debtor company" as defined in s. 2 of the CCAA because it was not insolvent.

[2] Allow me to observe that there was a great deal of debate in the materials and submissions as to the reason(s) that Stelco found itself in with respect to what Michael Locker (indicating he was "an expert in the area of corporate restructuring and a leading steel industry analyst") swore to at paragraph 12 of his affidavit was the "current crisis":

12. Contending with weak operating results and resulting tight cash flow, management has deliberately chosen not to fund its employee benefits. By contrast, Dofasco and certain other steel companies have consistently funded both their employee benefit obligations as well as debt service. If Stelco's management had chosen to fund pension obligations, presumably with borrowed money, *the current crisis* and related restructuring plans would focus on debt restructuring as opposed to the reduction of employee benefits and related liabilities. [Emphasis added.]

[3] For the purpose of determining whether Stelco is insolvent and therefore could be considered to be a debtor company, it matters not what the cause or who caused the financial difficulty that Stelco is in as admitted by Locker on behalf of the Union. The management of a corporation could be completely incompetent, inadvertently or advertently; the corporation could be in the grip of ruthless, hard hearted and hard nosed outside financiers; the corporation could be the innocent victim of uncaring policy of a level of government; the employees (unionized or non-unionized) could be completely incompetent, inadvertently or advertently; the relationship of labour and management could be absolutely poisonous; the corporation could be the victim of unforeseen events affecting its viability such as a fire destroying an essential area of its plant and equipment or of rampaging dumping. One or more or all of these factors (without being exhaustive), whether or not of varying degree and whether or not in combination of some may well have been the cause of a corporation's difficulty. The point here is that Stelco's difficulty exists; the only question is whether Stelco is insolvent within the meaning of that in the "debtor company" definition of the CCAA. However, I would point out, as I did in closing, that no matter how this motion turns out, Stelco does have a problem which has to be addressed – addressed within the CCAA process if Stelco is insolvent or addressed outside that process if Stelco is determined not to be insolvent. The status quo will lead to ruination of Stelco (and its Sub Applicants) and as a result will very badly affect its stakeholder, including pensioners, employees (unionized and non-unionized), management, creditors, suppliers, customers, local and other governments and the local communities. In such situations, time is a precious commodity; it cannot be wasted; no matter how much some would like to take time out, the clock cannot be stopped. The watchwords of the Commercial List are equally applicable in such circumstances. They are communication, cooperation and common sense. I appreciate that these cases frequently invoke emotions running high and wild; that is understandable on a human basis but it is the considered, rational approach which will solve the problem.

[4] The time to determine whether a corporation is insolvent for the purpose of it being a "debtor company" and thus able to make an application to proceed under the CCAA is the date of filing, in this case January 29, 2004.

[5] The Monitor did not file a report as to this question of insolvency as it properly advised that it wished to take a neutral role. I understand however, that it did provide some assistance in the preparation of Exhibit C to Hap Steven's affidavit.

[6] If I determine in this motion that Stelco is not insolvent, then the initial order would be set aside. See *Montreal Trust Co. of Canada v. Timber Lodge Ltd.* (1992), 15 C.B.R. (3d) 14 (P.E.I.C.A.). The onus is on Stelco as I indicated in my January 29, 2004 endorsement.

[7] S. 2 of the CCAA defines "debtor company" as:

"debtor company" means any company that:

(a) is bankrupt or insolvent;

(b) has committed an act of bankruptcy within the meaning of *Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act* ["BIA"] or deemed insolvent within the meaning of the *Winding-Up and Restructuring Act*, whether or not proceedings in respect of the company have been taken under either of those Acts;

(c) has made an authorized assignment against which a receiving order has been made under the *Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act*; or

(d) is in the course of being wound-up under the *Winding-Up and Restructuring Act* because the company is insolvent.

[8] Counsel for the Existing Stelco Lenders and the DIP Lenders posited that Stelco would be able to qualify under (b) in light of the fact that as of January 29, 2004 whether or not it was entitled to receive the CCAA protection under (a) as being insolvent, it had ceased to pay its pre-filing debts. I would merely observe as I did at the time of the hearing that I do not find this argument attractive in the least. The most that could be said for that is that such game playing would be ill advised and in my view would not be rewarded by the exercise of judicial discretion to allow such an applicant the benefit of a CCAA stay and other advantages of the procedure for if it were capriciously done where there is not reasonable need, then such ought not to be granted. However, I would point out that if a corporation did capriciously do so, then one might well expect a creditor-initiated application so as to take control of the process (including likely the ouster of management including directors who authorized such unnecessary stoppage); in such a case, while the corporation would not likely be successful in a corporation application, it is likely that a creditor application would find favour of judicial discretion.

[9] This judicial discretion would be exercised in the same way generally as is the case where s. 43(7) of the BIA comes into play whereby a bankruptcy receiving order which otherwise meets the test may be refused. See *Re Kenwood Hills Development Inc.* (1995), 30 C.B.R. (3d) 44 (Ont. Gen. Div.) where at p. 45 I observed:

The discretion must be exercised judicially based on credible evidence; it should be used according to common sense and justice and in a manner which does not result in an injustice: See *Re Churchill Forest Industries (Manitoba) Ltd.* (1971), 16 C.B.R. (NS) 158 (Man. Q.B.).

[10] Anderson J. in *Re MGM Electric Co. Ltd.* (1982), 42 C.B.R. (N.S.) 29 (Ont. S.C.) at p. 30 declined to grant a bankruptcy receiving order for the eminently good sense reason that it would be counterproductive: "Having regard for the value of the enterprise and having regard to the evidence before me, I think it far from clear that a receiving order would confer a benefit on anyone." This

common sense approach to the judicial exercise of discretion may be contrasted by the rather more puzzling approach in *Re TDM Software Systems Inc.* (1986), 60 C.B.R. (N.S.) 92 (Ont. S.C.).

[11] The Union, supported by the International United Steel Workers of America ("International"), indicated that if certain of the obligations of Stelco were taken into account in the determination of insolvency, then a very good number of large Canadian corporations would be able to make an application under the CCAA. I am of the view that this concern can be addressed as follows. The test of insolvency is to be determined on its own merits, not on the basis that an otherwise technically insolvent corporation should not be allowed to apply. However, if a technically insolvent corporation were to apply and there was no material advantage to the corporation and its stakeholders (in other words, a pressing need to restructure), then one would expect that the court's discretion would be judicially exercised against granting CCAA protection and ancillary relief. In the case of Stelco, it is recognized, as discussed above, that it is in crisis and in need of restructuring – which restructuring, if it is insolvent, would be best accomplished within a CCAA proceeding. Further, I am of the view that the track record of CCAA proceedings in this country demonstrates a healthy respect for the fundamental concerns of interested parties and stakeholders. I have consistently observed that much more can be achieved by negotiations outside the courtroom where there is a reasonable exchange of information, views and the exploration of possible solutions and negotiations held on a without prejudice basis than likely can be achieved by resorting to the legal combative atmosphere of the courtroom. A mutual problem requires a mutual solution. The basic interest of the CCAA is to rehabilitate insolvent corporations for the benefit of all stakeholders. To do this, the cause(s) of the insolvency must be fixed on a long term viable basis so that the corporation may be turned around. It is not achieved by positional bargaining in a tug of war between two parties, each trying for a larger slice of a defined size pie; it may be achieved by taking steps involving shorter term equitable sacrifices and implementing sensible approaches to improve productivity to ensure that the pie grows sufficiently for the long term to accommodate the reasonable needs of the parties.

[12] It appears that it is a given that the Sub Applicants are in fact insolvent. The question then is whether Stelco is insolvent.

[13] There was a question as to whether Stelco should be restricted to the material in its application as presented to the Court on January 29, 2004. I would observe that CCAA proceedings are not in the nature of the traditional adversarial lawsuit usually found in our courtrooms. It seems to me that it would be doing a disservice to the interest of the CCAA to artificially keep the Court in the dark on such a question. Presumably an otherwise deserving "debtor company" would not be allowed access to a continuing CCAA proceeding that it would be entitled to merely because some potential evidence were excluded for traditional adversarial technical reasons. I would point out that in such a case, there would be no prohibition against such a corporation reapplying (with the additional material) subsequently. In such a case, what would be the advantage for anyone of a "pause" before being able to proceed under the rehabilitative process under the CCAA. On a practical basis, I would note that all too often corporations will wait too long before applying, at least this was a significant problem in the early 1990s. In *Re Inducon Development Corp.* (1991), 8 C.B.R. (3d) 306 (Ont. Gen. Div.), I observed:

Secondly, CCAA is designed to be remedial; it is not, however, designed to be preventative. CCAA should not be the *last* gasp of a dying company; it should be implemented, if it is to be implemented, at a stage prior to the death throes.

[14] It seems to me that the phrase "death throe" could be reasonably replaced with "death spiral". In *Re Cumberland Trading Inc.* (1994), 23 C.B.R. (3d) 225 (Ont. Gen. Div.), I went on to expand on this at p. 228:

I would also observe that all too frequently debtors wait until virtually the last moment, the last moment, or in some cases, beyond the last moment before even beginning to think about reorganizational (and the attendant support that any successful reorganization requires from the creditors). I noted the lamentable tendency of debtors to deal with these situations as "last gasp" desperation moves in *Re Inducon Development Corp.* (1992), 8 C.B.R. (3d) 308 (Ont. Gen. Div.). To deal with matters on this basis minimizes the chances of success, even if "success" may have been available with earlier spade work.

[15] I have not been able to find in the CCAA reported cases any instance where there has been an objection to a corporation availing itself of the facilities of the CCAA on the basis of whether the corporation was insolvent. Indeed, as indicated above, the major concern here has been that an applicant leaves it so late that the timetable of necessary steps may get impossibly compressed. That is not to say that there have not been objections by parties opposing the application on various other grounds. Prior to the 1992 amendments, there had to be debentures (plural) issued pursuant to a trust deed; I recall that in *Nova Metal Products Inc. v. Comiskey (Trustee of)* (1990), 1 C.B.R. (3d) 101; 1 O.R. (3d) 280 (C.A.), the initial application was rejected in the morning because there had only been one debenture issued but another one was issued prior to the return to court that afternoon. This case stands for the general proposition that the CCAA should be given a large and liberal interpretation. I should note that there was in *Enterprise Capital Management Inc. v. Semi-Tech Corp.* (1999), 10 C.B.R. (4th) 133 (Ont. S.C.J.) a determination that in a creditor application, the corporation was found not to be insolvent, but see below as to BIA test (c) my views as to the correctness of this decision.

[16] In *Re Lehndorff General Partner Ltd.* (1993), 17 C.B.R. (3d) 24 (Ont. Gen. Div.) I observed at p. 32:

One of the purposes of the CCAA is to facilitate ongoing operations of a business where its assets have a greater value as part of an integrated system than individually. The CCAA facilitates reorganization of a company where the alternative, sale of the property piecemeal, is likely to yield far less satisfaction to the creditors.

[17] In *Re Anvil Range Mining Corp.* (2002), 34 C.B.R. (4th) 157 (Ont. C.A.), the court stated to the same effect:

The second submission is that the plan is contrary to the purposes of the CCAA. Courts have recognized that the purpose of the CCAA is to enable compromises to be made for the common benefit of the creditors and the company and to keep the company alive and out of the hands of liquidators.

[18] Encompassed in this is the concept of saving employment if a restructuring will result in a viable enterprise. See *Diemaster Tool Inc. v. Skvortsoff (Trustee of)* (1991), 3 C.B.R. (3d) 133 (Ont. Gen. Div.). This concept has been a continuing thread in CCAA cases in this jurisdiction stretching back for at least the past 15 years, if not before.

[19] I would also note that the jurisprudence and practical application of the bankruptcy and insolvency regime in place in Canada has been constantly evolving. The early jails of what became Canada were populated to the extent of almost half their capacity by bankrupts. Rehabilitation and a fresh start for the honest but unfortunate debtor came afterwards. Most recently, the *Bankruptcy Act* was revised to the BIA in 1992 to better facilitate the rehabilitative aspect of making a proposal to creditors. At the same time, the CCAA was amended to eliminate the threshold criterion of there having to be debentures issued under a trust deed (this concept was embodied in the CCAA upon its enactment in 1933 with a view that it would only be large companies with public issues of debt securities which could apply). The size restriction was continued as there was now a threshold criterion of at least \$5 million of claims against the applicant. While this restriction may appear discriminatory, it does have the practical advantage of taking into account that the costs (administrative costs including professional fees to the applicant, and indeed to the other parties who retain professionals) is a significant amount, even when viewed from the perspective of \$5 million. These costs would be prohibitive in a smaller situation. Parliament was mindful of the time horizons involved in proposals under BIA where the maximum length of a proceeding including a stay is six months (including all possible extensions) whereas under CCAA, the length is in the discretion of the court judicially exercised in accordance with the facts and the circumstances of the case. Certainly sooner is better than later. However, it is fair to observe that virtually all CCAA cases which proceed go on for over six months and those with complexity frequently exceed a year.

[20] Restructurings are not now limited in practical terms to corporations merely compromising their debts with their creditors in a balance sheet exercise. Rather there has been quite an emphasis recently on operational restructuring as well so that the emerging company will have the benefit of a long term viable fix, all for the benefit of stakeholders. See *Sklar-Pepplar Furniture Corp. v. Bank of Nova Scotia* (1991), 8 C.B.R. (3d) 312 (Ont. Gen. Div.) at p. 314 where Borins J. states:

The proposed plan exemplifies the policy and objectives of the Act as it proposes a regime for the court-supervised re-organization for the Applicant company intended to avoid the devastating social and economic effects of a creditor-initiated termination of its ongoing business operations and enabling the company to carry on its business in a manner in which it is intended to cause the least possible harm to the company, its creditors, its employees and former employees and the communities in which its carries on and carried on its business operations.

[21] The CCAA does not define "insolvent" or "insolvency". Houlden & Morawetz, *The 2004 Annotated Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act* (Toronto, Carswell; 2003) at p. 1107 (N5) states:

In interpreting "debtor company", reference must be had to the definition of "insolvent person" in s. 2(1) of the *Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act* ...

To be able to use the Act, a company must be bankrupt or insolvent: *Reference re Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act (Canada)*, 16 C.B.R. 1 [1934] S.C.R. 659, [1934] 4 D.L.R. 75. The company must, in its application, admit its insolvency.

[22] It appears to have become fairly common practice for applicants and others when reference is made to insolvency in the context of the CCAA to refer to the definition of "insolvent person" in the BIA. That definition is as follows:

s. 2(1)...

"insolvent person" means a person who is not bankrupt and who resides, carries on business or has property in Canada, and whose liability to creditors provable as claims under this Act amount to one thousand dollars, and

(a) who is for any reason unable to meet his obligations as they generally become due,

(b) who has ceased paying his current obligations in the ordinary course of business as they generally become due, or

(c) the aggregate of whose property is not, at a fair valuation, sufficient, or, if disposed of at a fairly conducted sale under legal process, would not be sufficient to enable payment of all his obligations, due and accruing due.

[23] Stelco acknowledges that it does not meet the test of (b); however, it does assert that it meets the test of both (a) and (c). In addition, however, Stelco also indicates that since the CCAA does not have a reference over to the BIA in relation to the (a) definition of "debtor company" as being a company that is "(a) bankrupt or insolvent", then this term of "insolvent" should be given the meaning that the overall context of the CCAA requires. See the modern rule of statutory interpretation which directs the court to take a contextual and purposive approach to the language of the provision at issue as illustrated by *Bell ExpressVu Limited Partnership v. Rex*, [2002] 2 S.C.R. 559 at p. 580:

Today there is only one principle or approach, namely the words of an Act are to be read in their entire context and in their grammatical and ordinary sense harmoniously with the scheme of the Act, the object of the Act, and the intention of Parliament.

[24] I note in particular that the (b), (c) and (d) aspects of the definition of "debtor company" all refer to other statutes, including the BIA; (a) does not. S. 12 of the CCAA defines "claims" with reference over to the BIA (and otherwise refers to the BIA and the *Winding-Up and Restructuring Act*). It seems to me that there is merit in considering that the test for insolvency under the CCAA may differ somewhat from that under the BIA, so as to meet the special circumstances of the CCAA and those corporations which would apply under it. In that respect, I am mindful of the above discussion regarding the time that is usually and necessarily (in the circumstances) taken in a CCAA reorganization restructuring which is engaged in coming up with a plan of compromise and arrangement. The BIA definition would appear to have been historically focussed on the question of bankruptcy – and not reorganization of a corporation under a proposal since before 1992, secured creditors could not be forced to compromise their claims, so that in practice there were no reorganizations under the former *Bankruptcy Act* unless all secured creditors voluntarily agreed to have their secured claims compromised. The BIA definition then was essentially useful for being a pre-condition to the "end" situation of a bankruptcy petition or voluntary receiving order where the upshot would be a realization on the bankrupt's assets (not likely involving the business carried on – and certainly not by the bankrupt). Insolvency under the BIA is also important as to the Paulian action events (eg., fraudulent preferences, settlements) as to the conduct of the debtor *prior* to the bankruptcy; similarly as to the question of provincial preference legislation. Reorganization under a plan or proposal, on the contrary, is with a general objective of the applicant continuing to exist,

albeit that the CCAA may also be used to have an orderly disposition of the assets and undertaking in whole or in part.

[25] It seems to me that given the time and steps involved in a reorganization, and the condition of insolvency perforce requires an expanded meaning under the CCAA. Query whether the definition under the BIA is now sufficient in that light for the allowance of sufficient time to carry through with a realistically viable proposal within the maximum of six months allowed under the BIA? I think it sufficient to note that there would not be much sense in providing for a rehabilitation program of restructuring/reorganization under either statute if the entry test was that the applicant could not apply until a rather late stage of its financial difficulties with the rather automatic result that in situations of complexity of any material degree, the applicant would not have the financial resources sufficient to carry through to hopefully a successful end. This would indeed be contrary to the renewed emphasis of Parliament on "rescues" as exhibited by the 1992 and 1997 amendments to the CCAA and the BIA.

[26] Allow me now to examine whether Stelco has been successful in meeting the onus of demonstrating with credible evidence on a common sense basis that it is insolvent within the meaning required by the CCAA in regard to the interpretation of "debtor company" in the context and within the purpose of that legislation. To a similar effect, see *PWA Corp. v. Gemini Group Automated Distribution Systems Inc.* (1993), 103 D.L.R. (4th) 609 (Ont. C.A.), leave to appeal to S.C.C. dismissed wherein it was determined that the trial judge was correct in holding that a party was not insolvent and that the statutory definition of insolvency pursuant to the BIA definition was irrelevant to determine that issue, since the agreement in question effectively provided its own definition by implication. It seems to me that the CCAA test of insolvency advocated by Stelco and which I have determined is a proper interpretation is that the BIA definition of (a), (b) or (c) of insolvent person is acceptable with the caveat that as to (a), a financially troubled corporation is insolvent if it is reasonably expected to run out of liquidity within reasonable proximity of time as compared with the time reasonably required to implement a restructuring. That is, there should be a reasonable cushion, which cushion may be adjusted and indeed become in effect an encroachment depending upon reasonable access to DIP between financing. In the present case, Stelco accepts the view of the Union's affiant, Michael Mackey of Deloitte and Touche that it will otherwise run out of funding by November 2004.

[27] On that basis, allow me to determine whether Stelco is insolvent on the basis of (i) what I would refer to as the CCAA test as described immediately above, (ii) BIA test (a) or (iii) BIA test (c). In doing so, I will have to take into account the fact that Stephen, albeit a very experienced and skilled person in the field of restructurings under the CCAA, unfortunately did not appreciate that the material which was given to him in Exhibit E to his affidavit was modified by the caveats in the source material that in effect indicated that based on appraisals, the fair value of the real assets acquired was in excess of the purchase price for two of the U.S. comparators. Therefore the evidence as to these comparators is significantly weakened. In addition at Q. 175-177 in his cross examination, Stephen acknowledged that it was reasonable to assume that a purchaser would "take over some liabilities, some pension liabilities and OPEB liabilities, for workers who remain with the plant." The extent of that assumption was not explored; however, I do note that there was acknowledgement on the part of the Union that such an assumption would also have a reciprocal negative effect on the purchase price.

[28] The BIA tests are disjunctive so that anyone meeting any of these tests is determined to be insolvent: see *Re Optical Recording Laboratories Inc.* (1990), 75 D.L.R. (4th) 747 (Ont. C.A.) at p. 756; *Re Viteway Natural Foods Ltd.* (1986), 63 C.B.R. (N.S.) 157 (B.C.S.C.) at p. 161. Thus, if I determine that Stelco is insolvent on *any one* of these tests, then it would be a "debtor company" entitled to apply for protection under the CCAA.

[29] In my view, the Union's position that Stelco is not insolvent under BIA (a) because it has not entirely used up its cash and cash facilities (including its credit line), that is, it is not yet as of January 29, 2004 run out of liquidity conflates inappropriately the (a) test with the (b) test. The Union's view would render the (a) test necessarily as being redundant. See *R. v. Proulx*, [2000] 1 S.C.R. 61 at p. 85 for the principle that no legislative provision ought to be interpreted in a manner which would "render it mere surplusage." Indeed the plain meaning of the phrase "unable to meet his obligations as they generally become due" requires a construction of test (a) which permits the court to take a purposive assessment of a debtor's ability to meet his future obligations. See *Re King Petroleum Ltd.* (1978), 29 C.B.R. (N.S.) 76 (Ont. S.C.) where Steele J. stated at p. 80:

With respect to cl. (a), it was argued that at the time the disputed payments were made the company was able to meet its obligations as they generally became due because no major debts were in fact due at that time. This was premised on the fact that the moneys owed to Imperial Oil were not due until 10 days after the receipt of the statements and that the statements had not then been received. I am of the opinion that this is not a proper interpretation of cl. (a). *Clause (a) speaks in the present and future tenses and not in the past.* I am of the opinion that the company was an "insolvent person" within the meaning of cl. (a) because by the very payment-out of the money in question it placed itself in a position that it was unable to meet its obligations as they would generally become due. In other words, it had placed itself in a position that it would not be able to pay the obligations that it knew it had incurred and which it knew would become due in the immediate future. [Emphasis added.]

[30] *King* was a case involving the question in a bankruptcy scenario of whether there was a fraudulent preference during a period when the corporation was insolvent. Under those circumstances, the "immediate future" does not have the same expansive meaning that one would attribute to a time period in a restructuring forward looking situation.

[31] Stephen at paragraphs 40-49 addressed the restructuring question in general and its applicability to the Stelco situation. At paragraph 41, he outlined the significant stages as follows:

The process of restructuring under the CCAA entails a number of different stages, the most significant of which are as follows:

- (a) identification of the debtor's stakeholders and their interests;
- (b) arranging for a process of meaningful communication;
- (c) dealing with immediate relationship issues arising from a CCAA filing;
- (d) sharing information about the issues giving rise to the debtor's need to restructure;

(e) developing restructuring alternatives; and

(f) building a consensus around a plan of restructuring.

[32] I note that January 29, 2004 is just 9-10 months away from November 2004. I accept as correct his conclusion based on his experience (and this is in accord with my own objective experience in large and complicated CCAA proceedings) that Stelco would have the liquidity problem within the time horizon indicated. In that regard, I also think it fair to observe that Stelco realistically cannot expect any increase in its credit line with its lenders or access further outside funding. To bridge the gap it must rely upon the stay to give it the uplift as to pre-filing liabilities (which the Union misinterpreted as a general turnaround in its cash position without taking into account this uplift). As well, the Union was of the view that recent price increases would relieve Stelco's liquidity problems; however, the answers to undertaking in this respect indicated:

With respect to the Business Plan, the average spot market sales price per ton was \$514, and the average contract business sales price per ton was \$599. The Forecast reflects an average spot market sales price per ton of \$575, and average contract business sales price per ton of \$611. The average spot price used in the forecast considers further announced price increases, recognizing, among other things, the timing and the extent such increases are expected to become effective. The benefit of the increase in sales prices from the Business Plan is essentially offset by the substantial increase in production costs, and in particular in raw material costs, primarily scrap and coke, as well as higher working capital levels and a higher loan balance outstanding on the CIT credit facility as of January 2004.

I accept that this is generally a cancel out or wash in all material respects.

[33] I note that \$145 million of cash resources had been used from January 1, 2003 to the date of filing. Use of the credit facility of \$350 million had increased from \$241 million on November 30, 2003 to \$293 million on the date of filing. There must be a reasonable reserve of liquidity to take into account day to day, week to week or month to month variances and also provide for unforeseen circumstances such as the breakdown of a piece of vital equipment which would significantly affect production until remedied. Trade credit had been contracting as a result of appreciation by suppliers of Stelco's financial difficulties. The DIP financing of \$75 million is only available if Stelco is under CCAA protection. I also note that a shut down as a result of running out of liquidity would be complicated in the case of Stelco and that even if conditions turned around more than reasonably expected, start-up costs would be heavy and quite importantly, there would be a significant erosion of the customer base (reference should be had to the Slater Hamilton plant in this regard). One does not liquidate assets which one would not sell in the ordinary course of business to thereby artificially salvage some liquidity for the purpose of the test: see *Re Pacific Mobile Corporation; Robitaille v. Les Industries l'Islet Inc. and Banque Canadienne Nationale* (1979), 32 C.B.R. (N.S.) 209 (Que. S.C.) at p. 220. As a rough test, I note that Stelco (albeit on a consolidated basis with all subsidiaries) running significantly behind plan in 2003 from its budget of a profit of \$80 million now to a projected loss of \$192 million and cash has gone from a positive \$209 million to a negative \$114 million.

[34] Locker made the observation at paragraph 8 of his affidavit that:

8. Stelco has performed poorly for the past few years primarily due to an inadequate business strategy, poor utilization of assets, inefficient operations and generally weak management leadership and decision-making. This point is best supported by the fact that Stelco's local competitor, Dofasco, has generated outstanding results in the same period.

Table 1 to his affidavit would demonstrate that Dofasco has had superior profitability and cashflow performance than its "neighbour" Stelco. He went on to observe at paragraphs 36-37:

36. Stelco can achieve significant cost reductions through means other than cutting wages, pensions and benefits for employees and retirees. Stelco could bring its cost levels down to those of restructured U.S. mills, with the potential for lowering them below those of many U.S. mills.

37. Stelco could achieve substantial savings through productivity improvements within the mechanisms of the current collective agreements. More importantly, a major portion of this cost reduction could be achieved through constructive negotiations with the USWA in an out-of-court restructuring that does not require intervention of the courts through the vehicle of CCAA protection.

I accept his constructive comments that there is room for cost reductions and that there are substantial savings to be achieved through productivity improvements. However, I do not see anything detrimental to these discussions and negotiations by having them conducted within the umbrella of a CCAA proceeding. See my comments above regarding the CCAA in practice.

[35] But I would observe and I am mystified by Locker's observations at paragraph 12 (quoted above), that Stelco should have borrowed to fund pension obligations to avoid its current financial crisis. This presumes that the borrowed funds would not constitute an obligation to be paid back as to principal and interest, but rather that it would assume the character of a cost-free "gift".

[36] I note that Mackey, without the "laundry list" he indicates at paragraph 17 of his second affidavit, is unable to determine at paragraph 19 (for himself) whether Stelco was insolvent. Mackey was unable to avail himself of all available information in light of the Union's refusal to enter into a confidentiality agreement. He does not closely adhere to the BIA tests as they are defined. In the face of positive evidence about an applicant's financial position by an experienced person with expertise, it is not sufficient to displace this evidence by filing evidence which goes no further than raising questions: see *Anvil*, *supra* at p. 162.

[37] The Union referred me to one of my decisions *Standard Trustco Ltd. (Trustee of) v. Standard Trust Co.* (1993), 13 O.R. (3d) 7 (Gen. Div.) where I stated as to the MacGirr affidavit:

The Trustee's cause of action is premised on MacGirr's opinion that STC was insolvent as at August 3, 1990 and therefore the STC common shares and promissory note received by Trustco in return for the Injection had no value at the time the Injection was made. Further, MacGirr ascribed no value to the opportunity which the Injection gave to Trustco to restore STC and salvage its thought to be existing \$74 million investment. In stating his opinion MacGirr defined solvency as:

- (a) the ability to meet liabilities as they fall due; and
- (b) that assets exceed liabilities.

On cross-examination MacGirr testified that in his opinion on either test STC was insolvent as at August 3, 1990 since as to (a) STC was experiencing then a negative cash flow and as to (b) the STC financial statements incorrectly reflected values. As far as (a) is concerned, I would comment that while I concur with MacGirr that at some time in the long run a company that is experiencing a negative cash flow will eventually not be able to meet liabilities as they fall due but that is not the test (which is a "present exercise"). On that current basis STC was meeting its liabilities on a timely basis.

[38] As will be seen from that expanded quote, MacGirr gave his own definitions of insolvency which are not the same as the s. 2 BIA tests (a), (b) and (c) but only a very loose paraphrase of (a) and (c) and an omission of (b). Nor was I referred to the *King* or *Proulx* cases *supra*. Further, it is obvious from the context that "*sometime in the long run...eventually*" is not a finite time in the foreseeable future.

[39] I have not given any benefit to the \$313 - \$363 million of improvements referred to in the affidavit of William Vaughan at paragraph 115 as those appear to be capital expenditures which will have to be accommodated within a plan of arrangement or after emergence.

[40] It seems to me that if the BIA (a) test is restrictively dealt with (as per my question to Union counsel as to how far in the future should one look on a prospective basis being answered "24 hours") then Stelco would not be insolvent under that test. However, I am of the view that that would be unduly restrictive and a proper contextual and purposive interpretation to be given when it is being used for a restructuring purpose even under BIA would be to see whether there is a reasonably foreseeable (at the time of filing) expectation that there is a looming liquidity condition or crisis which will result in the applicant running out of "cash" to pay its debts as they generally become due in the future without the benefit of the stay and ancillary protection and procedure by court authorization pursuant to an order. I think this is the more appropriate interpretation of BIA (a) test in the context of a reorganization or "rescue" as opposed to a threshold to bankruptcy consideration or a fraudulent preferences proceeding. On that basis, I would find Stelco insolvent from the date of filing. Even if one were not to give the latter interpretation to the BIA (a) test, clearly for the above reasons and analysis, if one looks at the meaning of "insolvent" within the context of a CCAA reorganization or rescue solely, then of necessity, the time horizon must be such that the liquidity crisis would occur in the sense of running out of "cash" but for the grant of the CCAA order. On that basis Stelco is certainly insolvent given its limited cash resources unused, its need for a cushion, its rate of cash burn recently experienced and anticipated.

[41] What about the BIA (c) test which may be roughly referred to as an assets compared with obligations test. See *New Quebec Reglan Mines Ltd. v. Blok-Andersen*, [1993] O.J. No. 727 (Gen. Div.) as to fair value and fair market valuation. The Union observed that there was no intention by Stelco to wind itself up or proceed with a sale of some or all of its assets and undertaking and therefore some of the liabilities which Stelco and Stephen took into account would not crystallize. However, as I discussed at the time of the hearing, the (c) test is what one might reasonably call or describe as an "artificial" or notional/hypothetical test. It presumes certain things which are in fact not necessarily contemplated to take place or to be involved. In that respect, I appreciate that it may

be difficult to get one's mind around that concept and down the right avenue of that (c) test. See my views at trial in *Olympia & York Developments Ltd. (Trustee of) v. Olympia & York Realty Corp.*, [2001] O.J. No. 3394 (S.C.J.) at paragraphs 13, 21 and 33; affirmed [2003] O.J. No. 5242 (C.A.). At paragraph 33, I observed in closing:

33...They (and their expert witnesses) all had to contend with dealing with rambling and complicated facts and, in Section 100 BIA, a section which is difficult to administer when fmv [fair market value] in a notational or hypothetical market involves ignoring what would often be regarded as self evidence truths but at the same time appreciating that this notational or hypothetical market requires that the objects being sold have to have realistic true to life attributes recognized.

[42] The Court of Appeal stated at paragraphs 24-25 as follows:

24. Nor are the appellants correct to argue that the trial judge also assumed an imprudent vendor in arriving at his conclusion about the fair market value of the OYSF note would have to know that in order to realize value from the note any purchaser would immediately put OYSF and thus OYDL itself into bankruptcy to pre-empt a subsequent triggering event in favour of EIB. While this was so, and the trial judge clearly understood it, the error in this submission is that it seeks to inject into the analysis factors subjected to the circumstances of OYDL as vendor and not intrinsic to the value of the OYSF note. The calculation of fair market value does not permit this but rather must assume an unconstrained vendor.

25. The Applicants further argue that the trial judge eroded in determining the fair market value of the OYSF note by reference to a transaction which was entirely speculative because it was never considered by OYDL nor would have it been since it would have resulted in OYDL's own bankruptcy. I disagree. The transaction hypothesized by the trial judge was one between a notational, willing, prudent and informed vendor and purchaser based on factors relevant to the OYSF note itself rather than the particular circumstances of OYDL as the seller of the note. This is an entirely appropriate way to determine the fair market value of the OYSF note.

[43] Test (c) deems a person to be insolvent if "the aggregate of [its] property is not, at a fair valuation, sufficient, or of disposed at a fairly conducted sale under legal process would not be sufficient to enable payment of all [its] obligations, due and accruing due." The origins of this legislative test appear to be the decision of Spragge V-C in *Davidson v. Douglas* (1868), 15 Gr. 347 at p. 351 where he stated with respect to the solvency or insolvency of a debtor, the proper course is:

to see and examine whether all his property, real and personal, be sufficient if presently realized for the payment of his debts, and in this view we must estimate his land, as well as his chattel property, not at what his neighbours or others may consider to be its value, but at what it would bring in the market at a forced sale, or a sale where the seller cannot await his opportunities, but must sell.

[44] In *Clarkson v. Sterling* (1887), 14 O.R. 460 (Div Ct.) at p. 463, Rose J. indicted that the sale must be fair and reasonable, but that the determination of fairness and reasonableness would depend on the facts of each case.

[45] The Union essentially relied on garnishment cases. Because of the provisions relating as to which debts may or may not be garnished, these authorities are of somewhat limited value when dealing with the test (c) question. However I would refer to one of the Union's cases *Bank of Montreal v. I. M. Krisp Foods Ltd.*, [1996] S.J. No. 655 (C.A.) where it is stated at paragraph 11:

"11. Few phrases have been as problematic to define as "debt due or accruing due". The Shorter Oxford English Dictionary, 3rd ed. defines "accruing" as "arising in due course", but an examination of English and Canadian authority reveals that not all debts "arising in due course" are permitted to be garnished. (See Professor Dunlop's extensive research for his British Columbia Law Reform Commission's Report on Attachment of Debts Act, 1978 at 17 to 29 and its text *Creditor-Debtor Law in Canada*, 2nd ed. at 374 to 385.)

[46] In *Barsi v. Farcas*, [1924] 1 D.L.R. 1154 (Sask. C.A.), Lamont J.A. was cited for his statement at p. 522 of *Webb v. Stanton* (1883), 11 Q.B.D. 518 that: "an accruing debt, therefore, is a debt not yet actually payable, but a debt which is represented by an existing obligation."

[47] Saunders J. noted in *633746 Ont. Inc. (Trustee of) v. Salvati* (1990), 79 C.B.R. (N.S.) 72 (Ont. S.C.) at p. 81 that a sale out of the ordinary course of business would have an adverse effect on that actually realized.

[48] There was no suggestion by any of the parties that any of the assets and undertaking would have any enhanced value from that shown on the financial statements prepared according to GAAP.

[49] In *King, supra* at p. 81 Steele J. observed:

To consider the question of insolvency under cl. (c) I must look to the aggregate property of the company and come to a conclusion as to whether or not it would be sufficient to enable payment of all obligations due and accruing due. There are two tests to be applied: First, its fair value and, secondly, its value if disposed of at a fairly conducted sale under legal process. The balance sheet is a starting point, but the evidence relating to the fair value of the assets and what they might realize if disposed of at a fairly conducted sale under legal process must be reviewed in interpreting it. In this case, I find no difficulty in accepting the obligations shown as liabilities because they are known. I have more difficulty with respect to the assets.

[50] To my view the preferable interpretation to be given to "sufficient to enable payment of all his obligations, due and accruing due" is to be determined in the context of this test as a whole. What is being put up to satisfy those obligations is the debtor's assets and undertaking *in total*; in other words, the debtor in essence is taken as having sold everything. There would be no residual assets and undertaking to pay off any obligations which would not be encompassed by the phrase "all of his obligations, due and accruing due". Surely, there cannot be "orphan" obligations which are left hanging unsatisfied. It seems to me that the intention of "due and accruing due" was to cover off all obligations of whatever nature or kind and leave nothing in limbo.

[51] S. 121(1) and (2) of the BIA, which are incorporated by reference in s. 12 of the CCAA, provide in respect to provable claims:

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

(2) The determination whether a contingent or unliquidated claim is a provable claim and the valuation of such claim shall be made in accordance with s. 135.

[52] *Houlden and Morawetz 2004 Annotated supra* at p. 537 (G28(3)) indicates:

The word "liability" is a very broad one. It includes all obligations to which the bankrupt is subject on the day on which he becomes bankrupt except for contingent and unliquidated claims which are dealt with in s. 121(2).

However contingent and unliquidated claims would be encompassed by the term "obligations".

[53] In *Garden v. Newton* (1916), 29 D.L.R. 276 (Man. K.B.), Mathers C.J.K.B. observed at p. 281 that "contingent claim, that is, a claim which may or may not ripen into a debt, according as some future event does or does not happen." See *In re A Debtor* (No. 64 of 1992), [1993] 1 W.L.R. 264 (Ch. D) at p. 268 for the definition of a "liquidated sum" which is an amount which can be readily ascertained and hence by corollary an "unliquidated claim" would be one which is not easily ascertained, but will have to be valued. In *Re Leo Gagnier* (1950), 30 C.B.R. 74 (Ont. S.C.), there appears to be a conflation of not only the (a) test with the (c) test, but also the invocation of the judicial discretion not to grant the receiving order pursuant to a bankruptcy petition, notwithstanding that "[the judge was] unable to find the debtor is bankrupt". The debtor was able to survive the (a) test as he had the practice (accepted by all his suppliers) of providing them with post dated cheques. The (c) test was not a problem since the judge found that his assets should be valued at considerably more than his obligations. However, this case does illustrate that the application of the tests present some difficulties. These difficulties are magnified when one is dealing with something more significantly complex and a great deal larger than a haberdashery store – in the case before us, a giant corporation in which, amongst other things, is engaged in a very competitive history including competition from foreign sources which have recently restructured into more cost efficient structures, having shed certain of their obligations. As well, that is without taking into account that a sale would entail significant transaction costs. Even of greater significance would be the severance and termination payments to employees not continued by the new purchaser. Lastly, it was recognized by everyone at the hearing that Stelco's plants, especially the Hamilton-Hilton works, have extremely high environmental liabilities lurking in the woodwork. Stephen observed that these obligations would be substantial, although not quantified.

[54] It is true that there are no appraisals of the plant and equipment nor of the assets and undertaking of Stelco. Given the circumstances of this case and the complexities of the market, one may realistically question whether or not the appraisals would be all that helpful or accurate.

[55] I would further observe that in the notional or hypothetical exercise of a sale, then all the obligations which would be triggered by such sale would have to be taken into account.

[56] All liabilities, contingent or unliquidated would have to be taken into account. See *King, supra* p. 81; *Salvati, supra* pp. 80-1; *Maybank Foods Inc. (Trustee of) v. Provisseurs Maritimes Ltd.* (1989), 45 B.L.R. 14 (N.S.S.C.) at p. 29; *Re Challmie* (1976), 22 C.B.R. (N.S.) 78 (B.C.S.C.) at pp. 81-2. In *Challmie* the debtor ought to have known that his guarantee was very much exposed given the perilous state of his company whose liabilities he had guaranteed. It is interesting to note what was stated in *Maybank*, even if it is rather patently obvious. Tidman J. said in respect of the branch of the company at p. 29:

Mr. MacAdam argues also that the \$4.8 million employees' severance obligation was not a liability on January 20, 1986. The *Bankruptcy Act* includes as obligations both those due and accruing due. Although the employees' severance obligation was not due and payable on January 20, 1986 it was an obligation "accruing due". The Toronto facility had experienced severe financial difficulties for some time; in fact, it was the major, if not the sole cause, of Maybank's financial difficulties. I believe it is reasonable to conclude that a reasonably astute perspective buyer of the company has a going concern would have considered that obligation on January 20, 1986 and that it would have substantially reduced the price offered by that perspective buyer. Therefore that obligation must be considered as an obligation of the company on January 20, 1986.

[57] With the greatest of respect for my colleague, I disagree with the conclusion of Ground J. in *Enterprise Capital, supra* as to the approach to be taken to "due and accruing due" when he observed at pp. 139-140:

It therefore becomes necessary to determine whether the principle amount of the Notes constitutes an obligation "due or accruing due" as of the date of this application.

There is a paucity of helpful authority on the meaning of "accruing due" for purposes of a definition of insolvency. Historically, in 1933, in *P. Lyall & Sons Construction Co. v. Baker*, [1933] O.R. 286 (Ont. C.A.), the Ontario Court of Appeal, in determining a question of set-off under the *Dominion Winding-Up Act* had to determine whether the amount claimed as set-off was a debt due or accruing due to the company in liquidation for purposes of that Act. Marsten J. at pp. 292-293 quoted from Moss J.A. in *Mail Printing Co. v. Clarkson* (1898), 25 O.R. 1 (Ont. C.A.) at p. 8:

A debt is defined to be a sum of money which is certainly, and at all event, payable without regard to the fact whether it be payable now or at a future time. And an accruing debt is a debt not yet actually payable, but a debt which is represented by an existing obligation: Per Lindley L.J. in *Webb v. Stenton* (1883), 11 Q.D.D. at p. 529.

Whatever relevance such definition may have had for purposes of dealing with claims by and against companies in liquidation under the old winding-up legislation, it is apparent to me that it should not be applied to definitions of insolvency. To include every debt payable at some future date in "accruing due"

for the purposes of insolvency tests would render numerous corporations, with long term debt due over a period of years in the future and anticipated to be paid out of future income, "insolvent" for the purposes of the BIA and therefore the CCAA. For the same reason, I do not accept the statement quoted in the Enterprise factum from the decision of the Bankruptcy Court for the Southern District of New York in *Centennial Textiles Inc., Re* 220 B.R. 165 (U.S.N.Y.D.C. 1998) that "if the present saleable value of assets are less than the amount required to pay existing debt as they mature, the debtor is insolvent". In my view, the obligations, which are to be measured against the fair valuation of a company's property as being obligations due and accruing due, must be limited to obligations currently payable or properly chargeable to the accounting period during which the test is being applied as, for example, a sinking fund payment due within the current year. Black's Law Dictionary defines "accrued liability" as "an obligation or debt which is properly chargeable in a given accounting period, but which is not yet paid or payable". The principal amount of the Notes is neither due nor accruing due in this sense.

[58] There appears to be some confusion in this analysis as to "debts" and "obligations", the latter being much broader than debts. Please see above as to my views concerning the floodgates argument under the BIA and CCAA being addressed by judicially exercised discretion even if "otherwise warranted" applications were made. I pause to note that an insolvency test under general corporate litigation need not be and likely is not identical, or indeed similar to that under these insolvency statutes. As well, it is curious to note that the cut off date is the end of the current fiscal period which could have radically different results if there were a calendar fiscal year and the application was variously made in the first week of January, mid-summer or the last day of December. Lastly, see above and below as to my views concerning the proper interpretation of this question of "accruing due".

[59] It seems to me that the phrase "accruing due" has been interpreted by the courts as broadly identifying obligations that will "become due". See *Viteway* below at pp. 163-4 – at least at some point in the future. Again, I would refer to my conclusion above that *every obligation* of the corporation in the hypothetical or notional sale must be treated as "accruing due" to avoid orphan obligations. In that context, it matters not that a wind-up pension liability may be discharged over 15 years; in a test (c) situation, it is crystallized on the date of the test. See *Optical supra* at pp. 756-7; *Re Viteway Natural Foods Ltd.* (1986), 63 C.B.R. (N.S.) 157 (B.C.S.C.) at pp. 164-63-4; *Re Consolidated Seed Exports Ltd.* (1986), 62 C.B.R. (N.S.) 156 (B.C.S.C.) at p. 163. In *Consolidated Seed*, Spencer J. at pp. 162-3 stated:

In my opinion, a futures broker is not in that special position. The third definition of "insolvency" may apply to a futures trader at any time even though he has open long positions in the market. Even though Consolidated's long positions were not required to be closed on 10th December, the chance that they might show a profit by March 1981 or even on the following day and thus wipe out Consolidated's cash deficit cannot save it from a condition of insolvency on that day. The circumstances fit precisely within the third definition; if all Consolidated's assets had been sold on that day at a fair value, the proceeds would not have covered its obligations due and accruing due, including its

obligations to pay in March 1981 for its long positions in rapeseed. The market prices from day to day establish a fair valuation. ...

The contract to buy grain at a fixed price at a future time imposes a present obligation upon a trader taking a long position in the futures market to take delivery in exchange for payment at that future time. It is true that in the practice of the market, that obligation is nearly always washed out by buying an offsetting short contract, but until that is done the obligation stands. The trader does not know who will eventually be on the opposite side of his transaction if it is not offset but all transactions are treated as if the clearing house is on the other side. It is a present obligation due at a future time. It is therefore an obligation accruing due within the meaning of the third definition of "insolvency".

[60] The possibility of an expectancy of future profits or a change in the market is not sufficient; *Consolidated Seed* at p. 162 emphasizes that the test is to be done on that day, the day of filing in the case of an application for reorganization.

[61] I see no objection to using Exhibit C to Stephen's affidavit as an aid to review the balance sheet approach to test (c). While Stephen may not have known who prepared Exhibit C, he addressed each of its components in the text of his affidavit and as such he could have mechanically prepared the exhibit himself. He was comfortable with and agreed with each of its components. Stelco's factum at paragraphs 70-1 submits as follows:

70. In Exhibit C to his Affidavit, Mr. Stephen addresses a variety of adjustments to the Shareholder's Equity of Stelco necessary to reflect the values of assets and liabilities as would be required to determine whether Stelco met the test of insolvency under Clause C. In cross examination of both Mr. Vaughan and Mr. Stephen only one of these adjustments was challenged – the "Possible Reductions in Capital Assets."

71. The basis of the challenge was that the comparative sales analysis was flawed. In the submission of Stelco, none of these challenges has any merit. Even if the entire adjustment relating to the value in capital assets is ignored, the remaining adjustments leave Stelco with assets worth over \$600 million less than the value of its obligations due and accruing due. This fundamental fact is not challenged.

[62] Stelco went on at paragraphs 74-5 of its factum to submit:

74. The values relied upon by Mr. Stephen if anything, understate the extent of Stelco's insolvency. As Mr. Stephen has stated, and no one has challenged by affidavit evidence or on cross examination, in a fairly conducted sale under legal process, the value of Stelco's working capital and other assets would be further impaired by: (i) increased environmental liabilities not reflected on the financial statements, (ii) increased pension deficiencies that would be generated on a wind up of the pension plans, (iii) severance and termination claims and (iv) substantial liquidation costs that would be incurred in connection with such a sale.

75. No one on behalf of the USWA has presented any evidence that the capital assets of Stelco are in excess of book value on a stand alone basis. Certainly no one has suggested that these assets would be in excess of book value if the related environmental legacy costs and collective agreements could not be separated from the assets.

[63] Before turning to that exercise, I would also observe that test (c) is also disjunctive. There is an insolvency condition if the total obligation of the debtor exceed either (i) a fair valuation of its assets or (ii) the proceeds of a sale fairly conducted under legal process of its assets.

[64] As discussed above and confirmed by Stephen, if there were a sale under legal process, then it would be unlikely, especially in this circumstance that values would be enhanced; in all probability they would be depressed from book value. Stephen took the balance sheet GAAP calculated figure of equity at November 30, 2003 as \$804.2 million. From that, he deducted the loss for December 2003 – January 2004 of \$17 million to arrive at an equity position of \$787.2 million as at the date of filing.

[65] From that, he deducted, reasonably in my view, those "booked" assets that would have no value in a test (c) sale namely: (a) \$294 million of future income tax recourse which would need taxable income in the future to realize; (b) \$57 million for a write-off of the Platemill which is presently hot idled (while Locker observed that it would not be prohibitive in cost to restart production, I note that neither Stephen nor Vaughn were cross examined as to the decision not to do so); and (c) the capitalized deferred debt issue expense of \$3.2 million which is being written off over time and therefore, truly is a "nothing". This totals \$354.2 million so that the excess of value over liabilities before reflecting obligations not included in the financials directly, but which are, substantiated as to category in the notes would be \$433 million.

[66] On a windup basis, there would be a pension deficiency of \$1252 million; however, Stephen conservatively in my view looked at the Mercer actuary calculations on the basis of a going concern finding deficiency of \$656 million. If the \$1252 million windup figure had been taken, then the picture would have been even bleaker than it is as Stephen has calculated it for test (c) purposes. In addition, there are deferred pension costs of \$198.7 million which under GAAP accounting calculations is allowed so as to defer recognition of past bad investment experience, but this has no realizable value. Then there is the question of Employee Future Benefits. These have been calculated as at December 31, 2003 by the Mercer actuary as \$909.3 million but only \$684 million has been accrued and booked on the financial statements so that there has to be an increased provision of \$225.3 million. These off balance sheet adjustments total \$1080 million.

[67] Taking that last adjustment into account would result in a *negative* equity of (\$433 million minus \$1080 million) or *negative* \$647 million. On that basis without taking into account possible reductions in capital assets as dealt with in the somewhat flawed Exhibit E nor environmental and other costs discussed above, Stelco is insolvent according to the test (c). With respect to Exhibit E, I have not relied on it in any way, but it is entirely likely that a properly calculated Exhibit E would provide comparators (also being sold in the U.S. under legal process in a fairly conducted process) which tend to require a further downward adjustment. Based on test (c), Stelco is significantly, not marginally, under water.

[68] In reaching my conclusion as to the negative equity (and I find that Stephen approached that exercise fairly and constructively), please note my comments above regarding the possible

assumption of pension obligations by the purchaser being offset by a reduction of the purchase price. The 35% adjustment advocated as to pension and employee benefits in this regard is speculation by the Union. Secondly, the Union emphasized cash flow as being important in evaluation, but it must be remembered that Stelco has been negative cash flow for some time which would make that analysis unreliable and to the detriment of the Union's position. The Union treated the \$773 million estimated contribution to the shortfall in the pension deficiency by the Pension Benefits Guarantee Fund as eliminating that as a Stelco obligation. That is not the case however as that Fund would be subrogated to the claims of the employees in that respect with a result that Stelco would remain liable for that \$773 million. Lastly, the Union indicated that there should be a \$155 million adjustment as to the negative equity in Sub Applicants when calculating Stelco's equity. While Stephen at Q. 181-2 acknowledged that there was no adjustment for that, I agree with him that there ought not to be since Stelco was being examined (and the calculations were based) on an unconsolidated basis, not on a consolidated basis.

[69] In the end result, I have concluded on the balance of probabilities that Stelco is insolvent and therefore it is a "debtor company" as at the date of filing and entitled to apply for the CCAA initial order. My conclusion is that (i) BIA test (c) strongly shows Stelco is insolvent; (ii) BIA test (a) demonstrates, to a less certain but sufficient basis, an insolvency and (iii) the "new" CCAA test again strongly supports the conclusion of insolvency. I am further of the opinion that I properly exercised my discretion in granting Stelco and the Sub Applicants the initial order on January 29, 2004 and I would confirm that as of the present date with effect on the date of filing. The Union's motion is therefore dismissed.

[70] I appreciate that all the employees (union and non-union alike) and the Union and the International have a justifiable pride in their work and their workplace – and a human concern about what the future holds for them. The pensioners are in the same position. Their respective positions can only be improved by engaging in discussion, an exchange of views and information reasonably advanced and conscientiously listened to and digested, leading to mutual problem solving, ideas and negotiations. Negative attitudes can only lead to the detriment to all stakeholders. Unfortunately there has been some finger pointing on various sides; that should be put behind everyone so that participants in this process can concentrate on the future and not inappropriately dwell on the past. I understand that there have been some discussions and interchange over the past two weeks since the hearing and that is a positive start.

J.M. Farley

Released: March 22, 20004

TAB 6

CITATION: Target Canada Co. (Re), 2015 ONSC 303
COURT FILE NO.: CV-15-10832-00CL
DATE: 2015-01-16

SUPERIOR COURT OF JUSTICE - ONTARIO

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

AND IN THE MATTER OF A PLAN OF COMPROMISE OR
ARRANGEMENT OF TARGET CANADA CO., TARGET CANADA
HEALTH CO., TARGET CANADA MOBILE GP CO., TARGET CANADA
PHARMACY (BC) CORP., TARGET CANADA PHARMACY (ONTARIO)
CORP., TARGET CANADA PHARMACY CORP., TARGET CANADA
PHARMACY (SK) CORP., and TARGET CANADA PROPERTY LLC.

BEFORE: Regional Senior Justice Morawetz

COUNSEL: *Tracy Sandler and Jeremy Dacks*, for the Target Canada Co., Target Canada
Health Co., Target Canada Mobile GP Co., Target Canada Pharmacy (BC) Corp.,
Target Canada Pharmacy (Ontario) Corp., Target Canada Pharmacy Corp., Target
Canada Pharmacy (SK) Corp., and Target Canada Property LLC (the
“Applicants”)

Jay Swartz, for the Target Corporation

Alan Mark, Melaney Wagner, and Jesse Mighton, for the Proposed Monitor,
Alvarez and Marsal Canada ULC (“Alvarez”)

Terry O’Sullivan, for The Honourable J. Ground, Trustee of the Proposed
Employee Trust

Susan Philpott, for the Proposed Employee Representative Counsel for employees
of the Applicants

HEARD and ENDORSED: January 15, 2015

REASONS: January 16, 2015

ENDORSEMENT

[1] Target Canada Co. (“TCC”) and the other applicants listed above (the “Applicants”) seek relief under the *Companies’ Creditors Arrangement Act*, R.S.C., 1985, c. C-36, as amended (the “CCAA”). While the limited partnerships listed in Schedule “A” to the draft Order (the “Partnerships”) are not applicants in this proceeding, the Applicants seek to have a stay of

proceedings and other benefits of an initial order under the CCAA extended to the Partnerships, which are related to or carry on operations that are integral to the business of the Applicants.

[2] TCC is a large Canadian retailer. It is the Canadian operating subsidiary of Target Corporation, one of the largest retailers in the United States. The other Applicants are either corporations or partners of the Partnerships formed to carry on specific aspects of TCC's Canadian retail business (such as the Canadian pharmacy operations) or finance leasehold improvements in leased Canadian stores operated by TCC. The Applicants, therefore, do not represent the entire Target enterprise; the Applicants consist solely of entities that are integral to the Canadian retail operations. Together, they are referred as the "Target Canada Entities".

[3] In early 2011, Target Corporation determined to expand its retail operations into Canada, undertaking a significant investment (in the form of both debt and equity) in TCC and certain of its affiliates in order to permit TCC to establish and operate Canadian retail stores. As of today, TCC operates 133 stores, with at least one store in every province of Canada. All but three of these stores are leased.

[4] Due to a number of factors, the expansion into Canada has proven to be substantially less successful than expected. Canadian operations have shown significant losses in every quarter since stores opened. Projections demonstrate little or no prospect of improvement within a reasonable time.

[5] After exploring multiple solutions over a number of months and engaging in extensive consultations with its professional advisors, Target Corporation concluded that, in the interest of all of its stakeholders, the responsible course of action is to cease funding the Canadian operations.

[6] Without ongoing investment from Target Corporation, TCC and the other Target Canada Entities cannot continue to operate and are clearly insolvent. Due to the magnitude and complexity of the operations of the Target Canada Entities, the Applicants are seeking a stay of proceedings under the CCAA in order to accomplish a fair, orderly and controlled wind-down of their operations. The Target Canada Entities have indicated that they intend to treat all of their stakeholders as fairly and equitably as the circumstances allow, particularly the approximately 17,600 employees of the Target Canada Entities.

[7] The Applicants are of the view that an orderly wind-down under Court supervision, with the benefit of inherent jurisdiction of the CCAA, and the oversight of the proposed monitor, provides a framework in which the Target Canada Entities can, among other things:

- a) Pursue initiatives such as the sale of real estate portfolios and the sale of inventory;
- b) Develop and implement support mechanisms for employees as vulnerable stakeholders affected by the wind-down, particularly (i) an employee trust (the "Employee Trust") funded by Target Corporation; (ii) an employee representative counsel to safeguard employee interests; and (iii) a key

employee retention plan (the “KERP”) to provide essential employees who agree to continue their employment and to contribute their services and expertise to the Target Canada Entities during the orderly wind-down;

- c) Create a level playing field to ensure that all affected stakeholders are treated as fairly and equitably as the circumstances allow; and
- d) Avoid the significant maneuvering among creditors and other stakeholders that could be detrimental to all stakeholders, in the absence of a court-supervised proceeding.

[8] The Applicants are of the view that these factors are entirely consistent with the well-established purpose of a CCAA stay: to give a debtor the “breathing room” required to restructure with a view to maximizing recoveries, whether the restructuring takes place as a going concern or as an orderly liquidation or wind-down.

[9] TCC is an indirect, wholly-owned subsidiary of Target Corporation and is the operating company through which the Canadian retail operations are carried out. TCC is a Nova Scotia unlimited liability company. It is directly owned by Nicollet Enterprise 1 S. à r.l. (“NE1”), an entity organized under the laws of Luxembourg. Target Corporation (which is incorporated under the laws of the State of Minnesota) owns NE1 through several other entities.

[10] TCC operates from a corporate headquarters in Mississauga, Ontario. As of January 12, 2015, TCC employed approximately 17,600 people, almost all of whom work in Canada. TCC’s employees are not represented by a union, and there is no registered pension plan for employees.

[11] The other Target Canada Entities are all either: (i) direct or indirect subsidiaries of TCC with responsibilities for specific aspects of the Canadian retail operation; or (ii) affiliates of TCC that have been involved in the financing of certain leasehold improvements.

[12] A typical TCC store has a footprint in the range of 80,000 to 125,000 total retail square feet and is located in a shopping mall or large strip mall. TCC is usually the anchor tenant. Each TCC store typically contains an in-store Target brand pharmacy, Target Mobile kiosk and a Starbucks café. Each store typically employs approximately 100 – 150 people, described as “Team Members” and “Team Leaders”, with a total of approximately 16,700 employed at the “store level” of TCC’s retail operations.

[13] TCC owns three distribution centres (two in Ontario and one in Alberta) to support its retail operations. These centres are operated by a third party service provider. TCC also leases a variety of warehouse and office spaces.

[14] In every quarter since TCC opened its first store, TCC has faced lower than expected sales and greater than expected losses. As reported in Target Corporation’s Consolidated Financial Statements, the Canadian segment of the Target business has suffered a significant loss in every quarter since TCC opened stores in Canada.

[15] TCC is completely operationally funded by its ultimate parent, Target Corporation, and related entities. It is projected that TCC's cumulative pre-tax losses from the date of its entry into the Canadian market to the end of the 2014 fiscal year (ending January 31, 2015) will be more than \$2.5 billion. In his affidavit, Mr. Mark Wong, General Counsel and Secretary of TCC, states that this is more than triple the loss originally expected for this period. Further, if TCC's operations are not wound down, it is projected that they would remain unprofitable for at least 5 years and would require significant and continued funding from Target Corporation during that period.

[16] TCC attributes its failure to achieve expected profitability to a number of principal factors, including: issues of scale; supply chain difficulties; pricing and product mix issues; and the absence of a Canadian online retail presence.

[17] Following a detailed review of TCC's operations, the Board of Directors of Target Corporation decided that it is in the best interests of the business of Target Corporation and its subsidiaries to discontinue Canadian operations.

[18] Based on the stand-alone financial statements prepared for TCC as of November 1, 2014 (which consolidated financial results of TCC and its subsidiaries), TCC had total assets of approximately \$5.408 billion and total liabilities of approximately \$5.118 billion. Mr. Wong states that this does not reflect a significant impairment charge that will likely be incurred at fiscal year end due to TCC's financial situation.

[19] Mr. Wong states that TCC's operational funding is provided by Target Corporation. As of November 1, 2014, NE1 (TCC's direct parent) had provided equity capital to TCC in the amount of approximately \$2.5 billion. As a result of continuing and significant losses in TCC's operations, NE1 has been required to make an additional equity investment of \$62 million since November 1, 2014.

[20] NE1 has also lent funds to TCC under a Loan Facility with a maximum amount of \$4 billion. TCC owed NE1 approximately \$3.1 billion under this Facility as of January 2, 2015. The Loan Facility is unsecured. On January 14, 2015, NE1 agreed to subordinate all amounts owing by TCC to NE1 under this Loan Facility to payment in full of proven claims against TCC.

[21] As at November 1, 2014, Target Canada Property LLC ("TCC Propco") had assets of approximately \$1.632 billion and total liabilities of approximately \$1.643 billion. Mr. Wong states that this does not reflect a significant impairment charge that will likely be incurred at fiscal year end due to TCC Propco's financial situation. TCC Propco has also borrowed approximately \$1.5 billion from Target Canada Property LP and TCC Propco also owes U.S. \$89 million to Target Corporation under a Demand Promissory Note.

[22] TCC has subleased almost all the retail store leases to TCC Propco, which then made real estate improvements and sub-sub leased the properties back to TCC. Under this arrangement, upon termination of any of these sub-leases, a "make whole" payment becomes owing from TCC to TCC Propco.

[23] Mr. Wong states that without further funding and financial support from Target Corporation, the Target Canada Entities are unable to meet their liabilities as they become due, including TCC's next payroll (due January 16, 2015). The Target Canada Entities, therefore state that they are insolvent.

[24] Mr. Wong also states that given the size and complexity of TCC's operations and the numerous stakeholders involved in the business, including employees, suppliers, landlords, franchisees and others, the Target Canada Entities have determined that a controlled wind-down of their operations and liquidation under the protection of the CCAA, under Court supervision and with the assistance of the proposed monitor, is the only practical method available to ensure a fair and orderly process for all stakeholders. Further, Mr. Wong states that TCC and Target Corporation seek to benefit from the framework and the flexibility provided by the CCAA in effecting a controlled and orderly wind-down of the Canadian operations, in a manner that treats stakeholders as fairly and as equitably as the circumstances allow.

[25] On this initial hearing, the issues are as follows:

- a) Does this court have jurisdiction to grant the CCAA relief requested?
 - a) Should the stay be extended to the Partnerships?
 - b) Should the stay be extended to "Co-tenants" and rights of third party tenants?
 - c) Should the stay extend to Target Corporation and its U.S. subsidiaries in relation to claims that are derivative of claims against the Target Canada Entities?
 - d) Should the Court approve protections for employees?
 - e) Is it appropriate to allow payment of certain pre-filing amounts?
 - f) Does this court have the jurisdiction to authorize pre-filing claims to "critical" suppliers;
 - g) Should the court should exercise its discretion to authorize the Applicants to seek proposals from liquidators and approve the financial advisor and real estate advisor engagement?
 - h) Should the court exercise its discretion to approve the Court-ordered charges?

[26] "Insolvent" is not expressly defined in the CCAA. However, for the purposes of the CCAA, a debtor is insolvent if it meets the definition of an "insolvent person" in section 2 of the *Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act*, R.S.C., 1985, c. B-3 ("BIA") or if it is "insolvent" as described in *Stelco Inc. (Re)*, [2004] O.J. No. 1257, [Stelco], leave to appeal refused, [2004] O.J. No. 1903, leave to appeal to S.C.C. refused [2004] S.C.C.A. No. 336, where Farley, J. found that "insolvency" includes a corporation "reasonably expected to run out of liquidity within [a]

reasonable proximity of time as compared with the time reasonably required to implement a restructuring” (at para 26). The decision of Farley, J. in *Stelco* was followed in *Prizm Income Fund (Re)*, [2011] O.J. No. 1491 (SCJ), 2011 and *Canwest Global Communications Corp. (Re)*, [2009] O.J. No. 4286, (SCJ) [*Canwest*].

[27] Having reviewed the record and hearing submissions, I am satisfied that the Target Canada Entities are all insolvent and are debtor companies to which the CCAA applies, either by reference to the definition of “insolvent person” under the *Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act* (the “BIA”) or under the test developed by Farley J. in *Stelco*.

[28] I also accept the submission of counsel to the Applicants that without the continued financial support of Target Corporation, the Target Canada Entities face too many legal and business impediments and too much uncertainty to wind-down their operations without the “breathing space” afforded by a stay of proceedings or other available relief under the CCAA.

[29] I am also satisfied that this Court has jurisdiction over the proceeding. Section 9(1) of the CCAA provides that an application may be made to the court that has jurisdiction in (a) the province in which the head office or chief place of business of the company in Canada is situated; or (b) any province in which the company’s assets are situated, if there is no place of business in Canada.

[30] In this case, the head office and corporate headquarters of TCC is located in Mississauga, Ontario, where approximately 800 employees work. Moreover, the chief place of business of the Target Canada Entities is Ontario. A number of office locations are in Ontario; 2 of TCC’s 3 primary distribution centres are located in Ontario; 55 of the TCC retail stores operate in Ontario; and almost half the employees that support TCC’s operations work in Ontario.

[31] The Target Canada Entities state that the purpose for seeking the proposed initial order in these proceedings is to effect a fair, controlled and orderly wind-down of their Canadian retail business with a view to developing a plan of compromise or arrangement to present to their creditors as part of these proceedings. I accept the submissions of counsel to the Applicants that although there is no prospect that a restructured “going concern” solution involving the Target Canada Entities will result, the use of the protections and flexibility afforded by the CCAA is entirely appropriate in these circumstances. In arriving at this conclusion, I have noted the comments of the Supreme Court of Canada in *Century Services Inc. v. Canada (Attorney General)*, [2010] SCC 50 (“*Century Services*”) that “courts frequently observe that the CCAA is skeletal in nature”, and does not “contain a comprehensive code that lays out all that is permitted or barred”. The flexibility of the CCAA, particularly in the context of large and complex restructurings, allows for innovation and creativity, in contrast to the more “rules-based” approach of the BIA.

[32] Prior to the 2009 amendments to the CCAA, Canadian courts accepted that, in appropriate circumstances, debtor companies were entitled to seek the protection of the CCAA where the outcome was not going to be a going concern restructuring, but instead, a “liquidation” or wind-down of the debtor companies’ assets or business.

[33] The 2009 amendments did not expressly address whether the CCAA could be used generally to wind-down the business of a debtor company. However, I am satisfied that the enactment of section 36 of the CCAA, which establishes a process for a debtor company to sell assets outside the ordinary course of business while under CCAA protection, is consistent with the principle that the CCAA can be a vehicle to downsize or wind-down a debtor company's business.

[34] In this case, the sheer magnitude and complexity of the Target Canada Entities business, including the number of stakeholders whose interests are affected, are, in my view, suited to the flexible framework and scope for innovation offered by this "skeletal" legislation.

[35] The required audited financial statements are contained in the record.

[36] The required cash flow statements are contained in the record.

[37] Pursuant to s. 11.02 of the CCAA, the court may make an order staying proceedings, restraining further proceedings, or prohibiting the commencement of proceedings, "on any terms that it may impose" and "effective for the period that the court considers necessary" provided the stay is no longer than 30 days. The Target Canada Entities, in this case, seek a stay of proceedings up to and including February 13, 2015.

[38] Certain of the corporate Target Canada Entities (TCC, TCC Health and TCC Mobile) act as general or limited partners in the partnerships. The Applicants submit that it is appropriate to extend the stay of proceedings to the Partnerships on the basis that each performs key functions in relation to the Target Canada Entities' businesses.

[39] The Applicants also seek to extend the stay to Target Canada Property LP which was formerly the sub-leasee/sub-sub lessor under the sub-sub lease back arrangement entered into by TCC to finance the leasehold improvements in its leased stores. The Applicants contend that the extension of the stay to Target Canada Property LP is necessary in order to safeguard it against any residual claims that may be asserted against it as a result of TCC Propco's insolvency and filing under the CCAA.

[40] I am satisfied that it is appropriate that an initial order extending the protection of a CCAA stay of proceedings under section 11.02(1) of the CCAA should be granted.

[41] Pursuant to section 11.7(1) of the CCAA, Alvarez & Marsal Inc. is appointed as Monitor.

[42] It is well established that the court has the jurisdiction to extend the protection of the stay of proceedings to Partnerships in order to ensure that the purposes of the CCAA can be achieved (see: *Lehndorff General Partner Ltd.* (1993), 17 CBR (3d) 24 (Ont. Gen. Div.); *Re Prizm Income Fund*, 2011 ONSC 2061; *Re Canwest Publishing Inc.* 2010 ONSC 222 ("*Canwest Publishing*") and *Re Canwest Global Communications Corp.*, 2009 CarswellOnt 6184 ("*Canwest Global*").

[43] In these circumstances, I am also satisfied that it is appropriate to extend the stay to the Partnerships as requested.

[44] The Applicants also seek landlord protection in relation to third party tenants. Many retail leases of non-anchored tenants provide that tenants have certain rights against their landlords if the anchor tenant in a particular shopping mall or centre becomes insolvent or ceases operations. In order to alleviate the prejudice to TCC's landlords if any such non-anchored tenants attempt to exercise these rights, the Applicants request an extension of the stay of proceedings (the "Co-Tenancy Stay") to all rights of these third party tenants against the landlords that arise out of the insolvency of the Target Canada Entities or as a result of any steps taken by the Target Canada Entities pursuant to the Initial Order.

[45] The Applicants contend that the authority to grant the Co-Tenancy Stay derives from the broad jurisdiction under sections 11 and 11.02(1) of the CCAA to make an initial order on any terms that the court may impose. Counsel references *Re T. Eaton Co.*, 1997 CarswellOnt 1914 (Gen. Div.) as a precedent where a stay of proceedings of the same nature as the Co-Tenancy Stay was granted by the court in Eaton's second CCAA proceeding. The Court noted that, if tenants were permitted to exercise these "co-tenancy" rights during the stay, the claims of the landlord against the debtor company would greatly increase, with a potentially detrimental impact on the restructuring efforts of the debtor company.

[46] In these proceedings, the Target Canada Entities propose, as part of the orderly wind-down of their businesses, to engage a financial advisor and a real estate advisor with a view to implementing a sales process for some or all of its real estate portfolio. The Applicants submit that it is premature to determine whether this process will be successful, whether any leases will be conveyed to third party purchasers for value and whether the Target Canada Entities can successfully develop and implement a plan that their stakeholders, including their landlords, will accept. The Applicants further contend that while this process is being resolved and the orderly wind-down is underway, the Co-Tenancy Stay is required to postpone the contractual rights of these tenants for a finite period. The Applicants contend that any prejudice to the third party tenants' clients is significantly outweighed by the benefits of the Co-Tenancy Stay to all of the stakeholders of the Target Canada Entities during the wind-down period.

[47] The Applicants therefore submit that it is both necessary and appropriate to grant the Co-Tenancy Stay in these circumstances.

[48] I am satisfied the Court has the jurisdiction to grant such a stay. In my view, it is appropriate to preserve the status quo at this time. To the extent that the affected parties wish to challenge the broad nature of this stay, the same can be addressed at the "comeback hearing".

[49] The Applicants also request that the benefit of the stay of proceedings be extended (subject to certain exceptions related to the cash management system) to Target Corporation and its U.S. subsidiaries in relation to claims against these entities that are derivative of the primary liability of the Target Canada Entities.

[50] I am satisfied that the Court has the jurisdiction to grant such a stay. In my view, it is appropriate to preserve the status quo at this time and the stay is granted, again, subject to the proviso that affected parties can challenge the broad nature of the stay at a comeback hearing directed to this issue.

[51] With respect to the protection of employees, it is noted that TCC employs approximately 17,600 individuals.

[52] Mr. Wong contends that TCC and Target Corporation have always considered their employees to be integral to the Target brand and business. However, the orderly wind-down of the Target Canada Entities' business means that the vast majority of TCC employees will receive a notice immediately after the CCAA filing that their employment is to be terminated as part of the wind-down process.

[53] In order to provide a measure of financial security during the orderly wind-down and to diminish financial hardship that TCC employees may suffer, Target Corporation has agreed to fund an Employee Trust to a maximum of \$70 million.

[54] The Applicants seek court approval of the Employee Trust which provides for payment to eligible employees of certain amounts, such as the balance of working notice following termination. Counsel contends that the Employee Trust was developed in consultation with the proposed monitor, who is the administrator of the trust, and is supported by the proposed Representative Counsel. The proposed trustee is The Honourable J. Ground. The Employee Trust is exclusively funded by Target Corporation and the costs associated with administering the Employee Trust will be borne by the Employee Trust, not the estate of Target Canada Entities. Target Corporation has agreed not to seek to recover from the Target Canada Entities estates any amounts paid out to employee beneficiaries under the Employee Trust.

[55] In my view, it is questionable as to whether court authorization is required to implement the provisions of the Employee Trust. It is the third party, Target Corporation, that is funding the expenses for the Employee Trust and not one of the debtor Applicants. However, I do recognize that the implementation of the Employee Trust is intertwined with this proceeding and is beneficial to the employees of the Applicants. To the extent that Target Corporation requires a court order authorizing the implementation of the employee trust, the same is granted.

[56] The Applicants seek the approval of a KERP and the granting of a court ordered charge up to the aggregate amount of \$6.5 million as security for payments under the KERP. It is proposed that the KERP Charge will rank after the Administration Charge but before the Directors' Charge.

[57] The approval of a KERP and related KERP Charge is in the discretion of the Court. KERPs have been approved in numerous CCAA proceedings, including *Re Nortel Networks Corp.*, 2009 CarswellOnt 1330 (S.C.J.) [*Nortel Networks (KERP)*], and *Re Grant Forest Products Inc.*, 2009 CarswellOnt 4699 (Ont. S.C.J.). In *U.S. Steel Canada Inc.*, 2014 ONSC 6145, I recently approved the KERP for employees whose continued services were critical to the stability of the business and for the implementation of the marketing process and whose services

could not easily be replaced due, in part, to the significant integration between the debtor company and its U.S. parent.

[58] In this case, the KERP was developed by the Target Canada Entities in consultation with the proposed monitor. The proposed KERP and KERP Charge benefits between 21 and 26 key management employees and approximately 520 store-level management employees.

[59] Having reviewed the record, I am of the view that it is appropriate to approve the KERP and the KERP Charge. In arriving at this conclusion, I have taken into account the submissions of counsel to the Applicants as to the importance of having stability among the key employees in the liquidation process that lies ahead.

[60] The Applicants also request the Court to appoint Koskie Minsky LLP as employee representative counsel (the "Employee Representative Counsel"), with Ms. Susan Philpott acting as senior counsel. The Applicants contend that the Employee Representative Counsel will ensure that employee interests are adequately protected throughout the proceeding, including by assisting with the Employee Trust. The Applicants contend that at this stage of the proceeding, the employees have a common interest in the CCAA proceedings and there appears to be no material conflict existing between individual or groups of employees. Moreover, employees will be entitled to opt out, if desired.

[61] I am satisfied that section 11 of the CCAA and the *Rules of Civil Procedure* confer broad jurisdiction on the court to appoint Representative Counsel for vulnerable stakeholder groups such as employee or investors (see *Re Nortel Networks Corp.*, 2009 CarswellOnt 3028 (S.C.J.) (Nortel Networks Representative Counsel)). In my view, it is appropriate to approve the appointment of Employee Representative Counsel and to provide for the payment of fees for such counsel by the Applicants. In arriving at this conclusion, I have taken into account:

- (i) the vulnerability and resources of the groups sought to be represented;
- (ii) the social benefit to be derived from the representation of the groups;
- (iii) the avoidance of multiplicity of legal retainers; and
- (iv) the balance of convenience and whether it is fair and just to creditors of the estate.

[62] The Applicants also seek authorization, if necessary, and with the consent of the Monitor, to make payments for pre-filing amounts owing and arrears to certain critical third parties that provide services integral to TCC's ability to operate during and implement its controlled and orderly wind-down process.

[63] Although the objective of the CCAA is to maintain the status quo while an insolvent company attempts to negotiate a plan of arrangement with its creditors, the courts have expressly acknowledged that preservation of the status quo does not necessarily entail the preservation of the relative pre-stay debt status of each creditor.

[64] The Target Canada Entities seek authorization to pay pre-filing amounts to certain specific categories of suppliers, if necessary and with the consent of the Monitor. These include:

- a) Logistics and supply chain providers;
- b) Providers of credit, debt and gift card processing related services; and
- c) Other suppliers up to a maximum aggregate amount of \$10 million, if, in the opinion of the Target Canada Entities, the supplier is critical to the orderly wind-down of the business.

[65] In my view, having reviewed the record, I am satisfied that it is appropriate to grant this requested relief in respect of critical suppliers.

[66] In order to maximize recovery for all stakeholders, TCC indicates that it intends to liquidate its inventory and attempt to sell the real estate portfolio, either en bloc, in groups, or on an individual property basis. The Applicants therefore seek authorization to solicit proposals from liquidators with a view to entering into an agreement for the liquidation of the Target Canada Entities inventory in a liquidation process.

[67] TCC's liquidity position continues to deteriorate. According to Mr. Wong, TCC and its subsidiaries have an immediate need for funding in order to satisfy obligations that are coming due, including payroll obligations that are due on January 16, 2015. Mr. Wong states that Target Corporation and its subsidiaries are no longer willing to provide continued funding to TCC and its subsidiaries outside of a CCAA proceeding. Target Corporation (the "DIP Lender") has agreed to provide TCC and its subsidiaries (collectively, the "Borrower") with an interim financing facility (the "DIP Facility") on terms advantageous to the Applicants in the form of a revolving credit facility in an amount up to U.S. \$175 million. Counsel points out that no fees are payable under the DIP Facility and interest is to be charged at what they consider to be the favourable rate of 5%. Mr. Wong also states that it is anticipated that the amount of the DIP Facility will be sufficient to accommodate the anticipated liquidity requirements of the Borrower during the orderly wind-down process.

[68] The DIP Facility is to be secured by a security interest on all of the real and personal property owned, leased or hereafter acquired by the Borrower. The Applicants request a court-ordered charge on the property of the Borrower to secure the amount actually borrowed under the DIP Facility (the "DIP Lenders Charge"). The DIP Lenders Charge will rank in priority to all unsecured claims, but subordinate to the Administration Charge, the KERP Charge and the Directors' Charge.

[69] The authority to grant an interim financing charge is set out at section 11.2 of the CCAA. Section 11.2(4) sets out certain factors to be considered by the court in deciding whether to grant the DIP Financing Charge.

[70] The Target Canada Entities did not seek alternative DIP Financing proposals based on their belief that the DIP Facility was being offered on more favourable terms than any other

potentially available third party financing. The Target Canada Entities are of the view that the DIP Facility is in the best interests of the Target Canada Entities and their stakeholders. I accept this submission and grant the relief as requested.

[71] Accordingly, the DIP Lenders' Charge is granted in the amount up to U.S. \$175 million and the DIP Facility is approved.

[72] Section 11 of the CCAA provides the court with the authority to allow the debtor company to enter into arrangements to facilitate a restructuring under the CCAA. The Target Canada Entities wish to retain Lazard and Northwest to assist them during the CCAA proceeding. Both the Target Canada Entities and the Monitor believe that the quantum and nature of the remuneration to be paid to Lazard and Northwest is fair and reasonable. In these circumstances, I am satisfied that it is appropriate to approve the engagement of Lazard and Northwest.

[73] With respect to the Administration Charge, the Applicants are requesting that the Monitor, along with its counsel, counsel to the Target Canada Entities, independent counsel to the Directors, the Employee Representative Counsel, Lazard and Northwest be protected by a court ordered charge and all the property of the Target Canada Entities up to a maximum amount of \$6.75 million as security for their respective fees and disbursements (the "Administration Charge"). Certain fees that may be payable to Lazard are proposed to be protected by a Financial Advisor Subordinated Charge.

[74] In *Canwest Publishing Inc.*, 2010 ONSC 222, Pepall J. (as she then was) provided a non-exhaustive list of factors to be considered in approving an administration charge, including:

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

[75] Having reviewed the record, I am satisfied, that it is appropriate to approve the Administration Charge and the Financial Advisor Subordinated Charge.

[76] The Applicants seek a Directors' and Officers' charge in the amount of up to \$64 million. The Directors Charge is proposed to be secured by the property of the Target Canada Entities and to rank behind the Administration Charge and the KERP Charge, but ahead of the DIP Lenders' Charge.

[77] Pursuant to section 11.51 of the CCAA, the court has specific authority to grant a “super priority” charge to the directors and officers of a company as security for the indemnity provided by the company in respect of certain obligations.

[78] I accept the submissions of counsel to the Applicants that the requested Directors’ Charge is reasonable given the nature of the Target Canada Entities retail business, the number of employees in Canada and the corresponding potential exposure of the directors and officers to personal liability. Accordingly, the Directors’ Charge is granted.

[79] In the result, I am satisfied that it is appropriate to grant the Initial Order in these proceedings.

[80] The stay of proceedings is in effect until February 13, 2015.

[81] A comeback hearing is to be scheduled on or prior to February 13, 2015. I recognize that there are many aspects of the Initial Order that go beyond the usual first day provisions. I have determined that it is appropriate to grant this broad relief at this time so as to ensure that the status quo is maintained.

[82] The comeback hearing is to be a “true” comeback hearing. In moving to set aside or vary any provisions of this order, moving parties do not have to overcome any onus of demonstrating that the order should be set aside or varied.

[83] Finally, a copy of Lazard’s engagement letter (the “Lazard Engagement Letter”) is attached as Confidential Appendix “A” to the Monitor’s pre-filing report. The Applicants request that the Lazard Engagement Letter be sealed, as the fee structure contemplated in the Lazard Engagement Letter could potentially influence the structure of bids received in the sales process.

[84] Having considered the principles set out in *Sierra Club of Canada v. Canada (Minister of Finance)*, [2002] 211 D.L.R. (4th) 193 2 S.C.R. 522, I am satisfied that it is appropriate in the circumstances to seal Confidential Appendix “A” to the Monitor’s pre-filing report.

[85] The Initial Order has been signed in the form presented.

Regional Senior Justice Morawetz

Date: January 16, 2015

TAB 7

CITATION: Laurentian University of Sudbury, 2021 ONSC 659
COURT FILE NO.: CV-21-656040-00CL
DATE: 2021-02-01

SUPERIOR COURT OF JUSTICE - ONTARIO

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

AND IN THE MATTER OF A PLAN OF COMPROMISE OR
ARRANGEMENT OF LAURENTIAN UNIVERSITY OF
SUDBURY

BEFORE: Chief Justice G.B. Morawetz

COUNSEL: *D.J. Miller, Mitch W. Grossell, Andrew Hanrahan and Derek Harland*, for the
Applicant

Ashley John Taylor and Elizabeth Pillon, for the Monitor

Peter J. Osborne, for the Board of Governors

Natasha MacParland, Lender Counsel to the Applicant

Pamela L.J. Huff and Aryo Shalviri, for Royal Bank of Canada

Stuart Brotman and Dylan Chochla, for Toronto Dominion Bank

Martin R. Kaplan and Vern W. DaRe, for Firm Capital Mortgage Fund Inc., DIP
Lender

Michael Kennedy, Labour Counsel for the Applicant

George Benchetrit, for Bank of Montreal

HEARD: February 1, 2021

ENDORSEMENT

Introduction

[1] Laurentian University of Sudbury (“LU” or the “Applicant”) seeks certain relief pursuant to an order (the “Initial Order”) under the *Companies’ Creditors Arrangement Act* (the “CCAA”).¹

[2] LU is a publicly funded, bilingual and tricultural postsecondary institution in Sudbury, Ontario. Since inception, LU has provided higher education to the community of Sudbury and Northern Ontario at large and is an integral part of the economic fabric of the Northern Ontario community.

[3] As a result of many years of recurring operational deficits in the millions of dollars, and notwithstanding LU’s recent efforts to improve its financial stability, LU is experiencing a liquidity crisis and is insolvent.

[4] LU submits that it requires the protection of the Court and the relief available under the CCAA so that it can financially and operationally restructure itself in order to emerge as a financially sustainable university for the benefit of all its stakeholders.

[5] The facts with respect to this application are briefly summarized below and more fully set out in the Affidavit of Dr. Robert Haché sworn January 30, 2021, filed in support of this application (the “Haché Affidavit”).²

[6] For the following reasons, the Interim Order is granted.

Overview of the Applicant

[7] LU is a non-share capital corporation that was incorporated pursuant to *An Act to Incorporate Laurentian University of Sudbury*, S.O. 1960, c. 151, as amended by S.O. 1961-62, c. 154 (the “LU Act”) and is a registered charity pursuant to the *Income Tax Act*, R.S.C. 1985, c. 1 (5th Supp.).

[8] The governance structure of LU is bicameral. The Board of Governors (the “Board”), the President, and the Vice-Chancellor generally have powers over the operational and financial management of LU, whereas the Senate of LU (the “Senate”) is responsible for the academic policy of LU.

[9] LU primarily focuses on undergraduate programming, with approximately 8,200 total domestic and international undergraduate students (approximately 6,250 full-time equivalents) enrolled in the 2020-21 academic year. LU has five undergraduate faculties, each of which offer

¹ *Companies’ Creditors Arrangement Act*, R.S.C. 1985, c. C-36, as amended.

² Capitalized terms used herein but not otherwise defined have the meanings ascribed to them in the Haché Affidavit. All references to currency in this factum are to Canadian dollars, unless otherwise noted.

programs in both English and French, and students can choose from 132 undergraduate programs to enroll in.

[10] LU also has a graduate program, with approximately 1,098 total domestic and international graduate students enrolled during the 2020-21 academic year. LU offers 43 Masters and PhD programs in a variety of disciplines.

[11] LU has a federated school structure whereby it has formal affiliations with several independent universities under the overall LU umbrella: the University of Sudbury, the University of Thorneloe, and Huntington University. The Federated Universities are integrated into LU, however, each of the Federated Universities are separate legal entities and are governed by Boards that are independent of LU.

[12] LU is one of the largest employers in the Greater Sudbury area. As at December 30, 2020, LU employed approximately 1,751 people, of which approximately 758 are full-time employees. Total salaries and benefits represent the single largest expense item for LU on an annual basis (approximately \$134 million of \$201 million in total expenses during fiscal year 2019-20).

[13] Approximately 612 LU employees are represented by the Laurentian University Faculty Association (“LUFA”). Approximately 268 non-faculty staff are represented by the Laurentian University Staff Union (“LUSU”).

[14] LUFA and the Board of LU are parties to a Collective Agreement (the “LUFA CA”), with a three-year term that expired on June 30, 2020.

[15] Since April 2020, LU and LUFA have been engaged in bargaining with respect to a new collective bargaining agreement.

[16] On July 1, 2018, LUSU and LU entered into a Collective Agreement that was set to expire on June 30, 2021 (the “LUSU CA”).

Assets and Liabilities

[17] LU does not prepare interim financial statements. The most recent audited statements for the year ended April 30, 2020, are attached to the Haché Affidavit.

[18] As at April 30, 2020, LU had assets with a book value totaling approximately \$358 million, of which approximately \$33 million is comprised of current assets such as cash and short-term investments, accounts receivable, and other current assets. The remaining assets of LU consist primarily of investments in LU’s segregated endowment fund (\$53 million) and capital assets (\$272 million), comprising LU’s land and buildings.

[19] As at April 30, 2020, LU had liabilities with a book value totaling approximately \$322 million, comprised of: (i) approximately \$43 million of current liabilities; (ii) approximately \$168 million of deferred contributions; and (iii) approximately \$110 million in long-term liabilities.

LU's Liquidity Crisis and Insolvency

[20] LU has experienced recurring operational deficits in the millions of dollars each year for a significant period of time. These operational deficits have led to the accumulated deficit in the operational fund of LU of approximately \$20 million at the end of 2019-20 fiscal year. In the current 2020-21 fiscal year, LU projects a further operational deficit of \$5.6 million.

[21] LU takes the position that it is insolvent and absent the relief sought in the Initial Order, will run out of cash to meet payroll in February.

[22] LU advises that it has a number of structural issues that are causing financial challenges and that need to be resolved to ensure long-term stability, including:

- (a) The terms of the LUFA CA are above market in several respects, and that issue is exacerbated by the tenuous labour relationship between LU and LUFA;
- (b) Operationally, the structure of the academic programming offered by LU and the distribution of enrollment among the programs offered is flawed and must be addressed; and
- (c) With its current cost structure, it costs more for LU and the Federated Universities to educate each student than the average for all Ontario universities by approximately \$2,000 per student, per year.

[23] LU submits that the financial challenges that LU faces are significant and, absent fundamental change, LU's short-term and long-term financial and operational sustainability are at risk.

Objective of CCAA Filing

[24] As part of its restructuring strategy, LU intends to implement long-term financial stability initiatives including, among other things:

- (a) A review of the breadth of academic programs offered at LU and their enrollment levels;
- (b) A re-evaluation of the Federated Universities model;
- (c) Negotiations with LU's unions regarding what LU must look like in the future and ensuring that a restructured LU can be aligned with collective agreements that will facilitate its future sustainability;
- (d) Identification of opportunities for future revenue generation;
- (e) Refinement of the student experience at LU to continue providing a top-notch education; and
- (f) Consideration of options for addressing current and long-term indebtedness.

Law and Analysis

[25] The CCAA applies to a “debtor company” whose liabilities exceed \$5 million. A “debtor company” is defined, *inter alia*, as a “company” that is “insolvent” or that has committed an act of bankruptcy within the meaning of the *Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act*.³

[26] The CCAA defines “company” to include, among other things, a company incorporated by or under an Act of the legislature of a province.⁴

[27] The Applicant is incorporated under an act of the legislature of the Province of Ontario, the LU Act, and therefore is a “company” for the purposes of the CCAA.⁵ Further, as a not-for-profit, non-share capital corporation, the Applicant falls under the *Corporations Act* (Ontario).⁶

[28] There have been several CCAA proceedings commenced in respect of not-for-profit corporations, such as *Canadian Red Cross Society*⁷ and *The Land Conservancy of British Columbia*.⁸

[29] I am satisfied that the Applicant’s status as a not-for-profit, non-share capital corporation does not impact the applicability of the CCAA to the Applicant.

Insolvency

[30] The insolvency of a debtor is assessed at the time of the filing of the CCAA application. While the CCAA does not define “insolvent”, the definition of “insolvent person” under the BIA is commonly referenced by the Court in assessing whether an applicant is a debtor company in the context of the CCAA.⁹ The BIA defines “insolvent person” as follows:¹⁰

“insolvent person” means a person who is not bankrupt and who resides, carries on business or has property in Canada, whose liabilities to creditors provable as claims under this Act amount to one thousand dollars, and

- (i) who is for any reason unable to meet his obligations as they generally become due,

³ R.S.C. 1985, c. B-3 (“BIA”).

⁴ CCAA, s. 2(1).

⁵ S.O. 1960, c. 151, as amended by S.O. 1961-62, c. 154.

⁶ R.S.O. 1990, c. C.38.

⁷ *Canadian Red Cross Society*, 2000 CarswellOnt 3269 (S.C.).

⁸ *TLC, The Land Conservancy of British Columbia, Re*, 2014 BCSC 97 at paras. 14-18.

⁹ *Stelco Inc. (Re)*, 2004 CarswellOnt 1211 (S.C.) at paras. 21-22 [*Stelco*].

¹⁰ BIA, s. 2.

- (ii) who has ceased paying his current obligations in the ordinary course of business as they generally become due, or
- (iii) the aggregate of whose property is not, at a fair valuation, sufficient, or, if disposed of at a fairly conducted sale under legal process, would not be sufficient to enable payment of all his obligations, due and accruing due.

[31] The tests for “insolvent person” under the BIA are disjunctive. A company satisfying either (i), (ii) or (iii) of the test is considered insolvent for the purposes of the CCAA.¹¹

[32] In addition to the foregoing tests, in *Stelco*, Farley J. held that a financially troubled corporation is insolvent if it is reasonably expected to run out of liquidity within a reasonable proximity of time as compared with the time reasonably required to implement a restructuring.¹²

[33] Based on the evidence set out in the Haché Affidavit and as summarized in the Report of Ernst & Young Inc., the Proposed Monitor, I find that the Applicant is plainly insolvent and faces a severe liquidity crisis.

[34] I also find that the Applicant is a “debtor company” to which the CCAA applies.

Stay of Proceedings

[35] Pursuant to section 11.02(1) of the CCAA, a Court may grant an order staying all proceedings in respect of a debtor company for a period of not more than ten days, provided that the Court is satisfied that circumstances exist to make the order appropriate.

[36] The Applicant submits that it is just and appropriate to grant a stay of proceedings. The Applicant submits that it requires a stay of proceedings in order to provide it with the breathing room necessary to financially and operationally restructure itself in order to emerge as a sustainable and long-term financially viable university to continue providing quality post-secondary education in Northern Ontario.

[37] The Proposed Initial Order provides for a stay of proceedings in favour of the Applicant’s current and future directors and officers who may subsequently be appointed. The Applicant submits that the stay in favour of the current and future directors and officers is critical to retain the involvement of the Board and key officers who have knowledge that will assist the Applicant in negotiating with stakeholders and implementing a restructuring plan. I accept this submission.

[38] The Applicant also seeks a limited stay in respect of the Laurentian University Students General Association (the “Non-Applicant Stay Party” or “the SGA”). The stay in respect of the

¹¹ *Stelco*, *supra* note 9 at para. 28.

¹² *Stelco*, *supra* note 9 at para. 26.

Non-Applicant Stay Party is limited to preventing any person from: (i) commencing proceedings against the Non-Applicant Stay Party, (ii) terminating, repudiating, making any demand or otherwise altering any contractual relationships with the Non-Applicant Stay Party or enforcing any rights or remedies, or (iii) discontinuing or ceasing to perform any obligations under any contractual agreements with the Non-Applicant Stay Party, resulting from the commencement of this CCAA proceeding by the Applicant, the stay of proceedings granted to the Applicant and any default or cross-default arising due to the foregoing.

[39] CCAA courts have, on numerous occasions, extended the initial stay of proceedings to non-applicants.¹³ The Court's authority to grant such an order is derived from its broad jurisdiction under ss. 11 and 11.02(1) of the CCAA to make an initial order on "any terms that [the Court] may impose." It is well-established that it is appropriate for the Court to extend the protection of the stay of proceedings to third party entities where such parties are integrally and closely interrelated to the debtor companies' business or where doing so furthers the primary purpose of the CCAA, being the successful restructuring of an insolvent company.¹⁴

[40] In particular, where the business operations of a group of entities are inextricably intertwined, such as where there are agreements among the entities, guarantees provided by certain entities in the group in respect of the obligations of other entities in the group or shared cash management systems, courts have found it necessary and appropriate to extend a stay in respect of non-applicant parties.¹⁵

[41] In the present circumstances, the Applicant has provided a written guarantee in respect of a credit facility obtained by the Non-Applicant Stay Party. If counterparties were to exercise remedies due to the Applicant's insolvency, it would disrupt the Non-Applicant Stay Party and have financial implications for the Applicant.

[42] In my view, it is desirable to avoid disruption to the Non-Applicant Stay Party which is particularly critical given the Applicant's status as an operating university and its overarching aim in this CCAA proceeding to avoid or minimize any disruption to students resulting from the commencement of this proceeding. In furtherance of this objective, the Non-Applicant Stay Party will be essential to ensuring students are given all of the information and resources they need to stay informed. The Non-Applicant Stay Party will play a crucial role in maintaining an open dialogue between the Applicant and the interests/concerns of all students.

¹³ For example, *Sino-Forest Corporation (Re)*, 2012 ONSC 2063; *Canwest Global Communications Corp, Re*, 2009 CarswellOnt 6184 (S.C.) [*Canwest*]; *Cinram International Inc (Re)*, 2012 ONSC 3767 [*Cinram*].

¹⁴ *Cinram*, *ibid* at paras. 61-65.

¹⁵ *Tamerlane Ventures Inc., Re*, 2013 ONSC 5461 at paras. 20-21; *Cinram*, *ibid* at paras. 61-65.

[43] I am satisfied that extending a limited stay of proceedings to the Non-Applicant Stay Party will allow it to continue fulfilling its intended role and providing the myriad of other key services it provides to the Applicant's students.

Pre-Filing and Post-Filing Payments

[44] The Proposed Initial Order allows the Applicant to continue to make certain pre-filing and post-filing payments, including express authorization to:

- (a) pay all outstanding amounts owing in respect of the current 2020-21 academic year and future amounts owing in respect of rebates, refunds or other amounts that are owing or may be owed to students (directly, or to the student associations of the Applicant on behalf of students), in each case, subject to the policies and procedures of the Applicant; and
- (b) pay all outstanding amounts owing in respect of the current 2020-21 academic year and future amounts payable to students in respect of student scholarship, bursary or grants.

[45] The Applicant intends on operating in the ordinary course during this CCAA proceeding and minimizing the disruption to students as much as possible. To facilitate this, the Applicant must be able to process certain rebates owing to students and continue to provide students with scholarship and bursary money that is critical to their ongoing studies. Some students must pay tuition prior to the receipt of funding from the Ontario Student Assistance Program (OSAP). Upon receipt of OSAP funding, the Applicant reimburses the students who receive such funding. In many instances, scholarship, bursary and grant money has been committed and is critical to students in need of financial aid to fund their education.

[46] If the Applicant is unable to continue to process such payments, vulnerable students may be irreparably harmed. Many of these students are younger than 19 years of age, and therefore particularly vulnerable. In addition, a change to the manner in which these financial aspects are addressed by the Applicant with their students could create immediate emergencies and disruption to their ability to continue their studies.

[47] The proposed Monitor supports the inclusion of this provision and I am satisfied that it is reasonable in the circumstances.

The Administration Charge

[48] The Applicant requests that this Court grant a super-priority Administration Charge on the Property (as defined in the proposed form of the Initial Order) in favour of the Proposed Monitor, counsel to the Proposed Monitor, the Applicant's counsel and advisors, and independent counsel to the Board. At the initial hearing the Administration Charge was requested in the amount of \$400,000, and the Applicant will seek to increase it to \$1.25 million pursuant to a proposed Amended and Restated Initial Order on the Comeback Hearing. Section 11.52 of the CCAA provides the Court with statutory jurisdiction to grant the Administration Charge.

[49] In *Canwest Publishing*, Pepall, J. (as she then was) considered section 11.52 of the CCAA and identified the following non-exhaustive list of factors the Court may consider when granting an administration charge:

- (a) the size and complexity of the business being restructured;
- (b) the proposed role of the beneficiaries of the charge;
- (c) whether there is an unwarranted duplication of roles;
- (d) whether the quantum of the proposed charge appears to be fair and reasonable;
- (e) the position of the secured creditors likely to be affected by the charge; and
- (f) the position of the monitor.¹⁶

[50] The Applicant submits that the Administration Charge is warranted, necessary, and appropriate in the circumstances, given that:

- (a) the proposed restructuring will require the extensive involvement of the professional advisors subject to the Administration Charge;
- (b) the professionals subject to the Administration Charge have contributed, and will continue to contribute, to the restructuring of the Applicant;
- (c) there is no unwarranted duplication of roles so the professional fees associated with these proceedings will be minimized;
- (d) the Administration Charge will rank in priority to the DIP Charge and the Directors' Charge; and
- (e) the Proposed Monitor believes that the proposed quantum of the Administration Charge is reasonable.

[51] Further, the Applicant has limited the quantum of the Administration Charge that it seeks approval of to what is reasonably necessary for the first ten days of the CCAA proceedings.

[52] The proposed Monitor supports the requested relief.

[53] I am satisfied that the Administrative Charge is reasonable in the circumstances.

The Directors' Charge

[54] The Applicant requests that this Court also grant a priority charge in favour of the Applicant's current and future directors and officers in the amount of \$2 million (the "Directors' Charge"). The Applicant will seek to increase the Directors' Charge at the comeback hearing to

¹⁶ *Canwest Publishing Inc./Publications Canwest Inc., Re*, 2010 ONSC 222 at para. 54; *Mountain Equipment Co-Operative (Re)*, 2020 BCSC 2037 at para. 58.

\$5 million, \$3 million of which will rank subordinate to the DIP Charge. The Directors' Charge protects the current and future directors and officers against obligations and liabilities they may incur as directors and officers of the Applicant after the commencement of the CCAA proceedings, except to the extent that any such claims or the obligation or liability is incurred as a result of the director's or officer's gross negligence or wilful misconduct.

[55] The Applicant has certain insurance policies in place (as defined in the Haché Affidavit); however, the Applicant is concerned that the directors and officers may be unwilling to continue in their roles with the Applicant absent the Court granting the Directors' Charge. The Directors' Charge will only be available to the extent that any claim or liability is not covered by any applicable D&O insurance and in the event that the Applicant's D&O insurance does not respond to claims against the directors and officers.

[56] Section 11.51 of the CCAA provides the Court with the express statutory jurisdiction to grant the Directors' Charge in an amount the Court considers appropriate, provided notice is given to the secured creditors who are likely to be affected by it.¹⁷

[57] In approving a similar charge in *Canwest*, Pepall J. applied section 11.51 of the CCAA and noted the Court must be satisfied with the amount of the charge and that it is limited to obligations the directors and officers may incur after the commencement of the proceedings, so long as adequate insurance cannot be obtained at a reasonable cost.¹⁸

[58] The proposed Monitor supports the relief requested.

[59] I am satisfied that the Directors' Charge is reasonable in the circumstances because: (i) the Applicant will benefit from the active and committed involvement of the directors and officers, who have considerable institutional knowledge and valuable experience and whose continued participation will help facilitate an effective restructuring, (ii) the Applicant cannot be certain whether the existing insurance will be applicable or respond to any claims made, and the Applicant does not have sufficient funds available to satisfy any given indemnity should its directors and officers need to call upon such indemnities, (iii) the Directors' Charge does not secure obligations incurred by a director as a result of the directors' gross negligence or wilful misconduct, and (iv) the Proposed Monitor is of the view that the Directors' Charge is reasonable and appropriate in the circumstances.

¹⁷ CCAA, section 11.51.

¹⁸ *Canwest*, *supra* note 17 at paras. 46 and 48.

Sealing Provision

[60] Pursuant to the *Courts of Justice Act* (Ontario), this Court has the discretion to order that any document filed in a civil proceeding be treated as “confidential”, sealed and not form part of the public record.”¹⁹

[61] In *Sierra Club of Canada v. Canada (Minister of Finance)*, Iacobucci J. set out that a sealing order should only be granted when:

- (a) such an order is necessary in order to prevent serious risk to an important interest, including a commercial interest, in the context of litigation because reasonable alternatives measures will not prevent the risk; and
- (b) the salutary effects of the confidentiality order, including the effects on the right of civil litigants to a fair trial, outweigh the deleterious effects, including the effects on the right to free expression, which in this context includes the public interest in open and accessible court proceedings.²⁰

[62] The Applicant requests that, in the Initial Order, this Court seal Confidential Exhibits “FFF” and “GGG” to the Haché Affidavit. These documents relate to correspondence between the Applicant and the Ministry of Colleges and Universities (the “Ministry”). The documents contain information with respect to the Applicant and certain stakeholders of the Applicant, including various rights or positions that stakeholders of the Applicant may take either inside or outside of a CCAA proceeding, which could jeopardize the Applicant’s efforts to restructure.

[63] If the Confidential Exhibits are not sealed, the Applicant submits that stakeholders may react in such a way that jeopardizes the viability of the Applicant’s restructuring. As such, the salutary effects of the sealing order, which provides the Applicant with the best possible chance to effect a restructuring, far outweigh the deleterious effects of not disclosing the correspondence between the Applicant and the Ministry.

[64] I have reviewed the Confidential Exhibits and I accept the submissions of the Applicant and grant the sealing request.

¹⁹ *Courts of Justice Act*, R.S.O. 1990, c C.43, s. 137(2). See also *Target Canada Corp (Re)*, 2015 ONSC 1487 at paras. 28 – 30.

²⁰ *Sierra Club of Canada v. Canada (Minister of Finance)*, 2002 SCC 41, [2002] 2 S.C.R. 522 at para. 53.

The Requested Relief Sought is Reasonably Necessary

[65] Pursuant to s. 11.001, the relief sought on an initial application is to be limited to what is reasonably necessary for the continued operations of the debtor company in the ordinary course of business during the initial stay period.²¹

[66] The stated purpose of s. 11.001 is to “limit the decisions that can be taken at the outset of a CCAA proceeding to measures necessary to avoid the immediate liquidation of an insolvent company, thereby improving participation of all players.”²²

[67] For the purposes of relief sought on this initial hearing, I accept the facts as stated in the Haché affidavit.

[68] The financial information required pursuant to s. 10(2) of the CCAA has been provided.

[69] I am satisfied the Ernst & Young Inc. is qualified to act as Monitor.

Disposition

[70] The requested relief complies with s. 11.001 of the CCAA in that it is limited to relief that is reasonably necessary for the continued operation of the applicant in the ordinary course of business. The Initial Order is granted in the form presented and it has been signed by me.

[71] The comeback hearing is to be held by Zoom on Wednesday, February 10, 2021 at 9:00 a.m.

Court-Appointed Mediator

[72] Finally, LU is also seeking an Order for the appointment of a mediator by the Court (the “Court-Appointed Mediator”) to oversee negotiations with respect to the various restructuring initiatives necessary for the Applicant to achieve a successful restructuring.

[73] If appointed, the Applicant expects the Court-Appointed Mediator to assist with (i) negotiations related to the review and restructuring of the academic programs and (ii) the collective agreement between the Applicant and LUFA.

[74] The Applicant is of the view that the need for the appointment of a mediator by the court is urgent and a high priority item.

²¹ CCAA, s. 11.001, 11.02(1) and (3).

²² *Lydian International Limited (Re)*, 2019 ONSC 7473 at paras. 22-26.

[75] The proposed Monitor is of the view that the appointment of a Court-Appointed Mediator is critical to ensure that LU, LUFA and the other negotiating parties have the best possible opportunity to succeed.

[76] It is the Proposed Monitor's view that it is necessary that the Court-Appointed Mediator be someone who is independent and objective, has experience in both insolvency matters as well as collective agreements and labour negotiations, someone who will appreciate the urgency with which the mediation must be conducted and have the time available to dedicate to it. Finally, in the Proposed Monitor's view, a sitting or recently retired judge meeting these characteristics would be preferable. The Proposed Monitor asks that the appointment be made by the court on an urgent basis.

[77] I appreciate and acknowledge the points put forth by counsel to both the Applicant and the Proposed Monitor. However, prior to determining this issue, in my view it is necessary to provide LUFA with an opportunity to make submissions.

[78] In recognition of the compressed timeline in these proceedings, it is desirable to determine this issue at the earliest opportunity and, in any event, not later than the comeback hearing on February 10, 2021.

[79] If LU, LUFA and the Proposed Monitor wish to address this matter prior to February 10, 2021, a case conference can be scheduled with me through the Commercial List Office.

CHIEF JUSTICE G.B. MORAWETZ

Date: February 1, 2021

TAB 8

Century Services Inc. Appellant

v.

**Attorney General of Canada on behalf
of Her Majesty The Queen in Right of
Canada Respondent**

**INDEXED AS: CENTURY SERVICES INC. v. CANADA
(ATTORNEY GENERAL)**

2010 SCC 60

File No.: 33239.

2010: May 11; 2010: December 16.

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

**ON APPEAL FROM THE COURT OF APPEAL FOR
BRITISH COLUMBIA**

Bankruptcy and Insolvency — Priorities — Crown applying on eve of bankruptcy of debtor company to have GST monies held in trust paid to Receiver General of Canada — Whether deemed trust in favour of Crown under Excise Tax Act prevails over provisions of Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act purporting to nullify deemed trusts in favour of Crown — Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act, R.S.C. 1985, c. C-36, s. 18.3(1) — Excise Tax Act, R.S.C. 1985, c. E-15, s. 222(3).

Bankruptcy and insolvency — Procedure — Whether chambers judge had authority to make order partially lifting stay of proceedings to allow debtor company to make assignment in bankruptcy and to stay Crown's right to enforce GST deemed trust — Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act, R.S.C. 1985, c. C-36, s. 11.

Trusts — Express trusts — GST collected but unremitted to Crown — Judge ordering that GST be held by Monitor in trust account — Whether segregation of Crown's GST claim in Monitor's account created an express trust in favour of Crown.

Century Services Inc. Appelante

c.

**Procureur général du Canada au
nom de Sa Majesté la Reine du chef du
Canada Intimé**

**RÉPERTORIÉ : CENTURY SERVICES INC. c. CANADA
(PROCUREUR GÉNÉRAL)**

2010 CSC 60

N^o du greffe : 33239.

2010 : 11 mai; 2010 : 16 décembre.

Présents : La juge en chef McLachlin et les juges Binnie,
LeBel, Deschamps, Fish, Abella, Charron, Rothstein et
Cromwell.

**EN APPEL DE LA COUR D'APPEL DE LA
COLOMBIE-BRITANNIQUE**

Faillite et insolvabilité — Priorités — Demande de la Couronne à la société débitrice, la veille de la faillite, sollicitant le paiement au receveur général du Canada de la somme détenue en fiducie au titre de la TPS — La fiducie réputée établie par la Loi sur la taxe d'accise en faveur de la Couronne l'emporte-t-elle sur les dispositions de la Loi sur les arrangements avec les créanciers des compagnies censées neutraliser ces fiducies? — Loi sur les arrangements avec les créanciers des compagnies, L.R.C. 1985, ch. C-36, art. 18.3(1) — Loi sur la taxe d'accise, L.R.C. 1985, ch. E-15, art. 222(3).

Faillite et insolvabilité — Procédure — Le juge en cabinet avait-il le pouvoir, d'une part, de lever partiellement la suspension des procédures pour permettre à la compagnie débitrice de faire cession de ses biens en faillite et, d'autre part, de suspendre les mesures prises par la Couronne pour bénéficier de la fiducie réputée se rapportant à la TPS? — Loi sur les arrangements avec les créanciers des compagnies, L.R.C. 1985, ch. C-36, art. 11.

Fiducies — Fiducies expresses — Somme perçue au titre de la TPS mais non versée à la Couronne — Ordonnance du juge exigeant que la TPS soit détenue par le contrôleur dans son compte en fiducie — Le fait que le montant de TPS réclamé par la Couronne soit détenu séparément dans le compte du contrôleur a-t-il créé une fiducie expresse en faveur de la Couronne?

The debtor company commenced proceedings under the *Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act* ("CCAA"), obtaining a stay of proceedings to allow it time to reorganize its financial affairs. One of the debtor company's outstanding debts at the commencement of the reorganization was an amount of unremitted Goods and Services Tax ("GST") payable to the Crown. Section 222(3) of the *Excise Tax Act* ("ETA") created a deemed trust over unremitted GST, which operated despite any other enactment of Canada except the *Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act* ("BIA"). However, s. 18.3(1) of the CCAA provided that any statutory deemed trusts in favour of the Crown did not operate under the CCAA, subject to certain exceptions, none of which mentioned GST.

Pursuant to an order of the CCAA chambers judge, a payment not exceeding \$5 million was approved to the debtor company's major secured creditor, Century Services. However, the chambers judge also ordered the debtor company to hold back and segregate in the Monitor's trust account an amount equal to the unremitted GST pending the outcome of the reorganization. On concluding that reorganization was not possible, the debtor company sought leave of the court to partially lift the stay of proceedings so it could make an assignment in bankruptcy under the BIA. The Crown moved for immediate payment of unremitted GST to the Receiver General. The chambers judge denied the Crown's motion, and allowed the assignment in bankruptcy. The Court of Appeal allowed the appeal on two grounds. First, it reasoned that once reorganization efforts had failed, the chambers judge was bound under the priority scheme provided by the ETA to allow payment of unremitted GST to the Crown and had no discretion under s. 11 of the CCAA to continue the stay against the Crown's claim. Second, the Court of Appeal concluded that by ordering the GST funds segregated in the Monitor's trust account, the chambers judge had created an express trust in favour of the Crown.

Held (Abella J. dissenting): The appeal should be allowed.

Per McLachlin C.J. and Binnie, LeBel, Deschamps, Charron, Rothstein and Cromwell JJ.: The apparent conflict between s. 222(3) of the ETA and s. 18.3(1) of the CCAA can be resolved through an interpretation that properly recognizes the history of the CCAA, its function amidst the body of insolvency legislation enacted by

La compagnie débitrice a déposé une requête sous le régime de la *Loi sur les arrangements avec les créanciers des compagnies* (« LACC ») et obtenu la suspension des procédures dans le but de réorganiser ses finances. Parmi les dettes de la compagnie débitrice au début de la réorganisation figurait une somme due à la Couronne, mais non versée encore, au titre de la taxe sur les produits et services (« TPS »). Le paragraphe 222(3) de la *Loi sur la taxe d'accise* (« LTA ») crée une fiducie réputée visant les sommes de TPS non versées. Cette fiducie s'applique malgré tout autre texte législatif du Canada sauf la *Loi sur la faillite et l'insolvabilité* (« LFI »). Toutefois, le par. 18.3(1) de la LACC prévoyait que, sous réserve de certaines exceptions, dont aucune ne concerne la TPS, les fiducies réputées établies par la loi en faveur de la Couronne ne s'appliquaient pas sous son régime.

Le juge siégeant en son cabinet chargé d'appliquer la LACC a approuvé par ordonnance le paiement à Century Services, le principal créancier garanti du débiteur, d'une somme d'au plus cinq millions de dollars. Toutefois, il a également ordonné à la compagnie débitrice de retenir un montant égal aux sommes de TPS non versées et de le déposer séparément dans le compte en fiducie du contrôleur jusqu'à l'issue de la réorganisation. Ayant conclu que la réorganisation n'était pas possible, la compagnie débitrice a demandé au tribunal de lever partiellement la suspension des procédures pour lui permettre de faire cession de ses biens en vertu de la LFI. La Couronne a demandé par requête le paiement immédiat au receveur général des sommes de TPS non versées. Le juge siégeant en son cabinet a rejeté la requête de la Couronne et autorisé la cession des biens. La Cour d'appel a accueilli l'appel pour deux raisons. Premièrement, elle a conclu que, après que la tentative de réorganisation eut échoué, le juge siégeant en son cabinet était tenu, en raison de la priorité établie par la LTA, d'autoriser le paiement à la Couronne des sommes qui lui étaient dues au titre de la TPS, et que l'art. 11 de la LACC ne lui conférait pas le pouvoir discrétionnaire de maintenir la suspension de la demande de la Couronne. Deuxièmement, la Cour d'appel a conclu que, en ordonnant la ségrégation des sommes de TPS dans le compte en fiducie du contrôleur, le juge siégeant en son cabinet avait créé une fiducie expresse en faveur de la Couronne.

Arrêt (la juge Abella est dissidente) : Le pourvoi est accueilli.

La juge en chef McLachlin et les juges Binnie, LeBel, Deschamps, Charron, Rothstein et Cromwell : Il est possible de résoudre le conflit apparent entre le par. 222(3) de la LTA et le par. 18.3(1) de la LACC en les interprétant d'une manière qui tienne compte adéquatement de l'historique de la LACC, de la fonction de cette loi parmi

Parliament and the principles for interpreting the *CCAA* that have been recognized in the jurisprudence. The history of the *CCAA* distinguishes it from the *BIA* because although these statutes share the same remedial purpose of avoiding the social and economic costs of liquidating a debtor's assets, the *CCAA* offers more flexibility and greater judicial discretion than the rules-based mechanism under the *BIA*, making the former more responsive to complex reorganizations. Because the *CCAA* is silent on what happens if reorganization fails, the *BIA* scheme of liquidation and distribution necessarily provides the backdrop against which creditors assess their priority in the event of bankruptcy. The contemporary thrust of legislative reform has been towards harmonizing aspects of insolvency law common to the *CCAA* and the *BIA*, and one of its important features has been a cutback in Crown priorities. Accordingly, the *CCAA* and the *BIA* both contain provisions nullifying statutory deemed trusts in favour of the Crown, and both contain explicit exceptions exempting source deductions deemed trusts from this general rule. Meanwhile, both Acts are harmonious in treating other Crown claims as unsecured. No such clear and express language exists in those Acts carving out an exception for GST claims.

When faced with the apparent conflict between s. 222(3) of the *ETA* and s. 18.3(1) of the *CCAA*, courts have been inclined to follow *Ottawa Senators Hockey Club Corp. (Re)* and resolve the conflict in favour of the *ETA*. *Ottawa Senators* should not be followed. Rather, the *CCAA* provides the rule. Section 222(3) of the *ETA* evinces no explicit intention of Parliament to repeal *CCAA* s. 18.3. 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 expressly and elaborately. Meanwhile, there is no express statutory basis for concluding that GST claims enjoy a preferred treatment under the *CCAA* or the *BIA*. The internal logic of the *CCAA* appears to subject a GST deemed trust to the waiver by Parliament of its priority. A strange asymmetry would result if differing treatments of GST deemed trusts under the *CCAA* and the *BIA* were found to exist, as this would encourage statute shopping, undermine the *CCAA*'s remedial purpose and invite the very social ills that the statute was enacted to avert. The later in time enactment of the more general s. 222(3) of the *ETA* does not require application of the doctrine of implied repeal to the earlier and more specific s. 18.3(1) of the *CCAA* in the circumstances of this case. In any event,

l'ensemble des textes adoptés par le législateur fédéral en matière d'insolvabilité et des principes d'interprétation de la *LACC* reconnus dans la jurisprudence. L'historique de la *LACC* permet de distinguer celle-ci de la *LFI* en ce sens que, bien que ces lois aient pour objet d'éviter les coûts sociaux et économiques liés à la liquidation de l'actif d'un débiteur, la *LACC* offre plus de souplesse et accorde aux tribunaux un plus grand pouvoir discrétionnaire que le mécanisme fondé sur des règles de la *LFI*, ce qui rend la première mieux adaptée aux réorganisations complexes. Comme la *LACC* ne précise pas ce qui arrive en cas d'échec de la réorganisation, la *LFI* fournit la norme de référence permettant aux créanciers de savoir s'ils ont la priorité dans l'éventualité d'une faillite. Le travail de réforme législative contemporain a principalement visé à harmoniser les aspects communs à la *LACC* et à la *LFI*, et l'une des caractéristiques importantes de cette réforme est la réduction des priorités dont jouit la Couronne. Par conséquent, la *LACC* et la *LFI* contiennent toutes deux des dispositions neutralisant les fiducies réputées établies en vertu d'un texte législatif en faveur de la Couronne, et toutes deux comportent des exceptions expresses à la règle générale qui concernent les fiducies réputées établies à l'égard des retenues à la source. Par ailleurs, ces deux lois considèrent les autres créances de la Couronne comme des créances non garanties. Ces lois ne comportent pas de dispositions claires et expresses établissant une exception pour les créances relatives à la TPS.

Les tribunaux appelés à résoudre le conflit apparent entre le par. 222(3) de la *LTA* et le par. 18.3(1) de la *LACC* ont été enclins à appliquer l'arrêt *Ottawa Senators Hockey Club Corp. (Re)* et à trancher en faveur de la *LTA*. Il ne convient pas de suivre cet arrêt. C'est plutôt la *LACC* qui énonce la règle applicable. Le paragraphe 222(3) de la *LTA* ne révèle aucune intention explicite du législateur d'abroger l'art. 18.3 de la *LACC*. Quand le législateur a voulu protéger certaines créances de la Couronne au moyen de fiducies réputées et voulu que celles-ci continuent de s'appliquer en situation d'insolvabilité, il l'a indiqué de manière explicite et minutieuse. En revanche, il n'existe aucune disposition législative expresse permettant de conclure que les créances relatives à la TPS bénéficient d'un traitement préférentiel sous le régime de la *LACC* ou de la *LFI*. Il semble découler de la logique interne de la *LACC* que la fiducie réputée établie à l'égard de la TPS est visée par la renonciation du législateur à sa priorité. Il y aurait une étrange asymétrie si l'on concluait que la *LACC* ne traite pas les fiducies réputées à l'égard de la TPS de la même manière que la *LFI*, car cela encouragerait les créanciers à recourir à la loi la plus favorable, minerait les objectifs réparateurs de la *LACC* et risquerait de favoriser les maux sociaux que l'édiction de ce texte législatif visait justement à

recent amendments to the *CCAA* in 2005 resulted in s. 18.3 of the Act being renumbered and reformulated, making it the later in time provision. This confirms that Parliament's intent with respect to GST deemed trusts is to be found in the *CCAA*. The conflict between the *ETA* and the *CCAA* is more apparent than real.

The exercise of judicial discretion has allowed the *CCAA* to adapt and evolve to meet contemporary business and social needs. As reorganizations become increasingly complex, *CCAA* courts have been called upon to innovate. In determining their jurisdiction to sanction measures in a *CCAA* proceeding, courts should first interpret the provisions of the *CCAA* before turning to their inherent or equitable jurisdiction. Noteworthy in this regard is the expansive interpretation the language of the *CCAA* is capable of supporting. The general language of the *CCAA* should not be read as being restricted by the availability of more specific orders. The requirements of appropriateness, good faith and due diligence are baseline considerations that a court should always bear in mind when exercising *CCAA* authority. The question is whether the order will usefully further efforts to avoid the social and economic losses resulting from liquidation of an insolvent company, which extends to both the purpose of the order and the means it employs. Here, the chambers judge's order staying the Crown's GST claim was in furtherance of the *CCAA*'s objectives because it blunted the impulse of creditors to interfere in an orderly liquidation and fostered a harmonious transition from the *CCAA* to the *BIA*, meeting the objective of a single proceeding that is common to both statutes. 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 *BIA* proceedings, but no gap exists between the two statutes because they operate in tandem and creditors in both cases look to the *BIA* scheme of distribution to foreshadow how they will fare if the reorganization is unsuccessful. The breadth of the court's discretion under the *CCAA* is sufficient to construct a bridge to liquidation under the *BIA*. Hence, the chambers judge's order was authorized.

prévenir. Le paragraphe 222(3) de la *LTA*, une disposition plus récente et générale que le par. 18.3(1) de la *LACC*, n'exige pas l'application de la doctrine de l'abrogation implicite dans les circonstances de la présente affaire. En tout état de cause, par suite des modifications apportées récemment à la *LACC* en 2005, l'art. 18.3 a été reformulé et renuméroté, ce qui en fait la disposition postérieure. Cette constatation confirme que c'est dans la *LACC* qu'est exprimée l'intention du législateur en ce qui a trait aux fiducies réputées visant la TPS. Le conflit entre la *LTA* et la *LACC* est plus apparent que réel.

L'exercice par les tribunaux de leurs pouvoirs discrétionnaires a fait en sorte que la *LACC* a évolué et s'est adaptée aux besoins commerciaux et sociaux contemporains. Comme les réorganisations deviennent très complexes, les tribunaux chargés d'appliquer la *LACC* ont été appelés à innover. Les tribunaux doivent d'abord interpréter les dispositions de la *LACC* avant d'invoquer leur compétence inhérente ou leur compétence en equity pour établir leur pouvoir de prendre des mesures dans le cadre d'une procédure fondée sur la *LACC*. À cet égard, il faut souligner que le texte de la *LACC* peut être interprété très largement. La possibilité pour le tribunal de rendre des ordonnances plus spécifiques n'a pas pour effet de restreindre la portée des termes généraux utilisés dans la *LACC*. L'opportunité, la bonne foi et la diligence sont des considérations de base que le tribunal devrait toujours garder à l'esprit lorsqu'il exerce les pouvoirs conférés par la *LACC*. Il s'agit de savoir si l'ordonnance contribuera utilement à la réalisation de l'objectif d'éviter les pertes sociales et économiques résultant de la liquidation d'une compagnie insolvable. Ce critère s'applique non seulement à l'objectif de l'ordonnance, mais aussi aux moyens utilisés. En l'espèce, l'ordonnance du juge siégeant en son cabinet qui a suspendu l'exécution des mesures de recouvrement de la Couronne à l'égard de la TPS contribuait à la réalisation des objectifs de la *LACC*, parce qu'elle avait pour effet de dissuader les créanciers d'entraver une liquidation ordonnée et favorisait une transition harmonieuse entre la *LACC* et la *LFI*, répondant ainsi à l'objectif — commun aux deux lois — qui consiste à avoir une seule procédure. Le passage de la *LACC* à la *LFI* peut exiger la levée partielle d'une suspension de procédures ordonnée en vertu de la *LACC*, de façon à permettre l'engagement des procédures fondées sur la *LFI*, mais il n'existe aucun hiatus entre ces lois étant donné qu'elles s'appliquent de concert et que, dans les deux cas, les créanciers examinent le régime de distribution prévu par la *LFI* pour connaître la situation qui serait la leur en cas d'échec de la réorganisation. L'ampleur du pouvoir discrétionnaire conféré au tribunal par la *LACC* suffit pour établir une passerelle vers une liquidation opérée sous le régime de la *LFI*. Le juge siégeant en son cabinet pouvait donc rendre l'ordonnance qu'il a prononcée.

No express trust was created by the chambers judge's order in this case because there is no certainty of object inferable from his order. Creation of an express trust requires certainty of intention, subject matter and object. At the time the chambers judge accepted the proposal to segregate the monies in the Monitor's trust account there was no certainty that the Crown would be the beneficiary, or object, of the trust because exactly who might take the money in the final result was in doubt. In any event, no dispute over the money would even arise under the interpretation of s. 18.3(1) of the CCAA established above, 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.

Per Fish J.: The GST monies collected by the debtor are not subject to a deemed trust or priority in favour of the Crown. In recent years, Parliament has given detailed consideration to the Canadian insolvency scheme but has declined to amend the provisions at issue in this case, a deliberate exercise of legislative discretion. On the other hand, in upholding deemed trusts created by the *ETA* notwithstanding insolvency proceedings, courts have been unduly protective of Crown interests which Parliament itself has chosen to subordinate to competing prioritized claims. In the context of the Canadian insolvency regime, deemed trusts exist only where there is a statutory provision creating the trust and a CCAA or BIA provision explicitly confirming its effective operation. The *Income Tax Act*, the *Canada Pension Plan* and the *Employment Insurance Act* all contain deemed trust provisions that are strikingly similar to that in s. 222 of the *ETA* but they are all also confirmed in s. 37 of the CCAA and in s. 67(3) of the BIA in clear and unmistakable terms. The same is not true of the deemed trust created under the *ETA*. Although Parliament created 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 did not confirm the continued operation of the trust in either the BIA or the CCAA, reflecting Parliament's intention to allow the deemed trust to lapse with the commencement of insolvency proceedings.

L'ordonnance du juge siégeant en son cabinet n'a pas créé de fiducie expresse en l'espèce, car aucune certitude d'objet ne peut être inférée de cette ordonnance. La création d'une fiducie expresse exige la présence de certitudes quant à l'intention, à la matière et à l'objet. Lorsque le juge siégeant en son cabinet a accepté la proposition que les sommes soient détenues séparément dans le compte en fiducie du contrôleur, il n'existait aucune certitude que la Couronne serait le bénéficiaire ou l'objet de la fiducie, car il y avait un doute quant à la question de savoir qui au juste pourrait toucher l'argent en fin de compte. De toute façon, suivant l'interprétation du par. 18.3(1) de la LACC dégagee précédemment, aucun différend ne saurait même exister quant à l'argent, étant donné que la priorité accordée aux réclamations de la Couronne fondées sur la fiducie réputée visant la TPS ne s'applique pas sous le régime de la LACC et que la Couronne est reléguée au rang de créancier non garanti à l'égard des sommes en question.

Le juge Fish : Les sommes perçues par la débitrice au titre de la TPS ne font l'objet d'aucune fiducie réputée ou priorité en faveur de la Couronne. Au cours des dernières années, le législateur fédéral a procédé à un examen approfondi du régime canadien d'insolvabilité, mais il a refusé de modifier les dispositions qui sont en cause dans la présente affaire. Il s'agit d'un exercice délibéré du pouvoir discrétionnaire de légiférer. Par contre, en maintenant, malgré l'existence des procédures d'insolvabilité, la validité de fiducies réputées créées en vertu de la LTA, les tribunaux ont protégé indûment des droits de la Couronne que le Parlement avait lui-même choisi de subordonner à d'autres créances prioritaires. Dans le contexte du régime canadien d'insolvabilité, il existe une fiducie réputée uniquement lorsqu'une disposition législative crée la fiducie et qu'une disposition de la LACC ou de la LFI confirme explicitement l'existence de la fiducie. La *Loi de l'impôt sur le revenu*, le *Régime de pensions du Canada* et la *Loi sur l'assurance-emploi* renferment toutes des dispositions relatives aux fiducies réputées dont le libellé offre une ressemblance frappante avec celui de l'art. 222 de la LTA, mais le maintien en vigueur des fiducies réputées créées en vertu de ces dispositions est confirmé à l'art. 37 de la LACC et au par. 67(3) de la LFI en termes clairs et explicites. La situation est différente dans le cas de la fiducie réputée créée par la LTA. Bien que le législateur crée en faveur de la Couronne une fiducie réputée dans laquelle seront conservées les sommes recueillies au titre de la TPS mais non encore versées, et bien qu'il prétende maintenir cette fiducie en vigueur malgré les dispositions à l'effet contraire de toute loi fédérale ou provinciale, il ne confirme pas l'existence de la fiducie dans la LFI ou la LACC, ce qui témoigne de son intention de laisser la fiducie réputée devenir caduque au moment de l'introduction de la procédure d'insolvabilité.

Per Abella J. (dissenting): Section 222(3) of the *ETA* gives priority during *CCAA* proceedings to the Crown's deemed trust in unremitted GST. This provision unequivocally defines its boundaries in the clearest possible terms and excludes only the *BIA* from its legislative grasp. The language used reflects a clear legislative intention that s. 222(3) would prevail if in conflict with any other law except the *BIA*. This is borne out by the fact that following the enactment of s. 222(3), amendments to the *CCAA* were introduced, and despite requests from various constituencies, s. 18.3(1) was not amended to make the priorities in the *CCAA* consistent with those in the *BIA*. This indicates a deliberate legislative choice to protect the deemed trust in s. 222(3) from the reach of s. 18.3(1) of the *CCAA*.

The application of other principles of interpretation reinforces this conclusion. An earlier, specific provision may be overruled by a subsequent general statute if the legislature indicates, through its language, an intention that the general provision prevails. Section 222(3) achieves this 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). By operation of s. 44(f) of the *Interpretation Act*, the transformation of s. 18.3(1) into s. 37(1) after the enactment of s. 222(3) of the *ETA* has no effect on the interpretive queue, and s. 222(3) of the *ETA* remains the "later in time" provision. This means that the deemed trust provision in s. 222(3) of the *ETA* takes precedence over s. 18.3(1) during *CCAA* proceedings. While s. 11 gives a court discretion to make orders notwithstanding the *BIA* and the *Winding-up Act*, 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.

La juge Abella (dissidente) : Le paragraphe 222(3) de la *LTA* donne préséance, dans le cadre d'une procédure relevant de la *LACC*, à la fiducie réputée qui est établie en faveur de la Couronne à l'égard de la TPS non versée. Cette disposition définit sans équivoque sa portée dans des termes on ne peut plus clairs et n'exclut que la *LFI* de son champ d'application. Les termes employés révèlent l'intention claire du législateur que le par. 222(3) l'emporte en cas de conflit avec toute autre loi sauf la *LFI*. Cette opinion est confortée par le fait que des modifications ont été apportées à la *LACC* après l'édiction du par. 222(3) et que, malgré les demandes répétées de divers groupes, le par. 18.3(1) n'a pas été modifié pour aligner l'ordre de priorité établi par la *LACC* sur celui de la *LFI*. Cela indique que le législateur a délibérément choisi de soustraire la fiducie réputée établie au par. 222(3) à l'application du par. 18.3(1) de la *LACC*.

Cette conclusion est renforcée par l'application d'autres principes d'interprétation. Une disposition spécifique antérieure peut être supplantée par une loi ultérieure de portée générale si le législateur, par les mots qu'il a employés, a exprimé l'intention de faire prévaloir la loi générale. Le paragraphe 222(3) accomplit cela de par son libellé, lequel précise que la disposition l'emporte sur tout autre texte législatif fédéral, tout texte législatif provincial ou « toute autre règle de droit » sauf la *LFI*. Le paragraphe 18.3(1) de la *LACC* est par conséquent rendu inopérant aux fins d'application du par. 222(3). Selon l'alinéa 44f) de la *Loi d'interprétation*, le fait que le par. 18.3(1) soit devenu le par. 37(1) à la suite de l'édiction du par. 222(3) de la *LTA* n'a aucune incidence sur l'ordre chronologique du point de vue de l'interprétation, et le par. 222(3) de la *LTA* demeure la disposition « postérieure ». Il s'ensuit que la disposition créant une fiducie réputée que l'on trouve au par. 222(3) de la *LTA* l'emporte sur le par. 18.3(1) dans le cadre d'une procédure fondée sur la *LACC*. Bien que l'art. 11 accorde au tribunal le pouvoir discrétionnaire de rendre des ordonnances malgré les dispositions de la *LFI* et de la *Loi sur les liquidations*, ce pouvoir discrétionnaire demeure assujéti à l'application de toute autre loi fédérale. L'exercice de ce pouvoir discrétionnaire est donc circonscrit par les limites imposées par toute loi autre que la *LFI* et la *Loi sur les liquidations*, et donc par la *LTA*. En l'espèce, le juge siégeant en son cabinet était donc tenu de respecter le régime de priorités établi au par. 222(3) de la *LTA*. Ni le par. 18.3(1), ni l'art. 11 de la *LACC* ne l'autorisaient à en faire abstraction. Par conséquent, 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*.

Cases Cited

By Deschamps J.

Overruled: *Ottawa Senators Hockey Club Corp. (Re)* (2005), 73 O.R. (3d) 737; **distinguished:** *Doré v. Verdun (City)*, [1997] 2 S.C.R. 862; **referred to:** *Reference re Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act*, [1934] S.C.R. 659; *Quebec (Revenu) v. Caisse populaire Desjardins de Montmagny*, 2009 SCC 49, [2009] 3 S.C.R. 286; *Deputy Minister of Revenue v. Rainville*, [1980] 1 S.C.R. 35; *Gauntlet Energy Corp., Re*, 2003 ABQB 894, 30 Alta. L.R. (4th) 192; *Komunik Corp. (Arrangement relatif à)*, 2009 QCCS 6332 (CanLII), leave to appeal granted, 2010 QCCA 183 (CanLII); *Royal Bank of Canada v. Sparrow Electric Corp.*, [1997] 1 S.C.R. 411; *First Vancouver Finance v. M.N.R.*, 2002 SCC 49, [2002] 2 S.C.R. 720; *Solid Resources Ltd., Re* (2002), 40 C.B.R. (4th) 219; *Metcalf & Mansfield Alternative Investments II Corp. (Re)*, 2008 ONCA 587, 92 O.R. (3d) 513; *Dylex Ltd., Re* (1995), 31 C.B.R. (3d) 106; *Elan Corp. v. Comiskey* (1990), 41 O.A.C. 282; *Chef Ready Foods Ltd. v. Hongkong Bank of Can.* (1990), 51 B.C.L.R. (2d) 84; *Pacific National Lease Holding Corp., Re* (1992), 19 B.C.A.C. 134; *Canadian Airlines Corp., Re*, 2000 ABQB 442, 84 Alta. L.R. (3d) 9; *Air Canada, Re* (2003), 42 C.B.R. (4th) 173; *Air Canada, Re*, 2003 CanLII 49366; *Canadian Red Cross Society/Société Canadienne de la Croix Rouge, Re* (2000), 19 C.B.R. (4th) 158; *Skydome Corp., Re* (1998), 16 C.B.R. (4th) 118; *United Used Auto & Truck Parts Ltd., Re*, 2000 BCCA 146, 135 B.C.A.C. 96, aff'g (1999), 12 C.B.R. (4th) 144; *Skeena Cellulose Inc., Re*, 2003 BCCA 344, 13 B.C.L.R. (4th) 236; *Stelco Inc. (Re)* (2005), 75 O.R. (3d) 5; *Philip's Manufacturing Ltd., Re* (1992), 9 C.B.R. (3d) 25; *Ivaco Inc. (Re)* (2006), 83 O.R. (3d) 108.

By Fish J.

Referred to: *Ottawa Senators Hockey Club Corp. (Re)* (2005), 73 O.R. (3d) 737.

By Abella J. (dissenting)

Ottawa Senators Hockey Club Corp. (Re) (2005), 73 O.R. (3d) 737; *Tele-Mobile Co. v. Ontario*, 2008 SCC 12, [2008] 1 S.C.R. 305; *Doré v. Verdun (City)*, [1997] 2 S.C.R. 862; *Attorney General of Canada v. Public Service Staff Relations Board*, [1977] 2 F.C. 663.

Statutes and Regulations Cited

An Act to establish the Wage Earner Protection Program Act, to amend the Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act and

Jurisprudence

Citée par la juge Deschamps

Arrêt renversé : *Ottawa Senators Hockey Club Corp. (Re)* (2005), 73 O.R. (3d) 737; **distinction d'avec l'arrêt :** *Doré c. Verdun (Ville)*, [1997] 2 R.C.S. 862; **arrêts mentionnés :** *Reference re Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act*, [1934] R.C.S. 659; *Québec (Revenu) c. Caisse populaire Desjardins de Montmagny*, 2009 CSC 49, [2009] 3 R.C.S. 286; *Sous-ministre du Revenu c. Rainville*, [1980] 1 R.C.S. 35; *Gauntlet Energy Corp., Re*, 2003 ABQB 894, 30 Alta. L.R. (4th) 192; *Komunik Corp. (Arrangement relatif à)*, 2009 QCCS 6332 (CanLII), autorisation d'appel accordée, 2010 QCCA 183 (CanLII); *Banque Royale du Canada c. Sparrow Electric Corp.*, [1997] 1 R.C.S. 411; *First Vancouver Finance c. M.N.R.*, 2002 CSC 49, [2002] 2 R.C.S. 720; *Solid Resources Ltd., Re* (2002), 40 C.B.R. (4th) 219; *Metcalf & Mansfield Alternative Investments II Corp. (Re)*, 2008 ONCA 587, 92 O.R. (3d) 513; *Dylex Ltd., Re* (1995), 31 C.B.R. (3d) 106; *Elan Corp. c. Comiskey* (1990), 41 O.A.C. 282; *Chef Ready Foods Ltd. v. Hongkong Bank of Can.* (1990), 51 B.C.L.R. (2d) 84; *Pacific National Lease Holding Corp., Re* (1992), 19 B.C.A.C. 134; *Canadian Airlines Corp., Re*, 2000 ABQB 442, 84 Alta. L.R. (3d) 9; *Air Canada, Re* (2003), 42 C.B.R. (4th) 173; *Air Canada, Re*, 2003 CanLII 49366; *Canadian Red Cross Society/Société Canadienne de la Croix Rouge, Re* (2000), 19 C.B.R. (4th) 158; *Skydome Corp., Re* (1998), 16 C.B.R. (4th) 118; *United Used Auto & Truck Parts Ltd., Re*, 2000 BCCA 146, 135 B.C.A.C. 96, conf. (1999), 12 C.B.R. (4th) 144; *Skeena Cellulose Inc., Re*, 2003 BCCA 344, 13 B.C.L.R. (4th) 236; *Stelco Inc. (Re)* (2005), 75 O.R. (3d) 5; *Philip's Manufacturing Ltd., Re* (1992), 9 C.B.R. (3d) 25; *Ivaco Inc. (Re)* (2006), 83 O.R. (3d) 108.

Citée par le juge Fish

Arrêt mentionné : *Ottawa Senators Hockey Club Corp. (Re)* (2005), 73 O.R. (3d) 737.

Citée par la juge Abella (dissidente)

Ottawa Senators Hockey Club Corp. (Re) (2005), 73 O.R. (3d) 737; *Société Télé-Mobile Co. c. Ontario*, 2008 CSC 12, [2008] 1 R.C.S. 305; *Doré c. Verdun (Ville)*, [1997] 2 R.C.S. 862; *Procureur général du Canada c. Commission des relations de travail dans la Fonction publique*, [1977] 2 C.F. 663.

Lois et règlements cités

Loi d'interprétation, L.R.C. 1985, ch. I-21, art. 2 « texte », 44f).

- the Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act and to make consequential amendments to other Acts*, S.C. 2005, c. 47, ss. 69, 128, 131.
- Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act*, R.S.C. 1985, c. B-3, ss. 67, 81.1, 81.2, 86 [am. 1992, c. 27, s. 39; 1997, c. 12, s. 73; 2000, c. 30, s. 148; 2005, c. 47, s. 69; 2009, c. 33, s. 25].
- Canada Pension Plan*, R.S.C. 1985, c. C-8, s. 23.
- Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act*, R.S.C. 1985, c. C-36, ss. 11 [am. 2005, c. 47, s. 128], 11.02 [ad. *idem*], 11.09 [ad. *idem*], 11.4 [am. *idem*], 18.3 [ad. 1997, c. 12, s. 125; rep. 2005, c. 47, s. 131], 18.4 [*idem*], 20 [am. 2005, c. 47, s. 131], 21 [ad. 1997, c. 12, s. 126; am. 2005, c. 47, s. 131], s. 37 [ad. 2005, c. 47, s. 131].
- Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act, 1933*, S.C. 1932-33, c. 36 [am. 1952-53, c. 3].
- Employment Insurance Act*, S.C. 1996, c. 23, ss. 86(2), (2.1).
- Excise Tax Act*, R.S.C. 1985, c. E-15, s. 222.
- Income Tax Act*, R.S.C. 1985, c. 1 (5th Supp.), ss. 227(4), (4.1).
- Interpretation Act*, R.S.C. 1985, c. I-21, ss. 2 "enactment", 44(f).
- Winding-up Act*, R.S.C. 1985, c. W-11.
- Loi de l'impôt sur le revenu*, L.R.C. 1985, ch. 1 (5^e suppl.), art. 227(4), (4.1).
- Loi édictant la Loi sur le Programme de protection des salariés et modifiant la Loi sur la faillite et l'insolvabilité, la Loi sur les arrangements avec les créanciers des compagnies et d'autres lois en conséquence*, L.C. 2005, ch. 47, art. 69, 128, 131.
- Loi sur l'assurance-emploi*, L.C. 1996, ch. 23, art. 86(2), (2.1).
- Loi sur la faillite et l'insolvabilité*, L.R.C. 1985, ch. B-3, art. 67, 81.1, 81.2, 86 [mod. 1992, ch. 27, art. 39; 1997, ch. 12, art. 73; 2000, ch. 30, art. 148; 2005, ch. 47, art. 69; 2009, ch. 33, art. 25].
- Loi sur la taxe d'accise*, L.R.C. 1985, ch. E-15, art. 222.
- Loi sur les arrangements avec les créanciers des compagnies*, L.R.C. 1985, ch. C-36, art. 11 [mod. 2005, ch. 47, art. 128], 11.02 [aj. *idem*], 11.09 [aj. *idem*], 11.4 [mod. *idem*], 18.3 [aj. 1997, ch. 12, art. 125; abr. 2005, ch. 47, art. 131], 18.4 [*idem*], 20 [mod. 2005, ch. 47, art. 131], 21 [aj. 1997, ch. 12, art. 126; mod. 2005, ch. 47, art. 131], 37 [aj. 2005, ch. 47, art. 131].
- Loi sur les arrangements avec les créanciers des compagnies*, S.C. 1932-33, ch. 36 [mod. 1952-53, ch. 3].
- Loi sur les liquidations*, L.R.C. 1985, ch. W-11.
- Régime de pensions du Canada*, L.R.C. 1985, ch. C-8, art. 23.

Authors Cited

- Canada. Advisory Committee on Bankruptcy and Insolvency. *Proposed Bankruptcy Act Amendments: Report of the Advisory Committee on Bankruptcy and Insolvency*. Ottawa: Minister of Supply and Services Canada, 1986.
- Canada. House of Commons. *Minutes of Proceedings and Evidence of the Standing Committee on Consumer and Corporate Affairs and Government Operations*, Issue No. 15, 3rd Sess., 34th Parl., October 3, 1991, 15:15.
- Canada. Industry Canada. Marketplace Framework Policy Branch. *Report on the Operation and Administration of the Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act and the Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act*. Ottawa: Corporate and Insolvency Law Policy Directorate, 2002.
- Canada. Senate. *Debates of the Senate*, vol. 142, 1st Sess., 38th Parl., November 23, 2005, p. 2147.
- Canada. Senate. Standing Committee on Banking, Trade and Commerce. *Debtors and Creditors Sharing the Burden: A Review of the Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act and the Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act*. Ottawa: Senate of Canada, 2003.
- Canada. Study Committee on Bankruptcy and Insolvency Legislation. *Bankruptcy and Insolvency: Report of*

Doctrine citée

- Canada. Chambre des communes. *Procès-verbaux et témoignages du Comité permanent des Consommateurs et Sociétés et Administration gouvernementale*, fascicule n^o 15, 3^e sess., 34^e lég., 3 octobre 1991, 15:15.
- Canada. Comité consultatif en matière de faillite et d'insolvabilité. *Propositions d'amendements à la Loi sur la faillite : Rapport du Comité consultatif en matière de faillite et d'insolvabilité*. Ottawa : Ministre des Approvisionnements et Services Canada, 1986.
- Canada. Comité d'étude sur la législation en matière de faillite et d'insolvabilité. *Faillite et Insolvabilité : Rapport du comité d'étude sur la législation en matière de faillite et d'insolvabilité*. Ottawa : Information Canada, 1970.
- Canada. Industrie Canada. Direction générale des politiques-cadres du marché. *Rapport sur la mise en application de la Loi sur la faillite et l'insolvabilité et de la Loi sur les arrangements avec les créanciers des compagnies*. Ottawa : Direction des politiques du droit corporatif et de l'insolvabilité, 2002.
- Canada. Sénat. Comité sénatorial permanent des banques et du commerce. *Les débiteurs et les créanciers doivent se partager le fardeau : Examen de la Loi sur la faillite et l'insolvabilité et de la Loi sur les arrange-*

- the Study Committee on Bankruptcy and Insolvency Legislation*. Ottawa: Information Canada, 1970.
- Côté, Pierre-André. *The Interpretation of Legislation in Canada*, 3rd ed. Scarborough, Ont.: Carswell, 2000.
- Côté, Pierre-André, avec la collaboration de Stéphane Beaulac et Mathieu Devinat. *Interprétation des lois*, 4^e éd. Montréal: Thémis, 2009.
- Edwards, Stanley E. "Reorganizations Under the Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act" (1947), 25 *Can. Bar Rev.* 587.
- Insolvency Institute of Canada and Canadian Association of Insolvency and Restructuring Professionals. Joint Task Force on Business Insolvency Law Reform. *Report* (2002) (online: <http://www.cairp.ca/publications/submissions-to-government/law-reform/index.php>).
- Insolvency Institute of Canada and Canadian Association of Insolvency and Restructuring Professionals. Legislative Review Task Force (Commercial). *Report on the Commercial Provisions of Bill C-55* (2005).
- Jackson, Georgina R. and Janis Sarra. "Selecting the Judicial Tool to get the Job Done: An Examination of Statutory Interpretation, Discretionary Power and Inherent Jurisdiction in Insolvency Matters", in Janis P. Sarra, ed., *Annual Review of Insolvency Law 2007*. Toronto: Thomson Carswell, 2008, 41.
- Jones, Richard B. "The Evolution of Canadian Restructuring: Challenges for the Rule of Law", in Janis P. Sarra, ed., *Annual Review of Insolvency Law 2005*. Toronto: Thomson Carswell, 2006, 481.
- Lamer, Francis L. *Priority of Crown Claims in Insolvency*. Toronto: Carswell, 1996 (loose-leaf updated 2010, release 1).
- Morgan, Barbara K. "Should the Sovereign be Paid First? A Comparative International Analysis of the Priority for Tax Claims in Bankruptcy" (2000), 74 *Am. Bankr. L.J.* 461.
- Sarra, Janis. *Creditor Rights and the Public Interest: Restructuring Insolvent Corporations*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2003.
- Sarra, Janis P. *Rescue! The Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act*. Toronto: Thomson Carswell, 2007.
- Sullivan, Ruth. *Sullivan on the Construction of Statutes*, 5th ed. Markham, Ont.: LexisNexis, 2008.
- Waters, Donovan W. M., Mark R. Gillen and Lionel D. Smith, eds. *Waters' Law of Trusts in Canada*, 3rd ed. Toronto: Thomson Carswell, 2005.
- Wood, Roderick J. *Bankruptcy and Insolvency Law*. Toronto: Irwin Law, 2009.
- ments avec les créanciers des compagnies*. Ottawa : 2003.
- Canada. Sénat. *Débats du Sénat*, vol. 142, 1^{re} sess., 38^e lég., 23 novembre 2005, p. 2147.
- Côté, Pierre-André. *The Interpretation of Legislation in Canada*, 3rd ed. Scarborough, Ont. : Carswell, 2000.
- Côté, Pierre-André, avec la collaboration de Stéphane Beaulac et Mathieu Devinat. *Interprétation des lois*, 4^e éd. Montréal : Thémis, 2009.
- Edwards, Stanley E. « Reorganizations Under the Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act » (1947), 25 *R. du B. can.* 587.
- Institut d'insolvabilité du Canada et Association canadienne des professionnels de l'insolvabilité et de la réorganisation. Joint Task Force on Business Insolvency Law Reform. *Report* (2002) (en ligne : <http://www.cairp.ca/publications/submissions-to-government/law-reform/index.php>).
- Institut d'insolvabilité du Canada et Association canadienne des professionnels de l'insolvabilité et de la réorganisation. Legislative Review Task Force (Commercial). *Report on the Commercial Provisions of Bill C-55* (2005).
- Jackson, Georgina R. and Janis Sarra. « Selecting the Judicial Tool to get the Job Done : An Examination of Statutory Interpretation, Discretionary Power and Inherent Jurisdiction in Insolvency Matters », in Janis P. Sarra, ed., *Annual Review of Insolvency Law 2007*. Toronto : Thomson Carswell, 2008, 41.
- Jones, Richard B. « The Evolution of Canadian Restructuring : Challenges for the Rule of Law », in Janis P. Sarra, ed., *Annual Review of Insolvency Law 2005*. Toronto : Thomson Carswell, 2006, 481.
- Lamer, Francis L. *Priority of Crown Claims in Insolvency*. Toronto : Carswell, 1996 (loose-leaf updated 2010, release 1).
- Morgan, Barbara K. « Should the Sovereign be Paid First? A Comparative International Analysis of the Priority for Tax Claims in Bankruptcy » (2000), 74 *Am. Bankr. L.J.* 461.
- Sarra, Janis. *Creditor Rights and the Public Interest : Restructuring Insolvent Corporations*. Toronto : University of Toronto Press, 2003.
- Sarra, Janis P. *Rescue! The Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act*. Toronto : Thomson Carswell, 2007.
- Sullivan, Ruth. *Sullivan on the Construction of Statutes*, 5th ed. Markham, Ont. : LexisNexis, 2008.
- Waters, Donovan W. M., Mark R. Gillen and Lionel D. Smith, eds. *Waters' Law of Trusts in Canada*, 3rd ed. Toronto : Thomson Carswell, 2005.
- Wood, Roderick J. *Bankruptcy and Insolvency Law*. Toronto : Irwin Law, 2009.

APPEAL from a judgment of the British Columbia Court of Appeal (Newbury, Tysoe and Smith J.J.A.), 2009 BCCA 205, 98 B.C.L.R. (4th) 242, 270 B.C.A.C. 167, 454 W.A.C. 167, [2009] 12 W.W.R. 684, [2009] G.S.T.C. 79, [2009] B.C.J. No. 918 (QL), 2009 CarswellBC 1195, reversing a judgment of Brenner C.J.S.C., 2008 BCSC 1805, [2008] G.S.T.C. 221, [2008] B.C.J. No. 2611 (QL), 2008 CarswellBC 2895, dismissing a Crown application for payment of GST monies. Appeal allowed, Abella J. dissenting.

Mary I. A. Buttery, Owen J. James and Matthew J. G. Curtis, for the appellant.

Gordon Bourgard, David Jacyk and Michael J. Lema, for the respondent.

The judgment of McLachlin C.J. and Binnie, LeBel, Deschamps, Charron, Rothstein and Cromwell J.J. was delivered by

[1] DESCHAMPS J. — 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*

POURVOI contre un arrêt de la Cour d'appel de la Colombie-Britannique (les juges Newbury, Tysoe et Smith), 2009 BCCA 205, 98 B.C.L.R. (4th) 242, 270 B.C.A.C. 167, 454 W.A.C. 167, [2009] 12 W.W.R. 684, [2009] G.S.T.C. 79, [2009] B.C.J. No. 918 (QL), 2009 CarswellBC 1195, qui a infirmé une décision du juge en chef Brenner, 2008 BCSC 1805, [2008] G.S.T.C. 221, [2008] B.C.J. No. 2611 (QL), 2008 CarswellBC 2895, qui a rejeté la demande de la Couronne sollicitant le paiement de la TPS. Pourvoi accueilli, la juge Abella est dissidente.

Mary I. A. Buttery, Owen J. James et Matthew J. G. Curtis, pour l'appelante.

Gordon Bourgard, David Jacyk et Michael J. Lema, pour l'intimé.

Version française du jugement de la juge en chef McLachlin et des juges Binnie, LeBel, Deschamps, Charron, Rothstein et Cromwell rendu par

[1] LA JUGE DESCHAMPS — C'est la première fois que la Cour est appelée à interpréter directement les dispositions de la *Loi sur les arrangements avec les créanciers des compagnies*, L.R.C. 1985, ch. C-36 (« LACC »). À cet égard, deux questions sont soulevées. La première requiert la conciliation d'une disposition de la LACC et d'une disposition de la *Loi sur la taxe d'accise*, L.R.C. 1985, ch. E-15 (« LTA »), qui, selon des juridictions inférieures, sont en conflit l'une avec l'autre. La deuxième concerne la portée du pouvoir discrétionnaire du tribunal qui surveille une réorganisation. Les dispositions législatives pertinentes sont reproduites en annexe. Pour ce qui est de la première question, après avoir examiné l'évolution des priorités de la Couronne en matière d'insolvabilité et le libellé des diverses lois qui établissent ces priorités, j'arrive à la conclusion que c'est la LACC, et non la LTA, qui énonce la règle applicable. Pour ce qui est de la seconde question, je conclus qu'il faut interpréter les larges pouvoirs discrétionnaires conférés au juge en tenant compte de la nature réparatrice de la LACC et de la législation sur l'insolvabilité en général. Par conséquent, le tribunal avait le pouvoir

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.

discrétionnaire de lever partiellement la suspension des procédures pour permettre au débiteur de faire cession de ses biens en vertu de la *Loi sur la faillite et l’insolvabilité*, L.R.C. 1985, ch. B-3 (« *LFI* »). Je suis d’avis d’accueillir le pourvoi.

1. Faits et décisions des juridictions inférieures

[2] Le 13 décembre 2007, Ted LeRoy Trucking Ltd. (« LeRoy Trucking ») a déposé une requête sous le régime de la *LACC* devant la Cour suprême de la Colombie-Britannique et obtenu la suspension des procédures dans le but de réorganiser ses finances. L’entreprise a vendu certains éléments d’actif excédentaires, comme l’y autorisait l’ordonnance.

[3] Parmi les dettes de LeRoy Trucking figurait une somme perçue par celle-ci au titre de la taxe sur les produits et services (« TPS ») mais non versée à la Couronne. La *LTA* crée en faveur de la Couronne une fiducie réputée visant les sommes perçues au titre de la TPS. Cette fiducie réputée s’applique à tout bien ou toute recette détenue par la personne qui perçoit la TPS et à tout bien de cette personne détenu par un créancier garanti, et le produit découlant de ces biens doit être payé à la Couronne par priorité sur tout droit en garantie. Aux termes de la *LTA*, la fiducie réputée s’applique malgré tout autre texte législatif du Canada sauf la *LFI*. Cependant, la *LACC* prévoit également que, sous réserve de certaines exceptions, dont aucune ne concerne la TPS, ne s’appliquent pas sous son régime les fiducies réputées qui existent en faveur de la Couronne. Par conséquent, pour ce qui est de la TPS, la Couronne est un créancier non garanti dans le cadre de cette loi. Néanmoins, à l’époque où LeRoy Trucking a débuté ses procédures en vertu de la *LACC*, la jurisprudence dominante indiquait que la *LTA* l’emportait sur la *LACC*, la Couronne jouissant ainsi d’un droit prioritaire à l’égard des créances relatives à la TPS dans le cadre de la *LACC*, malgré le fait qu’elle aurait perdu cette priorité en vertu de la *LFI*. La *LACC* a fait l’objet de modifications substantielles en 2005, et certaines des dispositions en cause dans le présent pourvoi ont alors été renumérotées et reformulées (L.C. 2005, ch. 47). Mais ces modifications ne sont entrées en vigueur que le 18 septembre 2009. Je ne me reporterai aux dispositions modifiées que lorsqu’il sera utile de le faire.

[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).

[6] The Crown's appeal was allowed by the British Columbia Court of Appeal (2009 BCCA 205, 270 B.C.A.C. 167). 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

[4] Le 29 avril 2008, le juge en chef Brenner de la Cour suprême de la Colombie-Britannique, dans le contexte des procédures intentées en vertu de la *LACC*, a approuvé le paiement à Century Services, le principal créancier garanti du débiteur, d'une somme d'au plus cinq millions de dollars, soit le produit de la vente d'éléments d'actif excédentaires. LeRoy Trucking a proposé de retenir un montant égal aux sommes perçues au titre de la TPS mais non versées à la Couronne et de le déposer dans le compte en fiducie du contrôleur jusqu'à ce que l'issue de la réorganisation soit connue. Afin de maintenir le statu quo, en raison du succès incertain de la réorganisation, le juge en chef Brenner a accepté la proposition et ordonné qu'une somme de 305 202,30 \$ soit détenue par le contrôleur dans son compte en fiducie.

[5] Le 3 septembre 2008, ayant conclu que la réorganisation n'était pas possible, LeRoy Trucking a demandé à la Cour suprême de la Colombie-Britannique l'autorisation de faire cession de ses biens en vertu de la *LFI*. Pour sa part, la Couronne a demandé au tribunal d'ordonner le paiement au receveur général du Canada de la somme détenue par le contrôleur au titre de la TPS. Le juge en chef Brenner a rejeté cette dernière demande. Selon lui, comme la détention des fonds dans le compte en fiducie du contrôleur visait à [TRADUCTION] « faciliter le paiement final des sommes de TPS qui étaient dues avant que l'entreprise ne débute les procédures, mais seulement si un plan viable était proposé », l'impossibilité de procéder à une telle réorganisation, suivie d'une cession de biens, signifiait que la Couronne perdrait sa priorité sous le régime de la *LFI* (2008 BCSC 1805, [2008] G.S.T.C. 221).

[6] La Cour d'appel de la Colombie-Britannique a accueilli l'appel interjeté par la Couronne (2009 BCCA 205, 270 B.C.A.C. 167). Rédigeant l'arrêt unanime de la cour, le juge Tysoe a invoqué deux raisons distinctes pour y faire droit.

[7] Premièrement, le juge d'appel Tysoe a conclu que le pouvoir conféré au tribunal par l'art. 11 de la *LACC* n'autorisait pas ce dernier à rejeter la demande de la Couronne sollicitant le paiement immédiat des sommes de TPS faisant l'objet de la fiducie réputée,

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), 73 O.R. (3d) 737 (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?

après qu'il fut devenu clair que la tentative de réorganisation avait échoué et que la faillite était inévitable. Comme la restructuration n'était plus une possibilité, il ne servait plus à rien, dans le cadre de la LACC, de suspendre le paiement à la Couronne des sommes de TPS et le tribunal était tenu, en raison de la priorité établie par la *LTA*, d'en autoriser le versement à la Couronne. Ce faisant, le juge Tysoe a adopté le raisonnement énoncé dans l'arrêt *Ottawa Senators Hockey Club Corp. (Re)* (2005), 73 O.R. (3d) 737 (C.A.), suivant lequel la fiducie réputée que crée la *LTA* à l'égard des sommes dues au titre de la TPS établissait la priorité de la Couronne sur les créanciers garantis dans le cadre de la LACC.

[8] Deuxièmement, le juge Tysoe a conclu que, en ordonnant la ségrégation des sommes de TPS dans le compte en fiducie du contrôleur le 29 avril 2008, le tribunal avait créé une fiducie expresse en faveur de la Couronne, et que les sommes visées ne pouvaient être utilisées à quelque autre fin que ce soit. En conséquence, la Cour d'appel a ordonné que les sommes détenues par le contrôleur en fiducie pour la Couronne soient versées au receveur général.

2. Questions en litige

[9] Le pourvoi soulève trois grandes questions que j'examinerai à tour de rôle :

- (1) Le paragraphe 222(3) de la *LTA* l'emporte-t-il sur le par. 18.3(1) de la LACC et donne-t-il priorité à la fiducie réputée qui est établie par la *LTA* en faveur de la Couronne pendant des procédures régies par la LACC, comme il a été décidé dans l'arrêt *Ottawa Senators*?
- (2) Le tribunal a-t-il outrepassé les pouvoirs qui lui étaient conférés par la LACC en levant la suspension des procédures dans le but de permettre au débiteur de faire cession de ses biens?
- (3) L'ordonnance du tribunal datée du 29 avril 2008 exigeant que le montant de TPS réclamé par la Couronne soit détenu séparément dans le compte en fiducie du contrôleur a-t-elle créé une fiducie expresse en faveur de la Couronne à l'égard des fonds en question?

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

3. Analyse

[10] La première question porte sur les priorités de la Couronne dans le contexte de l’insolvabilité. Comme nous le verrons, la *LTA* crée en faveur de la Couronne une fiducie réputée à l’égard de la TPS due par un débiteur « [m]algré [. . .] tout autre texte législatif fédéral (sauf la *Loi sur la faillite et l’insolvabilité*) » (par. 222(3)), alors que selon la disposition de la *LACC* en vigueur à l’époque, « par dérogation à toute disposition législative fédérale ou provinciale ayant pour effet d’assimiler certains biens à des biens détenus en fiducie pour Sa Majesté, aucun des biens de la compagnie débitrice ne peut être considéré comme [tel] » (par. 18.3(1)). Il est difficile d’imaginer deux dispositions législatives plus contradictoires en apparence. Cependant, comme c’est souvent le cas, le conflit apparent peut être résolu au moyen des principes d’interprétation législative.

[11] Pour interpréter correctement ces dispositions, il faut examiner l’historique de la *LACC*, la fonction de cette loi parmi l’ensemble des textes adoptés par le législateur fédéral en matière d’insolvabilité et les principes reconnus dans la jurisprudence. Nous verrons que les priorités de la Couronne en matière d’insolvabilité ont été restreintes de façon appréciable. La réponse à la deuxième question repose aussi sur le contexte de la *LACC*, mais l’objectif de cette loi et l’interprétation qu’en a donnée la jurisprudence jouent également un rôle essentiel. Après avoir examiné les deux premières questions soulevées en l’espèce, j’aborderai la conclusion du juge Tysoe selon laquelle l’ordonnance rendue par le tribunal le 29 avril 2008 a eu pour effet de créer une fiducie expresse en faveur de la Couronne.

3.1 *Objectif et portée du droit relatif à l’insolvabilité*

[12] L’insolvabilité est la situation de fait qui se présente quand un débiteur n’est pas en mesure de payer ses créanciers (voir, généralement, R. J. Wood, *Bankruptcy and Insolvency Law* (2009), p. 16). Certaines procédures judiciaires peuvent être intentées en cas d’insolvabilité. Ainsi, le débiteur peut généralement obtenir une ordonnance judiciaire

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

ayant pour effet de suspendre les mesures d'exécution de ses créanciers, puis tenter de conclure avec eux une transaction à caractère exécutoire contenant des conditions de paiement plus réalistes. Ou alors, les biens du débiteur sont liquidés et ses dettes sont remboursées sur le produit de cette liquidation, selon les règles de priorité établies par la loi. Dans le premier cas, on emploie habituellement les termes de réorganisation ou de restructuration, alors que dans le second, on parle de liquidation.

[13] Le droit canadien en matière d'insolvabilité commerciale n'est pas codifié dans une seule loi exhaustive. En effet, le législateur a plutôt adopté plusieurs lois sur l'insolvabilité, la principale étant la *LFI*. Cette dernière établit un régime juridique autonome qui concerne à la fois la réorganisation et la liquidation. Bien qu'il existe depuis longtemps des mesures législatives relatives à la faillite, la *LFI* elle-même est une loi assez récente — elle a été adoptée en 1992. Ses procédures se caractérisent par une approche fondée sur des règles préétablies. Les débiteurs insolvable — personnes physiques ou personnes morales — qui doivent 1 000 \$ ou plus peuvent recourir à la *LFI*. Celle-ci comporte des mécanismes permettant au débiteur de présenter à ses créanciers une proposition de rajustement des dettes. Si la proposition est rejetée, la *LFI* établit la démarche aboutissant à la faillite : les biens du débiteur sont liquidés et le produit de cette liquidation est versé aux créanciers conformément à la répartition prévue par la loi.

[14] La possibilité de recourir à la *LACC* est plus restreinte. Le débiteur doit être une compagnie dont les dettes dépassent cinq millions de dollars. Contrairement à la *LFI*, la *LACC* ne contient aucune disposition relative à la liquidation de l'actif d'un débiteur en cas d'échec de la réorganisation. Une procédure engagée sous le régime de la *LACC* peut se terminer de trois façons différentes. Le scénario idéal survient dans les cas où la suspension des recours donne au débiteur un répit lui permettant de rétablir sa solvabilité et où le processus régi par la *LACC* prend fin sans qu'une réorganisation soit nécessaire. Le deuxième scénario le plus souhaitable est le cas où la transaction ou l'arrangement proposé par le débiteur est

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*

accepté par ses créanciers et où la compagnie réorganisée poursuit ses activités au terme de la procédure engagée en vertu de la *LACC*. Enfin, dans le dernier scénario, la transaction ou l'arrangement échoue et la compagnie ou ses créanciers cherchent habituellement à obtenir la liquidation des biens en vertu des dispositions applicables de la *LFI* ou la mise sous séquestre du débiteur. Comme nous le verrons, la principale différence entre les régimes de réorganisation prévus par la *LFI* et la *LACC* est que le second établit un mécanisme plus souple, dans lequel les tribunaux disposent d'un plus grand pouvoir discrétionnaire, ce qui rend le mécanisme mieux adapté aux réorganisations complexes.

[15] Comme je vais le préciser davantage plus loin, la *LACC* — la première loi canadienne régissant la réorganisation — a pour objectif de permettre au débiteur de continuer d'exercer ses activités et, dans les cas où cela est possible, d'éviter les coûts sociaux et économiques liés à la liquidation de son actif. Les propositions faites aux créanciers en vertu de la *LFI* répondent au même objectif, mais au moyen d'un mécanisme fondé sur des règles et offrant moins de souplesse. Quand la réorganisation s'avère impossible, les dispositions de la *LFI* peuvent être appliquées pour répartir de manière ordonnée les biens du débiteur entre les créanciers, en fonction des règles de priorité qui y sont établies.

[16] Avant l'adoption de la *LACC* en 1933 (S.C. 1932-33, ch. 36), la liquidation de la compagnie débitrice constituait la pratique la plus courante en vertu de la législation existante en matière d'insolvabilité commerciale (J. Sarra, *Creditor Rights and the Public Interest: Restructuring Insolvent Corporations* (2003), p. 12). Les ravages de la Grande Dépression sur les entreprises canadiennes et l'absence d'un mécanisme efficace susceptible de permettre aux débiteurs et aux créanciers d'arriver à des compromis afin d'éviter la liquidation commandaient une solution législative. La *LACC* a innové en permettant au débiteur insolvable de tenter une réorganisation sous surveillance judiciaire, hors du cadre de la législation existante en matière d'insolvabilité qui, une fois entrée en jeu,

Arrangement Act, [1934] S.C.R. 659, 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

aboutissait presque invariablement à la liquidation (*Reference re Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act*, [1934] R.C.S. 659, p. 660-661; Sarra, *Creditor Rights*, p. 12-13).

[17] Le législateur comprenait, lorsqu'il a adopté la LACC, que la liquidation d'une compagnie insolvable causait préjudice à la plupart des personnes touchées — notamment les créanciers et les employés — et que la meilleure solution consistait dans un arrangement permettant à la compagnie de survivre (Sarra, *Creditor Rights*, p. 13-15).

[18] Les premières analyses et décisions judiciaires à cet égard ont également entériné les objectifs réparateurs de la LACC. On y reconnaissait que la valeur de la compagnie demeurait plus grande lorsque celle-ci pouvait poursuivre ses activités, tout en soulignant les pertes intangibles découlant d'une liquidation, par exemple la disparition de la clientèle (S. E. Edwards, « Reorganizations Under the Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act » (1947), 25 *R. du B. can.* 587, p. 592). La réorganisation sert l'intérêt public en permettant la survie de compagnies qui fournissent des biens ou des services essentiels à la santé de l'économie ou en préservant un grand nombre d'emplois (*ibid.*, p. 593). Les effets de l'insolvabilité pouvaient même toucher d'autres intéressés que les seuls créanciers et employés. Ces arguments se font entendre encore aujourd'hui sous une forme un peu différente, lorsqu'on justifie la réorganisation par la nécessité de remettre sur pied des compagnies qui constituent des volets essentiels d'un réseau complexe de rapports économiques interdépendants, dans le but d'éviter les effets négatifs de la liquidation.

[19] La LACC est tombée en désuétude au cours des décennies qui ont suivi, vraisemblablement parce que des modifications apportées en 1953 ont restreint son application aux compagnies émettant des obligations (S.C. 1952-53, ch. 3). Pendant la récession du début des années 1980, obligés de s'adapter au nombre grandissant d'entreprises en difficulté, les avocats travaillant dans le domaine de l'insolvabilité ainsi que les tribunaux ont redécouvert cette loi et s'en sont servis pour relever les nouveaux défis de l'économie. Les participants aux

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, 3rd Sess., 34th Parl., October 3, 1991, at 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

procédures en sont peu à peu venus à reconnaître et à apprécier la caractéristique propre de la loi : l'attribution, au tribunal chargé de surveiller le processus, d'une grande latitude lui permettant de rendre les ordonnances nécessaires pour faciliter la réorganisation du débiteur et réaliser les objectifs de la LACC. Nous verrons plus loin comment les tribunaux ont utilisé de façon de plus en plus souple et créative les pouvoirs qui leur sont conférés par la LACC.

[20] Ce ne sont pas seulement les tribunaux qui se sont employés à faire évoluer le droit de l'insolvabilité pendant cette période. En 1970, un comité constitué par le gouvernement a mené une étude approfondie au terme de laquelle il a recommandé une réforme majeure, mais le législateur n'a rien fait (voir *Faillite et insolvabilité : Rapport du comité d'étude sur la législation en matière de faillite et d'insolvabilité* (1970)). En 1986, un autre comité d'experts a formulé des recommandations de portée plus restreinte, qui ont finalement conduit à l'adoption de la *Loi sur la faillite et l'insolvabilité* de 1992 (L.C. 1992, ch. 27) (voir *Propositions d'amendements à la Loi sur la faillite : Rapport du Comité consultatif en matière de faillite et d'insolvabilité* (1986)). Des dispositions à caractère plus général concernant la réorganisation des débiteurs insolvable ont alors été ajoutées à la loi canadienne relative à la faillite. Malgré l'absence de recommandations spécifiques au sujet de la LACC dans les rapports de 1970 et 1986, le comité de la Chambre des communes qui s'est penché sur le projet de loi C-22 à l'origine de la *LFI* a semblé accepter le témoignage d'un expert selon lequel le nouveau régime de réorganisation de la *LFI* supplanterait rapidement la LACC, laquelle pourrait alors être abrogée et l'insolvabilité commerciale et la faillite seraient ainsi régies par un seul texte législatif (*Procès-verbaux et témoignages du Comité permanent des Consommateurs et Sociétés et Administration gouvernementale*, fascicule n° 15, 3^e sess., 34^e lég., 3 octobre 1991, 15:15-15:16).

[21] En rétrospective, cette conclusion du comité de la Chambre des communes ne correspondait pas à la réalité. Elle ne tenait pas compte de la nouvelle vitalité de la LACC dans la pratique contemporaine,

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,

ni des avantages qu’offrait, en présence de réorganisations de plus en plus complexes, un processus souple de réorganisation sous surveillance judiciaire par rapport au régime plus rigide de la *LFI*, fondé sur des règles préétablies. La « souplesse de la *LACC* [était considérée comme offrant] de grands avantages car elle permet de prendre des décisions créatives et efficaces » (Industrie Canada, Direction générale des politiques-cadres du marché, *Rapport sur la mise en application de la Loi sur la faillite et l’insolvabilité et de la Loi sur les arrangements avec les créanciers des compagnies* (2002), p. 50). Au cours des trois dernières décennies, la résurrection de la *LACC* a donc été le moteur d’un processus grâce auquel, selon un auteur, [TRADUCTION] « le régime juridique canadien de restructuration en cas d’insolvabilité — qui était au départ un instrument plutôt rudimentaire — a évolué pour devenir un des systèmes les plus sophistiqués du monde développé » (R. B. Jones, « The Evolution of Canadian Restructuring : Challenges for the Rule of Law », dans J. P. Sarra, dir., *Annual Review of Insolvency Law 2005* (2006), 481, p. 481).

[22] Si les instances en matière d’insolvabilité peuvent être régies par des régimes législatifs différents, elles n’en présentent pas moins certains points communs, dont le plus frappant réside dans le modèle de la procédure unique. Le professeur Wood a décrit ainsi la nature et l’objectif de ce modèle dans *Bankruptcy and Insolvency Law* :

[TRADUCTION] Elles prévoient toutes une procédure collective qui remplace la procédure civile habituelle dont peuvent se prévaloir les créanciers pour faire valoir leurs droits. Les recours des créanciers sont collectivisés afin d’éviter l’anarchie qui régnerait si ceux-ci pouvaient exercer leurs recours individuellement. En l’absence d’un processus collectif, chaque créancier sait que faute d’agir de façon rapide et déterminée pour saisir les biens du débiteur, il sera devancé par les autres créanciers. [p. 2-3]

Le modèle de la procédure unique vise à faire échec à l’inefficacité et au chaos qui résulteraient de l’insolvabilité si chaque créancier engageait sa propre procédure dans le but de recouvrer sa créance. La réunion — en une seule instance relevant d’un même tribunal — de toutes les actions possibles contre le débiteur a pour effet de faciliter la négociation avec

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, s. 25; see also *Quebec (Revenue) v. Caisse populaire Desjardins de Montmagny*, 2009 SCC 49, [2009] 3 S.C.R. 286; *Deputy Minister of Revenue v. Rainville*, [1980] 1 S.C.R. 35; *Proposed Bankruptcy Act Amendments: Report of the Advisory Committee on Bankruptcy and Insolvency*).

[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, 30 Alta. L.R. (4th) 192, at para. 19).

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

les créanciers en les mettant tous sur le même pied. Cela évite le risque de voir un créancier plus combatif obtenir le paiement de ses créances sur l'actif limité du débiteur pendant que les autres créanciers tentent d'arriver à une transaction. La *LACC* et la *LFI* autorisent toutes deux pour cette raison le tribunal à ordonner la suspension de toutes les actions intentées contre le débiteur pendant qu'on cherche à conclure une transaction.

[23] Un autre point de convergence entre la *LACC* et la *LFI* concerne les priorités. Comme la *LACC* ne précise pas ce qui arrive en cas d'échec de la réorganisation, la *LFI* fournit la norme de référence pour ce qui se produira dans une telle situation. De plus, l'une des caractéristiques importantes de la réforme dont ces deux lois ont fait l'objet depuis 1992 est la réduction des priorités de la Couronne (L.C. 1992, ch. 27, art. 39; L.C. 1997, ch. 12, art. 73 et 125; L.C. 2000, ch. 30, art. 148; L.C. 2005, ch. 47, art. 69 et 131; L.C. 2009, ch. 33, art. 25; voir aussi *Québec (Revenu) c. Caisse populaire Desjardins de Montmagny*, 2009 CSC 49, [2009] 3 R.C.S. 286; *Sous-ministre du Revenu c. Rainville*, [1980] 1 R.C.S. 35; *Propositions d'amendements à la Loi sur la faillite : Rapport du Comité consultatif en matière de faillite et d'insolvabilité*).

[24] Comme les régimes de restructuration parallèles de la *LACC* et de la *LFI* constituent désormais une caractéristique reconnue dans le domaine du droit de l'insolvabilité, le travail de réforme législative contemporain a principalement visé à harmoniser, dans la mesure du possible, les aspects communs aux deux régimes et à privilégier la réorganisation plutôt que la liquidation (voir la *Loi édictant la Loi sur le Programme de protection des salariés et modifiant la Loi sur la faillite et l'insolvabilité, la Loi sur les arrangements avec les créanciers des compagnies et d'autres lois en conséquence*, L.C. 2005, ch. 47; *Gauntlet Energy Corp., Re*, 2003 ABQB 894, 30 Alta L.R. (4th) 192, par. 19).

[25] Ayant à l'esprit le contexte historique de la *LACC* et de la *LFI*, je vais maintenant aborder la première question en litige.

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. (Arrangement relatif à)*, 2009 QCCS 6332 (CanLII), leave to appeal granted, 2010 QCCA 183 (CanLII)). 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

3.2 *Fiducie réputée se rapportant à la TPS dans le cadre de la LACC*

[26] La Cour d'appel a estimé que la *LTA* empêchait le tribunal de suspendre les mesures prises par la Couronne pour bénéficier de la fiducie réputée se rapportant à la TPS, lorsqu'il a partiellement levé la suspension des procédures engagées contre le débiteur afin de permettre à celui-ci de faire cession de ses biens. Ce faisant, la cour a adopté un raisonnement qui s'insère dans un courant jurisprudentiel dominé par l'arrêt *Ottawa Senators*, suivant lequel il demeure possible de demander le bénéfice d'une fiducie réputée établie par la *LTA* pendant une réorganisation opérée en vertu de la *LACC*, et ce, malgré les dispositions de la *LACC* qui semblent dire le contraire.

[27] S'appuyant largement sur l'arrêt *Ottawa Senators* de la Cour d'appel de l'Ontario, la Couronne plaide que la disposition postérieure de la *LTA* créant la fiducie réputée visant la TPS l'emporte sur la disposition de la *LACC* censée neutraliser la plupart des fiducies réputées qui sont créées par des dispositions législatives. Si la Cour d'appel a accepté ce raisonnement dans la présente affaire, les tribunaux provinciaux ne l'ont pas tous adopté (voir, p. ex., *Komunik Corp. (Arrangement relatif à)*, 2009 QCCS 6332 (CanLII), autorisation d'appel accordée, 2010 QCCA 183 (CanLII)). Dans ses observations écrites adressées à la Cour, Century Services s'est fondée sur l'argument suivant lequel le tribunal pouvait, en vertu de la *LACC*, maintenir la suspension de la demande de la Couronne visant le paiement de la TPS non versée. Au cours des plaidoiries, la question de savoir si l'arrêt *Ottawa Senators* était bien fondé a néanmoins été soulevée. Après l'audience, la Cour a demandé aux parties de présenter des observations écrites supplémentaires à ce sujet. Comme il ressort clairement des motifs de ma collègue la juge Abella, cette question a pris une grande importance devant notre Cour. Dans ces circonstances, la Cour doit statuer sur le bien-fondé du raisonnement adopté dans l'arrêt *Ottawa Senators*.

[28] Le contexte général dans lequel s'inscrit cette question concerne l'évolution considérable, signalée plus haut, de la priorité dont jouit la Couronne en tant que créancier en cas d'insolvabilité. Avant les

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 added 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. Bankr. 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

années 1990, les créances de la Couronne bénéficiaient dans une large mesure d’une priorité en cas d’insolvabilité. Cette situation avantageuse suscitait une grande controverse. Les propositions de réforme du droit de l’insolvabilité de 1970 et de 1986 en témoignent — elles recommandaient que les créances de la Couronne ne fassent l’objet d’aucun traitement préférentiel. Une question connexe se posait : celle de savoir si la Couronne était même assujettie à la *LACC*. Les modifications apportées à la *LACC* en 1997 ont confirmé qu’elle l’était bel et bien (voir *LACC*, art. 21, ajouté par L.C. 1997, ch. 12, art. 126).

[29] Les revendications de priorité par l’État en cas d’insolvabilité sont abordées de différentes façons selon les pays. Par exemple, en Allemagne et en Australie, l’État ne bénéficie d’aucune priorité, alors qu’aux États-Unis et en France il jouit au contraire d’une large priorité (voir B. K. Morgan, « Should the Sovereign be Paid First? A Comparative International Analysis of the Priority for Tax Claims in Bankruptcy » (2000), 74 *Am. Bankr. L.J.* 461, p. 500). Le Canada a choisi une voie intermédiaire dans le cadre d’une réforme législative amorcée en 1992 : la Couronne a conservé sa priorité pour les sommes retenues à la source au titre de l’impôt sur le revenu et des cotisations à l’assurance-emploi (« AE ») et au Régime de pensions du Canada (« RPC »), mais elle est un créancier ordinaire non garanti pour la plupart des autres sommes qui lui sont dues.

[30] Le législateur a fréquemment adopté des mécanismes visant à protéger les créances de la Couronne et à permettre leur exécution. Les deux plus courants sont les fiducies présumées et les pouvoirs de saisie-arrêt (voir F. L. Lamer, *Priority of Crown Claims in Insolvency* (feuilles mobiles), §2).

[31] Pour ce qui est des sommes de TPS perçues, le législateur a établi une fiducie réputée. La *LTA* précise que la personne qui perçoit une somme au titre de la TPS est réputée la détenir en fiducie pour la Couronne (par. 222(1)). La fiducie réputée s’applique aux autres biens de la personne qui perçoit la taxe, pour une valeur égale à la somme réputée détenue en fiducie, si la somme en question n’a pas été versée en conformité avec la *LTA*. La fiducie réputée vise

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 of Canada v. Sparrow Electric Corp.*, [1997] 1 S.C.R. 411, 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. M.N.R.*, 2002 SCC 49, [2002] 2 S.C.R. 720, 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”).

également les biens détenus par un créancier garanti qui, si ce n’était de la sûreté, seraient les biens de la personne qui perçoit la taxe (par. 222(3)).

[32] Utilisant pratiquement les mêmes termes, le législateur a créé de semblables fiducies réputées à l’égard des retenues à la source relatives à l’impôt sur le revenu et aux cotisations à l’AE et au RPC (voir par. 227(4) de la *Loi de l’impôt sur le revenu*, L.R.C. 1985, ch. 1 (5^e suppl.) (« *LIR* »), par. 86(2) et (2.1) de la *Loi sur l’assurance-emploi*, L.C. 1996, ch. 23, et par. 23(3) et (4) du *Régime de pensions du Canada*, L.R.C. 1985, ch. C-8). J’emploierai ci-après le terme « retenues à la source » pour désigner les retenues relatives à l’impôt sur le revenu et aux cotisations à l’AE et au RPC.

[33] Dans *Banque Royale du Canada c. Sparrow Electric Corp.*, [1997] 1 R.C.S. 411, la Cour était saisie d’un litige portant sur la priorité de rang entre, d’une part, une fiducie réputée établie en vertu de la *LIR* à l’égard des retenues à la source, et, d’autre part, des sûretés constituées en vertu de la *Loi sur les banques*, L.C. 1991, ch. 46, et de la loi de l’Alberta intitulée *Personal Property Security Act*, S.A. 1988, ch. P-4.05 (« *PPSA* »). D’après les dispositions alors en vigueur, une fiducie réputée — établie en vertu de la *LIR* à l’égard des biens du débiteur pour une valeur égale à la somme due au titre de l’impôt sur le revenu — commençait à s’appliquer au moment de la liquidation, de la mise sous séquestre ou de la cession de biens. Dans *Sparrow Electric*, la Cour a conclu que la fiducie réputée de la *LIR* ne pouvait pas l’emporter sur les sûretés, au motif que, comme celles-ci constituaient des privilèges fixes grevant les biens dès que le débiteur acquérait des droits sur eux, il n’existait pas de biens susceptibles d’être visés par la fiducie réputée de la *LIR* lorsqu’elle prenait naissance par la suite. Ultérieurement, dans *First Vancouver Finance c. M.R.N.*, 2002 CSC 49, [2002] 2 R.C.S. 720, la Cour a souligné que le législateur était intervenu pour renforcer la fiducie réputée de la *LIR* en précisant qu’elle est réputée s’appliquer dès le moment où les retenues ne sont pas versées à la Couronne conformément aux exigences de la *LIR*, et en donnant à la Couronne la priorité sur toute autre garantie (par. 27-29) (la « modification découlant de l’arrêt *Sparrow Electric* »).

[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,

[34] Selon le texte modifié du par. 227(4.1) de la *LIR* et celui des fiducies réputées correspondantes établies dans le *Régime de pensions du Canada* et la *Loi sur l'assurance-emploi* à l'égard des retenues à la source, la fiducie réputée s'applique malgré tout autre texte législatif fédéral sauf les art. 81.1 et 81.2 de la *LFI*. La fiducie réputée de la *LTA* qui est en cause en l'espèce est formulée en des termes semblables sauf que la limite à son application vise la *LFI* dans son entier. Voici le texte de la disposition pertinente :

222. . . .

. . . .

(3) Malgré les autres dispositions de la présente loi (sauf le paragraphe (4) du présent article), tout autre texte législatif fédéral (sauf la *Loi sur la faillite et l'insolvabilité*), tout texte législatif provincial ou toute autre règle de droit, lorsqu'un montant qu'une personne est réputée par le paragraphe (1) détenir en fiducie pour Sa Majesté du chef du Canada n'est pas versé au receveur général ni retiré selon les modalités et dans le délai prévus par la présente partie, les biens de la personne — y compris les biens détenus par ses créanciers garantis qui, en l'absence du droit en garantie, seraient ses biens — d'une valeur égale à ce montant sont réputés . . .

[35] La Couronne soutient que la modification découlant de l'arrêt *Sparrow Electric*, qui a été ajoutée à la *LTA* par le législateur en 2000, visait à maintenir la priorité de Sa Majesté sous le régime de la *LACC* à l'égard du montant de TPS perçu, tout en reléguant celle-ci au rang de créancier non garanti à l'égard de ce montant sous le régime de la *LFI* uniquement. De l'avis de la Couronne, il en est ainsi parce que, selon la *LTA*, la fiducie réputée visant la TPS demeure en vigueur « malgré » tout autre texte législatif sauf la *LFI*.

[36] Les termes utilisés dans la *LTA* pour établir la fiducie réputée à l'égard de la TPS créent un conflit apparent avec la *LACC*, laquelle précise que, sous réserve de certaines exceptions, les biens qui sont réputés selon un texte législatif être détenus en fiducie pour la Couronne ne doivent pas être considérés comme tels.

[37] Par une modification apportée à la *LACC* en 1997 (L.C. 1997, ch. 12, art. 125), le législateur

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.

semble, sous réserve d'exceptions spécifiques, avoir neutralisé les fiducies réputées créées en faveur de la Couronne lorsque des procédures de réorganisation sont engagées sous le régime de cette loi. La disposition pertinente, à l'époque le par. 18.3(1), était libellée ainsi :

18.3 (1) Sous réserve du paragraphe (2) et par dérogation à toute disposition législative fédérale ou provinciale ayant pour effet d'assimiler certains biens à des biens détenus en fiducie pour Sa Majesté, aucun des biens de la compagnie débitrice ne peut être considéré comme détenu en fiducie pour Sa Majesté si, en l'absence de la disposition législative en question, il ne le serait pas.

Cette neutralisation des fiducies réputées a été maintenue dans des modifications apportées à la *LACC* en 2005 (L.C. 2005, ch. 47), où le par. 18.3(1) a été reformulé et renuméroté, devenant le par. 37(1) :

37. (1) Sous réserve du paragraphe (2) et par dérogation à toute disposition législative fédérale ou provinciale ayant pour effet d'assimiler certains biens à des biens détenus en fiducie pour Sa Majesté, aucun des biens de la compagnie débitrice ne peut être considéré comme tel par le seul effet d'une telle disposition.

[38] La *LFI* comporte une disposition analogue, qui — sous réserve des mêmes exceptions spécifiques — neutralise les fiducies réputées établies en vertu d'un texte législatif et fait en sorte que les biens du failli qui autrement seraient visés par une telle fiducie font partie de l'actif du débiteur et sont à la disposition des créanciers (L.C. 1992, ch. 27, art. 39; L.C. 1997, ch. 12, art. 73; *LFI*, par. 67(2)). Il convient de souligner que, tant dans la *LACC* que dans la *LFI*, les exceptions visent les retenues à la source (*LACC*, par. 18.3(2); *LFI*, par. 67(3)). Voici la disposition pertinente de la *LACC* :

18.3 . . .

(2) Le paragraphe (1) ne s'applique pas à l'égard des montants réputés détenus en fiducie aux termes des paragraphes 227(4) ou (4.1) de la *Loi de l'impôt sur le revenu*, des paragraphes 23(3) ou (4) du *Régime de pensions du Canada* ou des paragraphes 86(2) ou (2.1) de la *Loi sur l'assurance-emploi*

Par conséquent, la fiducie réputée établie en faveur de la Couronne et la priorité dont celle-ci jouit de ce fait sur les retenues à la source continuent de s'appliquer autant pendant la réorganisation que pendant la faillite.

[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

[39] Par ailleurs, les autres créances de la Couronne sont considérées par la *LACC* et la *LFI* comme des créances non garanties (*LACC*, par. 18.4(1); *LFI*, par. 86(1)). Ces dispositions faisant de la Couronne un créancier non garanti comportent une exception expresse concernant les fiducies réputées établies par un texte législatif à l'égard des retenues à la source (*LACC*, par. 18.4(3); *LFI*, par. 86(3)). Voici la disposition de la *LACC* :

18.4 . . .

. . . .

(3) Le paragraphe (1) [suivant lequel la Couronne a le rang de créancier non garanti] n'a pas pour effet de porter atteinte à l'application des dispositions suivantes :

a) les paragraphes 224(1.2) et (1.3) de la *Loi de l'impôt sur le revenu*;

b) toute disposition du *Régime de pensions du Canada* ou de la *Loi sur l'assurance-emploi* qui renvoie au paragraphe 224(1.2) de la *Loi de l'impôt sur le revenu* et qui prévoit la perception d'une cotisation

Par conséquent, non seulement la *LACC* précise que les créances de la Couronne ne bénéficient pas d'une priorité par rapport à celles des autres créanciers (par. 18.3(1)), mais les exceptions à cette règle (maintien de la priorité de la Couronne dans le cas des retenues à la source) sont mentionnées à plusieurs reprises dans la Loi.

[40] Le conflit apparent qui existe dans la présente affaire fait qu'on doit se demander si la règle de la *LTA* adoptée en 2000, selon laquelle les fiducies réputées visant la TPS s'appliquent malgré tout autre texte législatif fédéral sauf la *LFI*, l'emporte sur la règle énoncée dans la *LACC* — qui a d'abord été édictée en 1997 à l'art. 18.3 — suivant laquelle, sous réserve de certaines exceptions explicites, les fiducies réputées établies par une disposition législative sont sans effet dans le cadre de la *LACC*. Avec égards pour l'opinion contraire exprimée par mon collègue le juge Fish, je ne crois pas qu'on puisse résoudre ce conflit apparent

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 (Alta. Q.B.); *Gauntlet*).

[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 v. Verdun (City)*, [1997] 2 S.C.R. 862, 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,

en niant son existence et en créant une règle qui exige à la fois une disposition législative établissant la fiducie présumée et une autre la confirmant. Une telle règle est inconnue en droit. Les tribunaux doivent reconnaître les conflits, apparents ou réels, et les résoudre lorsque la chose est possible.

[41] Un courant jurisprudentiel pancanadien a résolu le conflit apparent en faveur de la *LTA*, confirmant ainsi la validité des fiducies réputées à l’égard de la TPS dans le cadre de la *LACC*. Dans l’arrêt déterminant à ce sujet, *Ottawa Senators*, la Cour d’appel de l’Ontario a invoqué la doctrine de l’abrogation implicite et conclu que la disposition postérieure de la *LTA* devait avoir préséance sur la *LACC* (voir aussi *Solid Resources Ltd., Re* (2002), 40 C.B.R. (4th) 219 (B.R. Alb.); *Gauntlet*).

[42] Dans *Ottawa Senators*, la Cour d’appel de l’Ontario a fondé sa conclusion sur deux considérations. Premièrement, elle était convaincue qu’en mentionnant explicitement la *LFI* — mais pas la *LACC* — au par. 222(3) de la *LTA*, le législateur a fait un choix délibéré. Je cite le juge MacPherson :

[TRADUCTION] La *LFI* et la *LACC* sont des lois fédérales étroitement liées entre elles. Je ne puis concevoir que le législateur ait pu mentionner expressément la *LFI* à titre d’exception, mais ait involontairement omis de considérer la *LACC* comme une deuxième exception possible. À mon avis, le fait que la *LACC* ne soit pas mentionnée au par. 222(3) de la *LTA* était presque assurément une omission mûrement réfléchie de la part du législateur. [par. 43]

[43] Deuxièmement, la Cour d’appel de l’Ontario a comparé le conflit entre la *LTA* et la *LACC* à celui dont a été saisie la Cour dans *Doré c. Verdun (Ville)*, [1997] 2 R.C.S. 862, et les a jugés [TRADUCTION] « identiques » (par. 46). Elle s’estimait donc tenue de suivre l’arrêt *Doré* (par. 49). Dans cet arrêt, la Cour a conclu qu’une disposition d’une loi de nature plus générale et récemment adoptée établissant un délai de prescription — le *Code civil du Québec*, L.Q. 1991, ch. 64 (« *C.c.Q.* ») — avait eu pour effet d’abroger une disposition plus spécifique

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

d'un texte de loi antérieur, la *Loi sur les cités et villes* du Québec, L.R.Q., ch. C-19, avec laquelle elle entrerait en conflit. Par analogie, la Cour d'appel de l'Ontario a conclu que le par. 222(3) de la *LTA*, une disposition plus récente et plus générale, abrogeait implicitement la disposition antérieure plus spécifique, à savoir le par. 18.3(1) de la *LACC* (par. 47-49).

[44] En examinant la question dans tout son contexte, je suis amenée à conclure, pour plusieurs raisons, que ni le raisonnement ni le résultat de l'arrêt *Ottawa Senators* ne peuvent être adoptés. Bien qu'il puisse exister un conflit entre le libellé des textes de loi, une analyse téléologique et contextuelle visant à déterminer la véritable intention du législateur conduit à la conclusion que ce dernier 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 apporté à la *LTA*, en 2000, la modification découlant de l'arrêt *Sparrow Electric*.

[45] Je rappelle d'abord que le législateur a manifesté sa volonté de mettre un terme à la priorité accordée aux créances de la Couronne dans le cadre du droit de l'insolvabilité. Selon le par. 18.3(1) de la *LACC* (sous réserve des exceptions prévues au par. 18.3(2)), les fiducies réputées de la Couronne n'ont aucun effet sous le régime de cette loi. Quand le législateur a voulu protéger certaines créances de la Couronne au moyen de fiducies réputées et voulu que celles-ci continuent de s'appliquer en situation d'insolvabilité, il l'a indiqué de manière explicite et minutieuse. Par exemple, le par. 18.3(2) de la *LACC* et le par. 67(3) de la *LFI* énoncent expressément que les fiducies réputées visant les retenues à la source continuent de produire leurs effets en cas d'insolvabilité. Le législateur a donc clairement établi des exceptions à la règle générale selon laquelle les fiducies réputées n'ont plus d'effet dans un contexte d'insolvabilité. La *LACC* et la *LFI* sont en harmonie : elles préservent les fiducies réputées et établissent la priorité de la Couronne seulement à l'égard des retenues à la source. En revanche, il n'existe aucune disposition législative expresse permettant de conclure que les créances relatives à la

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.

TPS bénéficient d'un traitement préférentiel sous le régime de la *LACC* ou de la *LFI*. Alors que les retenues à la source font l'objet de dispositions explicites dans ces deux lois concernant l'insolvabilité, celles-ci ne comportent pas de dispositions claires et expresses analogues établissant une exception pour les créances relatives à la TPS.

[46] La logique interne de la *LACC* va également à l'encontre du maintien de la fiducie réputée établie dans la *LTA* à l'égard de la TPS. En effet, la *LACC* impose certaines limites à la suspension par les tribunaux des droits de la Couronne à l'égard des retenues à la source, mais elle ne fait pas mention de la *LTA* (art. 11.4). Comme les fiducies réputées visant les retenues à la source sont explicitement protégées par la *LACC*, il serait incohérent d'accorder une meilleure protection à la fiducie réputée établie par la *LTA* en l'absence de dispositions explicites en ce sens dans la *LACC*. Par conséquent, il semble découler de la logique de la *LACC* que la fiducie réputée établie par la *LTA* est visée par la renonciation du législateur à sa priorité (art. 18.4).

[47] De plus, il y aurait une étrange asymétrie si l'interprétation faisant primer la *LTA* sur la *LACC* préconisée par la Couronne était retenue en l'espèce : les créances de la Couronne relatives à la TPS conserveraient leur priorité de rang pendant les procédures fondées sur la *LACC*, mais pas en cas de faillite. Comme certains tribunaux l'ont bien vu, cela ne pourrait qu'encourager les créanciers à recourir à la loi la plus favorable dans les cas où, comme en l'espèce, l'actif du débiteur n'est pas suffisant pour permettre à la fois le paiement des créanciers garantis et le paiement des créances de la Couronne (*Gauntlet*, par. 21). Or, si les réclamations des créanciers étaient mieux protégées par la liquidation sous le régime de la *LFI*, les créanciers seraient très fortement incités à éviter les procédures prévues par la *LACC* et les risques d'échec d'une réorganisation. Le fait de donner à un acteur clé de telles raisons de s'opposer aux procédures de réorganisation fondées sur la *LACC* dans toute situation d'insolvabilité ne peut que miner les objectifs réparateurs de ce texte législatif et risque au contraire de favoriser les maux sociaux que son édicton visait justement à prévenir.

[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*.

[48] Peut-être l’effet de l’arrêt *Ottawa Senators* est-il atténué si la restructuration est tentée en vertu de la *LFI* au lieu de la *LACC*, mais il subsiste néanmoins. Si l’on suivait cet arrêt, la priorité de la créance de la Couronne relative à la TPS différerait selon le régime — *LACC* ou *LFI* — sous lequel la restructuration a lieu. L’anomalie de ce résultat ressort clairement du fait que les compagnies seraient ainsi privées de la possibilité de se restructurer sous le régime plus souple et mieux adapté de la *LACC*, régime privilégié en cas de réorganisations complexes.

[49] Les indications selon lesquelles le législateur voulait que les créances relatives à la TPS soient traitées différemment dans les cas de réorganisations et de faillites sont rares, voire inexistantes. Le paragraphe 222(3) de la *LTA* a été adopté dans le cadre d’un projet de loi d’exécution du budget de nature générale en 2000. Le sommaire accompagnant ce projet de loi n’indique pas que, dans le cadre de la *LACC*, le législateur entendait élever la priorité de la créance de la Couronne à l’égard de la TPS au même rang que les créances relatives aux retenues à la source ou encore à un rang supérieur à celles-ci. En fait, le sommaire mentionne simplement, en ce qui concerne les fiducies réputées, que les modifications apportées aux dispositions existantes visent à « faire en sorte que les cotisations à l’assurance-emploi et au Régime de pensions du Canada qu’un employeur est tenu de verser soient pleinement recouvrables par la Couronne en cas de faillite de l’employeur » (Sommaire de la L.C. 2000, ch. 30, p. 4a). Le libellé de la disposition créant une fiducie réputée à l’égard de la TPS ressemble à celui des dispositions créant de telles fiducies relatives aux retenues à la source et il comporte la même formule dérogatoire et la même mention de la *LFI*. Cependant, comme il a été souligné précédemment, le législateur a expressément précisé que seules les fiducies réputées visant les retenues à la source demeurent en vigueur. Une exception concernant la *LFI* dans la disposition créant les fiducies réputées à l’égard des retenues à la source est sans grande conséquence, car le texte explicite de la *LFI* elle-même (et celui de la *LACC*) établit ces fiducies et maintient leur effet. Il convient toutefois de souligner que ni la *LFI* ni la *LACC* ne comportent de disposition équivalente assurant le maintien en vigueur des fiducies réputées visant la TPS.

[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

[50] Il semble plus probable qu'en adoptant, pour créer dans la *LTA* les fiducies réputées visant la TPS, le même libellé que celui utilisé pour les fiducies réputées visant les retenues à la source, et en omettant d'inclure au par. 222(3) de la *LTA* une exception à l'égard de la *LACC* en plus de celle établie pour la *LFI*, le législateur ait par inadvertance commis une anomalie rédactionnelle. En raison d'une lacune législative dans la *LTA*, il serait possible de considérer que la fiducie réputée visant la TPS continue de produire ses effets dans le cadre de la *LACC*, tout en cessant de le faire dans le cas de la *LFI*, ce qui entraînerait un conflit apparent avec le libellé de la *LACC*. Il faut cependant voir ce conflit comme il est : un conflit apparent seulement, que l'on peut résoudre en considérant l'approche générale adoptée envers les créances prioritaires de la Couronne et en donnant préséance au texte de l'art. 18.3 de la *LACC* d'une manière qui ne produit pas un résultat insolite.

[51] Le paragraphe 222(3) de la *LTA* ne révèle aucune intention explicite du législateur d'abroger l'art. 18.3 de la *LACC*. Il crée simplement un conflit apparent qui doit être résolu par voie d'interprétation législative. L'intention du législateur était donc loin d'être dépourvue d'ambiguïté quand il a adopté le par. 222(3) de la *LTA*. S'il avait voulu donner priorité aux créances de la Couronne relatives à la TPS dans le cadre de la *LACC*, il aurait pu le faire de manière aussi explicite qu'il l'a fait pour les retenues à la source. Or, au lieu de cela, on se trouve réduit à inférer du texte du par. 222(3) de la *LTA* que le législateur entendait que la fiducie réputée visant la TPS produise ses effets dans les procédures fondées sur la *LACC*.

[52] Je ne suis pas convaincue que le raisonnement adopté dans *Doré* exige l'application de la doctrine de l'abrogation implicite dans les circonstances de la présente affaire. La question principale dans *Doré* était celle de l'impact de l'adoption du *C.c.Q.* sur les règles de droit administratif relatives aux municipalités. Bien que le juge Gonthier ait conclu, dans cet arrêt, que le délai de prescription établi à l'art. 2930 du *C.c.Q.* avait eu pour effet d'abroger implicitement une disposition de la *Loi sur les cités et villes* portant sur la prescription, sa conclusion n'était pas

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

fondée seulement sur une analyse textuelle. Il a en effet procédé à une analyse contextuelle approfondie des deux textes, y compris de l’historique législatif pertinent (par. 31-41). Par conséquent, les circonstances du cas dont était saisie la Cour dans *Doré* sont loin d’être « identiques » à celles du présent pourvoi, tant sur le plan du texte que sur celui du contexte et de l’historique législatif. On ne peut donc pas dire que l’arrêt *Doré* commande l’application automatique d’une règle d’abrogation implicite.

[53] Un bon indice de l’intention générale du législateur peut être tiré du fait qu’il n’a pas, dans les modifications subséquentes, écarté la règle énoncée dans la *LACC*. D’ailleurs, par suite des modifications apportées à cette loi en 2005, la règle figurant initialement à l’art. 18.3 a, comme nous l’avons vu plus tôt, été reprise sous une formulation différente à l’art. 37. Par conséquent, dans la mesure où l’interprétation selon laquelle la fiducie réputée visant la TPS demeurerait en vigueur dans le contexte de procédures en vertu de la *LACC* repose sur le fait que le par. 222(3) de la *LTA* constitue la disposition postérieure et a eu pour effet d’abroger implicitement le par. 18.3(1) de la *LACC*, nous revenons au point de départ. Comme le législateur a reformulé et renuméroté la disposition de la *LACC* précisant que, sous réserve des exceptions relatives aux retenues à la source, les fiducies réputées ne survivent pas à l’engagement de procédures fondées sur la *LACC*, c’est cette loi qui se trouve maintenant à être le texte postérieur. Cette constatation confirme que c’est dans la *LACC* qu’est exprimée l’intention du législateur en ce qui a trait aux fiducies réputées visant la TPS.

[54] Je ne suis pas d’accord avec ma collègue la juge Abella pour dire que l’al. 44f) de la *Loi d’interprétation*, L.R.C. 1985, ch. I-21, permet d’interpréter les modifications de 2005 comme n’ayant aucun effet. La nouvelle loi peut difficilement être considérée comme une simple refonte de la loi antérieure. De fait, la *LACC* a fait l’objet d’un examen approfondi en 2005. En particulier, conformément à son objectif qui consiste à faire concorder l’approche de la *LFI* et celle de la *LACC* à l’égard de l’insolvabilité, le législateur a apporté aux deux textes des modifications allant dans le même sens en ce qui concerne les

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.

propositions présentées par les entreprises. De plus, de nouvelles dispositions ont été ajoutées au sujet des contrats, des conventions collectives, du financement temporaire et des accords de gouvernance. Des clarifications ont aussi été apportées quant à la nomination et au rôle du contrôleur. Il convient par ailleurs de souligner les limites imposées par l'art. 11.09 de la *LACC* au pouvoir discrétionnaire du tribunal d'ordonner la suspension de l'effet des fiducies réputées créées en faveur de la Couronne relativement aux retenues à la source, limites qui étaient auparavant énoncées à l'art. 11.4. Il n'est fait aucune mention des fiducies réputées visant la TPS (voir le Sommaire de la L.C. 2005, ch. 47). Dans le cadre de cet examen, le législateur est allé jusqu'à se pencher sur les termes mêmes utilisés dans la loi pour écarter l'application des fiducies réputées. Les commentaires cités par ma collègue ne font que souligner l'intention manifeste du législateur de maintenir sa politique générale suivant laquelle seules les fiducies réputées visant les retenues à la source survivent en cas de procédures fondées sur la *LACC*.

[55] En l'espèce, le contexte législatif aide à déterminer l'intention du législateur et conforte la conclusion selon laquelle le par. 222(3) de la *LTA* ne visait pas à restreindre la portée de la disposition de la *LACC* écartant l'application des fiducies réputées. Eu égard au contexte dans son ensemble, le conflit entre la *LTA* et la *LACC* est plus apparent que réel. Je n'adopterais donc pas le raisonnement de l'arrêt *Ottawa Senators* et je confirmerais que l'art. 18.3 de la *LACC* a continué de produire ses effets.

[56] Ma conclusion est renforcée par l'objectif de la *LACC* en tant que composante du régime réparateur instauré la législation canadienne en matière d'insolvabilité. Comme cet aspect est particulièrement pertinent à propos de la deuxième question, je vais maintenant examiner la façon dont les tribunaux ont interprété l'étendue des pouvoirs discrétionnaires dont ils disposent lorsqu'ils surveillent une réorganisation fondée sur la *LACC*, ainsi que la façon dont le législateur a dans une large mesure entériné cette interprétation. L'interprétation de la *LACC* par les tribunaux aide en fait à comprendre comment celle-ci en est venue à jouer un rôle si important dans le droit canadien de l'insolvabilité.

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” (*Metcalfe & Mansfield Alternative Investments II Corp. (Re)*, 2008 ONCA 587, 92 O.R. (3d) 513, 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. Ct. (Gen. Div.)), 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.

(*Elan Corp. v. Comiskey* (1990), 41 O.A.C. 282, 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

3.3 Pouvoirs discrétionnaires du tribunal chargé de surveiller une réorganisation fondée sur la LACC

[57] Les tribunaux font souvent remarquer que [TRADUCTION] « [l]a LACC est par nature schématisque » et ne « contient pas un code complet énonçant tout ce qui est permis et tout ce qui est interdit » (*Metcalfe & Mansfield Alternative Investments II Corp. (Re)*, 2008 ONCA 587, 92 O.R. (3d) 513, par. 44, le juge Blair). Par conséquent, [TRADUCTION] « [l]’histoire du droit relatif à la LACC correspond à l’évolution de ce droit au fil de son interprétation par les tribunaux » (*Dylex Ltd., Re* (1995), 31 C.B.R. (3d) 106 (C. Ont. (Div. gén.)), par. 10, le juge Farley).

[58] Les décisions prises en vertu de la LACC découlent souvent de l’exercice discrétionnaire de certains pouvoirs. C’est principalement au fil de l’exercice par les juridictions commerciales de leurs pouvoirs discrétionnaires, et ce, dans des conditions décrites avec justesse par un praticien comme constituant [TRADUCTION] « la pépinière du contentieux en temps réel », que la LACC a évolué de façon graduelle et s’est adaptée aux besoins commerciaux et sociaux contemporains (voir Jones, p. 484).

[59] L’exercice par les tribunaux de leurs pouvoirs discrétionnaires doit évidemment tendre à la réalisation des objectifs de la LACC. Le caractère réparateur dont j’ai fait état dans mon aperçu historique de la Loi a à maintes reprises été reconnu dans la jurisprudence. Voici l’un des premiers exemples :

[TRADUCTION] La loi est réparatrice au sens le plus pur du terme, en ce qu’elle fournit un moyen d’éviter les effets dévastateurs, — tant sur le plan social qu’économique — de la faillite ou de l’arrêt des activités d’une entreprise, à l’initiation des créanciers, pendant que des efforts sont déployés, sous la surveillance du tribunal, en vue de réorganiser la situation financière de la compagnie débitrice.

(*Elan Corp. c. Comiskey* (1990), 41 O.A.C. 282, par. 57, le juge Doherty, dissident)

[60] Le processus décisionnel des tribunaux sous le régime de la LACC comporte plusieurs aspects. Le tribunal doit d’abord créer les conditions propres à permettre au débiteur de tenter une réorganisation.

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., *Chef Ready Foods Ltd. v. Hongkong Bank of Can.* (1990), 51 B.C.L.R. (2d) 84 (C.A.), at pp. 88-89; *Pacific National Lease Holding Corp., Re* (1992), 19 B.C.A.C. 134, 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, at para. 144, *per* Paperny J. (as she then was); *Air Canada, Re* (2003), 42 C.B.R. (4th) 173 (Ont. S.C.J.), at para. 3; *Air Canada, Re*, 2003 CanLII 49366 (Ont. S.C.J.), 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.

Il peut à cette fin suspendre les mesures d'exécution prises par les créanciers afin que le débiteur puisse continuer d'exploiter son entreprise, préserver le statu quo pendant que le débiteur prépare la transaction ou l'arrangement qu'il présentera aux créanciers et surveiller le processus et le mener jusqu'au point où il sera possible de dire s'il aboutira (voir, p. ex., *Chef Ready Foods Ltd. c. Hongkong Bank of Can.* (1990), 51 B.C.L.R. (2d) 84 (C.A.), p. 88-89; *Pacific National Lease Holding Corp., Re* (1992), 19 B.C.A.C. 134, par. 27). Ce faisant, le tribunal doit souvent déterminer les divers intérêts en jeu dans la réorganisation, lesquels peuvent fort bien ne pas se limiter aux seuls intérêts du débiteur et des créanciers, mais englober aussi ceux des employés, des administrateurs, des actionnaires et même de tiers qui font affaire avec la compagnie insolvable (voir, p. ex., *Canadian Airlines Corp., Re*, 2000 ABQB 442, 84 Alta. L.R. (3d) 9, par. 144, la juge Paperny (maintenant juge de la Cour d'appel); *Air Canada, Re* (2003), 42 C.B.R. (4th) 173 (C.S.J. Ont.), par. 3; *Air Canada, Re*, 2003 CanLII 49366 (C.S.J. Ont.), par. 13, le juge Farley; Sarra, *Creditor Rights*, p. 181-192 et 217-226). En outre, les tribunaux doivent reconnaître que, à l'occasion, certains aspects de la réorganisation concernent l'intérêt public et qu'il pourrait s'agir d'un facteur devant être pris en compte afin de décider s'il y a lieu d'autoriser une mesure donnée (voir, p. ex., *Canadian Red Cross Society/Société Canadienne de la Croix Rouge, Re* (2000), 19 C.B.R. (4th) 158 (C.S.J. Ont.), par. 2, le juge Blair (maintenant juge de la Cour d'appel); Sarra, *Creditor Rights*, p. 195-214).

[61] Quand de grandes entreprises éprouvent des difficultés, les réorganisations deviennent très complexes. Les tribunaux chargés d'appliquer la LACC ont ainsi été appelés à innover dans l'exercice de leur compétence et ne se sont pas limités à suspendre les procédures engagées contre le débiteur afin de lui permettre de procéder à une réorganisation. On leur a demandé de sanctionner des mesures non expressément prévues par la LACC. Sans dresser la liste complète des diverses mesures qui ont été prises par des tribunaux en vertu de la LACC, il est néanmoins utile d'en donner brièvement quelques exemples, pour bien illustrer la marge de manœuvre que la loi accorde à ceux-ci.

[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. Ct. (Gen. Div.)); *United Used Auto & Truck Parts Ltd., Re*, 2000 BCCA 146, 135 B.C.A.C. 96, aff'g (1999), 12 C.B.R. (4th) 144 (S.C.); 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

[62] L'utilisation la plus créative des pouvoirs conférés par la LACC est sans doute le fait que les tribunaux se montrent de plus en plus disposés à autoriser, après le dépôt des procédures, la constitution de sûretés pour financer le débiteur demeuré en possession des biens ou encore la constitution de charges super-prioritaires grevant l'actif du débiteur lorsque cela est nécessaire pour que ce dernier puisse continuer d'exploiter son entreprise pendant la réorganisation (voir, p. ex., *Skydome Corp., Re* (1998), 16 C.B.R. (4th) 118 (C. Ont. (Div. gén.)); *United Used Auto & Truck Parts Ltd., Re*, 2000 BCCA 146, 135 B.C.A.C. 96, conf. (1999), 12 C.B.R. (4th) 144 (C.S.); et, d'une manière générale, J. P. Sarra, *Rescue! The Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act* (2007), p. 93-115). La LACC a aussi été utilisée pour libérer des tiers des actions susceptibles d'être intentées contre eux, dans le cadre de l'approbation d'un plan global d'arrangement et de transaction, malgré les objections de certains créanciers dissidents (voir *Metcalfe & Mansfield*). Au départ, la nomination d'un contrôleur chargé de surveiller la réorganisation était elle aussi une mesure prise en vertu du pouvoir de surveillance conféré par la LACC, mais le législateur est intervenu et a modifié la loi pour rendre cette mesure obligatoire.

[63] L'esprit d'innovation dont ont fait montre les tribunaux pendant des procédures fondées sur la LACC n'a toutefois pas été sans susciter de controverses. Au moins deux des questions que soulève leur approche sont directement pertinentes en l'espèce : (1) Quelles sont les sources des pouvoirs dont dispose le tribunal pendant les procédures fondées sur la LACC? (2) Quelles sont les limites de ces pouvoirs?

[64] La première question porte sur la frontière entre les pouvoirs d'origine législative dont dispose le tribunal en vertu de la LACC et les pouvoirs résiduels dont jouit un tribunal en raison de sa compétence inhérente et de sa compétence en equity, lorsqu'il est question de surveiller une réorganisation. Pour justifier certaines mesures autorisées à l'occasion de procédures engagées sous le régime de la LACC, les tribunaux ont parfois prétendu se fonder sur leur compétence en equity dans le but

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, at paras. 45-47, *per* Newbury J.A.; *Stelco Inc. (Re)* (2005), 75 O.R. (3d) 5 (C.A.), at 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

de réaliser les objectifs de la Loi ou sur leur compétence inhérente afin de combler les lacunes de celle-ci. Or, dans de récentes décisions, des cours d’appel ont déconseillé aux tribunaux d’invoquer leur compétence inhérente, concluant qu’il est plus juste de dire que, dans la plupart des cas, les tribunaux ne font simplement qu’interpréter les pouvoirs se trouvant dans la LACC elle-même (voir, p. ex., *Skeena Cellulose Inc., Re*, 2003 BCCA 344, 13 B.C.L.R. (4th) 236, par. 45-47, la juge Newbury; *Stelco Inc. (Re)* (2005), 75 O.R. (3d) 5 (C.A.), par. 31-33, le juge Blair).

[65] Je suis d’accord avec la juge Georgina R. Jackson et la professeure Janis Sarra pour dire que la méthode la plus appropriée est une approche hiérarchisée. Suivant cette approche, les tribunaux procèdent d’abord à une interprétation des dispositions de la LACC avant d’invoquer leur compétence inhérente ou leur compétence en equity pour justifier des mesures prises dans le cadre d’une procédure fondée sur la LACC (voir G. R. Jackson et J. Sarra, « Selecting the Judicial Tool to get the Job Done : An Examination of Statutory Interpretation, Discretionary Power and Inherent Jurisdiction in Insolvency Matters », dans J. P. Sarra, dir., *Annual Review of Insolvency Law 2007* (2008), 41, p. 42). Selon ces auteures, pourvu qu’on lui donne l’interprétation téléologique et large qui s’impose, la LACC permettra dans la plupart des cas de justifier les mesures nécessaires à la réalisation de ses objectifs (p. 94).

[66] L’examen des parties pertinentes de la LACC et de l’évolution récente de la législation me font adhérer à ce point de vue jurisprudentiel et doctrinal : dans la plupart des cas, la décision de rendre une ordonnance durant une procédure fondée sur la LACC relève de l’interprétation législative. D’ailleurs, à cet égard, il faut souligner d’une façon particulière que le texte de loi dont il est question en l’espèce peut être interprété très largement.

[67] En vertu du pouvoir conféré initialement par la LACC, le tribunal pouvait, « chaque fois qu’une demande [était] faite sous le régime de la présente loi à l’égard d’une compagnie, [. . .] sur demande

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

d’un intéressé, [. . .] sous réserve des autres dispositions de la présente loi [. . .] rendre l’ordonnance prévue au présent article » (*LACC*, par. 11(1)). Cette formulation claire était très générale.

[68] Bien que ces dispositions ne soient pas strictement applicables en l’espèce, je signale à ce propos que le législateur a, dans des modifications récentes, apporté au texte du par. 11(1) un changement qui rend plus explicite le pouvoir discrétionnaire conféré au tribunal par la *LACC*. Ainsi, aux termes de l’art. 11 actuel de la *LACC*, le tribunal peut « rendre [. . .] sous réserve des restrictions prévues par la présente loi [. . .] toute ordonnance qu’il estime indiquée » (L.C. 2005, ch. 47, art. 128). Le législateur semble ainsi avoir jugé opportun de sanctionner l’interprétation large du pouvoir conféré par la *LACC* qui a été élaborée par la jurisprudence.

[69] De plus, la *LACC* prévoit explicitement certaines ordonnances. Tant à la suite d’une demande initiale que d’une demande subséquente, le tribunal peut, par ordonnance, suspendre ou interdire toute procédure contre le débiteur, ou surseoir à sa continuation. Il incombe à la personne qui demande une telle ordonnance de convaincre le tribunal qu’elle est indiquée et qu’il a agi et continue d’agir de bonne foi et avec la diligence voulue (*LACC*, par. 11(3), (4) et (6)).

[70] La possibilité pour le tribunal de rendre des ordonnances plus spécifiques n’a pas pour effet de restreindre la portée des termes généraux utilisés dans la *LACC*. Toutefois, l’opportunité, la bonne foi et la diligence sont des considérations de base que le tribunal devrait toujours garder à l’esprit lorsqu’il exerce les pouvoirs conférés par la *LACC*. Sous le régime de la *LACC*, le tribunal évalue l’opportunité de l’ordonnance demandée en déterminant si elle favorisera la réalisation des objectifs de politique générale qui sous-tendent la Loi. Il s’agit donc de savoir si cette ordonnance contribuera utilement à la réalisation de l’objectif réparateur de la *LACC* — à savoir éviter les pertes sociales et économiques résultant de la liquidation d’une compagnie insolvable. J’ajouterais que le critère de l’opportunité s’applique non seulement à l’objectif de l’ordonnance, mais aussi aux moyens utilisés. Les tribunaux

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*.

doivent se rappeler que les chances de succès d’une réorganisation sont meilleures lorsque les participants arrivent à s’entendre et que tous les intéressés sont traités de la façon la plus avantageuse et juste possible dans les circonstances.

[71] Il est bien établi qu’il est possible de mettre fin aux efforts déployés pour procéder à une réorganisation fondée sur la *LACC* et de lever la suspension des procédures contre le débiteur si la réorganisation est [TRADUCTION] « vouée à l’échec » (voir *Chef Ready*, p. 88; *Philip’s Manufacturing Ltd., Re* (1992), 9 C.B.R. (3d) 25 (C.A.C.-B.), par. 6-7). Cependant, quand l’ordonnance demandée contribue vraiment à la réalisation des objectifs de la *LACC*, le pouvoir discrétionnaire dont dispose le tribunal en vertu de cette loi l’habilite à rendre à cette ordonnance.

[72] L’analyse qui précède est utile pour répondre à la question de savoir si le tribunal avait, en vertu de la *LACC*, le pouvoir de maintenir la suspension des procédures à l’encontre de la Couronne, une fois qu’il est devenu évident que la réorganisation échouerait et que la faillite était inévitable.

[73] En Cour d’appel, le juge Tysoe a conclu que la *LACC* n’habilitait pas le tribunal à maintenir la suspension des mesures d’exécution de la Couronne à l’égard de la fiducie réputée visant la TPS après l’arrêt des efforts de réorganisation. Selon l’appelante, en tirant cette conclusion, le juge Tysoe a omis de tenir compte de l’objectif fondamental de la *LACC* et n’a pas donné à ce texte l’interprétation téléologique et large qu’il convient de lui donner et qui autorise le prononcé d’une telle ordonnance. La Couronne soutient que le juge Tysoe a conclu à bon droit que les termes impératifs de la *LTA* ne laissaient au tribunal d’autre choix que d’autoriser les mesures d’exécution à l’endroit de la fiducie réputée visant la TPS lorsqu’il a levé la suspension de procédures qui avait été ordonnée en application de la *LACC* afin de permettre au débiteur de faire cession de ses biens en vertu de la *LFI*. J’ai déjà traité de la question de savoir si la *LTA* a un effet contraignant dans une procédure fondée sur la *LACC*. Je vais maintenant traiter de la question de savoir si l’ordonnance était autorisée par la *LACC*.

[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

[74] Il n'est pas contesté que la *LACC* n'assujettit les procédures engagées sous son régime à aucune limite temporelle explicite qui interdirait au tribunal d'ordonner le maintien de la suspension des procédures engagées par la Couronne pour recouvrer la TPS, tout en levant temporairement la suspension générale des procédures prononcée pour permettre au débiteur de faire cession de ses biens.

[75] Il reste à se demander si l'ordonnance contribuait à la réalisation de l'objectif fondamental de la *LACC*. La Cour d'appel a conclu que non, parce que les efforts de réorganisation avaient pris fin et que, par conséquent, la *LACC* n'était plus d'aucune utilité. Je ne partage pas cette conclusion.

[76] Il ne fait aucun doute que si la réorganisation avait été entreprise sous le régime de la *LFI* plutôt qu'en vertu de la *LACC*, la Couronne aurait perdu la priorité que lui confère la fiducie réputée visant la TPS. De même, la Couronne ne conteste pas que, selon le plan de répartition prévu par la *LFI* en cas de faillite, cette fiducie réputée cesse de produire ses effets. Par conséquent, après l'échec de la réorganisation tentée sous le régime de la *LACC*, les créanciers auraient eu toutes les raisons de solliciter la mise en faillite immédiate du débiteur et la répartition de ses biens en vertu de la *LFI*. Pour pouvoir conclure que le pouvoir discrétionnaire dont dispose le tribunal ne l'autorise pas à lever partiellement la suspension des procédures afin de permettre la cession des biens, il faudrait présumer l'existence d'un hiatus entre la procédure fondée sur la *LACC* et celle fondée sur la *LFI*. L'ordonnance du juge en chef Brenner suspendant l'exécution des mesures de recouvrement de la Couronne à l'égard de la TPS faisait en sorte que les créanciers ne soient pas désavantagés par la tentative de réorganisation fondée sur la *LACC*. Cette ordonnance avait pour effet de dissuader les créanciers d'entraver une liquidation ordonnée et, de ce fait, elle contribuait à la réalisation des objectifs de la *LACC*, dans la mesure où elle établit une passerelle entre les procédures régies par la *LACC* d'une part et celles régies par la *LFI* d'autre part. Cette interprétation du pouvoir discrétionnaire du tribunal se trouve renforcée par

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

l'art. 20 de la *LACC*, qui précise que les dispositions de la Loi « peuvent être appliquées conjointement avec celles de toute loi fédérale [...] autorisant ou prévoyant l'homologation de transactions ou arrangements entre une compagnie et ses actionnaires ou une catégorie de ces derniers », par exemple la *LFI*. L'article 20 indique clairement que le législateur entend voir la *LACC* être appliquée *de concert* avec les autres lois concernant l'insolvabilité, telle la *LFI*.

[77] La *LACC* établit les conditions qui permettent de préserver le statu quo pendant qu'on tente de trouver un terrain d'entente entre les intéressés en vue d'une réorganisation qui soit juste pour tout le monde. Étant donné que, souvent, la seule autre solution est la faillite, les participants évaluent l'impact d'une réorganisation en regard de la situation qui serait la leur en cas de liquidation. En l'espèce, l'ordonnance favorisait une transition harmonieuse entre la réorganisation et la liquidation, tout en répondant à l'objectif — commun aux deux lois — qui consiste à avoir une seule procédure collective.

[78] À mon avis, le juge d'appel Tysoe a donc commis une erreur en considérant la *LACC* et la *LFI* comme des régimes distincts, séparés par un hiatus temporel, plutôt que comme deux lois faisant partie d'un ensemble intégré de règles du droit de l'insolvabilité. La décision du législateur de conserver deux régimes législatifs en matière de réorganisation, la *LFI* et la *LACC*, reflète le fait bien réel que des réorganisations de complexité différente requièrent des mécanismes légaux différents. En revanche, un seul régime législatif est jugé nécessaire pour la liquidation de l'actif d'un débiteur en faillite. Le passage de la *LACC* à la *LFI* peut exiger la levée partielle d'une suspension de procédures ordonnée en vertu de la *LACC*, de façon à permettre l'engagement des procédures fondées sur la *LFI*. Toutefois, comme l'a signalé le juge Laskin de la Cour d'appel de l'Ontario dans un litige semblable opposant des créanciers garantis et le Surintendant des services financiers de l'Ontario qui invoquait le bénéfice d'une fiducie réputée, [TRADUCTION] « [L]es deux lois sont

lost in bankruptcy (*Ivaco Inc. (Re)* (2006), 83 O.R. (3d) 108, 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

liées » et il n'existe entre elles aucun « hiatus » qui permettrait d'obtenir l'exécution, à l'issue de procédures engagées sous le régime de la *LACC*, de droits de propriété qui seraient perdus en cas de faillite (*Ivaco Inc. (Re)* (2006), 83 O.R. (3d) 108, par. 62-63).

[79] La priorité accordée aux réclamations de la Couronne fondées sur une fiducie réputée visant des retenues à la source n'affaiblit en rien cette conclusion. Comme ces fiducies réputées survivent tant sous le régime de la *LACC* que sous celui de la *LFI*, ce facteur n'a aucune incidence sur l'intérêt que pourraient avoir les créanciers à préférer une loi plutôt que l'autre. S'il est vrai que le tribunal agissant en vertu de la *LACC* dispose d'une grande latitude pour suspendre les réclamations fondée sur des fiducies réputées visant des retenues à la source, cette latitude n'en demeure pas moins soumise à des limitations particulières, applicables uniquement à ces fiducies réputées (*LACC*, art. 11.4). Par conséquent, si la réorganisation tentée sous le régime de la *LACC* échoue (p. ex. parce que le tribunal ou les créanciers refusent une proposition de réorganisation), la Couronne peut immédiatement présenter sa réclamation à l'égard des retenues à la source non versées. Mais il ne faut pas en conclure que cela compromet le passage harmonieux au régime de faillite ou crée le moindre « hiatus » entre la *LACC* et la *LFI*, car le fait est que, peu importe la loi en vertu de laquelle la réorganisation a été amorcée, les réclamations des créanciers auraient dans les deux cas été subordonnées à la priorité de la fiducie réputée de la Couronne à l'égard des retenues à la source.

[80] Abstraction faite des fiducies réputées visant les retenues à la source, c'est le mécanisme complet et exhaustif prévu par la *LFI* qui doit régir la répartition des biens du débiteur une fois que la liquidation est devenue inévitable. De fait, une transition ordonnée aux procédures de liquidation est obligatoire sous le régime de la *LFI* lorsqu'une proposition est rejetée par les créanciers. La *LACC* est muette à l'égard de cette transition, mais l'ampleur du pouvoir discrétionnaire conféré au tribunal par cette loi est suffisante pour établir une passerelle vers une liquidation opérée sous le régime

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.

de la *LFI*. Ce faisant, le tribunal doit veiller à ne pas perturber le plan de répartition établi par la *LFI*. La transition au régime de liquidation nécessite la levée partielle de la suspension des procédures ordonnée en vertu de la *LACC*, afin de permettre l'introduction de procédures en vertu de la *LFI*. Il ne faudrait pas que cette indispensable levée partielle de la suspension des procédures provoque une ruée des créanciers vers le palais de justice pour l'obtention d'une priorité inexistante sous le régime de la *LFI*.

[81] Je conclus donc que le juge en chef Brenner avait, en vertu de la *LACC*, le pouvoir de lever la suspension des procédures afin de permettre la transition au régime de liquidation.

3.4 *Fiducie expresse*

[82] La dernière question à trancher en l'espèce est celle de savoir si le juge en chef Brenner a créé une fiducie expresse en faveur de la Couronne quand il a ordonné, le 29 avril 2008, que le produit de la vente des biens de LeRoy Trucking — jusqu'à concurrence des sommes de TPS non remises — soit détenu dans le compte en fiducie du contrôleur jusqu'à ce que l'issue de la réorganisation soit connue. Un autre motif invoqué par le juge Tysoe de la Cour d'appel pour accueillir l'appel interjeté par la Couronne était que, selon lui, celle-ci était effectivement la bénéficiaire d'une fiducie expresse. Je ne peux souscrire à cette conclusion.

[83] La création d'une fiducie expresse exige la présence de trois certitudes : certitude d'intention, certitude de matière et certitude d'objet. Les fiducies expresses ou « fiducies au sens strict » découlent des actes et des intentions du constituant et se distinguent des autres fiducies découlant de l'effet de la loi (voir D. W. M. Waters, M. R. Gillen et L. D. Smith, dir., *Waters' Law of Trusts in Canada* (3^e éd. 2005), p. 28-29, particulièrement la note en bas de page 42).

[84] En l'espèce, il n'existe aucune certitude d'objet (c.-à-d. relative au bénéficiaire) pouvant être inférée de l'ordonnance prononcée le 29 avril 2008 par le tribunal et suffisante pour donner naissance à une fiducie expresse.

[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

[85] Au moment où l'ordonnance a été rendue, il y avait un différend entre Century Services et la Couronne au sujet d'une partie du produit de la vente des biens du débiteur. La solution retenue par le tribunal a consisté à accepter, selon la proposition de LeRoy Trucking, que la somme en question soit détenue séparément jusqu'à ce que le différend puisse être réglé. Par conséquent, il n'existait aucune certitude que la Couronne serait véritablement le bénéficiaire ou l'objet de la fiducie.

[86] Le fait que le compte choisi pour conserver séparément la somme en question était le compte en fiducie du contrôleur n'a pas à lui seul un effet tel qu'il suppléerait à l'absence d'un bénéficiaire certain. De toute façon, suivant l'interprétation du par. 18.3(1) de la LACC dégagée précédemment, aucun différend ne saurait même exister quant à la priorité de rang, étant donné que la priorité accordée aux réclamations de la Couronne fondées sur la fiducie réputée visant la TPS ne s'applique pas sous le régime de la LACC et que la Couronne est reléguée au rang de créancier non garanti à l'égard des sommes en question. Cependant, il se peut fort bien que le juge en chef Brenner ait estimé que, conformément à l'arrêt *Ottawa Senators*, la créance de la Couronne à l'égard de la TPS demeurerait effective si la réorganisation aboutissait, ce qui ne serait pas le cas si le passage au processus de liquidation régi par la LFI était autorisé. Une somme équivalente à cette créance serait ainsi mise de côté jusqu'à ce que le résultat de la réorganisation soit connu.

[87] Par conséquent, l'incertitude entourant l'issue de la restructuration tentée sous le régime de la LACC exclut l'existence d'une certitude permettant de conférer de manière permanente à la Couronne un intérêt bénéficiaire sur la somme en question. Cela ressort clairement des motifs exposés de vive voix par le juge en chef Brenner le 29 avril 2008, lorsqu'il a dit : [TRADUCTION] « Comme il est notoire que [des procédures fondées sur la LACC] peuvent échouer et que cela entraîne des faillites, le maintien du statu quo en l'espèce me semble militer en faveur de l'acceptation de la proposition d'ordonner au contrôleur de détenir ces fonds en fiducie. » Il y avait donc manifestement un doute quant à la question de savoir qui au juste pourrait toucher l'argent

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.

The following are the reasons delivered by

FISH J. —

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*").

en fin de compte. L'ordonnance ultérieure du juge en chef Brenner — dans laquelle ce dernier a rejeté, le 3 septembre 2008, la demande de la Couronne sollicitant le bénéfice de la fiducie présumée après qu'il fut devenu évident que la faillite était inévitable — confirme l'absence du bénéficiaire certain sans lequel il ne saurait y avoir de fiducie expresse.

4. Conclusion

[88] Je conclus que le juge en chef Brenner avait, en vertu de la *LACC*, le pouvoir discrétionnaire de maintenir la suspension de la demande de la Couronne sollicitant le bénéfice de la fiducie réputée visant la TPS, tout en levant par ailleurs la suspension des procédures de manière à permettre à LeRoy Trucking de faire cession de ses biens. Ma conclusion selon laquelle le par. 18.3(1) de la *LACC* neutralisait la fiducie réputée visant la TPS pendant la durée des procédures fondées sur cette loi confirme que les pouvoirs discrétionnaires exercés par le tribunal en vertu de l'art. 11 n'étaient pas limités par la priorité invoquée par la Couronne au titre de la TPS, puisqu'il n'existe aucune priorité de la sorte sous le régime de la *LACC*.

[89] Pour ces motifs, je suis d'avis d'accueillir le pourvoi et de déclarer que la somme de 305 202,30 \$ perçue par LeRoy Trucking au titre de la TPS mais non encore versée au receveur général du Canada ne fait l'objet d'aucune fiducie réputée ou priorité en faveur de la Couronne. Cette somme ne fait pas non plus l'objet d'une fiducie expresse. Les dépens sont accordés à l'égard du présent pourvoi et de l'appel interjeté devant la juridiction inférieure.

Version française des motifs rendus par

LE JUGE FISH —

I

[90] Je souscris dans l'ensemble aux motifs de la juge Deschamps et je disposerais du pourvoi comme elle le propose.

[91] Plus particulièrement, je me rallie à son interprétation de la portée du pouvoir discrétionnaire conféré au juge par l'art. 11 de la *Loi sur les arrangements avec les créanciers des compagnies*, L.R.C.

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).

[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 (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.

1985, ch. C-36 (« *LACC* »). Je partage en outre sa conclusion suivant laquelle le juge en chef Brenner n'a pas créé de fiducie expresse en faveur de la Couronne en ordonnant que les sommes recueillies au titre de la TPS soient détenues séparément dans le compte en fiducie du contrôleur (2008 BCSC 1805, [2008] G.S.T.C. 221).

[92] J'estime néanmoins devoir ajouter de brefs motifs qui me sont propres au sujet de l'interaction entre la *LACC* et la *Loi sur la taxe d'accise*, L.R.C. 1985, ch. E-15 (« *LTA* »).

[93] En maintenant, malgré l'existence des procédures d'insolvabilité, la validité de fiducies réputées créées en vertu de la *LTA*, l'arrêt *Ottawa Senators Hockey Club Corp. (Re)* (2005), 73 O.R. (3d) 737 (C.A.), et les décisions rendues dans sa foulée ont eu pour effet de protéger indûment des droits de la Couronne que le Parlement avait lui-même choisi de subordonner à d'autres créances prioritaires. À mon avis, il convient en l'espèce de rompre nettement avec ce courant jurisprudentiel.

[94] La juge Deschamps expose d'importantes raisons d'ordre historique et d'intérêt général à l'appui de cette position et je n'ai rien à ajouter à cet égard. Je tiens toutefois à expliquer pourquoi une analyse comparative de certaines dispositions législatives connexes vient renforcer la conclusion à laquelle ma collègue et moi-même en arrivons.

[95] Au cours des dernières années, le législateur fédéral a procédé à un examen approfondi du régime canadien d'insolvabilité. Il a refusé de modifier les dispositions qui sont en cause dans la présente affaire. Il ne nous appartient pas de nous interroger sur les raisons de ce choix. Nous devons plutôt considérer la décision du législateur de maintenir en vigueur les dispositions en question comme un exercice délibéré du pouvoir discrétionnaire de légiférer, pouvoir qui est exclusivement le sien. Avec égards, je rejette le point de vue suivant lequel nous devrions plutôt qualifier l'apparente contradiction entre le par. 18.3(1) (maintenant le par. 37(1)) de la *LACC* et l'art. 222 de la *LTA* d'anomalie rédactionnelle ou de lacune législative susceptible d'être corrigée par un tribunal.

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:

(4) 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) 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

II

[96] Dans le contexte du régime canadien d’insolvabilité, on conclut à l’existence d’une fiducie réputée uniquement lorsque deux éléments complémentaires sont réunis : en premier lieu, une disposition législative qui *crée* la fiducie et, en second lieu, une disposition de la *LACC* ou de la *Loi sur la faillite et l’insolvabilité*, L.R.C. 1985, ch. B-3 (« *LFI* ») qui *confirme* l’existence de la fiducie ou la maintient explicitement en vigueur.

[97] Cette interprétation se retrouve dans trois lois fédérales, qui renferment toutes une disposition relative aux fiducies réputées dont le libellé offre une ressemblance frappante avec celui de l’art. 222 de la *LTA*.

[98] La première est la *Loi de l’impôt sur le revenu*, L.R.C. 1985, ch. 1 (5^e suppl.) (« *LIR* »), dont le par. 227(4) *crée* une fiducie réputée :

(4) Toute personne qui déduit ou retient un montant en vertu de la présente loi est réputée, malgré toute autre garantie au sens du paragraphe 224(1.3) le concernant, le détenir en fiducie pour Sa Majesté, séparé de ses propres biens et des biens détenus par son créancier garanti au sens de ce paragraphe qui, en l’absence de la garantie, seraient ceux de la personne, et en vue de le verser à Sa Majesté selon les modalités et dans le délai prévus par la présente loi. [Dans la présente citation et dans celles qui suivent, les soulignements sont évidemment de moi.]

[99] Dans le paragraphe suivant, le législateur prend la peine de bien préciser que toute disposition législative fédérale ou provinciale à l’effet contraire n’a aucune incidence sur la fiducie ainsi constituée :

(4.1) Malgré les autres dispositions de la présente loi, la *Loi sur la faillite et l’insolvabilité* (sauf ses articles 81.1 et 81.2), tout autre texte législatif fédéral ou provincial ou toute règle de droit, en cas de non-versement à Sa Majesté, selon les modalités et dans le délai prévus par la présente loi, d’un montant qu’une personne est réputée par le paragraphe (4) détenir en fiducie pour Sa Majesté, les biens de la personne [. . .] d’une valeur égale à ce montant sont réputés :

a) être détenus en fiducie pour Sa Majesté, à compter du moment où le montant est déduit ou retenu,

apart from the property of the person, in trust for Her Majesty whether or not the property is subject to such a security interest, . . .

séparés des propres biens de la personne, qu'ils soient ou non assujettis à une telle garantie;

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

. . . et le produit découlant de ces biens est payé au receveur général par priorité sur une telle garantie.

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

[100] Le maintien en vigueur de cette fiducie réputée est expressément *confirmé* à l'art. 18.3 de la LACC :

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.

18.3(1) Sous réserve du paragraphe (2) et par dérogation à toute disposition législative fédérale ou provinciale ayant pour effet d'assimiler certains biens à des biens détenus en fiducie pour Sa Majesté, aucun des biens de la compagnie débitrice ne peut être considéré comme détenu en fiducie pour Sa Majesté si, en l'absence de la disposition législative en question, il ne le serait pas.

(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* . . .

(2) Le paragraphe (1) ne s'applique pas à l'égard des montants réputés détenus en fiducie aux termes des paragraphes 227(4) ou (4.1) de la *Loi de l'impôt sur le revenu*, des paragraphes 23(3) ou (4) du *Régime de pensions du Canada* ou des paragraphes 86(2) ou (2.1) de la *Loi sur l'assurance-emploi* . . .

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

[101] L'application de la fiducie réputée prévue par la *LIR* est également confirmée par l'art. 67 de la *LFI* :

(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.

(2) Sous réserve du paragraphe (3) et par dérogation à toute disposition législative fédérale ou provinciale ayant pour effet d'assimiler certains biens à des biens détenus en fiducie pour Sa Majesté, aucun des biens du failli ne peut, pour l'application de l'alinéa (1)a), être considéré comme détenu en fiducie pour Sa Majesté si, en l'absence de la disposition législative en question, il ne le serait pas.

(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* . . .

(3) Le paragraphe (2) ne s'applique pas à l'égard des montants réputés détenus en fiducie aux termes des paragraphes 227(4) ou (4.1) de la *Loi de l'impôt sur le revenu*, des paragraphes 23(3) ou (4) du *Régime de pensions du Canada* ou des paragraphes 86(2) ou (2.1) de la *Loi sur l'assurance-emploi* . . .

[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.

[102] Par conséquent, le législateur a *créé*, puis *confirmé le maintien en vigueur* de la fiducie réputée établie par la *LIR* en faveur de Sa Majesté *tant* sous le régime de la *LACC* *que* sous celui de la *LFI*.

[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) of the *CCAA* and in s. 67(3) of 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) 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

[103] La deuxième loi fédérale où l’on retrouve ce mécanisme est le *Régime de pensions du Canada*, L.R.C. 1985, ch. C-8 (« *RPC* »). À l’article 23, le législateur crée une fiducie réputée en faveur de la Couronne et précise qu’elle existe malgré les dispositions contraires de toute autre loi fédérale. Enfin, la *Loi sur l’assurance-emploi*, L.C. 1996, ch. 23 (« *LAE* »), crée dans des termes quasi identiques, une fiducie réputée en faveur de la Couronne : voir les par. 86(2) et (2.1).

[104] Comme nous l’avons vu, le maintien en vigueur des fiducies réputées créées en vertu de ces dispositions de la *LIR*, du *RPC* et de la *LAE* est confirmé au par. 18.3(2) de la *LACC* et au par. 67(3) de la *LFI*. Dans les trois cas, le législateur a exprimé en termes clairs et explicites sa volonté de voir la fiducie réputée établie en faveur de la Couronne produire ses effets pendant le déroulement de la procédure d’insolvabilité.

[105] La situation est différente dans le cas de la fiducie réputée créée par la *LTA*. Bien que le législateur crée en faveur de la Couronne une fiducie réputée dans laquelle seront conservées les sommes recueillies au titre de la TPS mais non encore versées, et bien qu’il prétende maintenir cette fiducie en vigueur malgré les dispositions à l’effet contraire de toute loi fédérale ou provinciale, il ne *confirme* pas l’existence de la fiducie — ni ne prévoit expressément le maintien en vigueur de celle-ci — dans la *LFI* ou dans la *LACC*. Le second des deux éléments obligatoires que j’ai mentionnés fait donc défaut, ce qui témoigne de l’intention du législateur de laisser la fiducie réputée devenir caduque au moment de l’introduction de la procédure d’insolvabilité.

[106] Le texte des dispositions en cause de la *LTA* est substantiellement identique à celui des dispositions de la *LIR*, du *RPC* et de la *LAE* :

222. (1) La personne qui perçoit un montant au titre de la taxe prévue à la section II est réputée, à toutes fins utiles et malgré tout droit en garantie le concernant, le détenir en fiducie pour Sa Majesté du chef du Canada, séparé de ses propres biens et des biens détenus par ses créanciers garantis qui, en l’absence du droit en garantie, seraient ceux de la personne, jusqu’à ce qu’il soit

security interest, would be property of the person, until the amount is remitted to the Receiver General or withdrawn under subsection (2).

. . .

(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

(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, at para. 37). *All* of the deemed trust

versé au receveur général ou retiré en application du paragraphe (2).

. . .

(3) Malgré les autres dispositions de la présente loi (sauf le paragraphe (4) du présent article), tout autre texte législatif fédéral (sauf la *Loi sur la faillite et l'insolvabilité*), tout texte législatif provincial ou toute autre règle de droit, lorsqu'un montant qu'une personne est réputée par le paragraphe (1) détenir en fiducie pour Sa Majesté du chef du Canada n'est pas versé au receveur général ni retiré selon les modalités et dans le délai prévus par la présente partie, les biens de la personne — y compris les biens détenus par ses créanciers garantis qui, en l'absence du droit en garantie, seraient ses biens — d'une valeur égale à ce montant sont réputés :

a) être détenus en fiducie pour Sa Majesté du chef du Canada, à compter du moment où le montant est perçu par la personne, séparés des propres biens de la personne, qu'ils soient ou non assujettis à un droit en garantie;

. . .

. . . et le produit découlant de ces biens est payé au receveur général par priorité sur tout droit en garantie.

[107] Pourtant, aucune disposition de la *LACC* ne prévoit le maintien en vigueur de la fiducie réputée une fois que la *LACC* entre en jeu.

[108] En résumé, le législateur a imposé *deux* conditions explicites — ou « composantes de base » — devant être réunies pour que survivent, sous le régime de la *LACC*, les fiducies réputées qui ont été établies par la *LIR*, le *RPC* et la *LAE*. S'il avait voulu préserver de la même façon, sous le régime de la *LACC*, les fiducies réputées qui sont établies par la *LTA*, il aurait inséré dans la *LACC* le type de disposition confirmatoire qui maintient explicitement en vigueur d'autres fiducies réputées.

[109] Avec égards pour l'opinion contraire exprimée par le juge Tysoe de la Cour d'appel, je ne trouve pas [TRADUCTION] « inconcevable que le législateur, lorsqu'il a adopté la version actuelle du par. 222(3) de la *LTA*, ait désigné expressément la *LFI* comme une exception sans envisager que la *LACC* puisse constituer une deuxième exception » (2009 BCCA

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

205, 98 B.C.L.R. (4th) 242, par. 37). *Toutes* les dispositions établissant des fiducies réputées qui sont reproduites ci-dessus font explicitement mention de la *LFI*. L'article 222 de la *LTA* ne rompt pas avec ce modèle. Compte tenu du libellé presque identique des quatre dispositions établissant une fiducie réputée, il aurait d'ailleurs été étonnant que le législateur ne fasse aucune mention de la *LFI* dans la *LTA*.

[110] L'intention du législateur était manifestement de rendre inopérantes les fiducies réputées visant la TPS dès l'introduction d'une procédure d'insolvabilité. Par conséquent, l'art. 222 mentionne la *LFI* de manière à l'*exclure* de son champ d'application — et non de l'y *inclure*, comme le font la *LIR*, le *RPC* et la *LAE*.

[111] En revanche, je constate qu'*aucune* de ces lois ne mentionne expressément la *LACC*. La mention explicite de la *LFI* dans ces textes n'a aucune incidence sur leur interaction avec la *LACC*. Là encore, ce sont les dispositions confirmatoires que l'on trouve *dans les lois sur l'insolvabilité* qui déterminent si une fiducie réputée continuera d'exister durant une procédure d'insolvabilité.

[112] Enfin, j'estime que les juges siégeant en leur cabinet ne devraient pas, comme cela s'est produit en l'espèce, ordonner que les sommes perçues au titre de la TPS soient détenues séparément dans le compte en fiducie du contrôleur pendant le déroulement d'une procédure fondée sur la *LACC*. Il résulte du raisonnement de la juge Deschamps que les réclamations de TPS deviennent des créances non garanties sous le régime de la *LACC*. Le législateur a délibérément décidé de supprimer certaines superpriorités accordées à la Couronne pendant l'insolvabilité; nous sommes en présence de l'un de ces cas.

III

[113] Pour les motifs qui précèdent, je suis d'avis, à l'instar de la juge Deschamps, d'accueillir le pourvoi avec dépens devant notre Cour et devant les juridictions inférieures, et d'ordonner que la somme de 305 202,30 \$ — qui a été perçue par LeRoy Trucking

be subject to no deemed trust or priority in favour of the Crown.

The following are the reasons delivered by

[114] ABELLA J. (dissenting) — The central issue in this appeal is whether s. 222 of the *Excise Tax Act*, R.S.C. 1985, c. E-15 (“ETA”), 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:

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.

au titre de la TPS mais n’a pas encore été versée au receveur général du Canada — ne fasse l’objet d’aucune fiducie réputée ou priorité en faveur de la Couronne.

Version française des motifs rendus par

[114] LA JUGE ABELLA (dissidente) — La question qui est au cœur du présent pourvoi est celle de savoir si l’art. 222 de la *Loi sur la taxe d’accise*, L.R.C. 1985, ch. E-15 (« *LTA* »), et plus particulièrement le par. 222(3), donnent préséance, dans le cadre d’une procédure relevant de la *Loi sur les arrangements avec les créanciers des compagnies*, L.R.C. 1985, ch. C-36 (« *LACC* »), à la fiducie réputée qui est établie en faveur de la Couronne à l’égard de la TPS non versée. À l’instar du juge Tysoe de la Cour d’appel, j’estime que tel est le cas. Il s’ensuit, à mon avis, que le pouvoir discrétionnaire conféré au tribunal par l’art. 11 de la *LACC* est circonscrit en conséquence.

[115] L’article 11¹ de la *LACC* disposait :

11. (1) Malgré toute disposition de la *Loi sur la faillite et l’insolvabilité* ou de la *Loi sur les liquidations*, chaque fois qu’une demande est faite sous le régime de la présente loi à l’égard d’une compagnie, le tribunal, sur demande d’un intéressé, peut, sous réserve des autres dispositions de la présente loi et avec ou sans avis, rendre l’ordonnance prévue au présent article.

Pour être en mesure de déterminer la portée du pouvoir discrétionnaire conféré au tribunal par l’art. 11, il est nécessaire de trancher d’abord la question de la priorité. Le paragraphe 222(3), la disposition de la *LTA* en cause en l’espèce, prévoit ce qui suit :

¹ L’article 11 a été modifié et le texte modifié, qui est entré en vigueur le 18 septembre 2009, est rédigé ainsi :

11. Malgré toute disposition de la *Loi sur la faillite et l’insolvabilité* ou de la *Loi sur les liquidations et les restructurations*, le tribunal peut, dans le cas de toute demande sous le régime de la présente loi à l’égard d’une compagnie débitrice, rendre, sur demande d’un intéressé, mais sous réserve des restrictions prévues par la présente loi et avec ou sans avis, toute ordonnance qu’il estime indiquée.

(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

(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 (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

(3) Malgré les autres dispositions de la présente loi (sauf le paragraphe (4) du présent article), tout autre texte législatif fédéral (sauf la *Loi sur la faillite et l'insolvabilité*), tout texte législatif provincial ou toute autre règle de droit, lorsqu'un montant qu'une personne est réputée par le paragraphe (1) détenir en fiducie pour Sa Majesté du chef du Canada n'est pas versé au receveur général ni retiré selon les modalités et dans le délai prévus par la présente partie, les biens de la personne — y compris les biens détenus par ses créanciers garantis qui, en l'absence du droit en garantie, seraient ses biens — d'une valeur égale à ce montant sont réputés :

a) être détenus en fiducie pour Sa Majesté du chef du Canada, à compter du moment où le montant est perçu par la personne, séparés des propres biens de la personne, qu'ils soient ou non assujettis à un droit en garantie;

b) ne pas faire partie du patrimoine ou des biens de la personne à compter du moment où le montant est perçu, que ces biens aient été ou non tenus séparés de ses propres biens ou de son patrimoine et qu'ils soient ou non assujettis à un droit en garantie.

Ces biens sont des biens dans lesquels Sa Majesté du chef du Canada a un droit de bénéficiaire malgré tout autre droit en garantie sur ces biens ou sur le produit en découlant, et le produit découlant de ces biens est payé au receveur général par priorité sur tout droit en garantie.

[116] Selon Century Services, la disposition dérogatoire générale de la *LACC*, le par. 18.3(1), l'emportait, et les dispositions déterminatives à l'art. 222 de la *LTA* étaient par conséquent inapplicables dans le cadre d'une procédure fondée sur la *LACC*. Le paragraphe 18.3(1) dispose :

18.3 (1) ... [P]ar dérogation à toute disposition législative fédérale ou provinciale ayant pour effet d'assimiler certains biens à des biens détenus en fiducie pour Sa Majesté, aucun des biens de la compagnie débitrice ne peut être considéré comme détenu en fiducie pour Sa Majesté si, en l'absence de la disposition législative en question, il ne le serait pas.

[117] Ainsi que l'a fait observer le juge d'appel MacPherson, dans l'arrêt *Ottawa Senators Hockey Club Corp. (Re)* (2005), 73 O.R. (3d) 737 (C.A.), le par. 222(3) de la *LTA* [TRADUCTION] « entre nettement en conflit » avec le par. 18.3(1) de la *LACC* (para. 31). Essentiellement, la résolution du conflit entre ces deux dispositions requiert à mon sens une

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

opération relativement simple d’interprétation des lois : Est-ce que les termes employés révèlent une intention claire du législateur? À mon avis, c’est le cas. Le texte de la disposition créant une fiducie réputée, soit le par. 222(3) de la *LTA*, précise sans ambiguïté que cette disposition s’applique malgré toute autre règle de droit sauf la *Loi sur la faillite et l’insolvabilité*, L.R.C. 1985, ch. B-3 (« *LFI* »).

[118] En excluant explicitement une seule loi du champ d’application du par. 222(3) et en déclarant de façon non équivoque qu’il s’applique malgré toute autre loi ou règle de droit au Canada *sauf* la *LFI*, le législateur a défini la portée de cette disposition dans des termes on ne peut plus clairs. Je souscris sans réserve aux propos suivants du juge d’appel MacPherson dans l’arrêt *Ottawa Senators* :

[TRADUCTION] L’intention du législateur au par. 222(3) de la *LTA* est claire. En cas de conflit avec « tout autre texte législatif fédéral (sauf la *Loi sur la faillite et l’insolvabilité*) », c’est le par. 222(3) qui l’emporte. En employant ces mots, le législateur fédéral a fait deux choses : il a décidé que le par. 222(3) devait l’emporter sur tout autre texte législatif fédéral et, fait important, il a abordé la question des exceptions à cette préséance en en mentionnant une seule, la *Loi sur la faillite et l’insolvabilité* [. . .] La *LFI* et la *LACC* sont des lois fédérales étroitement liées entre elles. Je ne puis concevoir que le législateur ait pu mentionner expressément la *LFI* à titre d’exception, mais ait involontairement omis de considérer la *LACC* comme une deuxième exception possible. À mon avis, le fait que la *LACC* ne soit pas mentionnée au par. 222(3) de la *LTA* était presque assurément une omission mûrement réfléchie de la part du législateur. [par. 43]

[119] L’opinion du juge d’appel MacPherson suivant laquelle le fait que la *LACC* n’ait pas été soustraite à l’application de la *LTA* témoigne d’une intention claire du législateur est confortée par la façon dont la *LACC* a par la suite été modifiée après l’édiction du par. 18.3(1) en 1997. En 2000, lorsque le par. 222(3) de la *LTA* est entré en vigueur, des modifications ont également été apportées à la *LACC*, mais le par. 18.3(1) de cette loi n’a pas été modifié.

[120] L’absence de modification du par. 18.3(1) vaut d’être soulignée, car elle a eu pour effet de maintenir le statu quo législatif, malgré les

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). 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 *Tele-Mobile Co. v. Ontario*, 2008 SCC 12, [2008] 1 S.C.R. 305, 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]

demandes répétées de divers groupes qui souhaitaient que cette disposition soit modifiée pour aligner l'ordre de priorité établi par la *LACC* sur celui de la *LFI*. En 2002, par exemple, lorsque Industrie Canada a procédé à l'examen de la *LFI* et de la *LACC*, l'Institut d'insolvabilité du Canada et l'Association canadienne des professionnels de l'insolvabilité et de la réorganisation ont recommandé que les règles de la *LFI* en matière de priorité soient étendues à la *LACC* (Joint Task Force on Business Insolvency Law Reform, *Report* (15 mars 2002), ann. B, proposition 71). Ces recommandations ont été reprises en 2003 par le Comité sénatorial permanent des banques et du commerce dans son rapport intitulé *Les débiteurs et les créanciers doivent se partager le fardeau : Examen de la Loi sur la faillite et l'insolvabilité et de la Loi sur les arrangements avec les créanciers des compagnies*, ainsi qu'en 2005 par le Legislative Review Task Force (Commercial) de l'Institut d'insolvabilité du Canada et de l'Association canadienne des professionnels de l'insolvabilité et de la réorganisation dans son *Report on the Commercial Provisions of Bill C-55*, et en 2007 par l'Institut d'insolvabilité du Canada dans un mémoire soumis au Comité sénatorial permanent des banques et du commerce au sujet de réformes alors envisagées.

[121] La *LFI* demeure néanmoins la seule loi soustraite à l'application du par. 222(3) de la *LTA*. Même à la suite de l'arrêt rendu en 2005 dans l'affaire *Ottawa Senators*, qui a confirmé que la *LTA* l'emportait sur la *LACC*, le législateur n'est pas intervenu. Cette absence de réaction de sa part me paraît tout aussi pertinente en l'espèce que dans l'arrêt *Société Télé-Mobile c. Ontario*, 2008 CSC 12, [2008] 1 R.C.S. 305, où la Cour a déclaré ceci :

Le silence du législateur n'est pas nécessairement déterminant quant à son intention, mais en l'espèce, il répond à la demande pressante de Telus et des autres entreprises et organisations intéressées que la loi prévoie expressément la possibilité d'un remboursement des frais raisonnables engagés pour communiquer des éléments de preuve conformément à une ordonnance. L'historique législatif confirme selon moi que le législateur n'a pas voulu qu'une indemnité soit versée pour l'obtempération à une ordonnance de communication. [par. 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 (*generalia specialibus non derogant*).

[122] Tout ce qui précède permet clairement d’inférer que le législateur a délibérément choisi de soustraire la fiducie réputée établie au par. 222(3) à l’application du par. 18.3(1) de la LACC.

[123] Je ne vois pas non plus 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. Je ne saurais expliquer mieux que ne l’a fait le juge d’appel Tysoe les raisons pour lesquelles l’argument invoquant des considérations de politique générale ne peut, selon moi, être retenu en l’espèce. Je vais donc reprendre à mon compte ses propos à ce sujet :

[TRADUCTION] Je ne conteste pas qu’il existe des raisons de politique générale valables qui justifient d’inciter les entreprises insolvables à tenter de se restructurer de façon à pouvoir continuer à exercer leurs activités avec le moins de perturbations possibles pour leurs employés et pour les autres intéressés. Les tribunaux peuvent légitimement tenir compte de telles considérations de politique générale, mais seulement si elles ont trait à une question que le législateur n’a pas examinée. Or, dans le cas qui nous occupe, il y a lieu de présumer que le législateur a tenu compte de considérations de politique générale lorsqu’il a adopté les modifications susmentionnées à la LACC et à la LTA. Comme le juge MacPherson le fait observer au par. 43 de l’arrêt *Ottawa Senators*, il est inconcevable que le législateur, lorsqu’il a adopté la version actuelle du par. 222(3) de la LTA, ait désigné expressément la LFI comme une exception sans envisager que la LACC puisse constituer une deuxième exception. Je signale par ailleurs que les modifications apportées en 1992 à la LFI ont permis de rendre les propositions concordataires opposables aux créanciers garantis et que, malgré la plus grande souplesse de la LACC, il est possible pour une compagnie insolvable de se restructurer sous le régime de la LFI. [par. 37]

[124] Bien que je sois d’avis que la clarté des termes employés au par. 222(3) tranche la question, j’estime également que cette conclusion est même renforcée par l’application d’autres principes d’interprétation. Dans leurs observations, les parties indiquent que les principes suivants étaient, selon elles, particulièrement pertinents : la Couronne a invoqué le principe voulant que la loi « postérieure » l’emporte; Century Services a fondé son argumentation sur le principe de la préséance de la loi spécifique sur la loi générale (*generalia 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 v. Verdun (City)*, [1997] 2 S.C.R. 862).

[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:

... the 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

[125] Le principe de la préséance de la « loi postérieure » accorde la priorité à la loi la plus récente, au motif que le législateur est présumé connaître le contenu des lois alors en vigueur. Si, dans la loi nouvelle, le législateur adopte une règle inconciliable avec une règle préexistante, on conclura qu’il a entendu déroger à celle-ci (Ruth Sullivan, *Sullivan on the Construction of Statutes* (5^e éd. 2008), p. 346-347; Pierre-André Côté, *The Interpretation of Legislation in Canada* (3^e éd. 2000), p. 358).

[126] L’exception à cette supplantation présumée des dispositions législatives préexistantes incompatibles réside dans le principe exprimé par la maxime *generalia specialibus non derogant* selon laquelle une disposition générale plus récente n’est pas réputée déroger à une loi spéciale antérieure (Côté, p. 359). Comme dans le jeu des poupées russes, cette exception comporte elle-même une exception. En effet, une disposition spécifique antérieure peut dans les faits être « supplannée » par une loi ultérieure de portée générale si le législateur, par les mots qu’il a employés, a exprimé l’intention de faire prévaloir la loi générale (*Doré c. Verdun (Ville)*, [1997] 2 R.C.S. 862).

[127] Ces principes d’interprétation visent principalement à faciliter la détermination de l’intention du législateur, comme l’a confirmé le juge d’appel MacPherson dans l’arrêt *Ottawa Senators*, au par. 42 :

[TRADUCTION] ... en matière d’interprétation des lois, la règle cardinale est la suivante : les dispositions législatives doivent être interprétées de manière à donner effet à l’intention du législateur lorsqu’il a adopté la loi. Cette règle fondamentale l’emporte sur toutes les maximes, outils ou canons d’interprétation législative, y compris la maxime suivant laquelle le particulier l’emporte sur le général (*generalia specialibus non derogant*). Comme l’a expliqué le juge Hudson dans l’arrêt *Canada c. Williams*, [1944] R.C.S. 226, [...] à la p. 239 ... :

On invoque la maxime *generalia specialibus non derogant* comme une règle qui devrait trancher la question. Or cette maxime, qui n’est pas une règle de droit mais un principe d’interprétation, cède le pas

legislature, if such intention can reasonably be gathered from all of the relevant legislation.

(See also Côté, at p. 358, and Pierre-Andre 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 *Attorney General of Canada v. Public Service Staff Relations Board*, [1977] 2 F.C. 663, dealing with the predecessor provision to s. 44(f)). It directs that new enactments not be construed as

devant l'intention du législateur, s'il est raisonnablement possible de la dégager de l'ensemble des dispositions législatives pertinentes.

(Voir aussi Côté, p. 358, et Pierre-André Côté, avec la collaboration de S. Beaulac et M. Devinat, *Interprétation des lois* (4^e éd. 2009), par. 1335.)

[128] J'accepte l'argument de la Couronne suivant lequel le principe de la loi « postérieure » est déterminant en l'espèce. Comme le par. 222(3) de la *LTA* a été édicté en 2000 et que le par. 18.3(1) de la *LACC* a été adopté en 1997, le par. 222(3) est, de toute évidence, la disposition postérieure. Cette victoire chronologique peut être neutralisée si, comme le soutient Century Services, on démontre que la disposition la plus récente, le par. 222(3) de la *LTA*, est une disposition générale, auquel cas c'est la disposition particulière antérieure, le par. 18.3(1), qui l'emporte (*generalia specialibus non derogant*). Mais, comme nous l'avons vu, la disposition particulière antérieure n'a pas préséance si la disposition générale ultérieure paraît la « supplanter ». C'est précisément, à mon sens, ce qu'accomplit le par. 222(3) de par son libellé, lequel précise que la disposition l'emporte sur tout autre texte législatif fédéral, tout texte législatif provincial ou « toute autre règle de droit » *sauf la LFI*. Le paragraphe 18.3(1) de la *LACC* est par conséquent rendu inopérant aux fins d'application du par. 222(3).

[129] Il est vrai que, lorsque la *LACC* a été modifiée en 2005², le par. 18.3(1) a été remplacé par le par. 37(1) (L.C. 2005, ch. 47, art. 131). Selon la juge Deschamps, le par. 37(1) est devenu, de ce fait, la disposition « postérieure ». Avec égards pour l'opinion exprimée par ma collègue, cette observation est réfutée par l'al. 44f) de la *Loi d'interprétation*, L.R.C. 1985, ch. I-21, qui décrit expressément l'effet (inexistant) qu'a le remplacement — sans modifications notables sur le fond — d'un texte antérieur qui a été abrogé (voir *Procureur général du Canada c. Commission des relations de travail dans la Fonction publique*, [1977] 2 C.F. 663, qui portait sur

2 The amendments did not come into force until September 18, 2009.

2 Les modifications ne sont entrées en vigueur que le 18 septembre 2009.

“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 re-order the provisions of this Act”. During second reading, the Hon. Bill Rompkey, then the Deputy Leader of the Government in the

la disposition qui a précédé l’al. 44f)). Cet alinéa précise que le nouveau texte ne doit pas être considéré de « droit nouveau », sauf dans la mesure où il diffère au fond du texte abrogé :

44. En cas d’abrogation et de remplacement, les règles suivantes s’appliquent :

. . .

f) sauf dans la mesure où les deux textes diffèrent au fond, le nouveau texte n’est pas réputé de droit nouveau, sa teneur étant censée constituer une refonte et une clarification des règles de droit du texte antérieur;

Le mot « texte » est défini ainsi à l’art. 2 de la *Loi d’interprétation* : « Tout ou partie d’une loi ou d’un règlement. »

[130] Le paragraphe 37(1) de la LACC actuelle est pratiquement identique quant au fond au par. 18.3(1). Pour faciliter la comparaison de ces deux dispositions, je les ai reproduites ci-après :

37. (1) Sous réserve du paragraphe (2) et par dérogation à toute disposition législative fédérale ou provinciale ayant pour effet d’assimiler certains biens à des biens détenus en fiducie pour Sa Majesté, aucun des biens de la compagnie débitrice ne peut être considéré comme tel par le seul effet d’une telle disposition.

18.3 (1) Sous réserve du paragraphe (2) et par dérogation à toute disposition législative fédérale ou provinciale ayant pour effet d’assimiler certains biens à des biens détenus en fiducie pour Sa Majesté, aucun des biens de la compagnie débitrice ne peut être considéré comme détenu en fiducie pour Sa Majesté si, en l’absence de la disposition législative en question, il ne le serait pas.

[131] L’application de l’al. 44f) de la *Loi d’interprétation* vient tout simplement confirmer l’intention clairement exprimée par le législateur, qu’a indiquée Industrie Canada dans l’analyse du Projet de loi C-55, où le par. 37(1) était qualifié de « modification d’ordre technique concernant le réaménagement des dispositions de la présente loi ». Par ailleurs, durant la deuxième lecture du projet de loi

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

au Sénat, l'honorable Bill Rompkey, qui était alors leader adjoint du gouvernement au Sénat, a confirmé que le par. 37(1) représentait seulement une modification d'ordre technique :

Sur une note administrative, je signale que, dans le cas du traitement de fiducies présumées aux fins d'impôt, le projet de loi ne modifie aucunement l'intention qui sous-tend la politique, alors que dans le cas d'une restructuration aux termes de la LACC, des articles de la loi ont été abrogés et remplacés par des versions portant de nouveaux numéros lors de la mise à jour exhaustive de la LACC.

(*Débats du Sénat*, vol. 142, 1^{re} sess., 38^e lég., 23 novembre 2005, p. 2147)

[132] Si le par. 18.3(1) avait fait l'objet de modifications notables sur le fond lorsqu'il a été remplacé par le par. 37(1), je me rangerais à l'avis de la juge Deschamps qu'il doit être considéré comme un texte de droit nouveau. Mais comme les par. 18.3(1) et 37(1) ne diffèrent pas sur le fond, le fait que le par. 18.3(1) soit devenu le par. 37(1) n'a aucune incidence sur l'ordre chronologique du point de vue de l'interprétation, et le par. 222(3) de la *LTA* demeure la disposition « postérieure » (Sullivan, p. 347).

[133] Il s'ensuit que la disposition créant une fiducie réputée que l'on trouve au par. 222(3) de la *LTA* l'emporte sur le par. 18.3(1) dans le cadre d'une procédure fondée sur la *LACC*. La question qui se pose alors est celle de savoir quelle est l'incidence de cette préséance sur le pouvoir discrétionnaire conféré au tribunal par l'art. 11 de la *LACC*.

[134] Bien que l'art. 11 accorde au tribunal le pouvoir discrétionnaire de rendre des ordonnances malgré les dispositions de la *LFI* et de la *Loi sur les liquidations*, L.R.C. 1985, ch. W-11, ce pouvoir discrétionnaire demeure assujéti à l'application de toute autre loi fédérale. L'exercice de ce pouvoir discrétionnaire est donc circonscrit par les limites imposées par toute loi *autre* que la *LFI* et la *Loi sur les liquidations*, et donc par la *LTA*. En l'espèce, le juge siégeant en son cabinet était donc tenu de respecter le régime de priorités établi au par. 222(3) de la *LTA*. Ni le par. 18.3(1) ni l'art. 11 de la *LACC* ne l'autorisaient à en faire abstraction. Par conséquent,

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.

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 (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.

(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,

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*.

[135] Vu cette conclusion, il n'est pas nécessaire d'examiner la question de savoir s'il existait une fiducie expresse en l'espèce.

[136] Je rejeterais le présent pourvoi.

ANNEXE

Loi sur les arrangements avec les créanciers des compagnies, L.R.C. 1985, ch. C-36 (en date du 13 décembre 2007)

11. (1) [Pouvoir du tribunal] Malgré toute disposition de la *Loi sur la faillite et l'insolvabilité* ou de la *Loi sur les liquidations*, chaque fois qu'une demande est faite sous le régime de la présente loi à l'égard d'une compagnie, le tribunal, sur demande d'un intéressé, peut, sous réserve des autres dispositions de la présente loi et avec ou sans avis, rendre l'ordonnance prévue au présent article.

. . .

(3) [Demande initiale — ordonnances] Dans le cas d'une demande initiale visant une compagnie, le tribunal peut, par ordonnance, aux conditions qu'il peut imposer et pour une période maximale de trente jours :

a) suspendre, jusqu'à ce qu'il rende une nouvelle ordonnance à l'effet contraire, les procédures intentées contre la compagnie au titre des lois mentionnées au paragraphe (1), ou qui pourraient l'être;

b) surseoir, jusqu'à ce qu'il rende une nouvelle ordonnance à l'effet contraire, au cours de toute action, poursuite ou autre procédure contre la compagnie;

c) interdire, jusqu'à ce qu'il rende une nouvelle ordonnance à l'effet contraire, d'intenter ou de continuer toute action, poursuite ou autre procédure contre la compagnie.

(4) [Autres demandes — ordonnances] Dans le cas d'une demande, autre qu'une demande initiale, visant une compagnie, le tribunal peut, par ordonnance, aux conditions qu'il peut imposer et pour la période qu'il estime indiquée :

(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,

a) suspendre, jusqu'à ce qu'il rende une nouvelle ordonnance à l'effet contraire, les procédures intentées contre la compagnie au titre des lois mentionnées au paragraphe (1), ou qui pourraient l'être;

b) surseoir, jusqu'à ce qu'il rende une nouvelle ordonnance à l'effet contraire, au cours de toute action, poursuite ou autre procédure contre la compagnie;

c) interdire, jusqu'à ce qu'il rende une nouvelle ordonnance à l'effet contraire, d'intenter ou de continuer toute action, poursuite ou autre procédure contre la compagnie.

. . . .

(6) [Preuve] Le tribunal ne rend l'ordonnance visée aux paragraphes (3) ou (4) que si :

a) le demandeur le convainc qu'il serait indiqué de rendre une telle ordonnance;

b) dans le cas de l'ordonnance visée au paragraphe (4), le demandeur le convainc en outre qu'il a agi — et continue d'agir — de bonne foi et avec toute la diligence voulue.

11.4 (1) [Suspension des procédures] Le tribunal peut ordonner :

a) la suspension de l'exercice par Sa Majesté du chef du Canada des droits que lui confère le paragraphe 224(1.2) de la *Loi de l'impôt sur le revenu* ou toute disposition du *Régime de pensions du Canada* ou de la *Loi sur l'assurance-emploi* qui renvoie à ce paragraphe et qui prévoit la perception d'une cotisation, au sens du *Régime de pensions du Canada*, ou d'une cotisation ouvrière ou d'une cotisation patronale, au sens de la *Loi sur l'assurance-emploi*, et des intérêts, pénalités ou autres montants y afférents, à l'égard d'une compagnie lorsque celle-ci est un débiteur fiscal visé à ce paragraphe ou à cette disposition, pour une période se terminant au plus tard :

(i) à l'expiration de l'ordonnance rendue en application de l'article 11,

(ii) au moment du rejet, par le tribunal ou les créanciers, de la transaction proposée,

(iii) six mois après que le tribunal a homologué la transaction ou l'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,

(iv) au moment de tout défaut d’exécution de la transaction ou de l’arrangement,

(v) au moment de l’exécution intégrale de la transaction ou de l’arrangement;

b) la suspension de l’exercice par Sa Majesté du chef d’une province, pour une période se terminant au plus tard au moment visé à celui des sous-alinéas a)(i) à (v) qui, le cas échéant, est applicable, des droits que lui confère toute disposition législative de cette province à l’égard d’une compagnie, lorsque celle-ci est un débiteur visé par la loi provinciale et qu’il s’agit d’une disposition dont l’objet est semblable à celui du paragraphe 224(1.2) de la *Loi de l’impôt sur le revenu*, ou qui renvoie à ce paragraphe, dans la mesure où elle prévoit la perception d’une somme, et des intérêts, pénalités ou autres montants y afférents, qui :

(i) soit a été retenue par une personne sur un paiement effectué à une autre personne, ou déduite d’un tel paiement, et se rapporte à un impôt semblable, de par sa nature, à l’impôt sur le revenu auquel les particuliers sont assujettis en vertu de la *Loi de l’impôt sur le revenu*,

(ii) soit est de même nature qu’une cotisation prévue par le *Régime de pensions du Canada*, si la province est « une province instituant un régime général de pensions » au sens du paragraphe 3(1) de cette loi et si la loi provinciale institue un « régime provincial de pensions » au sens de ce paragraphe.

(2) [Cessation] L’ordonnance cesse d’être en vigueur dans les cas suivants :

a) la compagnie manque à ses obligations de paiement pour un montant qui devient dû à Sa Majesté après l’ordonnance et qui pourrait faire l’objet d’une demande aux termes d’une des dispositions suivantes :

(i) le paragraphe 224(1.2) de la *Loi de l’impôt sur le revenu*,

(ii) toute disposition du *Régime de pensions du Canada* ou de la *Loi sur l’assurance-emploi* qui renvoie au paragraphe 224(1.2) de la *Loi de l’impôt sur le revenu* et qui prévoit la perception d’une cotisation, au sens du *Régime de pensions du Canada*, ou d’une cotisation ouvrière ou

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

d’une cotisation patronale, au sens de la *Loi sur l’assurance-emploi*, et des intérêts, pénalités ou autres montants y afférents,

(iii) toute disposition législative provinciale dont l’objet est semblable à celui du paragraphe 224(1.2) de la *Loi de l’impôt sur le revenu*, ou qui renvoie à ce paragraphe, dans la mesure où elle prévoit la perception d’une somme, et des intérêts, pénalités ou autres montants y afférents, qui :

(A) soit a été retenue par une personne sur un paiement effectué à une autre personne, ou déduite d’un tel paiement, et se rapporte à un impôt semblable, de par sa nature, à l’impôt sur le revenu auquel les particuliers sont assujettis en vertu de la *Loi de l’impôt sur le revenu*,

(B) soit est de même nature qu’une cotisation prévue par le *Régime de pensions du Canada*, si la province est « une province instituant un régime général de pensions » au sens du paragraphe 3(1) de cette loi et si la loi provinciale institue un « régime provincial de pensions » au sens de ce paragraphe;

b) un autre créancier a ou acquiert le droit de réaliser sa garantie sur un bien qui pourrait être réclamé par Sa Majesté dans l’exercice des droits que lui confère l’une des dispositions suivantes :

(i) le paragraphe 224(1.2) de la *Loi de l’impôt sur le revenu*,

(ii) toute disposition du *Régime de pensions du Canada* ou de la *Loi sur l’assurance-emploi* qui renvoie au paragraphe 224(1.2) de la *Loi de l’impôt sur le revenu* et qui prévoit la perception d’une cotisation, au sens du *Régime de pensions du Canada*, ou d’une cotisation ouvrière ou d’une cotisation patronale, au sens de la *Loi sur l’assurance-emploi*, et des intérêts, pénalités ou autres montants y afférents,

(iii) toute disposition législative provinciale dont l’objet est semblable à celui du paragraphe 224(1.2) de la *Loi de l’impôt sur le revenu*, ou qui renvoie à ce paragraphe, dans la mesure où elle prévoit la perception d’une somme, et des intérêts, pénalités ou autres montants y afférents, qui :

(A) soit a été retenue par une personne sur un paiement effectué à une autre personne,

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

ou déduite d’un tel paiement, et se rapporte à un impôt semblable, de par sa nature, à l’impôt sur le revenu auquel les particuliers sont assujettis en vertu de la *Loi de l’impôt sur le revenu*,

(B) soit est de même nature qu’une cotisation prévue par le *Régime de pensions du Canada*, si la province est « une province instituant un régime général de pensions » au sens du paragraphe 3(1) de cette loi et si la loi provinciale institue un « régime provincial de pensions » au sens de ce paragraphe.

(3) [Effet] Les ordonnances du tribunal, autres que celles rendues au titre du paragraphe (1), n’ont pas pour effet de porter atteinte à l’application des dispositions suivantes :

a) les paragraphes 224(1.2) et (1.3) de la *Loi de l’impôt sur le revenu*;

b) toute disposition du *Régime de pensions du Canada* ou de la *Loi sur l’assurance-emploi* qui renvoie au paragraphe 224(1.2) de la *Loi de l’impôt sur le revenu* et qui prévoit la perception d’une cotisation, au sens du *Régime de pensions du Canada*, ou d’une cotisation ouvrière ou d’une cotisation patronale, au sens de la *Loi sur l’assurance-emploi*, et des intérêts, pénalités ou autres montants y afférents;

c) toute disposition législative provinciale dont l’objet est semblable à celui du paragraphe 224(1.2) de la *Loi de l’impôt sur le revenu*, ou qui renvoie à ce paragraphe, dans la mesure où elle prévoit la perception d’une somme, et des intérêts, pénalités ou autres montants y afférents, qui :

(i) soit a été retenue par une personne sur un paiement effectué à une autre personne, ou déduite d’un tel paiement, et se rapporte à un impôt semblable, de par sa nature, à l’impôt sur le revenu auquel les particuliers sont assujettis en vertu de la *Loi de l’impôt sur le revenu*,

(ii) soit est de même nature qu’une cotisation prévue par le *Régime de pensions du Canada*, si la province est « une province instituant un régime général de pensions » au sens du paragraphe 3(1) de cette loi et si la loi provinciale institue un « régime provincial de pensions » au sens de ce paragraphe.

Pour l’application de l’alinéa c), la disposition législative provinciale en question est réputée avoir, à l’encontre de tout créancier et malgré tout texte législatif fédéral ou

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.

provincial et toute règle de droit, la même portée et le même effet que le paragraphe 224(1.2) de la *Loi de l'impôt sur le revenu* quant à la somme visée au sous-alinéa c)(i), ou que le paragraphe 23(2) du *Régime de pensions du Canada* quant à la somme visée au sous-alinéa c)(ii), et quant aux intérêts, pénalités ou autres montants y afférents, quelle que soit la garantie dont bénéficie le créancier.

18.3 (1) [Fiducies présumées] Sous réserve du paragraphe (2) et par dérogation à toute disposition législative fédérale ou provinciale ayant pour effet d'assimiler certains biens à des biens détenus en fiducie pour Sa Majesté, aucun des biens de la compagnie débitrice ne peut être considéré comme détenu en fiducie pour Sa Majesté si, en l'absence de la disposition législative en question, il ne le serait pas.

(2) [Exceptions] Le paragraphe (1) ne s'applique pas à l'égard des montants réputés détenus en fiducie aux termes des paragraphes 227(4) ou (4.1) de la *Loi de l'impôt sur le revenu*, des paragraphes 23(3) ou (4) du *Régime de pensions du Canada* ou des paragraphes 86(2) ou (2.1) de la *Loi sur l'assurance-emploi* (chacun étant appelé « disposition fédérale » au présent paragraphe) ou à l'égard des montants réputés détenus en fiducie aux termes de toute loi d'une province créant une fiducie présumée dans le seul but d'assurer à Sa Majesté du chef de cette province la remise de sommes déduites ou retenues aux termes d'une loi de cette province, dans la mesure où, dans ce dernier cas, se réalise l'une des conditions suivantes :

a) la loi de cette province prévoit un impôt semblable, de par sa nature, à celui prévu par la *Loi de l'impôt sur le revenu*, et les sommes déduites ou retenues aux termes de la loi de cette province sont de même nature que celles visées aux paragraphes 227(4) ou (4.1) de la *Loi de l'impôt sur le revenu*;

b) cette province est « une province instituant un régime général de pensions » au sens du paragraphe 3(1) du *Régime de pensions du Canada*, la loi de cette province institue un « régime provincial de pensions » au sens de ce paragraphe, et les sommes déduites ou retenues aux termes de la loi de cette province sont de même nature que celles visées aux paragraphes 23(3) ou (4) du *Régime de pensions du Canada*.

Pour l'application du présent paragraphe, toute disposition de la loi provinciale qui crée une fiducie présumée est réputée avoir, à l'encontre de tout créancier du failli et malgré tout texte législatif fédéral ou provincial et toute règle de droit, la même portée et le même effet que la disposition fédérale correspondante, quelle que soit la garantie dont bénéficie le créancier.

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

18.4 (1) [Réclamations de la Couronne] Dans le cadre de procédures intentées sous le régime de la présente loi, toutes les réclamations de Sa Majesté du chef du Canada ou d'une province ou d'un organisme compétent au titre d'une loi sur les accidents du travail, y compris les réclamations garanties, prennent rang comme réclamations non garanties.

. . .

(3) [Effet] Le paragraphe (1) n'a pas pour effet de porter atteinte à l'application des dispositions suivantes :

a) les paragraphes 224(1.2) et (1.3) de la *Loi de l'impôt sur le revenu*;

b) toute disposition du *Régime de pensions du Canada* ou de la *Loi sur l'assurance-emploi* qui renvoie au paragraphe 224(1.2) de la *Loi de l'impôt sur le revenu* et qui prévoit la perception d'une cotisation, au sens du *Régime de pensions du Canada*, ou d'une cotisation ouvrière ou d'une cotisation patronale, au sens de la *Loi sur l'assurance-emploi*, et des intérêts, pénalités ou autres montants y afférents;

c) toute disposition législative provinciale dont l'objet est semblable à celui du paragraphe 224(1.2) de la *Loi de l'impôt sur le revenu*, ou qui renvoie à ce paragraphe, dans la mesure où elle prévoit la perception d'une somme, et des intérêts, pénalités ou autres montants y afférents, qui :

(i) soit a été retenue par une personne sur un paiement effectué à une autre personne, ou déduite d'un tel paiement, et se rapporte à un impôt semblable, de par sa nature, à l'impôt sur le revenu auquel les particuliers sont assujettis en vertu de la *Loi de l'impôt sur le revenu*,

(ii) soit est de même nature qu'une cotisation prévue par le *Régime de pensions du Canada*, si la province est « une province instituant un régime général de pensions » au sens du paragraphe 3(1) de cette loi et si la loi provinciale institue un « régime provincial de pensions » au sens de ce paragraphe.

Pour l'application de l'alinéa c), la disposition législative provinciale en question est réputée avoir, à l'encontre de tout créancier et malgré tout texte législatif fédéral ou provincial et toute règle de droit, la même portée et le même effet que le paragraphe 224(1.2) de la *Loi de l'impôt sur le revenu* quant à la somme visée au sous-alinéa c)(i), ou que le paragraphe 23(2) du *Régime de pensions du Canada* quant à la somme visée au sous-alinéa c)(ii),

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);

et quant aux intérêts, pénalités ou autres montants y afférents, quelle que soit la garantie dont bénéficie le créancier.

20. [La loi peut être appliquée conjointement avec d'autres lois] Les dispositions de la présente loi peuvent être appliquées conjointement avec celles de toute loi fédérale ou provinciale, autorisant ou prévoyant l'homologation de transactions ou arrangements entre une compagnie et ses actionnaires ou une catégorie de ces derniers.

Loi sur les arrangements avec les créanciers des compagnies, L.R.C. 1985, ch. C-36 (en date du 18 septembre 2009)

11. [Pouvoir général du tribunal] Malgré toute disposition de la *Loi sur la faillite et l'insolvabilité* ou de la *Loi sur les liquidations et les restructurations*, le tribunal peut, dans le cas de toute demande sous le régime de la présente loi à l'égard d'une compagnie débitrice, rendre, sur demande d'un intéressé, mais sous réserve des restrictions prévues par la présente loi et avec ou sans avis, toute ordonnance qu'il estime indiquée.

11.02 (1) [Suspension : demande initiale] Dans le cas d'une demande initiale visant une compagnie débitrice, le tribunal peut, par ordonnance, aux conditions qu'il peut imposer et pour la période maximale de trente jours qu'il estime nécessaire :

a) suspendre, jusqu'à nouvel ordre, toute procédure qui est ou pourrait être intentée contre la compagnie sous le régime de la *Loi sur la faillite et l'insolvabilité* ou de la *Loi sur les liquidations et les restructurations*;

b) surseoir, jusqu'à nouvel ordre, à la continuation de toute action, poursuite ou autre procédure contre la compagnie;

c) interdire, jusqu'à nouvel ordre, l'introduction de toute action, poursuite ou autre procédure contre la compagnie.

(2) [Suspension : demandes autres qu'initiales] Dans le cas d'une demande, autre qu'une demande initiale, visant une compagnie débitrice, le tribunal peut, par ordonnance, aux conditions qu'il peut imposer et pour la période qu'il estime nécessaire :

a) suspendre, jusqu'à nouvel ordre, toute procédure qui est ou pourrait être intentée contre la compagnie sous le régime des lois mentionnées à l'alinéa (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*

b) surseoir, jusqu'à nouvel ordre, à la continuation de toute action, poursuite ou autre procédure contre la compagnie;

c) interdire, jusqu'à nouvel ordre, l'introduction de toute action, poursuite ou autre procédure contre la compagnie.

(3) [Preuve] Le tribunal ne rend l'ordonnance que si :

a) le demandeur le convainc que la mesure est opportune;

b) dans le cas de l'ordonnance visée au paragraphe (2), le demandeur le convainc en outre qu'il a agi et continue d'agir de bonne foi et avec la diligence voulue.

. . .

11.09 (1) [Suspension des procédures : Sa Majesté] L'ordonnance prévue à l'article 11.02 peut avoir pour effet de suspendre :

a) l'exercice par Sa Majesté du chef du Canada des droits que lui confère le paragraphe 224(1.2) de la *Loi de l'impôt sur le revenu* ou toute disposition du *Régime de pensions du Canada* ou de la *Loi sur l'assurance-emploi* qui renvoie à ce paragraphe et qui prévoit la perception d'une cotisation, au sens du *Régime de pensions du Canada*, ou d'une cotisation ouvrière ou d'une cotisation patronale, au sens de la *Loi sur l'assurance-emploi*, ainsi que des intérêts, pénalités et autres charges afférents, à l'égard d'une compagnie qui est un débiteur fiscal visé à ce paragraphe ou à cette disposition, pour la période se terminant au plus tard :

(i) à l'expiration de l'ordonnance,

(ii) au moment du rejet, par le tribunal ou les créanciers, de la transaction proposée,

(iii) six mois après que le tribunal a homologué la transaction ou l'arrangement,

(iv) au moment de tout défaut d'exécution de la transaction ou de l'arrangement,

(v) au moment de l'exécution intégrale de la transaction ou de l'arrangement;

b) l'exercice par Sa Majesté du chef d'une province, pour la période que le tribunal estime indiquée et se terminant au plus tard au moment visé à celui des sous-alinéas a)(i) à (v) qui, le cas échéant, est applicable, des droits que lui confère toute disposition

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

législative de cette province à l’égard d’une compagnie qui est un débiteur visé par la loi provinciale, s’il s’agit d’une disposition dont l’objet est semblable à celui du paragraphe 224(1.2) de la *Loi de l’impôt sur le revenu*, ou qui renvoie à ce paragraphe, et qui prévoit la perception d’une somme, ainsi que des intérêts, pénalités et autres charges afférents, laquelle :

(i) soit a été retenue par une personne sur un paiement effectué à une autre personne, ou déduite d’un tel paiement, et se rapporte à un impôt semblable, de par sa nature, à l’impôt sur le revenu auquel les particuliers sont assujettis en vertu de la *Loi de l’impôt sur le revenu*,

(ii) soit est de même nature qu’une cotisation prévue par le *Régime de pensions du Canada*, si la province est une province instituant un régime général de pensions au sens du paragraphe 3(1) de cette loi et si la loi provinciale institue un régime provincial de pensions au sens de ce paragraphe.

(2) [Cessation d’effet] Les passages de l’ordonnance qui suspendent l’exercice des droits de Sa Majesté visés aux alinéas (1)a) ou b) cessent d’avoir effet dans les cas suivants :

a) la compagnie manque à ses obligations de paiement à l’égard de toute somme qui devient due à Sa Majesté après le prononcé de l’ordonnance et qui pourrait faire l’objet d’une demande aux termes d’une des dispositions suivantes :

(i) le paragraphe 224(1.2) de la *Loi de l’impôt sur le revenu*,

(ii) toute disposition du *Régime de pensions du Canada* ou de la *Loi sur l’assurance-emploi* qui renvoie au paragraphe 224(1.2) de la *Loi de l’impôt sur le revenu* et qui prévoit la perception d’une cotisation, au sens du *Régime de pensions du Canada*, ou d’une cotisation ouvrière ou d’une cotisation patronale, au sens de la *Loi sur l’assurance-emploi*, ainsi que des intérêts, pénalités et autres charges afférents,

(iii) toute disposition législative provinciale dont l’objet est semblable à celui du paragraphe 224(1.2) de la *Loi de l’impôt sur le revenu*, ou qui renvoie à ce paragraphe, et qui prévoit la

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

perception d’une somme, ainsi que des intérêts, pénalités et autres charges afférents, laquelle :

(A) soit a été retenue par une personne sur un paiement effectué à une autre personne, ou déduite d’un tel paiement, et se rapporte à un impôt semblable, de par sa nature, à l’impôt sur le revenu auquel les particuliers sont assujettis en vertu de la *Loi de l’impôt sur le revenu*,

(B) soit est de même nature qu’une cotisation prévue par le *Régime de pensions du Canada*, si la province est une province instituant un régime général de pensions au sens du paragraphe 3(1) de cette loi et si la loi provinciale institue un régime provincial de pensions au sens de ce paragraphe;

b) un autre créancier a ou acquiert le droit de réaliser sa garantie sur un bien qui pourrait être réclamé par Sa Majesté dans l’exercice des droits que lui confère l’une des dispositions suivantes :

(i) le paragraphe 224(1.2) de la *Loi de l’impôt sur le revenu*,

(ii) toute disposition du *Régime de pensions du Canada* ou de la *Loi sur l’assurance-emploi* qui renvoie au paragraphe 224(1.2) de la *Loi de l’impôt sur le revenu* et qui prévoit la perception d’une cotisation, au sens du *Régime de pensions du Canada*, ou d’une cotisation ouvrière ou d’une cotisation patronale, au sens de la *Loi sur l’assurance-emploi*, ainsi que des intérêts, pénalités et autres charges afférents,

(iii) toute disposition législative provinciale dont l’objet est semblable à celui du paragraphe 224(1.2) de la *Loi de l’impôt sur le revenu*, ou qui renvoie à ce paragraphe, et qui prévoit la perception d’une somme, ainsi que des intérêts, pénalités et autres charges afférents, laquelle :

(A) soit a été retenue par une personne sur un paiement effectué à une autre personne, ou déduite d’un tel paiement, et se rapporte à un impôt semblable, de par sa nature, à l’impôt sur le revenu auquel les particuliers sont assujettis en vertu de la *Loi de l’impôt sur le revenu*,

(B) soit est de même nature qu’une cotisation prévue par le *Régime de pensions du Canada*, si la province est une province instituant un régime général de pensions au sens

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.

du paragraphe 3(1) de cette loi et si la loi provinciale institue un régime provincial de pensions au sens de ce paragraphe.

(3) [Effet] L’ordonnance prévue à l’article 11.02, à l’exception des passages de celle-ci qui suspendent l’exercice des droits de Sa Majesté visés aux alinéas (1)a) ou b), n’a pas pour effet de porter atteinte à l’application des dispositions suivantes :

a) les paragraphes 224(1.2) et (1.3) de la *Loi de l’impôt sur le revenu*;

b) toute disposition du *Régime de pensions du Canada* ou de la *Loi sur l’assurance-emploi* qui renvoie au paragraphe 224(1.2) de la *Loi de l’impôt sur le revenu* et qui prévoit la perception d’une cotisation, au sens du *Régime de pensions du Canada*, ou d’une cotisation ouvrière ou d’une cotisation patronale, au sens de la *Loi sur l’assurance-emploi*, ainsi que des intérêts, pénalités et autres charges afférents;

c) toute disposition législative provinciale dont l’objet est semblable à celui du paragraphe 224(1.2) de la *Loi de l’impôt sur le revenu*, ou qui renvoie à ce paragraphe, et qui prévoit la perception d’une somme, ainsi que des intérêts, pénalités et autres charges afférents, laquelle :

(i) soit a été retenue par une personne sur un paiement effectué à une autre personne, ou déduite d’un tel paiement, et se rapporte à un impôt semblable, de par sa nature, à l’impôt sur le revenu auquel les particuliers sont assujettis en vertu de la *Loi de l’impôt sur le revenu*,

(ii) soit est de même nature qu’une cotisation prévue par le *Régime de pensions du Canada*, si la province est une province instituant un régime général de pensions au sens du paragraphe 3(1) de cette loi et si la loi provinciale institue un régime provincial de pensions au sens de ce paragraphe.

Pour l’application de l’alinéa c), la disposition législative provinciale en question est réputée avoir, à l’encontre de tout créancier et malgré tout texte législatif fédéral ou provincial et toute autre règle de droit, la même portée et le même effet que le paragraphe 224(1.2) de la *Loi de l’impôt sur le revenu* quant à la somme visée au sous-alinéa c)(i), ou que le paragraphe 23(2) du *Régime de pensions du Canada* quant à la somme visée au sous-alinéa c)(ii), et quant aux intérêts, pénalités et autres charges afférents, quelle que soit la garantie dont bénéficie le créancier.

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) [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

37. (1) [Fiducies présumées] Sous réserve du paragraphe (2) et par dérogation à toute disposition législative fédérale ou provinciale ayant pour effet d’assimiler certains biens à des biens détenus en fiducie pour Sa Majesté, aucun des biens de la compagnie débitrice ne peut être considéré comme tel par le seul effet d’une telle disposition.

(2) [Exceptions] Le paragraphe (1) ne s’applique pas à l’égard des sommes réputées détenues en fiducie aux termes des paragraphes 227(4) ou (4.1) de la *Loi de l’impôt sur le revenu*, des paragraphes 23(3) ou (4) du *Régime de pensions du Canada* ou des paragraphes 86(2) ou (2.1) de la *Loi sur l’assurance-emploi* (chacun étant appelé « disposition fédérale » au présent paragraphe) ou à l’égard des sommes réputées détenues en fiducie aux termes de toute loi d’une province créant une fiducie présumée dans le seul but d’assurer à Sa Majesté du chef de cette province la remise de sommes déduites ou retenues aux termes d’une loi de cette province, si, dans ce dernier cas, se réalise l’une des conditions suivantes :

a) la loi de cette province prévoit un impôt semblable, de par sa nature, à celui prévu par la *Loi de l’impôt sur le revenu*, et les sommes déduites ou retenues au titre de cette loi provinciale sont de même nature que celles visées aux paragraphes 227(4) ou (4.1) de la *Loi de l’impôt sur le revenu*;

b) cette province est une province instituant un régime général de pensions au sens du paragraphe 3(1) du *Régime de pensions du Canada*, la loi de cette province institue un régime provincial de pensions au sens de ce paragraphe, et les sommes déduites ou retenues au titre de cette loi provinciale sont de même nature que celles visées aux paragraphes 23(3) ou (4) du *Régime de pensions du Canada*.

Pour l’application du présent paragraphe, toute disposition de la loi provinciale qui crée une fiducie présumée est réputée avoir, à l’encontre de tout créancier de la compagnie et malgré tout texte législatif fédéral ou provincial et toute règle de droit, la même portée et le même effet que la disposition fédérale correspondante, quelle que soit la garantie dont bénéficie le créancier.

Loi sur la taxe d’accise, L.R.C. 1985, ch. E-15 (en date du 13 décembre 2007)

222. (1) [Montants perçus détenus en fiducie] La personne qui perçoit un montant au titre de la taxe prévue à la section II est réputée, à toutes fins utiles et malgré tout droit en garantie le concernant, le détenir en fiducie pour Sa Majesté du chef du Canada, séparé de ses propres biens et des biens détenus par ses créanciers garantis qui, en l’absence du droit en garantie, seraient ceux de la

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

personne, jusqu'à ce qu'il soit versé au receveur général ou retiré en application du paragraphe (2).

(1.1) [Montants perçus avant la faillite] Le paragraphe (1) ne s'applique pas, à compter du moment de la faillite d'un failli, au sens de la *Loi sur la faillite et l'insolvabilité*, aux montants perçus ou devenus percevables par lui avant la faillite au titre de la taxe prévue à la section II.

. . .

(3) [Non-versement ou non-retrait] Malgré les autres dispositions de la présente loi (sauf le paragraphe (4) du présent article), tout autre texte législatif fédéral (sauf la *Loi sur la faillite et l'insolvabilité*), tout texte législatif provincial ou toute autre règle de droit, lorsqu'un montant qu'une personne est réputée par le paragraphe (1) détenir en fiducie pour Sa Majesté du chef du Canada n'est pas versé au receveur général ni retiré selon les modalités et dans le délai prévus par la présente partie, les biens de la personne — y compris les biens détenus par ses créanciers garantis qui, en l'absence du droit en garantie, seraient ses biens — d'une valeur égale à ce montant sont réputés :

a) être détenus en fiducie pour Sa Majesté du chef du Canada, à compter du moment où le montant est perçu par la personne, séparés des propres biens de la personne, qu'ils soient ou non assujettis à un droit en garantie;

b) ne pas faire partie du patrimoine ou des biens de la personne à compter du moment où le montant est perçu, que ces biens aient été ou non tenus séparés de ses propres biens ou de son patrimoine et qu'ils soient ou non assujettis à un droit en garantie.

Ces biens sont des biens dans lesquels Sa Majesté du chef du Canada a un droit de bénéficiaire malgré tout autre droit en garantie sur ces biens ou sur le produit en découlant, et le produit découlant de ces biens est payé au receveur général par priorité sur tout droit en garantie.

Loi sur la faillite et l'insolvabilité, L.R.C. 1985, ch. B-3 (en date du 13 décembre 2007)

67. (1) [Biens du failli] Les biens d'un failli, constituant le patrimoine attribué à ses créanciers, ne comprennent pas les biens suivants :

(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

a) les biens détenus par le failli en fiducie pour toute autre personne;

b) les biens qui, à l'encontre du failli, sont exempts d'exécution ou de saisie sous le régime des lois applicables dans la province dans laquelle sont situés ces biens et où réside le failli;

b.1) dans les circonstances prescrites, les paiements au titre de crédits de la taxe sur les produits et services et les paiements prescrits qui sont faits à des personnes physiques relativement à leurs besoins essentiels et qui ne sont pas visés aux alinéas a) et b),

mais ils comprennent :

c) tous les biens, où qu'ils soient situés, qui appartiennent au failli à la date de la faillite, ou qu'il peut acquérir ou qui peuvent lui être dévolus avant sa libération;

d) les pouvoirs sur des biens ou à leur égard, qui auraient pu être exercés par le failli pour son propre bénéfice.

(2) [Fiducies présumées] Sous réserve du paragraphe (3) et par dérogation à toute disposition législative fédérale ou provinciale ayant pour effet d'assimiler certains biens à des biens détenus en fiducie pour Sa Majesté, aucun des biens du failli ne peut, pour l'application de l'alinéa (1)a), être considéré comme détenu en fiducie pour Sa Majesté si, en l'absence de la disposition législative en question, il ne le serait pas.

(3) [Exceptions] Le paragraphe (2) ne s'applique pas à l'égard des montants réputés détenus en fiducie aux termes des paragraphes 227(4) ou (4.1) de la *Loi de l'impôt sur le revenu*, des paragraphes 23(3) ou (4) du *Régime de pensions du Canada* ou des paragraphes 86(2) ou (2.1) de la *Loi sur l'assurance-emploi* (chacun étant appelé « disposition fédérale » au présent paragraphe) ou à l'égard des montants réputés détenus en fiducie aux termes de toute loi d'une province créant une fiducie présumée dans le seul but d'assurer à Sa Majesté du chef de cette province la remise de sommes déduites ou retenues aux termes d'une loi de cette province, dans la mesure où, dans ce dernier cas, se réalise l'une des conditions suivantes :

a) la loi de cette province prévoit un impôt semblable, de par sa nature, à celui prévu par la *Loi de l'impôt sur le revenu*, et les sommes déduites ou retenues aux termes de la loi de cette province sont de même nature que celles visées aux paragraphes 227(4) ou (4.1) de la *Loi de l'impôt sur le revenu*;

(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

b) cette province est « une province instituant un régime général de pensions » au sens du paragraphe 3(1) du *Régime de pensions du Canada*, la loi de cette province institue un « régime provincial de pensions » au sens de ce paragraphe, et les sommes déduites ou retenues aux termes de la loi de cette province sont de même nature que celles visées aux paragraphes 23(3) ou (4) du *Régime de pensions du Canada*.

Pour l’application du présent paragraphe, toute disposition de la loi provinciale qui crée une fiducie présumée est réputée avoir, à l’encontre de tout créancier du failli et malgré tout texte législatif fédéral ou provincial et toute règle de droit, la même portée et le même effet que la disposition fédérale correspondante, quelle que soit la garantie dont bénéficie le créancier.

86. (1) [Réclamations de la Couronne] Dans le cadre d’une faillite ou d’une proposition, les réclamations prouvables — y compris les réclamations garanties — de Sa Majesté du chef du Canada ou d’une province ou d’un organisme compétent au titre d’une loi sur les accidents du travail prennent rang comme réclamations non garanties.

. . .

(3) [Effet] Le paragraphe (1) n’a pas pour effet de porter atteinte à l’application des dispositions suivantes :

a) les paragraphes 224(1.2) et (1.3) de la *Loi de l’impôt sur le revenu*;

b) toute disposition du *Régime de pensions du Canada* ou de la *Loi sur l’assurance-emploi* qui renvoie au paragraphe 224(1.2) de la *Loi de l’impôt sur le revenu* et qui prévoit la perception d’une cotisation, au sens du *Régime de pensions du Canada*, ou d’une cotisation ouvrière ou d’une cotisation patronale, au sens de la *Loi sur l’assurance-emploi*, et des intérêts, pénalités ou autres montants y afférents;

c) toute disposition législative provinciale dont l’objet est semblable à celui du paragraphe 224(1.2) de la *Loi de l’impôt sur le revenu*, ou qui renvoie à ce paragraphe, dans la mesure où elle prévoit la perception d’une somme, et des intérêts, pénalités ou autres montants y afférents, qui :

(i) soit a été retenue par une personne sur un paiement effectué à une autre personne, ou déduite d’un tel paiement, et se rapporte à un impôt semblable, de par sa nature, à l’impôt sur le revenu auquel les particuliers sont assujettis en vertu de la *Loi de l’impôt sur le revenu*,

(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.

Appeal allowed with costs, ABELLA J. dissenting.

Solicitors for the appellant: Fraser Milner Casgrain, Vancouver.

Solicitor for the respondent: Attorney General of Canada, Vancouver.

(ii) soit est de même nature qu’une cotisation prévue par le *Régime de pensions du Canada*, si la province est « une province instituant un régime général de pensions » au sens du paragraphe 3(1) de cette loi et si la loi provinciale institue un « régime provincial de pensions » au sens de ce paragraphe.

Pour l’application de l’alinéa c), la disposition législative provinciale en question est réputée avoir, à l’encontre de tout créancier et malgré tout texte législatif fédéral ou provincial et toute règle de droit, la même portée et le même effet que le paragraphe 224(1.2) de la *Loi de l’impôt sur le revenu* quant à la somme visée au sous-alinéa c)(i), ou que le paragraphe 23(2) du *Régime de pensions du Canada* quant à la somme visée au sous-alinéa c)(ii), et quant aux intérêts, pénalités ou autres montants y afférents, quelle que soit la garantie dont bénéficie le créancier.

Pourvoi accueilli avec dépens, la juge ABELLA est dissidente.

Procureurs de l’appelante : Fraser Milner Casgrain, Vancouver.

Procureur de l’intimé : Procureur général du Canada, Vancouver.

TAB 9

Court of King's Bench of Alberta

Citation: Mantle Materials Group, Ltd (Re), 2024 ABKB 19

Date: 20240110
Docket: B201 965622; 2301 16114
Registry: Calgary

In the Matter of the Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act,
RSC 1985 c B-3, as Amended

-and-

In the Matter of the Bankruptcy of
Mantle Materials Group Ltd

In the Matter of the Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act,
RSC 1985, c C-36, as Amended

-and-

In the Matter of the Compromise or Arrangement
of Mantle Materials Group, Ltd and RLF Canada Holdings Ltd

Reasons for Decision
of the
Associate Chief Justice
D.B. Nixon

I. Introduction

[1] This is an application by Mantle Materials Group, Ltd. (“**Mantle**”) to convert their action under the *Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act*, RSC 1985, c B-3 (the “**BIA**”) to a proceeding under the *Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act*, RSC 1985, c C-36 (the “**CCAA**”). The conversion

itself is not opposed, however, Travelers Capital Corp. (“**Travelers**”) has made applications both to compel responses to certain undertakings and questions as well as an application to enhance the powers of the proposed monitor FTI Consulting Canada Inc (“**FTI**”).

[2] In the following reasons I will first address the conversion application by Mantle before turning to the applications brought by Travelers.

II. Background

[3] Mantle is a wholly owned subsidiary of RLF Canada Holdings Limited (“**RLF Canada**”). RLF Canada itself is a wholly owned subsidiary of Resource Land Fund V, LP (“**RLF V**”), a Delaware limited partnership. RLF V is private equity fund managed by RLH LLP.

[4] Mantle was incorporated in British Columbia on July 17, 2020, and was continued in Alberta under the *Business Corporations Act*, RSA 2000, c B-9, as amended on April 30, 2021. It was amalgamated on May 1, 2021, with JMB Crushing Systems Inc (“**JMB**”) and its wholly owned subsidiary 2161889 Alberta Ltd (“**216Co**”).

[5] RLF Canada is a Colorado corporation incorporated on July 8, 2020, under Title 7, Corporations and Associations of the 2022 *Colorado Code*. The sole activity of RLF Canada is to hold all the shares in the capital of Mantle.

[6] Mantle’s business involves the extraction, processing and selling of gravel and other aggregates (“**Aggregate**”) from pits in Alberta (“**Aggregate Pits**”). It supplied Aggregate to service companies in the oil and gas sector, construction firms and municipalities. Mantle operates 14 Aggregate Pits on public land pursuant to surface material leases issued by Alberta Environment and Protected Areas (“**AEPA**”).

[7] Following the acquisition of its business and property from the CCAA proceedings involving JMB and 216Co, Mantle was responsible for the environment protection orders (“**EPOs**”) issued by the AEPA on the Aggregate Pits. These EPOs addressed the end-of-life reclamation steps to be taken.

[8] Mantle experienced operational problems and was burdened with excessive debt inherited from the JMB CCAA proceedings and incurred in the period following the acquisition of the gravel-producing properties. Mantle’s difficulties were compounded by the significant reclamation obligations it was required to complete to satisfy the EPOs. On July 14, 2023, Mantle filed a notice of intention (“**NOI**”) to make a proposal under s 50.4(1) of the *BIA* naming FTI as the proposal trustee.

[9] Mantle now seeks to convert the proposal proceedings under the *BIA* into a CCAA proceeding because the statutory time periods provided for under the *BIA* are not flexible enough to address its reclamation liabilities.

III. Issues

[10] In the present application I must decide the following:

- A. Should Mantle’s application to convert from the *BIA* to the CCAA be approved?
 - i. Is Mantle a company under the definition of the CCAA?

- ii. Is a conversion allowable under section 11.6(a) of the *CCAA*?
- B. Should the proposed extension to the stay of proceedings be granted?
- C. Should the charges be approved?
- D. Should the stay be extended to RLF Canada?
- E. Should FTI be appointed as monitor?
- F. Should the monitor's powers be enhanced?
- G. Should Mantle be compelled to respond to certain undertakings and questions posed by Travelers?

IV. Analysis

A. Should Mantle's application to convert from the *BIA* to the *CCAA* be approved?

[11] Given the nature of this application, this question engages the following inquiries.

i. Is Mantle a debtor company under the definition of the *CCAA*?

[12] Under the *CCAA* section 2(1), a company is defined as:

[...] any company, corporation or legal person incorporated by or under an Act of Parliament or of the legislature of a province, any incorporated company having assets or doing business in Canada, wherever incorporated, and any income trust, but does not include banks, authorized foreign banks within the meaning of section 2 of the *Bank Act*, telegraph companies, insurance companies and companies to which the *Trust and Loan Companies Act* applies;

[13] Given this definition, it is clear that Mantle is a company for the purposes of the *CCAA*.

[14] Further, under section 3(1), the *CCAA* applies to a debtor company. A debtor company has a few definitions under section 2(1), including that it is "any company that (a) is bankrupt or insolvent".

[15] Although the *CCAA* does not define what is meant by insolvent, this can be derived from the definition of "insolvent person" under section 2(1) of the *BIA* which states:

insolvent person means a person who is not bankrupt and who resides, carries on business or has property in Canada, whose liabilities to creditors provable as claims under this Act amount to one thousand dollars, and

(a) who is for any reason unable to meet his obligations as they generally become due,

(b) who has ceased paying his current obligations in the ordinary course of business as they generally become due, or

(c) the aggregate of whose property is not, at a fair valuation, sufficient, or, if disposed of at a fairly conducted sale under legal process, would not be sufficient to enable payment of all his obligations, due and accruing due;

[16] A more lenient definition of insolvent for the purposes of the CCAA has also been developed in *Stelco Inc (Re)*, 2004 CanLII 24933 (ONSC) at para 26 wherein Justice Farley noted:

[...] a proper interpretation is that the BIA definition of (a), (b) or (c) of insolvent person is acceptable with the caveat that as to (a), a financially troubled corporation is insolvent if it is reasonably expected to run out of liquidity within reasonable proximity of time as compared with the time reasonably required to implement a restructuring.

[17] Mantle has acknowledged its insolvency because it filed the NOI to commence the proposal proceedings. Further, based on its books and records, as at June 20, 2023, Mantle's liabilities to its creditors amounted to approximately \$16,046,272.21 whereas its aggregate book value of its assets amounted to approximately \$7,452,838. Given that there is no evidence before the Court to suggest that the fair market value of the assets exceeds the book value, I accept the book value for purposes of the solvency test. I do so because I have no other facts on which to rely.

[18] Based on the evidence and my analysis of the law, I find that Mantle is a debtor company for the purposes of the CCAA.

ii. Is a conversion allowable under section 11.6(a) of the CCAA?

[19] Section 11.6 of the CCAA sets out the process by which a court may convert matters from the BIA to the CCAA:

11.6 Notwithstanding the *Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act*,

(a) proceedings commenced under Part III of the *Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act* may be taken up and continued under this Act only if a proposal within the meaning of the *Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act* has not been filed under that Part;

[20] The factors that a court should consider in determining whether it is appropriate to continue a BIA matter are set out in *Clothing for Modern Times*, 2011 ONSC 7522 ("*Modern*") at paragraph 9:

(a) The company has satisfied the sole statutory condition set out in section 11.6(a) of the CCAA that it has not filed a proposal under the BIA;

(b) The proposed continuation would be consistent with the purposes of the CCAA; and,

(c) Evidence which serves as a reasonable surrogate for the information which section 10(2) of the CCAA requires accompany any initial application under the Act.

[21] I will address each of these three factors in sequence. I have restated the factors as questions.

a. Has Mantle filed a proposal under the BIA (the "First Factor")?

[22] Mantle has not filed a proposal under the BIA. Based on the evidence and my analysis of the law, I find that Mantle has satisfied the First Factor.

b. Is the proposed continuation consistent with the purposes of the CCAA (the “Second Factor”)?

[23] An issue in the present case is whether the CCAA is an appropriate vehicle for Mantle. As acknowledged by its counsel, the goal in this instance is not restructuring. Rather, the underlying goal in this case is a liquidation of Mantle’s business with a focus on the reclamation of its liabilities.

[24] The notion of liquidation being permissible under the CCAA was considered by the Supreme Court in *9354-9186 Québec inc v Callidus Capital Corp*, 2020 SCC 10 [“*Callidus*”]. The discussion by the Court in *Callidus* is a helpful guide to determining whether the continuation is consistent with the purposes of the CCAA. The Court highlights the following (footnotes excluded):

[43] Liquidating CCAs take diverse forms and may involve, among other things: the sale of the debtor company as a going concern; an “en bloc” sale of assets that are capable of being operationalized by a buyer; a partial liquidation or downsizing of business operations; or a piecemeal sale of assets (B. Kaplan, “Liquidating CCAs: Discretion Gone Awry?”, in J. P. Sarra, ed., *Annual Review of Insolvency Law* (2008), 79, at pp. 87-89). The ultimate commercial outcomes facilitated by liquidating CCAs are similarly diverse. Some may result in the continued operation of the business of the debtor under a different going concern entity (e.g., the liquidations in *Indalex* and *Re Canadian Red Cross Society* (1998), 1998 CanLII 14907 (ON SC), 5 C.B.R. (4th) 299 (Ont. C.J. (Gen. Div.)), while others may result in a sale of assets and inventory with no such entity emerging (e.g., the proceedings in *Re Target Canada Co.*, 2015 ONSC 303, 22 C.B.R. (6th) 323, at paras. 7 and 31). Others still, like the case at bar, may involve a going concern sale of most of the assets of the debtor, leaving residual assets to be dealt with by the debtor and its stakeholders.

[44] CCAA courts first began approving these forms of liquidation pursuant to the broad discretion conferred by the Act. The emergence of this practice was not without criticism, largely on the basis that it appeared to be inconsistent with the CCAA being a “restructuring statute” (see, e.g., *UTI Energy Corp. v. Fracmaster Ltd.*, 1999 ABCA 178, 244 A.R. 93, at paras. 15-16, aff’d 1999 ABQB 379, 11 C.B.R. (4th) 204, at paras. 40-43; A. Nocilla, “The History of the Companies’ Creditors Arrangement Act and the Future of Re-Structuring Law in Canada” (2014), 56 *Can. Bus. L.J.* 73, at pp. 88-92).

[45] However, since s. 36 of the CCAA came into force in 2009, courts have been using it to effect liquidating CCAs. Section 36 empowers courts to authorize the sale or disposition of a debtor company’s assets outside the ordinary course of business. Significantly, when the Standing Senate Committee on Banking, Trade and Commerce recommended the adoption of s. 36, it observed that liquidation is not necessarily inconsistent with the remedial objectives of the CCAA, and that it may be a means to “raise capital [to facilitate a restructuring], eliminate further loss for creditors or focus on the solvent operations of the business” (p. 147). Other commentators have observed that liquidation can be a “vehicle to restructure a business” by allowing the business to survive, albeit under a

different corporate form or ownership (Sarra, *Rescue! The Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act*, at p. 169; see also K. P. McElcheran, *Commercial Insolvency in Canada* (4th ed. 2019), at p. 311). Indeed, in *Indalex*, the company sold its assets under the CCAA in order to preserve the jobs of its employees, despite being unable to survive as their employer (see para. 51).

[46] Ultimately, the relative weight that the different objectives of the CCAA take on in a particular case may vary based on the factual circumstances, the stage of the proceedings, or the proposed solutions that are presented to the court for approval. Here, a parallel may be drawn with the BIA context. In *Orphan Well Association v. Grant Thornton Ltd.*, 2019 SCC 5, [2019] 1 S.C.R. 150, at para. 67, this Court explained that, as a general matter, the BIA serves two purposes: (1) the bankrupt's financial rehabilitation and (2) the equitable distribution of the bankrupt's assets among creditors. However, in circumstances where a debtor corporation will never emerge from bankruptcy, only the latter purpose is relevant (see para. 67). Similarly, under the CCAA, when a reorganization of the pre-filing debtor company is not a possibility, a liquidation that preserves going-concern value and the ongoing business operations of the pre-filing company may become the predominant remedial focus. Moreover, where a reorganization or liquidation is complete and the court is dealing with residual assets, the objective of maximizing creditor recovery from those assets may take centre stage. As we will explain, the architecture of the CCAA leaves the case-specific assessment and balancing of these remedial objectives to the supervising judge.

[25] The above discussion is helpful particularly in relation to the reclamation obligations as set out in *Orphan Well Association v Grant Thornton Ltd*, 2019 SCC 5 [*“Redwater”*]. These reclamation obligations are the remedial objectives of Mantle. Mantle has described its intentions if continued under the CCAA as follows:

- (a) complete the remaining Major Reclamation Work;
- (b) perform the Assessment Period Reclamation Work;
- (c) complete the collection of Mantle's accounts receivable;
- (d) complete the sale, if possible, of the Active Aggregate Pits to purchasers who assume the Reclamation Liabilities associated therewith, and if such sales are not possible, provide for such Reclamation Liabilities to be addressed;
- (e) complete the sale of the remaining assets of Mantle; and
- (f) once reasonable reserves are provided for, make distributions to Mantle's creditors.

[26] It bears repeating here that the continuation under the CCAA is not contested by any of the parties. Further, no other options for what to do with Mantle and its assets have been proposed.

[27] As noted by the proposed monitor (being FTI), proceeding under the CCAA would be the only available means by which the reclamation obligations and the sale of the active pits could be completed. I also note that FTI supports the continuation of the BIA proceedings under the CCAA.

[28] As noted above, one of the motivations underlying the conversion of the Mantle proceedings from the *BIA* to the *CCAA* concerns the inflexible timing issues legislated in the *BIA*. Under the current timelines stipulated in the *BIA*, Mantle would be adjudged bankrupt by the expiration of the period within which it may file a proposal, the ultimate deadline being January 13, 2024. As discussed in *Callidus*, the appropriateness of the *CCAA* for liquidation depends on the facts of each individual case, and these factors are particularly pertinent.

[29] Based on the evidence and my analysis of the law, I find that Mantle has satisfied the Second Factor. I make this determination because liquidation is not necessarily inconsistent with the remedial objectives of the *CCAA*: *Callidus* at para 45. This is particularly the case in these circumstances because the ultimate remedial objective of Mantle is to address its reclamation obligations.

c. Has Mantle filed evidence which serves as a reasonable surrogate for the information which section 10(2) of the CCAA requires accompany any initial application under the Act (the “Third Factor”)?

[30] Finally, under section 10(2) of the *CCAA*, Mantle must provide:

- (a) a statement indicating, on a weekly basis, the projected cash flow of the debtor company;
- (b) a report containing the prescribed representations of the debtor company regarding the preparation of the cash-flow statement; and
- (c) copies of all financial statements, audited or unaudited, prepared during the year before the application or, if no such statements were prepared in that year, a copy of the most recent such statement.

[31] This material was provided as exhibits attached to the affidavit of Byron Levkulich, dated November 27, 2023. Mr. Levkulich is a director of Mantle. There are also cash-flow statements attached to the fourth report of the proposed monitor FTI.

[32] Based on the evidence and my analysis of the law, I find that Mantle has satisfied the Third Factor.

[33] Based on my review of the evidence and my analysis of the law, I find Mantle has satisfied the three factors forming the test in *Modern*. As a result, it is appropriate to continue this matter from the *BIA* to the *CCAA*.

B. Should the proposed extension to the stay of proceedings be granted?

[34] Under section 11.02(2) of the *CCAA*, on application from a debtor company other than during an initial application, a court may stay for any period considered necessary all proceedings taken or that might be taken in respect of the company under an Act referred to in paragraph 1(a) of section 11.02.

[35] On such an application, under section 11.02(3) of the *CCAA*, the burden of proof is on the applicant to satisfy the court that circumstances exist to make the order appropriate, and the applicant has acted, and is acting, in good faith and with due diligence.

[36] Based on my review of the evidence and my analysis of the law, I find it appropriate to grant the proposed extension to the stay of proceedings against Mantle until January 20, 2024. I make this determination because I find that this is the best method by which Mantle can

accomplish the liquidation while continuing its reclamation work and attempting to sell the Aggregate Pits.

[37] In making this determination, I also find that Mantle has been acting in good faith and with due diligence. This finding is supported by the evidence that the proposed monitor is also of the view that Mantle has been acting in good faith and with due diligence. Further, the proposed monitor supports this extension.

C. Should the charges be approved?

[38] Mantle seeks to take up and continue the restructuring charges including an administration charge, the interim financing charge, and the directors & officers (“D&O”) charge that were granted on August 15 and August 28 from this Court by Justice Feasby (collectively, the “**Restructuring Charges**”): see *Re Mantle Materials Group, Ltd*, 2023 ABKB 488 [“*Mantle ABKB #1*”]. That decision was upheld by the Alberta Court of Appeal in *Mantle Materials Group, Ltd v Travelers Capital Corp*, 2023 ABCA 302 [“*Mantle ABCA #1*”] and *Mantle Materials Group, Ltd v Travelers Capital Corp*, 2023 ABCA 339 [“*Mantle ABCA #2*”].

[39] Section 11.52 of the CCAA provides the Court with jurisdiction to make an order as follows:

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

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

[40] A non exhaustive list of factors to consider in determining the appropriateness of such charges is set out at paragraph 54 of *Canwest Publishing Inc (Re)*, 2010 ONSC 222:

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

[41] I reiterate that the Restructuring Charges were initially approved by Justice Feasby under the BIA. Mantle has asserted that these charges should be taken up and continued under the

CCAA proceeding. It makes that assertion because the Restructuring Charges have already been approved by Justice Feasby. Further, Mantle asserts that it is warranted in this case because: (i) the proceedings will require the extensive involvement of professional advisors; (ii) the beneficiaries of the administrative charge will provide essential legal and financial advice throughout the CCAA proceedings; (iii) there is no unwarranted duplication of roles; (iv) the proposed administrative charge ranks in priority to the interests of the secured creditors who had received prior notice of Mantle's application for the charge and an opportunity to make submissions regarding same; and (v) the proposed monitor has indicated that the quantum of the proposed administrative charge is reasonable in the circumstances. In my view, these are all valid points, and I accept them for purposes of this analysis.

[42] Based on my review of the evidence and my analysis of the law, I find that it is appropriate for Mantle, in the context of the CCAA proceedings, to take up and continue the administration charge under section 11.52 of the CCAA.

[43] The authority to grant an interim financing charge is provided by section 11.2 of the CCAA and the factors are set out as follows:

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

(a) the period during which the company is expected to be subject to proceedings under this Act;

(b) how the company's business and financial affairs are to be managed during the proceedings;

(c) whether the company's management has the confidence of its major creditors;

(d) whether the loan would enhance the prospects of a viable compromise or arrangement being made in respect of the company;

(e) the nature and value of the company's property;

(f) whether any creditor would be materially prejudiced as a result of the security or charge; and

(g) the monitor's report referred to in paragraph 23(1)(b), if any.

[44] Mantle argues this interim financing charge is necessary because: (i) it allows the entity to continue operating in the ordinary course of business and to service associated professional fees in the period up to the week of March 1, 2024, (which date is based on how long the interim lending charge was estimated to be required for interim operational purposes); (ii) it provides the ability to draw on the interim financing facility which will allow Mantle to fund the reclamation work during the CCAA proceedings; and (iii) the interim financing charge will preserve the value and going concern operations of Mantle and enhance the probability of maximizing the amounts that will be available for distribution to the secured creditors, after the reclamation liabilities have been addressed. I also note that FTI supports the interim financing agreement and interim financing charge because it views it as being appropriate and limited to what is reasonably necessary in the circumstances. In my view, these are all valid points, and I accept them for purposes of this analysis.

[45] Based on my review of the evidence and my analysis of the law, I find that it is appropriate under 11.2 of the *CCAA* for Mantle to take up and continue the interim financing charge in the context of the *CCAA* proceeding.

[46] Finally, section 11.51 of the *CCAA* provides the Court with the jurisdiction to grant the D&O charge:

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

[47] The factors to be considered here are set out in *Jaguar Mining Inc (Re)*, 2014 ONSC 494:

[45] With respect to the Director's Charge, the court must be satisfied that:

- (i) notice has been given to the secured creditors likely to be affected by the charge;
- (ii) the amount is appropriate;
- (iii) the applicant could not obtain adequate indemnification insurance for the director or officer at a reasonable cost; and
- (iv) the charge does not apply in respect of any obligation incurred by a director or officer as a result of the director's or officer's gross negligence or wilful misconduct.

[48] Mantle argues that it would be appropriate in this case to take up and continue the D&O charge because: (i) the secured creditors have been notified of this application; (ii) the proposed monitor is of the view that D&O charge is reasonable and appropriate in the circumstances; (iii) the D&O charge will not provide protection in the event of a Mantle director or officer commits gross negligence or wilful misconduct; and (iv) it is proposed that the D&O charge will only be engaged if the D&O insurance fails to respond to a claim. In my view, these are all valid points, and I accept them for purposes of this analysis.

[49] Based on my review of the evidence and my analysis of the law, I find that it is appropriate under section 11.51 of the *CCAA* for Mantle, in the context of the *CCAA* proceedings, to take and continue the D&O charge.

[50] In summary, based on my review of evidence and my analysis of the law, I find that the Restructuring Charges granted by Justice Feasby in the August 15 and 28 orders be taken up and continued by Mantle in the context of the *CCAA* proceedings.

D. Should the stay be extended to RLF Canada?

[51] Mantle is a wholly owned subsidiary of RLF Canada. Notwithstanding its name, RLF Canada was incorporated in Colorado.

[52] Mantle submitted that the stay of proceedings should also be extended to RLF Canada. Mantle argues that this is necessary because the management of RLF Canada is the same as the management of Mantle.

[53] Pathward National Association (“**Pathward**”) is a secured creditor of Mantle. Pathward has filed court proceedings against RLF Canada.

[54] Mantle asserts that if Pathward is able to exercise remedies against the shares of Mantle, it would divert time and attention of Mantle’s management to respond to those remedies. Furthermore, Mantle argues that this would undermine Mantle’s ability to address its reclamation obligations. As a result, Mantle argues the extension of the stay of proceedings to RLF Canada is appropriate in the circumstances.

[55] This is opposed by Travelers and Pathward. To support their position they highlight the wording of section 11.04 of the CCAA, which reads as follows:

11.04 No order made under section 11.02 has affect on any action, suit or proceeding against a person, other than the company in respect of whom the order is made, who is obligated under a letter of credit or guarantee in relation to the company.

[56] To further support their position, Travelers and Pathward reference the decision of Justice Dario in *Northern Transportation Company Limited (Re)* [“*Northern Transportation*”] and James D. Gage and Trevor Curtis’s “Staying Guarantees by Non-Debtors and Section 11.04 of the CCAA”, 2022 20th *Annual Review of Insolvency Law* [“**2022 ARIL Paper**”] to argue it would be inappropriate in the present case to extend the stay of proceedings to RLF Canada.

[57] The 2022 ARIL Paper acknowledges that the proper interpretation of section 11.04 of the CCAA has been the subject of varying interpretive approaches, from the narrow to the broad, for what is implied by the exception. I note that in *Northern Transportation* at paragraph 101, the decision leaves open that in certain exceptional circumstances it would be appropriate to grant a stay of proceedings that might appear contrary to section 11.04 of the CCAA.

[58] Of particular note is the conclusion in the 2022 ARIL Paper (at page 64) that:

On balance, the factors seem to weigh in favour of a narrow interpretation of section 11.04 that would maintain the CCAA court’s flexibility to grant stays of proceedings that are necessary to facilitate the restructuring of the debtor company while preserving the court’s discretion to refuse to extend stays to issuers of letters of credit and guarantors if it is not appropriate to do so in the circumstances of a particular case. It that regard, it would be reasonable to expect that courts may draw a distinction between the treatment of letters of credit and guarantees in light of different policy and other considerations relating to them depending on their terms.

[59] The critical fact in this case are the existing reclamation obligations. Given the judicial direction issued in *Redwater*, the outstanding work associated with those reclamation obligations must be given priority. That environmental responsibility constitutes an exception which must be recognized in these circumstances.

[60] Based on my review of evidence and my analysis of the law, I find it is appropriate to extend the stay of proceedings to RLF Canada. I make this determination because, as highlighted

at paragraph 13 of *Mantle ABCA #2*, it is necessary to ensure that there is not further delay occurring for Mantle to complete its reclamation work.

E. Should FTI be appointed as monitor?

[61] Under section 11.7(1), the CCAA requires that the Court appoint a person to monitor the business and financial affairs of the company. This person must be a trustee within the meaning of subsection 2(1) of the *BIA*.

[62] FTI has been proposed as the monitor for these proceedings and this has not been opposed by any of the parties. Nor do any of the restrictions set out in section 11.7(2) of the CCAA apply in the present circumstances. Further, FTI is quite familiar with Mantle's financial records and business model as noted in FTI's reports.

[63] Based on my review of evidence and analysis of the law, I find that FTI should be appointed as monitor. I make this determination because of the supporting evidence in the preceding paragraph. I also take judicial notice of the fact that FTI has often been appointed a monitor by this Court in many proceedings that are analogous to the circumstances of this case.

F. Should the monitor's powers be enhanced?

[64] Travelers has made an application to enhance the monitor's powers for these CCAA proceedings. Travelers' argument is that Mantle has essentially finished most of the reclamation work and what remains is largely minor.

[65] Mantle opposes this application arguing that its management is the best fit to conduct the reclamation work and address its remaining reclamation liabilities. FTI, correctly in my view, takes no position on this question.

[66] The jurisdiction to enhance FTI's powers as a proposed monitor is derived from section 11 of the CCAA. That provision provides broad discretionary powers that allow this Court to "make any order that it considers appropriate in the circumstances". Similarly, section 23(k) of the CCAA allows this Court to direct the monitor to "carry out any other functions in relation to the company...".

[67] Travelers submits that there is a limited amount of work left to be done in the reclamation work, and that allowing Mantle's management to proceed with this work would be more costly than FTI if controlled the process. Travelers is of the view that FTI can handle these issues on its own.

[68] Travelers further argues that the Mantle management have a personal interest in this matter and that this might put them into conflict with their obligations throughout the CCAA proceedings.

[69] In contrast, Mantle argues that its management is best suited to this task and that there remain several unknown factors that might require more expertise. It also argues that the reclamation work left to accomplish is not as limited as suggested by Travelers.

[70] Mantle asserts that by the time FTI would hire the professionals needed to finish the reclamation work and to deal with other issues that may arise, it could well be as expensive if not more so. It also argues that it could take more time to accomplish.

[71] Mantle highlights that a member of its management team, Mr. Cory Pichota, has significant industry knowledge and experience in managing the reclamation of gravel and

aggregate pits. It also asserts that he has specific knowledge of Mantle's business, particularly in respect of its active and inactive Aggregate Pits. Mr. Pichota is noted as being key to the negotiations that have been ongoing, and this was agreed to by Mantle, Travelers and FTI.

[72] In his supplemental affidavit, Mr. Levkulich stated that Mr. Pichota is not prepared to work with FTI. Whether this will be the case is a matter of speculation because this assertion by Mr. Levkulich does not equate to evidence. I make this comment because we do not have sworn evidence from Mr. Pichota himself concerning the issue of whether he would work with FTI if the monitor's powers were enhanced.

[73] It was clear during oral submissions that everyone involved was of the view that Mr. Pichota is critical to the efficient progression of the reclamation efforts. To emphasize the point, FTI was clear in its oral submissions that the reclamation work would be much more efficient if Mr. Pichota is involved.

[74] Based on my review of the evidence and analysis of the law, I dismiss Travelers application to enhance the monitor's powers. I make this determination because the burden is on Travelers to establish that this will be a more effective approach. Given the evidence, I am of the view that the current management of Mantle would be best suited to dealing with the reclamation liabilities at issue here and to continue under the CCAA proceedings. I make this determination because the evidence supports the fact that Mr. Pichota is key to the reclamation work required in this case and Travelers has provided no evidence: (i) that FTI would be able to retain him if the enhanced powers were granted; or (ii) that FTI would be able to retain any other person who could effectively and efficiently advise on reclamation matters if the enhanced powers were granted.

[75] As a final comment, I acknowledge the comment during argument from Travelers to the effect that "[w]e have not attempted to sidestep the effect of *Redwater*. We don't think that decision has any relevance." I also acknowledge the further assertions of Travelers that it "... has not sidestepped or tried to avoid that decision in *Redwater*." While we can debate that point, I will simply highlight the careful reasoning of Justice Feasby in *Mantle ABKB #1* concerning the importance of end-of-life environmental obligations in this context as set out by *Redwater*, *Manitok Energy Inc (Re)*, 2022 ABCA 117 and *Orphan Well Association v Trident Exploration Corp*, 2022 ABKB 839. This was confirmed in the reasoning of *Mantle ABKA #1*. Given the development in the law, I am of the view that *Redwater* is relevant in this case concerning Mantle. The boundaries of the *Redwater* decision continue to be defined by the developing case law. In conclusion, to ensure that these environmental obligations are dealt with properly, I find that Mantle remains best suited to be in charge of the CCAA proceedings.

G. Should Mantle be compelled to respond to certain undertakings and questions posed by Travelers?

[76] Travelers has made an application to compel answers to certain undertakings and questions. *Rule 5.25* of the *Alberta Rules of Court* addresses this issue. That *Rule* reads as follows:

5.25 (1) During questioning, a person is required to answer only

- (a) relevant and material questions, and
- (b) questions in respect of which an objection is not upheld under subrule

(2) A party or a witness being questioned may object to an oral or written question during questioning but only for one or more of the following reasons:

- (a) privilege;
- (b) the question is not relevant and material;
- (c) the question is unreasonable or unnecessary;
- (d) any other ground recognized at law.

[77] What is relevant and material is defined in *Rule 5.2* as follows:

5.2(1) For the purposes of this Part, a question, record or information is relevant and material only if the answer to the question, or the record or information, could reasonably be expected

- (a) to significantly help determine one or more of the issues raised in the pleadings, or
- (b) to ascertain evidence that could reasonably be expected to significantly help determine one or more of the issues raised in the pleadings.

(2) The disclosure or production of a record under this Division is not, by reason of that fact alone, to be considered as an agreement or acknowledgment that the record is admissible or relevant and material.

[78] For reference, I am referring to the questions as set out in Schedule A of Travelers Application to Compel Answers filed on December 14, 2023.

[79] I find that questions m); n); u); v); and bb) are material and relevant and should be answered by Mantle. I make this determination because they are appropriately focused on questions of the liabilities and indemnities related to Mantle.

[80] I find that questions w) and x) should be answered by Mantle but only in regards to whether there is an ability to be indemnified from personal liability under the EPOs from Mantle, and not in regards to whether that ability exists regarding RLF Canada Lender, RLF V or RLH LLC.

[81] I find that the other questions do not have to be answered by Mantle. I make this determination because I am not satisfied that the questioning surrounding the other companies which are not parties to this application are relevant to these proceedings.

[82] I also find that Undertaking 30 must be answered by Mantle because it is relevant and material. However, it is stated in Mantle's responding brief to the Application to Compel Answers, filed on December 17, 2023, at paragraph 17 that this draft document was circulated to Travelers on December 8, 2023. If this is the case, then Mantle has already answered the undertaking.

[83] I find that Undertakings 1 and 2 need not be answered. I make this determination because I am not satisfied that the undertakings requiring copies of reporting on loans between RLF Canada Lender and RLF V are relevant to these proceedings because these bodies are not parties to the present application.

V. Conclusions

[84] In conclusion, I turn to address the issues that were frame above. Based on the evidence before me and my analysis of the law, I direct as follows.

- a. Mantle's proposal under the *BIA* can be converted into a *CCAA* proceeding.
- b. The stay of proceedings is extended until January 20, 2024.
- c. The restructuring charges set out in Justice Feasby's August 15, 2023 and August 28, 2023 orders are to be taken up and continued by Mantle in the context of the *CCAA* proceedings.
- d. The stay of proceedings is extended to RLF Canada.
- e. FTI is appointed as monitor.
- f. Travelers' application to enhance the monitor's powers is dismissed.
- g. Mantle is compelled to answer m); n); u); v); and bb). Mantle is also compelled to answer questions w) and x) insofar as it relates to Mantle's ability to indemnify Mr. Levkulich and Mr. Aaron Patsch for personal liabilities under the EPOs. Mantle is not required to answer the remaining questions. As a final matter, Mantle is compelled to answer Undertaking 30 insofar as that has not already been answered by the draft document circulated on December 8, 2023.

Heard on the 18th day of December 2023.

Dated at the City of Calgary, Alberta this 10th day of January 2024.

D.B. Nixon
A.C.J.C.K.B.A.

Appearances:

T.S Cumming, S.A. Gabor, C.E. Hanert, S. Kroeger
for Mantle Materials Group Ltd

R. Zahara, M. McIntosh
for Travelers Capital Corp

P. Kyriakakis
for FTI Consulting Canada Inc

D.R. Bieganek, KC
for 945441 Alberta Ltd and J. Shankowski

D.S. Nishimura
for Alberta Environment

R. Trainer
for Canadian Western Bank

N. Williams
for Pathward, National Association

P. Corney
for Fiera

T. Gusa
for ATB Financial

TAB 10

CITATION: (Re) Clothing for Modern Times Ltd., 2011 ONSC 7522
COURT FILE NO.: 31-1513595
DATE: 20111216

SUPERIOR COURT OF JUSTICE – ONTARIO

COMMERCIAL LIST

RE: IN THE MATTER OF THE Notice of Intention to make a Proposal of Clothing for Modern Times Ltd.

BEFORE: D. M. Brown J.

COUNSEL: M. Poliak and H. Chaiton, for the Applicant

M. Forte, for A. Farber & Partners Inc., the Proposal Trustee and Proposed Monitor

I. Aversa, for Roynat Asset Finance

D. Bish, for Cadillac Fairview

L. Galessiere, for Ivanhoe Cambridge Inc., Oxford Properties Group Inc., Primaris Retail Estate Investment Trust, Morguard Investment Limited and 20 VIC Management Inc.

M. Weinczuk, for 7951388 Canada Inc.

HEARD: December 16, 2011

REASONS FOR DECISION

I. Motion to continue *BIA* Part III proposal proceedings under the *CCAA*

[1] Clothing for Modern Times Ltd. (“CMT”), a retailer of fashion apparel, filed a Notice of Intention to Make a Proposal pursuant to section 50.4 of the *Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act*, R.S.C. 1985, c. B-3, on June 27, 2011. A. Farber & Partners Inc. was appointed CMT’s proposal trustee. At the time of the filing of the NOI CMT operated 116 retail stores from leased locations across Canada. CMT sold fashion apparel under the trade names Urban Behavior, Costa Blanca and Costa Blanca X.

[2] CMT has obtained from this Court several extensions of time to file a proposal. That time will expire on December 22, 2011. Under section 50.4(9) of the *BIA*, no further extensions are possible.

[3] Accordingly, CMT moves under section 11.6(a) of the *Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act*, R.S.C. 1985, c. C-36 for an order, effective December 22, 2011, continuing CMT's restructuring proceeding under the *CCAA* and granting an Initial Order, as well as approving a sale process as a going concern for part of CMT's business.

II. Key background events

[4] Following the filing of the NOI, pursuant to orders of this Court, CMT conducted a self-liquidation of underperforming stores across Canada and, as well, a going-concern sale of its Urban Behavior business. The latter transaction is scheduled to close on January 16, 2012.

[5] At the time of the filing of the NOI there were three major secured creditors of CMT: Roynat Asset Finance, CIC Asset Management Inc., and CMT Sourcing. The company's indebtedness to those creditors totaled approximately \$28.3 million. CMT anticipates that the proceeds from the Urban Behavior transaction and the liquidation of under-performing stores will prove sufficient to repay its loan obligations to Roynat in full before the expiration of a forbearance period on January 16, 2012.

[6] When CMT was last in court on November 7, 2011 it stated it intended to make a proposal to its unsecured creditors, an intention supported by the two remaining secured creditors, CIC and CMT Sourcing. Subsequently CMT met with representatives of certain landlords and commenced discussions about its proposed restructuring plan. As a result of those discussions CMT lacks the confidence that its proposal would be approved by the requisite majority of its unsecured creditors, and it does not believe that it can make a viable proposal to its creditors. Instead, CMT thinks that a going-concern sale of its Costa Blanca business would be in the best interests of stakeholders and would preserve employment for about 500 remaining employees, both full-time and hourly retail staff.

[7] In its Sixth Report dated December 14, 2011 Farber agrees that a going concern sale of the Costa Blanca business would be in the best interests of CMT's stakeholders, maximize recoveries to the two secured creditors, CIC and CMT Sourcing, and preserve employment for CMT's remaining employees. Farber supports CMT's request to continue its restructuring under the *CCAA*. Farber consents to act as the Monitor under *CCAA* proceedings and to administer the proposed sale process.

III. Continuation under the CCAA

A. Principles governing motions to continue *BIA* Part III proposal proceedings under the *CCAA*

[8] Continuations of *BIA* Part III proposal proceedings under the *CCAA* are governed by section 11.6(a) of that Act which provides:

11.6 Notwithstanding the *Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act*,

(a) proceedings commenced under Part III of the *Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act* may be taken up and continued under this Act only if a proposal within the meaning of the *Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act* has not been filed under that Part.

[9] It strikes me that on a motion to continue under the CCAA an applicant company should place before the court evidence dealing with three issues:

- (i) The company has satisfied the sole statutory condition set out in section 11.6(a) of the CCAA that it has not filed a proposal under the BIA;
- (ii) The proposed continuation would be consistent with the purposes of the CCAA; and,
- (iii) Evidence which serves as a reasonable surrogate for the information which section 10(2) of the CCAA requires accompany any initial application under the Act.

Let me deal with each in turn

B. The applicant has not filed a proposal under the BIA

[10] The evidence shows that CMT has satisfied this statutory condition.

C. The continuation would be consistent with the purposes of the CCAA

[11] In *Century Services Inc. v. Canada (Attorney General)*,¹ the Supreme Court of Canada articulated the purpose of the CCAA in several ways:

- (i) To permit the debtor to continue to carry on business and, where possible, avoid the social and economic costs of liquidating its assets;²
- (ii) To provide 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;³
- (iii) To avoid the social and economic losses resulting from liquidation of an insolvent company;⁴

¹ 2010 SCC 60.

² *Century Services*, para. 15.

³ *Ibid.*, para. 59.

⁴ *Ibid.*, para. 70.

- (iv) To create conditions for preserving the *status quo* while attempts are made to find common ground amongst stakeholders for a reorganization that is fair to all.⁵

As the Supreme Court noted in *Century Services*, proposals to creditors under the *BIA* serve the same remedial purpose, though this is achieved “through a rules-based mechanism that offers less flexibility.”⁶ In the present case CMT bumped up against one of those less flexible rules – the inability of a court to extend the time to file a proposal beyond six months after the filing of the NOI.

[12] The jurisprudence under the *CCAA* accepts that in appropriate circumstances the purposes of the *CCAA* will be met even though the re-organization involves the sale of the company as a going concern, with the consequence that the debtor no longer would continue to carry on the business, as is contemplated in the present case. In *Re Stelco Inc.* Farley J. observed that if a restructuring of a company is not feasible, “then there is the exploration of the feasibility of the sale of the operations/enterprise as a going concern (with continued employment) in whole or in part”.⁷ It also is well-established in the jurisprudence that a court may approve a sale of assets in the course of a *CCAA* proceeding before a plan of arrangement has been approved by creditors.⁸ In *Re Nortel Networks Inc.* Morawetz J. set out the rationale for this judicial approach:

The value of equity in an insolvent debtor is dubious, at best, and, in my view, it follows that the determining factor should not be whether the business continues under the debtor's stewardship or under a structure that recognizes a new equity structure. An equally important factor to consider is whether the case can be made to continue the business as a going concern.⁹

[13] The evidence filed by CMT and Farber supports a finding that a continuation under the *CCAA* to enable a going-concern sale of the Costa Blanca business and assets would be consistent with the purposes of the *CCAA*. Such a sale likely would maximize the recovery for the two remaining secured creditors, CIC and CMT Sourcing, preserve employment for many of the 500 remaining employees, and provide a tenant to the landlords of the 35 remaining Costa Blanca stores. Avoidance of the social and economic losses which would result from a liquidation and the maximization of value would best be achieved outside of a bankruptcy.

⁵ *Ibid.*, para. 77.

⁶ *Ibid.*, para. 15.

⁷ (2004), 6 C.B.R. (5th) 316 (Ont. S.C.J.), para. 1. In *Consumers Packaging Inc., Re*, 2001 CarswellOnt 3482 the Court of Appeal held that a sale of a business as a going concern during a *CCAA* proceeding is consistent with the purposes of that Act.

⁸ See the cases collected by Morawetz J. in *Re Nortel Networks Corp.* (2009), 55 C.B.R. (5th) 229 (Ont. S.C.J.), paras. 35 to 39. See also section 36 of the *CCAA*.

⁹ *Ibid.*, para. 40.

D. Evidence which serves as a reasonable surrogate for CCAA s. 10(2) information

[14] As the Supreme Court of Canada observed in *Century Services*, “the requirements of appropriateness, good faith, and due diligence are baseline considerations that a court should always bear in mind when exercising CCAA authority.”¹⁰ On an initial application under the CCAA a court will have before it the information specified in section 10(2) which assists it in considering the appropriateness, good faith and due diligence of the application. Section 10(2) of the CCAA provides:

10. (2) An initial application must be accompanied by

(a) a statement indicating, on a weekly basis, the projected cash flow of the debtor company;

(b) a report containing the prescribed representations of the debtor company regarding the preparation of the cash-flow statement; and

(c) copies of all financial statements, audited or unaudited, prepared during the year before the application or, if no such statements were prepared in that year, a copy of the most recent such statement.

[15] Section 11.6 of the CCAA does not stipulate the information which must be filed in support of a continuation motion, but a court should have before it sufficient financial and operating information to assess the viability of a continuation under the CCAA. In the present case CMT has filed, on a confidential basis,¹¹ cash flows for the period ending January 31, 2012, which show a net positive cash flow for the period and that CMT has sufficient resources to continue operating in the CCAA proceeding, as well as to conduct a sale process without the need for additional financing.

[16] In addition, the Proposal Trustee filed on this motion its Sixth Report in which it reported on its review of the cash flow statements. Although its opinion was expressed in the language of a double negative, I take from its report that it regards the cash flow statements as reasonable.

[17] Finally, the previous extension orders made by this Court under section 50.4(9) of the BIA indicate that CMT satisfied the Court that it has been acting in good faith and with due diligence.

¹⁰ *Century Services*, para. 70.

¹¹ CMT has filed evidence explaining that disclosure of the cash flows prior to the closing of the Urban Behavior transaction would make public the proceeds expected from that transaction. I agree that such information should not be made public until the deal has closed. CMT has satisfied the principles set out in *Sierra Club of Canada v. Canada (Minister of Finance)*, [2002] 2 S.C.R. 522 and a sealing order should issue.

E. Conclusion

[18] No interested person opposes CMT's motion to continue under the CCAA. Its two remaining secured creditors, CIC and CMT Sourcing, support the motion. From the evidence filed I am satisfied that CMT has satisfied the statutory condition contained in section 16(a) of the CCAA and that a continuation of its re-structuring under the CCAA would be consistent with the purposes of that Act.

IV. Sale Process

[19] In *Re Nortel Networks Corp.* Morawetz J. identified the factors which a court should consider when reviewing a proposed sale process under the CCAA in the absence of a plan:

- (a) is a sale transaction warranted at this time?
- (b) will the sale benefit the whole "economic community"?
- (c) do any of the debtors' creditors have a *bona fide* reason to object to a sale of the business?
- (d) is there a better viable alternative?¹²

[20] No objection has been taken to CMT's proposed sale of its Costa Blanca business or the proposed sale process under the direction of Farber as Monitor. Chris Johnson, CMT's CFO, deposed that CMT is not in a position to make a viable proposal to its creditors and has concluded that a going-concern sale of the Costa Blanca business would be the most appropriate course of action. The Proposal Trustee concurs with that assessment. In light of those opinions, an immediate sale of the Costa Blanca business would be warranted in order to attract the best bids for that business on a going-concern basis. Such a sale, according to the evidence, stands the best chance of maximizing recovery by the remaining secured creditors and preserving the employment of a large number of people. No better viable alternative has been put forward.

[21] Accordingly, I approve the proposed sale process as described in paragraph 37 of the affidavit of Chris Johnson.

V. Administration Charges

[22] CMT seeks approval under section 11.52 of the CCAA of an Administration Charge over the assets of CMT to secure the professional fees and disbursements of Farber as Monitor and its counsel, as well as the fees of Ernst & Young Orenda Corporate Finance Inc. ("E&Y"), who has been acting as CMT's financial advisor, together with its counsel. The order sought reflects, in

¹² *Nortel Networks, supra.*, para. 49. See also *Re Brainhunter Inc.* (2009), 62 C.B.R. (5th) 41 (Ont. S.C.J.), para. 13.

large part, the priorities of various charges approved during the *BIA* Part III proposal process. CMT proposes that the Professionals Charge approved under the *BIA* orders and the CCAA Administration Charge rank *pari passu*, and that whereas the *BIA* orders treated as ranking fourth “the balance of any indebtedness under the Professionals Charge”, the CCAA order would place a cap of \$250,000 on such portions of the Professionals and CCAA Administration Charges.

[23] No interested person opposes the charges sought.

[24] I am satisfied that the charge requested is appropriate given the importance of the professional advice to the completion of the Urban Behavior transaction and the sale process for the Costa Blanca business.

VI. Order granted

[25] I have reviewed the draft Initial Order submitted by CMT and am satisfied that an order should issue in that form.

[26] CMT also seeks a variation of paragraph 3 of the Approval and Vesting Order of Morawetz J. made November 7, 2011 in respect of the Urban Behavior transaction to include, in the released claims, the Professionals Charge and the CCAA Administration Charge. None of the secured creditors objects to the variation sought and it is consistent with the intent of the existing language of that order. I therefore grant the variation sought and I have signed the order.

(original signed by)

D. M. Brown J.

Date: December 16, 2011

TAB 11



ONTARIO SUPERIOR COURT OF JUSTICE
(COMMERCIAL LIST)

COUNSEL/ENDORSEMENT SLIP

COURT FILE NO.: BK-24-03050418-0031

DATE: July 5, 2024

NO. ON LIST: 3

TITLE OF PROCEEDING: THE BODY SHOP CANADA LIMITED et al

BEFORE: JUSTICE OSBORNE

PARTICIPANT INFORMATION

For Plaintiff, Applicant, Moving Party:

| Name of Person Appearing | Name of Party | Contact Info |
|---|------------------------------|---|
| Natasha MacParland Natalie Renner Chenyang Li | The Body Shop Canada Limited | nmacparland@dwpv.com; nrenner@dwpv.com; cli@dwpv.com; |

For Defendant, Respondent, Responding Party:

| Name of Person Appearing | Name of Party | Contact Info |
|------------------------------|--|--|
| Abir Shamim Andrew Hatnay | Stephanie Hood and other terminated employees of TBS Canada Ltd. | ashamim@kmlaw.ca; jharnum@kmlaw.ca; ahatnay@kmlaw.ca; |
| Jane Dietrich Alec Hoy | A&M Canada (Proposed Monitor) | jdietrich@cassels.com; ahoy@cassels.com; |
| Josh Nevsky Mitch Binder | Proposal Trustee | jnevsky@alvarezandmarsal.com; mbinder@alvarezandmarsal.com; |

For Other, Self-Represented:

| Name of Person Appearing | Name of Party | Contact Info |
|--------------------------|--|--------------------------------|
| David Bish | Cadillac Fairview | dbish@torys.com; |
| Linda Galessiere | Counsel for various landlords (RioCan, Ivanhoe, Cushman, Morguard, Salthill and Triovest | lgalessiere@cglegal.ca; |
| Jordan Searle | The Body Shop Canada | jordan.searle@thebodyshop.com; |

ENDORSEMENT OF JUSTICE OSBORNE:

- [1] The Body Shop Canada (“TBS Canada” or the “Company”) seeks three orders:
- a. an Initial Order authorizing under the *CCAA*, the continuation of this *BIA* proposal proceeding commenced pursuant to an NOI, together with related relief;
 - b. a Sale Process Order approving the sale and investor solicitation process (“SISP”) as described in the motion materials; and
 - c. a Discharge and Termination Order discharging the Proposal Trustee upon the filing of a certificate, terminating this NOI proceeding, together with related relief, in the alternative to which the Company seeks an order extending the period within which it must file a proposal from July 12, 2024 to and including August 26, 2024, pursuant to section 50.4(9) of the *BIA*.
- [2] The Service List was served with the motion materials on June 24, 2024. The relief sought today is unopposed, and is supported by Cadillac Fairview (one of the landlords) and recommended by the Proposal Trustee (which firm is proposed to be the Court-appointed Monitor if the relief being sought is granted).
- [3] TBS Canada relies on the affidavit of Jordan Searle sworn June 24, 2024, together with exhibits thereto, and the Fifth Report of the Proposal Trustee and Pre-Filing Report of the Proposed Monitor dated June 28, 2024. Defined terms in this Endorsement have the meaning given to them in my earlier Endorsements made in this proceeding, in the motion materials and/or in the Fifth Report, unless otherwise stated.
- [4] For the reasons that follow, I am satisfied that the proposed relief should be granted.
- [5] The background to, and context of, this motion is set out in the motion materials, the Fifth Report, and my earlier Endorsements made in this proceeding, including but not limited to my Endorsement of yesterday, July 4, 2024.
- [6] There is currently a sale process underway in respect of the UK Parent in the UK Administration. Given the highly integrated nature of the operations of TBS Canada and TBS International, any going-concern solution for the Company is heavily reliant and dependent upon the outcome of the UK Sale Process.
- [7] If not for the stay of proceedings already granted pursuant to the *BIA*, TBS Canada would lack sufficient funds to satisfy its obligations and continue its operations. It cannot meet its obligations as they generally become due and is therefore insolvent.

- [8] The *CCAA* offers significant flexibility for the Company to reorganize its business, and in particular would permit the UK Sale Process to develop and evolve, while providing flexibility as to timing and outcome for TBS Canada and avoiding the possibility where a *BIA* proposal is rejected by creditors with the result if protection continues within the current NOI proceeding, that there would be an automatic transition into bankruptcy. That is not in the interests of any stakeholder.
- [9] The protections available under the *CCAA* will allow TBS Canada to maintain the status quo, have sufficient breathing room to allow for the UK Sale Process to conclude, and to continue its own SISP, all with a view to maximizing value for the benefit of its stakeholders.
- [10] The Court has the jurisdiction to permit the Company to continue the NOI proceeding under the *CCAA* pursuant to section 11.6(a) of the *CCAA*. The factors relevant to the decision as to whether such a conversion should be approved are met here:
- a. it has not filed a proposal under the *BIA*;
 - b. the proposed continuation is consistent with the purposes of the *CCAA*; and
 - c. it has provided the Court with the information that would otherwise form part of an initial *CCAA* application under section 10(2) of the *CCAA*.

See: *Clothing for Modern Times Ltd.*, 2011 ONSC 7522 (“*Clothing*”) at para. 9, followed with approval in *Re Comstock Canada, Ltd.*, 2013 ONSC 4756 at paras. 36-45; *Re Urbancorp. Toronto Management Inc.*, 2016 ONSC 3288 at paras. 36-48; and *Re Stantive Technologies Group Inc.*, Ct. File No. 31-BK-244835.

- [11] Obviously, the Company must also be a company with liabilities that exceed \$5 million, as required by section 3.1 of the *CCAA*.

- [12] TBS Canada has not filed a *BIA* proposal.

- [13] The purposes of the *CCAA* have been set out by the Supreme Court of Canada:

- a. to permit a company to carry on business and, where possible, avoid the adverse effects of bankruptcy or liquidation while a court-supervised attempt to reorganize the financial affairs of the debtor is made; and
- b. to preserve the status quo while attempts are made to find a reorganization solution that is fair to all stakeholders.

See: *Century Services Inc. v. Canada (Attorney General)*, 2010 SCC 60, at paras. 15, 69, 70 and 77.

- [14] A sale of the debtor's business as a going concern satisfies the purposes of the *CCAA*: *Clothing*, at para. 12.
- [15] TBS Canada submits, and the Proposal Trustee concurs, that there is a prospect that a going concern solution may be negotiated that would allow the Company to carry on business and Canada. Additional time is required, however, given the independent developments in the UK Administration, and particularly the UK Sale Process. As a result of all of this, it is unlikely that TBS Canada will be able to complete a sale of its business within the strict deadlines applicable to this NOI proceeding under the *BIA*, which requires a proposal to be filed by September 1, 2024, failing which the Company will automatically be deemed bankrupt.
- [16] I am also satisfied that the conversion to a *CCAA* proceeding will have the additional benefit of reducing administrative and legal costs, given the flexibility with respect to reporting and attendances. It will also preserve the status quo by allowing TBS Canada to continue operations, maintain the employment of approximately 570 individuals, and pay its obligations in the ordinary course while it pursues the *SISP*, all for the benefit of stakeholders.
- [17] TBS Canada has provided all of the information that would otherwise be filed on a *CCAA* Initial Order application, including but not limited to a cash flow forecast for the period ending October 11, 2024 and the Company's most recent financial information, as well as a report demonstrating that the Proposal Trustee and proposed Monitor believe the cash flow analysis is reasonable and that they support the request for conversion.
- [18] I am also satisfied that TBS Canada is a debtor company with liabilities that exceed \$5 million. The firm currently acting in the capacity as Proposal Trustee, Alvarez & Marsal Canada Inc., is qualified to act as Court-appointed Monitor, has consented to do so and is not affected by any restrictions as set out in section 11.7(2) of the *CCAA*.
- [19] I am satisfied that the stay of proceedings can and should be extended to and including October 8, 2024. Such a period of time is appropriate and required for the reasons set out above, and has been authorized by this Court in previous cases on a conversion from a *BIA* proceeding, such as is this case, notwithstanding section 11.02(1) of the *CCAA*. See: *Re Cannmart Labs, Inc.*, CV-24-00719639-00CL; *Re Medifocus Inc.*, CV-20-00669781-00CL and *Re Tribalscale Inc.*, CV-20-00645116-00CL.
- [20] In my view, a comeback hearing within 10 days is both unnecessary and inefficient in that it will needlessly increase professional costs. Given that this is a transition proceeding, all affected parties are on notice. The usual considerations that may apply on an Initial Order application, and the imperative for very limited relief sought on what is usually an *ex parte* basis, do not apply the circumstances. The affected parties are here. Moreover, the proposed order contains the usual comeback clause such that any party who seeks to have the order amended or vacated has the ability to do so. The basis for the proposed stay is fully

set out in the materials and described above. Practically, nothing is going to have changed within the next 10 days. Moreover, the relief sought in the *CCAA* Initial Order is not new in the sense of being novel nor is it new even to the parties affected by this proceeding. Rather, it is simply an extension of the relief already granted in this NOI proceeding. Simply put, there is no utility in a hearing within that period of time.

- [21] For these reasons, the motion to convert and continue is more analogous to a motion contemplated under section 11.02(2) than section 11.02(1) of the *CCAA*. Pursuant to section 11.02(2), the Court may grant an extension of the stay for any period of time the Court thinks necessary where the Court is satisfied that: a) circumstances exist that make the order appropriate; and b) the applicant has acted, and is acting, in good faith and with due diligence. Those requirements are met here for the reasons set out above.
- [22] Accordingly, I am satisfied that a continuation of creditor protection under the *CCAA* is appropriate here, and that the terms of the proposed Initial Order are appropriate.
- [23] For the same reasons, I am satisfied that the Charges granted in the current NOI proceeding should be continued in the same order of priority. This is consistent with both sections 11.51 and 11.52 of the *CCAA* and the factors set out by Pepall, J. (as she then was) in *Re CanWest Publishing Inc.*, 2010 ONSC 222 at para. 54 in respect of an administration charge; and by Chief Justice Morawetz in respect of the Directors and Officers Charge as set out in *Re Jaguar Mining Inc.*, 2015 ONSC 494 at para. 45.
- [24] I am further satisfied that the KERP and the KERP Charge are appropriate, should be continued, and meet the factors set out in *Re Grant Forest Products Inc.*, 2009, CanLII 42046 at paras. 8-12.
- [25] Finally, I am satisfied that the proposed SISP should be approved. The factors set out in *Re Nortel Networks Corporation*, 2009 CanLII 39492 at para. 49, together with the additional factors identified in subsequent cases such as *CCM Master Qualified Fund v. blutip Power Technologies Inc.*, 2012 ONSC 1750 at para. 6 have all been met here.
- [26] In practical terms, the SISP and the outcome thereof, will be affected in large measure by the results of the UK Sale Process. If the ultimate purchaser of the UK Parent wishes to continue TBS Canada as a wholly-owned subsidiary, that will take the SISP here in one direction. If it does not, there will have to be an agreement between the successful purchaser in the UK and a successful purchaser of TBS Canada under the SISP with respect to intellectual property rights and other issues relevant to the continuation of the business of TBS Canada as a wholly independent enterprise. All of that remains to be seen, and the proposed SISP builds in the flexibility to account for, and adapt to, events as they develop and evolve in the UK.

- [27] Finally, it follows from all of the above that this NOI proceeding should be terminated and the conduct and fees of the Proposal Trustee and its counsel approved, and those parties be released from claims relating to this proceeding (other than claims arising from gross negligence or wilful misconduct). See: *Re Target Canada Co.*, 2015 ONSC 7574 at para. 22, which rationale applies also to proposal trustees and receivers under the *BIA*. Accordingly, the alternative relief of extending the time to file a proposal under the *BIA* is not necessary.
- [28] Here, the fees of the Proposal Trustee and its counsel are appropriate and are approved: *Bank of Nova Scotia v. Diemer*, 2014 ONCA 851 at paras. 33 ad 45. So too are the releases sought by the Proposal Trustee and its counsel, together with counsel for the Company: *Re Nordstrom Canada Retail, Inc.*, 2024 ONSC 1622 at para. 29.
- [29] For all of the above reasons, the Initial Order pursuant to the *CCAA*, the NOI Discharge and Termination Order under the *BIA* and the Sale Process (SISP) Order are granted.
- [30] Orders to go in the form signed by me which are effective immediately and without the necessity of issuing and entering.

Oliver, J.

TAB 12

Court File Number **2401-17986**

COURT FILE NUMBER 25-3086318 / B301-86318

COURT COURT OF KING'S BENCH OF ALBERTA

JUDICIAL CENTRE CALGARY

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

 AND IN THE MATTER OF THE COMPROMISE OR
ARRANGEMENT OF 420 INVESTMENTS LTD., 420
PREMIUM MARKETS LTD., GREEN ROCK CANNABIS
(EC 1) LIMITED and 420 DISPENSARIES LTD.

APPLICANTS 420 INVESTMENTS LTD., 420 PREMIUM MARKETS
LTD., GREEN ROCK CANNABIS (EC 1) LIMITED, and
420 DISPENSARIES LTD.

DOCUMENT **INITIAL ORDER**

ADDRESS FOR SERVICE **STIKEMAN ELLIOTT LLP**
AND CONTACT Barristers & Solicitors
INFORMATION OF 4200 Bankers Hall West
PARTY FILING THIS 888-3rd Street SW
DOCUMENT Calgary, AB T2P 5C5

Karen Fellowes, K.C. / Natasha Doelman
Tel: (403) 724-9469 / (403) 781-9196
Fax: (403) 266-9034
Email: kfellowes@stikeman.com / ndoelman@stikeman.com
File No.: 155857.1002

Clerk's stamp



DATE ON WHICH ORDER WAS PRONOUNCED: September 19, 2024

LOCATION WHERE ORDER WAS PRONOUNCED: Calgary, Alberta

JUSTICE WHO MADE THIS ORDER: The Honourable Justice Jones

UPON the application of 420 Investments Ltd., 420 Premium Markets Ltd., Green Rock Cannabis (EC 1) Limited, and 420 Dispensaries Ltd. (collectively, the "**Applicants**"); **AND UPON** having read the Originating Application, the Affidavit of Scott Morrow sworn on September 10, 2024 (the "**Morrow Affidavit**"); and the Affidavit of Service of Jessica Watts sworn September 19, 2024; **AND UPON** reading the consent of KSV Restructuring Inc. ("**KSV**") to act as Monitor (the "**Monitor**"); **AND UPON** being advised that the Applicants had previously commenced proceedings under Part III of the *Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act*, R.S.C. 1985, c. B-3 (the "**BIA**"), having Court File Number 25-3086318 (the "**NOI Proceedings**"), with the current stay under the NOI Proceedings scheduled to expire on September 26, 2024; **AND UPON** noting that KSV was appointed Proposal Trustee ("**Proposal Trustee**") in the NOI

Proceedings; **AND UPON** hearing submissions by counsel for the Applicants, counsel for the Proposal Trustee in the NOI Proceedings and the proposed Monitor, and any other counsel or other interested parties present; **AND UPON** reading the Third Report of the Proposal Trustee dated September 13, 2024;

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED AND DECLARED THAT:

SERVICE

1. The time for service of the notice of application for this order (the “**Order**”) is hereby abridged and deemed good and sufficient and this application is properly returnable today.

APPLICATION

2. The Applicants are companies to which the *Companies’ Creditors Arrangement Act* of Canada (the “**CCAA**”) applies.
3. The NOI Proceedings are hereby taken up and continued under the CCAA and the provisions of Part III of the BIA shall have no further application to the Applicants. The NOI Proceedings shall have no further force and effect, and are hereby terminated, save that any and all acts, steps, agreements and procedures validly taken, done or entered into by the Applicants during the NOI Proceedings shall remain valid, binding and actionable within these proceedings. For certainty, approval of the Monitor’s and its counsel’s fees and disbursements and approval of the Monitor’s activities in this proceeding shall be deemed approval of the fees and disbursements and activities of KSV in its capacity as Proposal Trustee and the fees and disbursements of the Proposal Trustee’s counsel in the NOI Proceedings. The Applicants are hereby directed and authorized to file a copy of this Order in the NOI Proceedings.

PLAN OF ARRANGEMENT

4. The Applicants shall have the authority to file and may, subject to further order of this Court, file with this Court a plan of compromise or arrangement (the “**Plan**”).

POSSESSION OF PROPERTY AND OPERATIONS

5. The Applicants shall:
 - (a) remain in possession and control of their current and future assets, undertakings and properties of every nature and kind whatsoever, and wherever situate including all proceeds thereof (the “**Property**”);
 - (b) subject to further order of this Court, continue to carry on business in a manner consistent with the preservation of their business (the “**Business**”) and Property; and

- (c) be authorized and empowered to continue to retain and employ the employees, consultants, agents, experts, accountants, counsel and such other persons (collectively “**Assistants**”) currently retained or employed by it, with liberty to retain such further Assistants as it deems reasonably necessary or desirable in the ordinary course of business or for the carrying out of the terms of this Order.
- 6. To the extent permitted by law, the Applicants shall be entitled but not required to make the following advances or payments of the following expenses, incurred prior to or after this Order:
 - (a) all outstanding and future wages, salaries, employee and pension benefits, vacation pay and expenses payable on or after the date of this Order, in each case incurred in the ordinary course of business and consistent with existing compensation policies and arrangements; and
 - (b) the reasonable fees and disbursements of any Assistants retained or employed by the Applicants in respect of these proceedings, at their standard rates and charges, including for periods prior to the date of this Order.
- 7. Except as otherwise provided to the contrary herein, the Applicants shall be entitled but not required to pay all reasonable expenses incurred by the Applicants in carrying on the Business in the ordinary course after this Order, and in carrying out the provisions of this Order, which expenses shall include, without limitation:
 - (a) all expenses and capital expenditures reasonably necessary for the preservation of the Property or the Business including, without limitation, payments on account of insurance (including directors and officers insurance), maintenance and security services; and
 - (b) payment for goods or services actually supplied to the Applicants following the date of this Order.
- 8. The Applicants shall remit, in accordance with legal requirements, or pay:
 - (a) any statutory deemed trust amounts in favour of the Crown in Right of Canada or of any Province thereof or any other taxation authority that are required to be deducted from employees' wages, including, without limitation, amounts in respect of:
 - (i) employment insurance,
 - (ii) Canada Pension Plan,
 - (iii) Quebec Pension Plan, and
 - (iv) income taxes,

but only where such statutory deemed trust amounts arise after the date of this Order, or are not required to be remitted until after the date of this Order, unless otherwise ordered by the Court;

- (b) all goods and services or other applicable sales taxes (collectively, "**Sales Taxes**") required to be remitted by the Applicants in connection with the sale of goods and services by the Applicants, but only where such Sales Taxes are accrued or collected after the date of this Order, or where such Sales Taxes were accrued or collected prior to the date of this Order but not required to be remitted until on or after the date of this Order; and
 - (c) any amount payable to the Crown in Right of Canada or of any Province thereof or any political subdivision thereof or any other taxation authority in respect of municipal realty, municipal business or other taxes, assessments or levies of any nature or kind which are entitled at law to be paid in priority to claims of secured creditors and that are attributable to or in respect of the carrying on of the Business by the Applicants.
9. Until such time as a real property lease is disclaimed or resiliated in accordance with the CCAA, the Applicants may pay all amounts constituting rent or payable as rent under real property leases (including, for greater certainty, common area maintenance charges, utilities and realty taxes and any other amounts payable as rent to the landlord under the lease) based on the terms of existing lease arrangements or as otherwise may be negotiated by the Applicants from time to time for the period commencing from and including the date of this Order ("**Rent**"), but shall not pay any rent in arrears.
10. Except as specifically permitted in this Order, the Applicants are hereby directed, until further order of this Court:
- (a) to make no payments of principal, interest thereon or otherwise on account of amounts owing by the Applicants to any of their creditors as of the date of this Order;
 - (b) to grant no security interests, trust, liens, charges or encumbrances upon or in respect of any of their Property; and
 - (c) not to grant credit or incur liabilities except in the ordinary course of the Business.

RESTRUCTURING

11. The Applicants shall, subject to such requirements as are imposed by the CCAA, have the right to:
- (a) permanently or temporarily cease, downsize or shut down any portion of its business or operations and to dispose of redundant or non-material assets not exceeding \$100,000 in any one transaction or \$250,000 in the aggregate, provided that any sale that is either

(i) in excess of the above thresholds, or (ii) in favour of a person related to the Applicants (within the meaning of section 36(5) of the CCAA), shall require authorization by this Court in accordance with section 36 of the CCAA;

- (b) terminate the employment of such of its employees or temporarily lay off such of its employees as it deems appropriate on such terms as may be agreed upon between the Applicants and such employee, or failing such agreement, to deal with the consequences thereof in the Plan;
- (c) disclaim or resiliate, in whole or in part, with the prior consent of the Monitor (as defined below) or further Order of the Court, their arrangements or agreements of any nature whatsoever with whomsoever, whether oral or written, as the Applicants deem appropriate, in accordance with section 32 of the CCAA; and
- (d) pursue all avenues of refinancing of its Business or Property, in whole or in part, subject to prior approval of this Court being obtained before any material refinancing,

all of the foregoing to permit the Applicants to proceed with an orderly restructuring of the Business (the “**Restructuring**”).

12. The Applicants shall provide each of the relevant landlords with notice of the Applicants' intention to remove any fixtures from any leased premises at least seven (7) days prior to the date of the intended removal. The relevant landlord shall be entitled to have a representative present in the leased premises to observe such removal. If the landlord disputes the Applicants' entitlement to remove any such fixture under the provisions of the lease, such fixture shall remain on the premises and shall be dealt with as agreed between any applicable secured creditors, such landlord and the Applicants, or by further order of this Court upon application by the Applicants on at least two (2) days' notice to such landlord and any such secured creditors. If the Applicants disclaim or resiliate the lease governing such leased premises in accordance with section 32 of the CCAA, they shall not be required to pay Rent under such lease pending resolution of any such dispute other than Rent payable for the notice period provided for in section 32(5) of the CCAA, and the disclaimer or resiliation of the lease shall be without prejudice to the Applicants' claim to the fixtures in dispute.
13. If a notice of disclaimer or resiliation is delivered pursuant to section 32 of the CCAA, then:
 - (a) during the notice period prior to the effective time of the disclaimer or resiliation, the landlord may show the affected leased premises to prospective tenants during normal business hours, on giving the Applicants and the Monitor 24 hours' prior written notice; and

- (b) at the effective time of the disclaimer or resiliation, the relevant landlord shall be entitled to take possession of any such leased premises without waiver of or prejudice to any claims or rights such landlord may have against the Applicants in respect of such lease or leased premises and such landlord shall be entitled to notify the Applicants of the basis on which it is taking possession and to gain possession of and re-lease such leased premises to any third party or parties on such terms as such landlord considers advisable, provided that nothing herein shall relieve such landlord of its obligation to mitigate any damages claimed in connection therewith.

NO PROCEEDINGS AGAINST THE APPLICANTS OR THE PROPERTY

- 14. Until and including September 29, 2024, or such later date as this Court may order (the “**Stay Period**”), no proceeding or enforcement process in any court (each, a “**Proceeding**”) shall be commenced or continued against or in respect of the Applicants or the Monitor, or affecting the Business or the Property, except with leave of this Court, and any and all Proceedings currently under way against or in respect of the Applicants or affecting the Business or the Property are hereby stayed and suspended pending further order of this Court.

NO EXERCISE OF RIGHTS OR REMEDIES

- 15. During the Stay Period, all rights and remedies of any individual, firm, corporation, governmental body or agency, or any other entities (all of the foregoing, collectively being “**Persons**” and each being a “**Person**”), whether judicial or extra-judicial, statutory or non-statutory against or in respect of the Applicants or the Monitor, or affecting the Business or the Property, are hereby stayed and suspended and shall not be commenced, proceeded with or continued except with leave of this Court, provided that nothing in this Order shall:
 - (a) empower the Applicants to carry on any business that the Applicants are not lawfully entitled to carry on;
 - (b) affect such investigations, actions, suits or proceedings by a regulatory body as are permitted by section 11.1 of the CCAA;
 - (c) prevent the filing of any registration to preserve or perfect a security interest;
 - (d) prevent the registration of a claim for lien; or
 - (e) exempt the Applicants from compliance with statutory or regulatory provisions relating to health, safety or the environment.
- 16. Nothing in this Order shall prevent any party from taking an action against the Applicants where such an action must be taken in order to comply with statutory time limitations in order to

preserve their rights at law, provided that no further steps shall be taken by such party except in accordance with the other provisions of this Order, and notice in writing of such action be given to the Monitor at the first available opportunity.

NO INTERFERENCE WITH RIGHTS

17. During the Stay Period, no person shall accelerate, suspend, discontinue, fail to honour, alter, interfere with, repudiate, terminate or cease to perform any right, renewal right, contract, agreement, licence or permit in favour of or held by the Applicants, except with the written consent of the Applicants and the Monitor, or leave of this Court.

CONTINUATION OF SERVICES

18. During the Stay Period, all persons having:

- (a) statutory or regulatory mandates for the supply of goods and/or services; or
- (b) oral or written agreements or arrangements with the Applicants, including without limitation all computer software, communication and other data services, centralized banking services, payroll services, insurance, transportation, services, utility or other services to the Business or the Applicants

are hereby restrained until further order of this Court from discontinuing, altering, interfering with, suspending or terminating the supply of such goods or services as may be required by the Applicants or exercising any other remedy provided under such agreements or arrangements. The Applicants shall be entitled to the continued use of their current premises, telephone numbers, facsimile numbers, internet addresses and domain names, provided in each case that the usual prices or charges for all such goods or services received after the date of this Order are paid by the Applicants in accordance with the payment practices of the Applicants, or such other practices as may be agreed upon by the supplier or service provider and each of the Applicants and the Monitor, or as may be ordered by this Court.

NON-DEROGATION OF RIGHTS

19. Nothing in this Order has the effect of prohibiting a person from requiring immediate payment for goods, services, use of leased or licensed property or other valuable consideration provided on or after the date of this Order, nor shall any person, other than the Interim Lender where applicable, be under any obligation on or after the date of this Order to advance or re-advance any monies or otherwise extend any credit to the Applicants.

PROCEEDINGS AGAINST DIRECTORS AND OFFICERS

20. During the Stay Period, and except as permitted by subsection 11.03(2) of the CCAA and paragraph 15 of this Order, no Proceeding may be commenced or continued against any of the former, current or future directors or officers of the Applicants with respect to any claim against the directors or officers that arose before the date of this Order and that relates to any obligations of the Applicants whereby the directors or officers are alleged under any law to be liable in their capacity as directors or officers for the payment or performance of such obligations, until a compromise or arrangement in respect of the Applicants, if one is filed, is sanctioned by this Court or is refused by the creditors of the Applicants or this Court.

DIRECTORS' AND OFFICERS' INDEMNIFICATION AND CHARGE

21. The Applicants shall indemnify their directors and officers against obligations and liabilities that they may incur as directors and or officers of the Applicants after the commencement of the within proceedings except to the extent that, with respect to any officer or director, the obligation was incurred as a result of the director's or officer's gross negligence or wilful misconduct.
22. The directors and officers of the Applicants shall be entitled to the benefit of and are hereby granted a charge (the "D&O Charge") on the Property, which charge shall not exceed an aggregate amount of \$433,000, as security for the indemnity provided in paragraph 21 of this Order. The D&O Charge shall have the priority set out in paragraphs 34 and 36 herein.
23. Notwithstanding any language in any applicable insurance policy to the contrary:
- (a) no insurer shall be entitled to be subrogated to or claim the benefit of the D&O Charge; and
 - (b) the Applicants' directors and officers shall only be entitled to the benefit of the D&O Charge to the extent that they do not have coverage under any directors' and officers' insurance policy, or to the extent that such coverage is insufficient to pay amounts indemnified in accordance with paragraph 21 of this Order.

APPOINTMENT OF MONITOR

24. KSV is hereby appointed pursuant to the CCAA as the Monitor, an officer of this Court, to monitor the Property, Business, and financial affairs and the Applicants with the powers and obligations set out in the CCAA or set forth herein and that the Applicants and their shareholders, officers, directors, and Assistants shall advise the Monitor of all material steps taken by the Applicants pursuant to this Order, and shall co-operate fully with the Monitor in the exercise of its powers

and discharge of its obligations and provide the Monitor with the assistance that is necessary to enable the Monitor to adequately carry out the Monitor's functions.

25. The Monitor, in addition to its prescribed rights and obligations under the CCAA, is hereby directed and empowered to:

- (a) monitor the Applicants' receipts and disbursements, Business and dealings with the Property;
- (b) report to this Court at such times and intervals as the Monitor may deem appropriate with respect to matters relating to the Property, the Business, and such other matters as may be relevant to the proceedings herein and immediately report to the Court if in the opinion of the Monitor there is a material adverse change in the financial circumstances of the Applicants;
- (c) advise the Applicants in their preparation of the Applicants' cash flow statements;
- (d) advise the Applicants in their development of the Plan and any amendments to the Plan;
- (e) assist the Applicants, to the extent required by the Applicants, with the holding and administering of creditors' or shareholders' meetings for voting on the Plan;
- (f) have full and complete access to the Property, including the premises, books, records, data, including data in electronic form and other financial documents of the Applicants to the extent that is necessary to adequately assess the Property, Business, and financial affairs of the Applicants or to perform its duties arising under this Order;
- (g) be at liberty to engage independent legal counsel or such other persons as the Monitor deems necessary or advisable respecting the exercise of its powers and performance of its obligations under this Order;
- (h) hold funds in trust or in escrow, to the extent required, to facilitate settlements between the Applicants and any other Person; and
- (i) perform such other duties as are required by this Order or by this Court from time to time.

26. The Monitor shall not take possession of the Property and shall take no part whatsoever in the management or supervision of the management of the Business and shall not, by fulfilling its obligations hereunder, or by inadvertence in relation to the due exercise of powers or performance of duties under this Order, be deemed to have taken or maintain possession or control of the Business or Property, or any part thereof. Nothing in this Order shall require the Monitor to occupy or to take control, care, charge, possession or management of any of the Property that might be environmentally contaminated, or might cause or contribute to a spill, discharge, release or deposit of a substance contrary to any federal, provincial or other law

respecting the protection, conservation, enhancement, remediation or rehabilitation of the environment or relating to the disposal or waste or other contamination, provided however that this Order does not exempt the Monitor from any duty to report or make disclosure imposed by applicable environmental legislation or regulation. The Monitor shall not, as a result of this Order or anything done in pursuance of the Monitor's duties and powers under this Order be deemed to be in possession of any of the Property within the meaning of any federal or provincial environmental legislation.

27. The Monitor shall provide any creditor of the Applicants and the Interim Lender with information provided by the Applicants in response to reasonable requests for information made in writing by such creditor addressed to the Monitor. The Monitor shall not have any responsibility or liability with respect to the information disseminated by it pursuant to this paragraph. In the case of information that the Monitor has been advised by the Applicants is confidential, the Monitor shall not provide such information to creditors unless otherwise directed by this Court or on such terms as the Monitor and the Applicants may agree.
28. In addition to the rights and protections afforded the Monitor under the CCAA or as an Officer of this Court, the Monitor shall incur no liability or obligation as a result of its appointment or the carrying out of the provisions of this Order, save and except for any gross negligence or wilful misconduct on its part. Nothing in this Order shall derogate from the protections afforded the Monitor by the CCAA or any applicable legislation.
29. The Monitor, counsel to the Monitor, and counsel to the Applicants shall be paid their reasonable fees and disbursements (including any pre-filing fees and disbursements related to these CCAA proceedings), in each case at their standard rates and charges, by the Applicants as part of the costs of these proceedings. The Applicants are hereby authorized and directed to pay the accounts of the Monitor, counsel for the Monitor and counsel for the Applicant on a monthly basis.
30. The Monitor and its legal counsel shall pass their accounts from time to time.
31. The Monitor, counsel to the Monitor, if any, and the Applicants' counsel, as security for the professional fees and disbursements incurred both before and after the granting of this Order, shall be entitled to the benefits of and are hereby granted a charge (the "**Administrative Charge**") on the Property, which charge shall not exceed an aggregate amount of \$300,000, as security for their professional fees and disbursements incurred at the normal rates and charges of the Monitor and such counsel, both before and after the making of this Order in respect of these proceedings. The Administrative Charge shall have the priority set out in paragraphs 34 and 36 hereof.

KEY EMPLOYEE RETENTION PLAN

32. The amounts payable to the key employees pursuant to the Key Employee Retention Plan (the “KERP”) are hereby secured by a charge (the “KERP Charge”) on the Property, in favour of the key employees identified in the KERP. The KERP Charge shall have the priority set out in paragraphs 34 and 36 hereof.
33. The aggregate amount secured by the KERP Charge granted to secure the Applicants’ obligations under the KERP shall be in an amount no more than \$373,928.17, less any amounts already paid pursuant to the KERP.

VALIDITY AND PRIORITY OF CHARGES

34. The priorities of the D&O Charge, the Administrative Charge and the Interim Lender’s Charge, as among them, shall be as follows:
- First – Administrative Charge (to the maximum amount of \$300,000);
- Second – D&O Charge (to the maximum amount of \$433,000); and
- Third – KERP Charge (to the maximum amount of \$373,928.17, less any amounts already paid pursuant to the KERP).
35. The filing, registration or perfection of the D&O Charge, the Administrative Charge or the KERP Charge (collectively, the “Charges”) shall not be required, and the Charges shall be valid and enforceable for all purposes, including as against any right, title or interest filed, registered, recorded or perfected subsequent to the Charges coming into existence, notwithstanding any such failure to file, register, record or perfect.
36. Each of the D&O Charge, the Administrative Charge, and the KERP Charge (all as constituted and defined herein) shall constitute a charge on the Property and subject always to section 34(11) of the CCAA such Charges shall rank in priority to all other security interests, trusts, liens, charges and encumbrances, and claims of secured creditors, statutory or otherwise (collectively, “Encumbrances”) in favour of any Person.
37. Except as otherwise expressly provided for herein, or as may be approved by this Court, the Applicants shall not grant any Encumbrances over any Property that rank in priority to, or *pari passu* with, any of the D&O Charge, the Administrative Charge or the KERP Charge, unless the Applicants also obtain the prior written consent of the Monitor and the beneficiaries of the Charges, or further order of this Court.

38. The D&O Charge, the Administrative Charge, and the KERP Charge shall not be rendered invalid or unenforceable and the rights and remedies of the chargees entitled to the benefit of the Charges (collectively, the "**Chargees**") shall not otherwise be limited or impaired in any way by:
- (a) the pendency of these proceedings and the declarations of insolvency made in this Order;
 - (b) any application(s) for bankruptcy order(s) issued pursuant to BIA, or any bankruptcy order made pursuant to such applications;
 - (c) the filing of any assignments for the general benefit of creditors made pursuant to the BIA;
 - (d) the provisions of any federal or provincial statutes; or
 - (e) any negative covenants, prohibitions or other similar provisions with respect to borrowings, incurring debt or the creation of Encumbrances, contained in any existing loan documents, lease, sublease, offer to lease or other agreement (collectively, an "**Agreement**") that binds the Applicants, and notwithstanding any provision to the contrary in any Agreement:
 - (i) neither the creation of the Charges nor the execution, delivery, perfection, registration or performance of any documents in respect thereof shall create or be deemed to constitute a new breach by the Applicants of any Agreement to which it is a party;
 - (ii) none of the Chargees shall have any liability to any Person whatsoever as a result of any breach of any Agreement caused by or resulting from the creation of the Charges; and
 - (iii) the payments made by the Applicants pursuant to this Order, and the granting of the Charges, do not and will not constitute preferences, fraudulent conveyances, transfers at undervalue, oppressive conduct or other challengeable or voidable transactions under any applicable law.

ALLOCATION

39. Any interested Person may apply to this Court on notice to any other party likely to be affected for an order to allocate the Administrative Charge, the KERP Charge, and the D&O Charge amongst the various assets comprising the Property.

SERVICE AND NOTICE

40. The Monitor shall (i) without delay, publish in the Globe and Mail a notice containing the information prescribed under the CCAA; (ii) within five (5) days after the date of this Order (A) make this Order publicly available in the manner prescribed under the CCAA, (B) send, in the prescribed manner, a notice to every known creditor who has a claim against the Applicants of more than \$1,000 and (C) prepare a list showing the names and addresses of those creditors and the estimated amounts of those claims, and make it publicly available in the prescribed manner, all in accordance with section 23(1)(a) of the CCAA and the regulations made thereunder.
41. The Monitor shall establish or continue a case website in respect of the within proceedings at <https://www.ksvadvisory.com/experience/case/420> (the "**Monitor's Website**").
42. The Applicants and the Monitor are at liberty to serve this Order, any other materials and orders in these proceedings, any notices or other correspondence, by sending true copies thereof by prepaid ordinary mail, recorded mail, courier, personal delivery or electronic transmission to the Applicants' creditors or other interested parties at their respective addresses as last shown on the records of the Applicants and that any such service or notice by courier, personal delivery or electronic transmission shall be deemed to be received on the next business day following the date of forwarding thereof, or if sent by ordinary mail or recorded mail, on the seventh day after mailing. Any person that wishes to be served with any application and other materials in these proceedings must deliver to the Applicants or the Monitor by way of ordinary mail, courier, or electronic transmission, a request to be added to the service list (the "**Service List**") to be maintained by the Monitor.
43. Any party to these proceedings may serve any court materials in these proceedings by emailing a PDF or other electronic copy of such materials to counsel's email addresses as recorded on the Service List from time to time, and the Monitor shall post a copy of all prescribed materials on the Monitor's Website.

GENERAL

44. The Applicants or the Monitor may from time to time apply to this Court for advice and directions in the discharge of their powers and duties hereunder.
45. Notwithstanding Rule 6.11 of the *Alberta Rules of Court*, unless otherwise ordered by this Court, the Monitor will report to the Court from time to time, which reporting is not required to be in affidavit form and shall be considered by this Court as evidence. The Monitor's reports shall be filed by the Court Clerk notwithstanding that they do not include an original signature.

46. Nothing in this Order shall prevent the Monitor from acting as an interim receiver, a receiver, a receiver and manager or a trustee in bankruptcy of the Applicants, the Business or the Property.
47. This Court hereby requests the aid and recognition of any court, tribunal, regulatory or administrative body having jurisdiction in Canada or in any foreign jurisdiction, to give effect to this Order and to assist the Applicants, the Monitor and their respective agents in carrying out the terms of this Order. All courts, tribunals, regulatory and administrative bodies are hereby respectfully requested to make such orders and to provide such assistance to the Applicants and to the Monitor, as an officer of this Court, as may be necessary or desirable to give effect to this Order, to grant representative status to the Monitor in any foreign proceeding, or to assist the Applicants and the Monitor and their respective agents in carrying out the terms of this Order.
48. Each of the Applicants and the Monitor be at liberty and are hereby authorized and empowered to apply to any court, tribunal, regulatory or administrative body, wherever located, for the recognition of this Order and for assistance in carrying out the terms of this Order and that the Monitor is authorized and empowered to act as a representative in respect of the within proceeding for the purpose of having these proceedings recognized in a jurisdiction outside Canada.
49. Any interested party (including the Applicants and the Monitor) may apply to this Court to vary or amend this Order on not less than seven (7) days' notice to any other party or parties likely to be affected by the order sought or upon such other notice, if any, as this Court may order.
50. This Order and all of its provisions are effective as of 12:01 a.m. Mountain Standard Time on the date of this Order.



Justice of the Court of King's Bench of Alberta

TAB 13

Court File Number **2401-17986**

COURT FILE NUMBER 25-3086318 / B301-086318

Clerk's stamp

COURT COURT OF KING'S BENCH OF ALBERTA

JUDICIAL CENTRE CALGARY

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

AND IN THE MATTER OF THE COMPROMISE OR
ARRANGEMENT OF 420 INVESTMENTS LTD., 420
PREMIUM MARKETS LTD., GREEN ROCK CANNABIS
(EC 1) LIMITED and 420 DISPENSARIES LTD.



APPLICANTS 420 INVESTMENTS LTD., 420 PREMIUM MARKETS
LTD., GREEN ROCK CANNABIS (EC 1) LIMITED, and
420 DISPENSARIES LTD.

DOCUMENT **AMENDED AND RESTATED INITIAL ORDER**

ADDRESS FOR SERVICE **STIKEMAN ELLIOTT LLP**
AND CONTACT Barristers & Solicitors
INFORMATION OF 4200 Bankers Hall West
PARTY FILING THIS 888-3rd Street SW
DOCUMENT Calgary, AB T2P 5C5

Karen Fellowes, K.C. / Natasha Doelman
Tel: (403) 724-9469 / (403) 781-9196
Fax: (403) 266-9034
Email: kfellowes@stikeman.com / ndoelman@stikeman.com
File No.: 155857.1002

DATE ON WHICH ORDER WAS PRONOUNCED: September 19, 2024

LOCATION WHERE ORDER WAS PRONOUNCED: Calgary, Alberta

JUSTICE WHO MADE THIS ORDER: The Honourable Justice Jones

UPON the application of 420 Investments Ltd., 420 Premium Markets Ltd., Green Rock Cannabis (EC 1) Limited, and 420 Dispensaries Ltd. (collectively, the "**Applicants**"); **AND UPON** having read the Originating Application, the Affidavit of Scott Morrow sworn on September 10, 2024 (the "**Morrow Affidavit**"); and the Affidavit of Service of Jessica Watts sworn September 19, 2024; **AND UPON** reading the consent of KSV Restructuring Inc. ("**KSV**") to act as Monitor (the "**Monitor**"); **AND UPON** being advised that the Applicants had previously commenced proceedings under Part III of the *Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act*, R.S.C. 1985, c. B-3 (the "**BIA**"), having Court File Number 25-3086318 (the "**NOI Proceedings**"), with the current stay under the NOI Proceedings scheduled to expire on September 26, 2024; **AND UPON** noting that KSV was appointed Proposal Trustee ("**Proposal Trustee**") in the NOI

Proceedings; **AND UPON** hearing submissions by counsel for the Applicants, counsel for the Proposal Trustee in the NOI Proceedings and the proposed Monitor, and any other counsel or other interested parties present; **AND UPON** reading the Third Report of the Proposal Trustee dated September 13, 2024;

AND UPON HAVING GRANTED the Initial Order commencing the within CCAA proceedings;

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED AND DECLARED THAT:

SERVICE

1. The time for service of the notice of application for this order (the “**Order**”) is hereby abridged and deemed good and sufficient and this application is properly returnable today.

APPLICATION

2. The Applicants are a company to which the *Companies’ Creditors Arrangement Act* of Canada (the “**CCAA**”) applies.
3. The NOI Proceedings are hereby taken up and continued under the CCAA and the provisions of Part III of the BIA shall have no further application to the Applicants. The NOI Proceedings shall have no further force and effect, and are hereby terminated, save that any and all acts, steps, agreements and procedures validly taken, done or entered into by the Applicants during the NOI Proceedings shall remain valid, binding and actionable within these proceedings. For certainty, approval of the Monitor’s and its counsel’s fees and disbursements and approval of the Monitor’s activities in this proceeding shall be deemed approval of the fees and disbursements and activities of KSV in its capacity as Proposal Trustee and the fees and disbursements of the Proposal Trustee’s counsel in the NOI Proceedings. The Applicants are hereby directed and authorized to file a copy of this Order in the NOI Proceedings.

PLAN OF ARRANGEMENT

4. The Applicants shall have the authority to file and may, subject to further order of this Court, file with this Court a plan of compromise or arrangement (the “**Plan**”).

POSSESSION OF PROPERTY AND OPERATIONS

5. The Applicants shall:
 - (a) remain in possession and control of their current and future assets, undertakings and properties of every nature and kind whatsoever, and wherever situate including all proceeds thereof (the “**Property**”);

- (b) subject to further order of this Court, continue to carry on business in a manner consistent with the preservation of their business (the “**Business**”) and Property; and
 - (c) be authorized and empowered to continue to retain and employ the employees, consultants, agents, experts, accountants, counsel and such other persons (collectively “**Assistants**”) currently retained or employed by it, with liberty to retain such further Assistants as it deems reasonably necessary or desirable in the ordinary course of business or for the carrying out of the terms of this Order.
- 6. To the extent permitted by law, the Applicants shall be entitled but not required to make the following advances or payments of the following expenses, incurred prior to or after this Order:
 - (a) all outstanding and future wages, salaries, employee and pension benefits, vacation pay and expenses payable on or after the date of this Order, in each case incurred in the ordinary course of business and consistent with existing compensation policies and arrangements; and
 - (b) the reasonable fees and disbursements of any Assistants retained or employed by the Applicants in respect of these proceedings, at their standard rates and charges, including for periods prior to the date of this Order.
- 7. Except as otherwise provided to the contrary herein, the Applicants shall be entitled but not required to pay all reasonable expenses incurred by the Applicants in carrying on the Business in the ordinary course after this Order, and in carrying out the provisions of this Order, which expenses shall include, without limitation:
 - (a) all expenses and capital expenditures reasonably necessary for the preservation of the Property or the Business including, without limitation, payments on account of insurance (including directors and officers insurance), maintenance and security services; and
 - (b) payment for goods or services actually supplied to the Applicants following the date of this Order.
- 8. The Applicants shall remit, in accordance with legal requirements, or pay:
 - (a) any statutory deemed trust amounts in favour of the Crown in Right of Canada or of any Province thereof or any other taxation authority that are required to be deducted from employees' wages, including, without limitation, amounts in respect of:
 - (i) employment insurance,
 - (ii) Canada Pension Plan,
 - (iii) Quebec Pension Plan, and
 - (iv) income taxes,

but only where such statutory deemed trust amounts arise after the date of this Order, or are not required to be remitted until after the date of this Order, unless otherwise ordered by the Court;

- (b) all goods and services or other applicable sales taxes (collectively, "**Sales Taxes**") required to be remitted by the Applicants in connection with the sale of goods and services by the Applicants, but only where such Sales Taxes are accrued or collected after the date of this Order, or where such Sales Taxes were accrued or collected prior to the date of this Order but not required to be remitted until on or after the date of this Order; and
 - (c) any amount payable to the Crown in Right of Canada or of any Province thereof or any political subdivision thereof or any other taxation authority in respect of municipal realty, municipal business or other taxes, assessments or levies of any nature or kind which are entitled at law to be paid in priority to claims of secured creditors and that are attributable to or in respect of the carrying on of the Business by the Applicants.
9. Until such time as a real property lease is disclaimed or resiliated in accordance with the CCAA, the Applicants may pay all amounts constituting rent or payable as rent under real property leases (including, for greater certainty, common area maintenance charges, utilities and realty taxes and any other amounts payable as rent to the landlord under the lease) based on the terms of existing lease arrangements or as otherwise may be negotiated by the Applicants from time to time for the period commencing from and including the date of this Order ("**Rent**"), but shall not pay any rent in arrears.
10. Except as specifically permitted in this Order, the Applicants are hereby directed, until further order of this Court:
- (a) to make no payments of principal, interest thereon or otherwise on account of amounts owing by the Applicants to any of their creditors as of the date of this Order;
 - (b) to grant no security interests, trust, liens, charges or encumbrances upon or in respect of any of their Property; and
 - (c) not to grant credit or incur liabilities except in the ordinary course of the Business.

RESTRUCTURING

11. The Applicants shall, subject to such requirements as are imposed by the CCAA, have the right to:
- (a) permanently or temporarily cease, downsize or shut down any portion of its business or operations and to dispose of redundant or non-material assets not exceeding \$100,000 in any one transaction or \$250,000 in the aggregate, provided that any sale that is either

- (i) in excess of the above thresholds, or (ii) in favour of a person related to the Applicants (within the meaning of section 36(5) of the CCAA), shall require authorization by this Court in accordance with section 36 of the CCAA;
 - (b) terminate the employment of such of its employees or temporarily lay off such of its employees as it deems appropriate on such terms as may be agreed upon between the Applicants and such employee, or failing such agreement, to deal with the consequences thereof in the Plan;
 - (c) disclaim or resiliate, in whole or in part, with the prior consent of the Monitor (as defined below) or further Order of the Court, their arrangements or agreements of any nature whatsoever with whomsoever, whether oral or written, as the Applicants deem appropriate, in accordance with section 32 of the CCAA; and
 - (d) pursue all avenues of refinancing of its Business or Property, in whole or part, subject to prior approval of this Court being obtained before any material refinancing,
- all of the foregoing to permit the Applicants to proceed with an orderly restructuring of the Business (the "**Restructuring**").

12. The Applicants shall provide each of the relevant landlords with notice of the Applicants' intention to remove any fixtures from any leased premises at least seven (7) days prior to the date of the intended removal. The relevant landlord shall be entitled to have a representative present in the leased premises to observe such removal. If the landlord disputes the Applicants' entitlement to remove any such fixture under the provisions of the lease, such fixture shall remain on the premises and shall be dealt with as agreed between any applicable secured creditors, such landlord and the Applicants, or by further order of this Court upon application by the Applicants on at least two (2) days' notice to such landlord and any such secured creditors. If the Applicants disclaim or resiliate the lease governing such leased premises in accordance with section 32 of the CCAA, they shall not be required to pay Rent under such lease pending resolution of any such dispute other than Rent payable for the notice period provided for in section 32(5) of the CCAA, and the disclaimer or resiliation of the lease shall be without prejudice to the Applicants' claim to the fixtures in dispute.
13. If a notice of disclaimer or resiliation is delivered pursuant to section 32 of the CCAA, then:
 - (a) during the notice period prior to the effective time of the disclaimer or resiliation, the landlord may show the affected leased premises to prospective tenants during normal business hours, on giving the Applicants and the Monitor 24 hours' prior written notice; and

- (b) at the effective time of the disclaimer or resiliation, the relevant landlord shall be entitled to take possession of any such leased premises without waiver of or prejudice to any claims or rights such landlord may have against the Applicants in respect of such lease or leased premises and such landlord shall be entitled to notify the Applicants of the basis on which it is taking possession and to gain possession of and re-lease such leased premises to any third party or parties on such terms as such landlord considers advisable, provided that nothing herein shall relieve such landlord of its obligation to mitigate any damages claimed in connection therewith.

NO PROCEEDINGS AGAINST THE APPLICANTS OR THE PROPERTY

- 14. Until and including December 16, 2024, or such later date as this Court may order (the “**Stay Period**”), no proceeding or enforcement process in any court (each, a “**Proceeding**”) shall be commenced or continued against or in respect of the Applicants or the Monitor, or affecting the Business or the Property, except with leave of this Court, and any and all Proceedings currently under way against or in respect of the Applicants or affecting the Business or the Property are hereby stayed and suspended pending further order of this Court.

NO EXERCISE OF RIGHTS OR REMEDIES

- 15. During the Stay Period, all rights and remedies of any individual, firm, corporation, governmental body or agency, or any other entities (all of the foregoing, collectively being “**Persons**” and each being a “**Person**”), whether judicial or extra-judicial, statutory or non-statutory against or in respect of the Applicants or the Monitor, or affecting the Business or the Property, are hereby stayed and suspended and shall not be commenced, proceeded with or continued except with leave of this Court, provided that nothing in this Order shall:
 - (a) empower the Applicants to carry on any business that the Applicants are not lawfully entitled to carry on;
 - (b) affect such investigations, actions, suits or proceedings by a regulatory body as are permitted by section 11.1 of the CCAA;
 - (c) prevent the filing of any registration to preserve or perfect a security interest;
 - (d) prevent the registration of a claim for lien; or
 - (e) exempt the Applicants from compliance with statutory or regulatory provisions relating to health, safety or the environment.
- 16. Nothing in this Order shall prevent any party from taking an action against the Applicants where such an action must be taken in order to comply with statutory time limitations in order to

preserve their rights at law, provided that no further steps shall be taken by such party except in accordance with the other provisions of this Order, and notice in writing of such action be given to the Monitor at the first available opportunity.

NO INTERFERENCE WITH RIGHTS

17. During the Stay Period, no person shall accelerate, suspend, discontinue, fail to honour, alter, interfere with, repudiate, terminate or cease to perform any right, renewal right, contract, agreement, licence or permit in favour of or held by the Applicants, except with the written consent of the Applicants and the Monitor, or leave of this Court.

CONTINUATION OF SERVICES

18. During the Stay Period, all persons having:

- (a) statutory or regulatory mandates for the supply of goods and/or services; or
- (b) oral or written agreements or arrangements with the Applicants, including without limitation all computer software, communication and other data services, centralized banking services, payroll services, insurance, transportation, services, utility or other services to the Business or the Applicants

are hereby restrained until further order of this Court from discontinuing, altering, interfering with, suspending or terminating the supply of such goods or services as may be required by the Applicants or exercising any other remedy provided under such agreements or arrangements. The Applicants shall be entitled to the continued use of their current premises, telephone numbers, facsimile numbers, internet addresses and domain names, provided in each case that the usual prices or charges for all such goods or services received after the date of this Order are paid by the Applicants in accordance with the payment practices of the Applicants, or such other practices as may be agreed upon by the supplier or service provider and each of the Applicants and the Monitor, or as may be ordered by this Court.

NON-DEROGATION OF RIGHTS

19. Nothing in this Order has the effect of prohibiting a person from requiring immediate payment for goods, services, use of leased or licensed property or other valuable consideration provided on or after the date of this Order, nor shall any person, other than the Interim Lender where applicable, be under any obligation on or after the date of this Order to advance or re-advance any monies or otherwise extend any credit to the Applicants.

PROCEEDINGS AGAINST DIRECTORS AND OFFICERS

20. During the Stay Period, and except as permitted by subsection 11.03(2) of the CCAA and paragraph 15 of this Order, no Proceeding may be commenced or continued against any of the former, current or future directors or officers of the Applicants with respect to any claim against the directors or officers that arose before the date of this Order and that relates to any obligations of the Applicants whereby the directors or officers are alleged under any law to be liable in their capacity as directors or officers for the payment or performance of such obligations, until a compromise or arrangement in respect of the Applicants, if one is filed, is sanctioned by this Court or is refused by the creditors of the Applicants or this Court.

DIRECTORS' AND OFFICERS' INDEMNIFICATION AND CHARGE

21. The Applicants shall indemnify their directors and officers against obligations and liabilities that they may incur as directors and or officers of the Applicants after the commencement of the within proceedings except to the extent that, with respect to any officer or director, the obligation was incurred as a result of the director's or officer's gross negligence or wilful misconduct.
22. The directors and officers of the Applicants shall be entitled to the benefit of and are hereby granted a charge (the "**D&O Charge**") on the Property, which charge shall not exceed an aggregate amount of \$433,000, as security for the indemnity provided in paragraph 21 of this Order. The D&O Charge shall have the priority set out in paragraphs 34 and 36 herein.
23. Notwithstanding any language in any applicable insurance policy to the contrary:
- (a) no insurer shall be entitled to be subrogated to or claim the benefit of the D&O Charge; and
 - (b) the Applicants' directors and officers shall only be entitled to the benefit of the D&O Charge to the extent that they do not have coverage under any directors' and officers' insurance policy, or to the extent that such coverage is insufficient to pay amounts indemnified in accordance with paragraph 21 of this Order.

APPOINTMENT OF MONITOR

24. KSV is hereby appointed pursuant to the CCAA as the Monitor, an officer of this Court, to monitor the Property, Business, and financial affairs and the Applicants with the powers and obligations set out in the CCAA or set forth herein and that the Applicants and their shareholders, officers, directors, and Assistants shall advise the Monitor of all material steps taken by the Applicants pursuant to this Order, and shall co-operate fully with the Monitor in the exercise of its powers

and discharge of its obligations and provide the Monitor with the assistance that is necessary to enable the Monitor to adequately carry out the Monitor's functions.

25. The Monitor, in addition to its prescribed rights and obligations under the CCAA, is hereby directed and empowered to:

- (a) monitor the Applicants' receipts and disbursements, Business and dealings with the Property;
- (b) report to this Court at such times and intervals as the Monitor may deem appropriate with respect to matters relating to the Property, the Business, and such other matters as may be relevant to the proceedings herein and immediately report to the Court if in the opinion of the Monitor there is a material adverse change in the financial circumstances of the Applicants;
- (c) advise the Applicants in their preparation of the Applicants' cash flow statements;
- (d) advise the Applicants in their development of the Plan and any amendments to the Plan;
- (e) assist the Applicants, to the extent required by the Applicants, with the holding and administering of creditors' or shareholders' meetings for voting on the Plan;
- (f) have full and complete access to the Property, including the premises, books, records, data, including data in electronic form and other financial documents of the Applicants to the extent that is necessary to adequately assess the Property, Business, and financial affairs of the Applicants or to perform its duties arising under this Order;
- (g) be at liberty to engage independent legal counsel or such other persons as the Monitor deems necessary or advisable respecting the exercise of its powers and performance of its obligations under this Order;
- (h) hold funds in trust or in escrow, to the extent required, to facilitate settlements between the Applicants and any other Person; and
- (i) perform such other duties as are required by this Order or by this Court from time to time.

26. The Monitor shall not take possession of the Property and shall take no part whatsoever in the management or supervision of the management of the Business and shall not, by fulfilling its obligations hereunder, or by inadvertence in relation to the due exercise of powers or performance of duties under this Order, be deemed to have taken or maintain possession or control of the Business or Property, or any part thereof. Nothing in this Order shall require the Monitor to occupy or to take control, care, charge, possession or management of any of the Property that might be environmentally contaminated, or might cause or contribute to a spill, discharge, release or deposit of a substance contrary to any federal, provincial or other law

respecting the protection, conservation, enhancement, remediation or rehabilitation of the environment or relating to the disposal or waste or other contamination, provided however that this Order does not exempt the Monitor from any duty to report or make disclosure imposed by applicable environmental legislation or regulation. The Monitor shall not, as a result of this Order or anything done in pursuance of the Monitor's duties and powers under this Order be deemed to be in possession of any of the Property within the meaning of any federal or provincial environmental legislation.

27. The Monitor shall provide any creditor of the Applicants and the Interim Lender with information provided by the Applicants in response to reasonable requests for information made in writing by such creditor addressed to the Monitor. The Monitor shall not have any responsibility or liability with respect to the information disseminated by it pursuant to this paragraph. In the case of information that the Monitor has been advised by the Applicants is confidential, the Monitor shall not provide such information to creditors unless otherwise directed by this Court or on such terms as the Monitor and the Applicants may agree.
28. In addition to the rights and protections afforded the Monitor under the CCAA or as an Officer of this Court, the Monitor shall incur no liability or obligation as a result of its appointment or the carrying out of the provisions of this Order, save and except for any gross negligence or wilful misconduct on its part. Nothing in this Order shall derogate from the protections afforded the Monitor by the CCAA or any applicable legislation.
29. The continued engagement by the Applicants of KSV to commence and carry out the sale and investment solicitation process approved by this Court by Order granted September 19, 2024 in the within proceedings is hereby approved.
30. The Monitor, counsel to the Monitor, and counsel to the Applicants shall be paid their reasonable fees and disbursements (including any pre-filing fees and disbursements related to these CCAA proceedings), in each case at their standard rates and charges, by the Applicants as part of the costs of these proceedings. The Applicants are hereby authorized and directed to pay the accounts of the Monitor, counsel for the Monitor and counsel for the Applicants on a monthly basis.
31. The Monitor and its legal counsel shall pass their accounts from time to time.
32. The Monitor, counsel to the Monitor, if any, and the Applicants' counsel, as security for the professional fees and disbursements incurred both before and after the granting of this Order, shall be entitled to the benefits of and are hereby granted a charge (the "**Administrative Charge**") on the Property, which charge shall not exceed an aggregate amount of \$300,000, as security for

their professional fees and disbursements incurred at the normal rates and charges of the Monitor and such counsel, both before and after the making of this Order in respect of these proceedings. The Administrative Charge shall have the priority set out in paragraphs 34 and 36 hereof.

KEY EMPLOYEE RETENTION PLAN

33. The amounts payable to the key employees pursuant to the Key Employee Retention Plan (the “KERP”) are hereby secured by a charge (the “KERP Charge”) on the Property, in favour of the key employees identified in the KERP. The KERP Charge shall have the priority set out in paragraphs 34 and 36 hereof.
34. The aggregate amount secured by the KERP Charge granted to secure the Applicants’ obligations under the KERP shall be in an amount no more than \$373,928.17, less any amounts already paid pursuant to the KERP.

VALIDITY AND PRIORITY OF CHARGES

35. The priorities of the D&O Charge, the Administrative Charge and the Interim Lender’s Charge, as among them, shall be as follows:
- First – Administrative Charge (to the maximum amount of \$300,000);
- Second – D&O Charge (to the maximum amount of \$433,000); and
- Third – KERP Charge (to the maximum amount of \$373,928.17, less any amounts already paid pursuant to the KERP).
36. The filing, registration or perfection of the D&O Charge, the Administrative Charge or the KERP Charge (collectively, the “Charges”) shall not be required, and the Charges shall be valid and enforceable for all purposes, including as against any right, title or interest filed, registered, recorded or perfected subsequent to the Charges coming into existence, notwithstanding any such failure to file, register, record or perfect.
37. Each of the D&O Charge, the Administrative Charge, and the KERP Charge (all as constituted and defined herein) shall constitute a charge on the Property and subject always to section 34(11) of the CCAA such Charges shall rank in priority to all other security interests, trusts, liens, charges and encumbrances, and claims of secured creditors, statutory or otherwise (collectively, “Encumbrances”) in favour of any Person.
38. Except as otherwise expressly provided for herein, or as may be approved by this Court, the Applicants shall not grant any Encumbrances over any Property that rank in priority to, or *pari passu* with, any of the D&O Charge, the Administrative Charge or the KERP Charge, unless the

Applicants also obtain the prior written consent of the Monitor and the beneficiaries of the Charges, or further order of this Court.

39. The D&O Charge, the Administrative Charge, and the KERP Charge shall not be rendered invalid or unenforceable and the rights and remedies of the chargees entitled to the benefit of the Charges (collectively, the "**Chargees**") shall not otherwise be limited or impaired in any way by:
- (a) the pendency of these proceedings and the declarations of insolvency made in this Order;
 - (b) any application(s) for bankruptcy order(s) issued pursuant to BIA, or any bankruptcy order made pursuant to such applications;
 - (c) the filing of any assignments for the general benefit of creditors made pursuant to the BIA;
 - (d) the provisions of any federal or provincial statutes; or
 - (e) any negative covenants, prohibitions or other similar provisions with respect to borrowings, incurring debt or the creation of Encumbrances, contained in any existing loan documents, lease, sublease, offer to lease or other agreement (collectively, an "**Agreement**") that binds the Applicants, and notwithstanding any provision to the contrary in any Agreement:
 - (i) neither the creation of the Charges nor the execution, delivery, perfection, registration or performance of any documents in respect thereof shall create or be deemed to constitute a new breach by the Applicants of any Agreement to which it is a party;
 - (ii) none of the Chargees shall have any liability to any Person whatsoever as a result of any breach of any Agreement caused by or resulting from the creation of the Charges; and
 - (iii) the payments made by the Applicants pursuant to this Order, and the granting of the Charges, do not and will not constitute preferences, fraudulent conveyances, transfers at undervalue, oppressive conduct or other challengeable or voidable transactions under any applicable law.

ALLOCATION

40. Any interested Person may apply to this Court on notice to any other party likely to be affected for an order to allocate the Administrative Charge, the KERP Charge, and the D&O Charge amongst the various assets comprising the Property.

SERVICE AND NOTICE

41. The Monitor shall (i) without delay, publish in the *Globe and Mail* a notice containing the information prescribed under the CCAA; (ii) within five (5) days after the date of this Order (A) make this Order publicly available in the manner prescribed under the CCAA, (B) send, in the prescribed manner, a notice to every known creditor who has a claim against the Applicants of more than \$1,000 and (C) prepare a list showing the names and addresses of those creditors and the estimated amounts of those claims, and make it publicly available in the prescribed manner, all in accordance with section 23(1)(a) of the CCAA and the regulations made thereunder.
42. The Monitor shall establish or continue a case website in respect of the within proceedings at <https://www.ksvadvisory.com/experience/case/420> (the “**Monitor’s Website**”).
43. The Applicants and the Monitor are at liberty to serve this Order, any other materials and orders in these proceedings, any notices or other correspondence, by sending true copies thereof by prepaid ordinary mail, recorded mail, courier, personal delivery or electronic transmission to the Applicants’ creditors or other interested parties at their respective addresses as last shown on the records of the Applicants and that any such service or notice by courier, personal delivery or electronic transmission shall be deemed to be received on the next business day following the date of forwarding thereof, or if sent by ordinary mail or recorded mail, on the seventh day after mailing. Any person that wishes to be served with any application and other materials in these proceedings must deliver to the Applicants or the Monitor by way of ordinary mail, courier, or electronic transmission, a request to be added to the service list (the “**Service List**”) to be maintained by the Monitor.
44. Any party to these proceedings may serve any court materials in these proceedings by emailing a PDF or other electronic copy of such materials to counsel’s email addresses as recorded on the Service List from time to time, and the Monitor shall post a copy of all prescribed materials on the Monitor’s Website.

GENERAL

45. The Applicants or the Monitor may from time to time apply to this Court for advice and directions in the discharge of their powers and duties hereunder.
46. Notwithstanding Rule 6.11 of the *Alberta Rules of Court*, unless otherwise ordered by this Court, the Monitor will report to the Court from time to time, which reporting is not required to be in affidavit form and shall be considered by this Court as evidence. The Monitor’s reports shall be filed by the Court Clerk notwithstanding that they do not include an original signature.

47. Nothing in this Order shall prevent the Monitor from acting as an interim receiver, a receiver, a receiver and manager or a trustee in bankruptcy of the Applicants, the Business or the Property.
48. This Court hereby requests the aid and recognition of any court, tribunal, regulatory or administrative body having jurisdiction in Canada or in any foreign jurisdiction, to give effect to this Order and to assist the Applicants, the Monitor and their respective agents in carrying out the terms of this Order. All courts, tribunals, regulatory and administrative bodies are hereby respectfully requested to make such orders and to provide such assistance to the Applicants and to the Monitor, as an officer of this Court, as may be necessary or desirable to give effect to this Order, to grant representative status to the Monitor in any foreign proceeding, or to assist the Applicants and the Monitor and their respective agents in carrying out the terms of this Order.
49. Each of the Applicants and the Monitor be at liberty and are hereby authorized and empowered to apply to any court, tribunal, regulatory or administrative body, wherever located, for the recognition of this Order and for assistance in carrying out the terms of this Order and that the Monitor is authorized and empowered to act as a representative in respect of the within proceeding for the purpose of having these proceedings recognized in a jurisdiction outside Canada.
50. Any interested party (including the Applicants and the Monitor) may apply to this Court to vary or amend this Order on not less than seven (7) days' notice to any other party or parties likely to be affected by the order sought or upon such other notice, if any, as this Court may order.
51. This Order and all of its provisions are effective as of 12:01 a.m. Mountain Standard Time on the date of this Order.



Justice of the Court of King's Bench of Alberta

TAB 14

Court File Number **2401-17986**

COURT FILE NUMBER 25-3086318 / B301-86318

Clerk's stamp

COURT COURT OF KING'S BENCH OF ALBERTA

JUDICIAL CENTRE CALGARY

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



AND IN THE MATTER OF THE COMPROMISE OR
ARRANGEMENT OF 420 INVESTMENTS LTD., 420
PREMIUM MARKETS LTD., GREEN ROCK CANNABIS
(EC 1) LIMITED and 420 DISPENSARIES LTD.

APPLICANTS 420 INVESTMENTS LTD., 420 PREMIUM MARKETS
LTD., GREEN ROCK CANNABIS (EC 1) LIMITED, and
420 DISPENSARIES LTD.

DOCUMENT **ORDER (APPROVING SALE AND INVESTMENT
SOLICITATION PROCESS)**

ADDRESS FOR SERVICE **STIKEMAN ELLIOTT LLP**
AND CONTACT Barristers & Solicitors
INFORMATION OF 4300 Bankers Hall West
PARTY FILING 888-3rd Street SW
THIS DOCUMENT Calgary, AB T2P 5C5

Karen Fellowes, K.C. / Natasha Doelman
Tel: (403) 724-9469 / (403) 781-9196
Fax: (403) 266-9034
Email: kfellowes@stikeman.com / ndoelman@stikeman.com
File No.: 155857.1002

DATE ON WHICH ORDER WAS PRONOUNCED: September 19, 2024

LOCATION WHERE ORDER WAS PRONOUNCED: Calgary, Alberta

JUSTICE WHO MADE THIS ORDER: The Honourable Justice Jones

UPON the application of Applicants, 420 Investments Ltd. ("**420 Parent**"), 420 Premium Markets Ltd. ("**420 Premium**"), Green Rock Cannabis (EC 1) Limited ("**GRC**") and 420 Dispensaries Ltd. ("**420 Dispensaries**") (collectively, "**FOUR20**" or the "**Applicants**"); **AND UPON** having read the Application for an Amended and Restated Initial Order, the Affidavit of Scott Morrow sworn on September 10, 2024, the Affidavit of Jessica Watts sworn on September 18, 2024, the Affidavit of Service of Jessica Watts sworn on September 19, 2024, Third Report of the Proposal Trustee and Pre-Filing Report of the Proposed Monitor dated September 13, 2024 (the "**Pre-Filing Report**"); **AND UPON** hearing counsel for the Applicants, and any other interested parties appearing at the application;

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED AND DECLARED THAT:

SERVICE

1. The time for service of the notice of application for this order (the "**Order**") together with all supporting materials is hereby deemed good and sufficient and this application is properly returnable today.

APPROVAL OF SALE AND INVESTMENT SOLICITATION PROCESS

2. Capitalized terms used but not otherwise defined herein shall have the meanings ascribed to them in the sales and investment solicitation process attached hereto as **Appendix "A" ("SISP")**.
3. The SISP is approved in the form attached, which includes all or part of FOUR20's Property and Business as defined in the SISP, without exception. For clarity, the litigation between 420 Parent and Tilray Inc and High Park Shops Inc. in Court of King's Bench of Alberta Court file No. 2001-02873 may be included in any Sale Proposal or Investment Proposal as described within the SISP, and the shares of 420 Parent may form part of an Investment Proposal as described in the SISP. The Applicants, the Monitor (as defined below) and their advisors are authorized and directed to perform their respective obligations and to do all things reasonably necessary to perform their obligations under the SISP.
4. Each of the Applicants, the Monitor and their respective affiliates, partners, directors, employees, advisors (including but not limited to legal counsel), agents, shareholders and controlling persons shall have no liability with respect to any losses, claims, damages or liability of any nature or kind to any person in connection with or as a result of the SISP or the conduct thereof, except to the extent of such losses, claims, damages or liabilities resulting from the gross negligence or willful misconduct of any of the foregoing in performing their obligations under the SISP (as determined by this Court). Pursuant to clause 7(3)(c) of the Canada *Personal Information Protection and Electronic Documents Act*, the Debtors and the Monitor may disclose personal information of identifiable individuals to Potential Bidders and their advisors in connection with the SISP, but only to the extent desirable or required to carry out the SISP. Each Potential Bidder (and their respective advisors) to whom any such personal information is disclosed shall maintain and protect the privacy of such information and limit the use of such information solely to its evaluation of a transaction in respect of the Applicants and the Property, and if it does not complete such a transaction, shall return all such information to the Monitor, or in the alternative destroy all such information. The Successful Bidder shall be entitled to continue to use the personal information provided to it in a manner that is in all material respects identical to the prior use of such information by the Applicants, and shall return all other personal information to the Monitor, or ensure that all other personal information is destroyed.

MISCELLANEOUS MATTERS

5. The Applicants or the Monitor may from time to time apply to this Court for advice and directions in the discharge of its powers and duties hereunder.
6. Notwithstanding Rule 6.11 of the Alberta Rules of Court, unless otherwise ordered by this Court, the Monitor will report to the Court from time to time, which reporting is not required to be in affidavit form and shall be considered by this Court as evidence. The Monitor's reports shall be filed by the Court Clerk notwithstanding that they do not include an original signature.
7. Service of this Order shall be deemed good and sufficient by serving the same by posting a copy of this Order on the Monitor's website at: <https://www.ksvadvisory.com/experience/case/420>



Justice of the Court of King's Bench of Alberta

Appendix "A"

SALE AND INVESTMENT SOLICITATION PROCESS

INTRODUCTION

On May 29, 2024, 420 Investments Ltd. ("**420 Parent**"), 420 Premium Markets Ltd. ("**420 Premium**"), Green Rock Cannabis (EC 1) Limited ("**GRC**") filed with the Alberta Court of King's Bench (the "**Court**") and the Office of the Superintendent of Bankruptcy a Notice of Intention to make a Proposal under Part III of the *Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act*, 1985, c. B-3 (the "**BIA**") (the "**NOI Proceedings**").

On September 10, 2024, 420 Parent, 420 Premium, GRC and 420 Dispensaries Ltd. ("**420 Dispensaries**") (collectively, "**FOUR20**") filed an application pursuant to s. 11.6(a) of the *Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act*, 1985, c C-36 ("**CCAA**") to continue the NOI Proceedings thereunder.

On September 19, 2024, the Alberta Court of King's Bench (the "**Court**") granted an Initial Order (the "**Initial Order**") pursuant to the *Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act*, 1985, c C-36 ("**CCAA**"), among other things, appointing KSV Restructuring Inc. ("**KSV**") as the monitor (the "**Monitor**") of FOUR20.

On September 19, 2024, the Court granted an amended and restated initial order (the "**ARIO**").

On September 19, 2024, the Court granted an order (the "**SISP Approval Order**") which, among other things, directed and empowered FOUR20, in consultation with the Monitor, to prepare and conduct a strategic sales and investment solicitation process ("**SISP**") to solicit offers for the Business or Property of FOUR20, in whole or in part, or investments related thereto. Capitalized terms not defined herein shall have the meaning ascribed to them in the ARIO.

The SISP Approval Order and this SISP shall exclusively govern the process for soliciting and selecting bids for the sale of all, substantially all, or one or more portions of FOUR20's Business or Property, or for the restructuring, recapitalization or refinancing of FOUR20 and FOUR20's Business. Under the SISP, all qualified interested parties will be provided with an opportunity to participate in the SISP.

This document outlines the SISP, which is comprised principally of three stages: pre-marketing, marketing, and offering/evaluation.

OPPORTUNITY AND SISP SUMMARY

1. The SISP is intended to solicit interest in, and opportunities for a sale of, or investment in, all or part of FOUR20's Property or Business (the "**Opportunity**"). In order to maximize the number of participants that may have an interest in the Opportunity, the SISP will provide for the solicitation of interest for:
 - (a) the sale of FOUR20's interests in the Property. In particular, interested parties may submit proposals to acquire all, substantially all or a portion of FOUR20's Property (a "**Sale Proposal**"); or

- (b) an investment in the Business, which may include one or more of the following: a restructuring, recapitalization or other form of reorganization of the Business and affairs of FOUR20 as a going concern, together with a plan of compromise or arrangement pursuant to the CCAA (an "**Investment Proposal**").
2. Except to the extent otherwise set forth in a definitive sale or investment agreement with a Successful Bidder (as defined below), any Sale Proposal or any Investment Proposal will be on an "as is, where is" basis and without surviving representations or warranties of any kind, nature, or description by, the Monitor or FOUR20, or any of their respective affiliates, agents, advisors or estates, and, in the event of a sale, all of the right, title and interest of FOUR20 in and to the Property to be acquired will be sold free and clear of all pledges, liens, security interests, encumbrances, claims, charges, options, and interests therein and thereon pursuant to Court orders, except as otherwise provided in such Court orders.
3. Solicitation of interest for Sale Proposals and Investment Proposals will be on an unpriced basis whereby no set asking price will be stipulated.
4. This SISP shall be conducted by the Monitor, in consultation with FOUR20.
5. As described more fully in this SISP, the major stages in the within procedure will be comprised of the following:
 - (a) Pre-Marketing: preparation of all marketing material, assembly of all relevant due diligence material, establishment of an electronic data;
 - (b) Marketing: advertising, contacting potential buyers/investors, responding to requests for information and disseminating marketing material to potential buyers and investors; and
 - (c) Offer Submission and Evaluation: solicitation, receipt of, evaluation and negotiation of offers from potential buyers and investors, as described below.
6. The offer submission and evaluation stage of the SISP will be comprised of a two phase offering process: "**Phase 1**" being the submission of letters of intent ("**LOIs**") from qualified bidders, and "**Phase 2**" being the submission of formal binding offers from those parties that submitted LOIs and that have been invited by the Monitor, in consultation with FOUR20, to participate in Phase 2 (defined below as Phase 1 Qualified Bidders).

TIMELINE

7. The Monitor, in consultation with FOUR20, shall commence the within SISP on or before September 27, 2024 (such time being referred to herein as the "**Commencement Date**"). As soon as reasonably practicable following the Commencement Date, the Monitor shall publish on its website established with respect to FOUR20's CCAA proceedings, a timeline of the key milestones set out below setting out the specific dates of the respective milestones. Furthermore, the Monitor shall publish the timeline in the Teaser Letter, referenced below.
8. The following table sets out the key milestones under the SISP:

| Milestone | Deadline |
|--|---------------------------------|
| Commencement Date (prepare data room and associates documents) | On or before September 27, 2024 |

| | |
|--|------------------------------|
| Marketing Stage: Publication of Notice and Sending Teaser to Know Potential Buyers | On or before October 4, 2017 |
| Completion of "Phase I" – interested parties to submit a non-binding letter of intent | November 15, 2024 |
| Completion of "Phase II" – interested parties to submit a binding offer that meets at least the requirements set forth in the SISP | November 30, 2024 |
| Selection of the highest or otherwise best bid(s) (the "Successful Bid(s)") | December 6, 2024 |
| Seek a Court order approving the Successful Bid(s) | As soon as practical |
| Close the transaction contemplated in the Successful Bid(s) | As soon as practical |

PRE-MARKETING STAGE

9. Prior to the Commencement Date:

- (a) the Monitor, in consultation with FOUR20, will prepare: (i) a process summary (the "**Teaser Letter**") describing the Opportunity, outlining the process under the SISP and inviting recipients of the Teaser Letter to express their interest pursuant to the SISP; (ii) a non-disclosure agreement with the Monitor and FOUR20 (an "**NDA**"); and (iii) a confidential Information Memorandum ("**CIM**"). The Teaser Letter, NDA and CIM shall be in form and substance satisfactory to the Monitor, in consultation with FOUR20. The CIM will specifically stipulate that the Monitor, FOUR20 and each of their respective advisors make no representation or warranty as to the accuracy or completeness of the information contained in the CIM, the Data Room (as defined below), or made available pursuant to the SISP or otherwise, except to the extent expressly contemplated in any definitive sale or investment agreement with a Successful Bidder (as defined below) ultimately executed and delivered by FOUR20 and/or the Monitor;
- (b) the Monitor, with the assistance of FOUR20 will gather and review all required due diligence material to be provided to interested parties and shall establish a secure, electronic data room (the "**Data Room**"), which will be maintained and administered by the Monitor during the SISP; and
- (c) FOUR20 and the Monitor will develop a draft form of LOI ("**LOI Form**") and a purchase and sale agreement or investment agreement for use during the SISP.

MARKETING STAGE

10. As soon as reasonably possible after the Commencement Date, the Monitor shall:

- (a) arrange for a notice of the SISP (and such other relevant information as the

Monitor, in consultation with FOUR20 considers appropriate) (the "**Notice**") to be published in the Calgary Herald, the website of the Monitor and any other newspaper or journals as the Monitor, in consultation with FOUR20 considers appropriate, if any; and

- (b) send the Teaser Letter and NDA to all parties that have approached the Monitor or FOUR20 indicating an interest in the Opportunity; and (ii) local, national and international strategic and financial parties who the Monitor believes may be interested in purchasing all or part of the Business and Property or investing in FOUR20 pursuant to the SISP (collectively, "**Known Potential Bidders**"), and to any other party who responds to the Notice as soon as reasonably practicable after such identification or request, as applicable.
- 11. The Monitor will send the CIM and grant access to the Data Room to those parties who have executed and delivered the NDA to the Monitor as soon as reasonably practicable after such execution and delivery.
 - 12. Requests for information and access to the Data Room will be directed to the Monitor, to the attention of the persons listed in Schedule "A" hereto. All printed information shall remain the property of FOUR20 and, if requested by the Monitor, shall be returned without further copies being made and/or destroyed with an acknowledgement that all such material has either been returned and/or destroyed and no electronic information has been retained.
 - 13. Any party who expresses a desire to participate in the SISP (a "**Potential Bidder**") must, prior to being given any additional information such as the CIM and access to the Data Room, provide to the Monitor an NDA executed by it, and which shall inure to the benefit of any ultimate Successful Bidder.
 - 14. If a Potential Bidder has delivered the NDA and a Qualified LOI (as defined below) that is satisfactory to the Monitor, acting reasonably, then such Potential Bidder will be deemed to be a "**Phase 1 Qualified Bidder**". No Potential Bidder shall be deemed not to be a Phase 1 Qualified Bidder without the approval of the Monitor.

OFFER SUBMISSION AND EVALUATION STAGE

Phase 1

Due Diligence

- 15. The Monitor in consultation FOUR20, and subject to competitive and other business considerations, will afford each Phase 1 Qualified Bidder such access to due diligence materials through the Data Room and information relating to the Property and Business as it deems appropriate. Due diligence access may further include management presentations with participation of the Monitor where appropriate, on-site inspections, and other matters which a Phase 1 Qualified Bidder may reasonably request and to which the Monitor, in its reasonable business judgment, may agree. The Monitor and FOUR20 will each designate a representative to coordinate all reasonable requests for additional information and due diligence access from Phase 1 Qualified Bidders and the manner in which such requests must be communicated. None of the Monitor or FOUR20 will be obligated to furnish any information relating to the Property or Business to any person other than to Phase 1 Qualified Bidders. Further and for the avoidance of doubt, selected due diligence materials

may be withheld from certain Phase 1 Qualified Bidders if the Monitor, in consultation FOUR20, determines such information to represent proprietary or competitively sensitive information.

LOI Submission

16. Potential Bidders must rely solely on their own independent review, investigation and/or inspection of all information and of the Property and Business in connection with their participation in the SISP and any transaction they ultimately enter into with FOUR20.
17. A Phase 1 Qualified Bidder who wishes to pursue the Opportunity further must deliver an executed LOI, identifying each specific Property or Business the Phase 1 Qualified Bidder is interested in, to the Monitor at the addresses specified in **Schedule "A"** hereto (including by email or fax transmission), so as to be received by them not later than 12:00 PM (Calgary time) on or before November 15, 2024 (the "**Phase 1 Bid Deadline**").
18. An LOI so submitted will be considered a qualified LOI (a "**Qualified LOI**") only if:
 - (a) it is submitted on or before the relevant Phase 1 Bid Deadline by a Phase 1 Qualified Bidder;
 - (b) it contains a letter setting forth the identity of the Potential Bidder, the contact information for such Potential Bidder and full disclosure of the direct and indirect principals and direct and indirect beneficial owners of the Potential Bidder it contains an indication of whether the Phase 1 Qualified Bidder is making a:
 - (i) Sale Proposal; or
 - (ii) an Investment Proposal;
 - (c) in the case of a Sale Proposal, it identifies or contains the following:
 - (i) the purchase price, in Canadian dollars, including details of any liabilities to be assumed by the Phase 1 Qualified Bidder and key assumptions supporting the valuation;
 - (ii) a description of each Property that is expected to be subject to the transaction and any of the Property or obligations for each Property expected to be excluded;
 - (iii) a specific indication of the financial capability, together with evidence of such capability, of the Phase 1 Qualified Bidder and the expected structure and financing of the transaction;
 - (iv) a description of the approvals required for a final and binding offer;
 - (v) all conditions to closing that the Phase 1 Qualified Bidder may wish to impose including any asset and liability thresholds that must be met for the

- Phase 1 Qualified Bidder to submit a final and binding offer;
- (vi) an outline of any additional due diligence required to be conducted in order to submit a final and binding offer; and
 - (vii) any other terms or conditions of the Sale Proposal that the Phase 1 Qualified Bidder believes are material to the transaction;
- (d) in the case of an Investment Proposal, it identifies the following:
- (i) a description of how the Phase 1 Qualified Bidder proposes to structure the proposed investment in the Business;
 - (ii) the aggregate amount of the equity and/or debt investment to be made in the Business or FOUR20 (including a description of which entity(s) will be invested in) in Canadian dollars;
 - (iii) the underlying assumptions regarding the *pro forma* capital structure;
 - (iv) a specific indication of the sources of capital for the Phase 1 Qualified Bidder and the structure and financing of the transaction;
 - (v) a description of the approvals required for a final and binding offer;
 - (vi) all conditions to closing that the Phase 1 Qualified Bidder may wish to impose including any asset and liability thresholds that must be met for the Phase 1 Qualified Bidder to submit a final and binding offer;
 - (vii) all conditions to closing that the Phase 1 Qualified Bidder may wish to impose;
 - (viii) an outline of any additional due diligence required to be conducted in order to submit a final and binding offer; and
 - (ix) any other terms or conditions of the Investment Proposal that the Phase 1 Qualified Bidder believes are material to the transaction;
- (e) in the case of a Sale Proposal, it contains a statement that the Phase 1 Qualified Bidder meets all eligibility requirements of governmental authorities to purchase and accept a transfer of the Property, including without limiting the generality of the foregoing, the eligibility requirements of the applicable federal and provincial legislation.
- (f) in the case of either a Sale Proposal or an Investment Proposal, it contains such other information as reasonably requested by the Monitor from time to time.

19. The Monitor, in consultation with FOUR20, may waive compliance with any one or more of

the requirements specified above and deem such non-compliant bids to be a Qualified LOI. For the avoidance of doubt, the completion of any Sale Proposal or Investment Proposal shall be subject to the approval of the Court and the requirement of approval of the Court may not be waived.

Preliminary Assessment of Phase 1 Bids and Subsequent Process

20. Following the Phase 1 Bid Deadline, the Monitor will assess the Qualified LOIs with respect to the Property or Business in consultation with the Monitor and FOUR20. If it is determined by the Monitor that a Phase 1 Qualified Bidder that has submitted a Qualified LOI: (i) has a *bona fide* interest in completing a Sale Proposal or Investment Proposal (as the case may be); and (ii) has the financial capability (based on availability of financing, experience and other considerations) to consummate such a transaction based on the financial information provided; then such Phase 1 Qualified Bidder will be deemed to be a **"Phase 2 Qualified Bidder"**, provided that the Monitor may, in its judgment but with the consent of the Monitor, limit the number of Phase 2 Qualified Bidders (and thereby eliminate some Phase 1 Qualified Bidders from the process). Only Phase 2 Qualified Bidders shall be permitted to proceed to Phase 2 of the SISP.
21. The Monitor, in consultation with FOUR20, will prepare a bid process letter for Phase 2 (the **"Bid Process Letter"**), which will include a draft purchase and sale agreement or investment agreement (a **"Draft Purchase/Investment Agreement"**) which will be made available in the Data Room, and the Bid Process Letter and will be sent to all Phase 2 Qualified Bidders who are invited to participate in Phase 2.

Phase 2: Formal Offers and Selection of Successful Bidder

Formal Binding Offers

22. Phase 2 Qualified Bidders that wish to make a formal Sale Proposal or an Investment Proposal shall submit to the Monitor a sealed binding offer that complies with all of the following requirements at the addresses specified in **Schedule "A"** hereto (including by email or fax transmission), so as to be received by the Monitor not later than 12:00 PM (Calgary time) on or before November 30, 2024, or such other date and time as may be modified in the Bid Process Letter (the **"Phase 2 Bid Deadline"**):
 - (a) the bid shall comply with all of the requirements set forth in respect of Phase 1 Qualified LOIs;
 - (b) cash is the preferred form of consideration, but if the bid utilizes other consideration (including a form of credit bid), a description of the material terms of the consideration shall be provided;
 - (c) the bid (either individually or in combination with other bids that make up one bid) is an offer to purchase or make an investment in some or all of the Property or Business on terms and conditions reasonably acceptable to FOUR20, in consultation with the Monitor;
 - (d) unless otherwise agreed, the bid shall take the form of the Draft Purchase/Investment Agreement (with a blackline showing any changes) and shall

include a letter stating that the Phase 2 Qualified Bidder's offer is irrevocable until Court approval of a Successful Bidder (as defined below), provided that if such Phase 2 Qualified Bidder is selected as the Successful Bidder, its offer shall remain irrevocable until the closing of the transaction with such Successful Bidder;

- (e) the bid includes duly authorized and executed transaction agreements as listed in the Draft Purchase/Investment Agreement; including, but not limited to, the purchase price, investment amount, or a combination thereof and any other key economic terms expressed in Canadian dollars (the "**Purchase Price**"), together with all exhibits and schedules thereto, and the name or names of the ultimate direct or indirect beneficial owner(s) of the Phase 2 Qualified Bidder including their respective percentage interests;
- (f) to the extent that a bid is conditional upon new or amended agreements being entered into with other parties, or existing agreements terminated, the interested parties shall provide the proposed terms of such terminated, amended or new agreements and identify how such agreements may differ from existing agreements to which FOUR20 may be a party. A Phase 2 Qualified Bidder's willingness to proceed without such conditions and, where such conditions are included in the bid, the likelihood of satisfying such conditions shall be an important factor in evaluating the bid;
- (g) the bid includes written evidence of a firm, irrevocable commitment for financing or other evidence of ability to consummate the proposed transaction, including the timetable for obtaining financing and, if appropriate, the amount of senior debt, subordinated debt, equity and other source of financing contemplated in the *pro forma* capital structure that will allow the Monitor to make a determination as to the Phase 2 Qualified Bidder's financial and other capabilities to consummate the proposed transaction;
- (h) the bid should identify any threshold of assets to be acquired or liabilities to be assumed as a condition to proceeding to close a transaction;
- (i) the bid should not be conditional on the outcome of unperformed due diligence by the Phase 2 Qualified Bidder, apart from, to the extent applicable, the disclosure of due diligence materials that represent proprietary or competitively sensitive information which was withheld in Phase 2 from the Phase 2 Qualified Bidder;
- (j) the bid fully discloses the identity of each entity that will be entering into the transaction or the financing, or that is participating or benefiting from such bid;
- (k) for a Sale Proposal, the bid includes a commitment by the Phase 2 Qualified Bidder to provide a refundable deposit in the amount of not less than 10% of the purchase price offered upon the Phase 2 Qualified Bidder being selected as the Successful Bidder, which shall be paid to "KSV Restructuring Inc. in trust" (the "**Deposit**"). One half of the Deposit shall be paid to "KSV Restructuring Inc. in trust" upon the submission of the Phase 2 Qualified Bidder's Phase 2 Bid. The second half of the Deposit shall be submitted upon the Phase 2 Qualified Bidder being selected as the Successful Bidder. The Successful Bidder's Deposit shall be applied as against the Purchase Price and all other Deposits submitted by Phase 2 Qualified Bidders who are not selected as the Successful Bidder shall be returned within five (5) business days of obtaining Court approval of the Successful Bid;

- (l) for an Investment Proposal, the bid includes a commitment by the Phase 2 Qualified Bidder to provide a refundable deposit in the amount of not less than 10% of the total new investment contemplated in the bid upon the Phase 2 Qualified Bidder being selected as the Successful Bidder, which shall be paid to "KSV Restructuring Inc. in trust". One half of the Deposit shall be paid to "KSV Restructuring Inc. in trust" upon the submission of the Phase 2 Qualified Bidder's Phase 2 Bid. The second half of the Deposit shall be submitted upon the Phase 2 Qualified Bidder being selected as the Successful Bidder. The Successful Bidder's Deposit shall be applied as against the Purchase Price and all other Deposits submitted by Phase 2 Qualified Bidders who are not selected as the Successful Bidder shall be returned within five (5) business days of obtaining Court approval for the Successful Bid;
 - (m) the bid includes acknowledgments and representations of the Phase 2 Qualified Bidder that: (i) it has had an opportunity to conduct any and all due diligence regarding the Property, Business and FOUR20 prior to making its offer (apart from, to the extent applicable, the disclosure of due diligence materials that represent proprietary or competitively sensitive information which was withheld in Phase 2 from the Phase 2 Qualified Bidder); (ii) it has relied solely upon its own independent review, investigation and/or inspection of any documents and/or the Property in making its bid; and (iii) it did not rely upon any written or oral statements, representations, warranties, or guarantees whatsoever made by the Monitor or FOUR20, whether express, implied, statutory or otherwise, regarding the Business, Property or FOUR20, or the accuracy or completeness of any information provided in connection therewith, except as expressly stated in the definitive transaction agreement(s) signed by FOUR20;
 - (n) all required corporate approvals of the Phase 2 Qualified Bidder will have been obtained prior to the submission of the bid;
 - (o) the bid shall identify any material conditions in favour of the purchaser to be resolved prior to closing the transaction;
 - (p) the bid is received by the relevant Phase 2 Bid Deadline; and
 - (q) the bid contemplates Court approval.
23. Following the Phase 2 Bid Deadline, the Monitor will assess the Phase 2 Bids received with respect to the Property or Business, in consultation with the Monitor and FOUR20. The Monitor will designate the most competitive bids that comply with the foregoing requirements to be "**Phase 2 Qualified Bids**". Only Phase 2 Qualified Bidders whose bids have been designated as Qualified Bids are eligible to become the Successful Bidder(s).
 24. The Monitor, in consultation with FOUR20, may waive strict compliance with any one or more of the requirements specified above and deem such non-compliant bids to be a Phase 2 Qualified Bid.
 25. The Monitor, in consultation with FOUR20, shall notify each Phase 2 Qualified Bidder in writing as to whether its bid constituted a Phase 2 Qualified Bid within ten (10) business days of the Phase 2 Bid Deadline, or at such later time as the Monitor deems appropriate.
 26. If the Monitor is not satisfied with the number or terms of the Phase 2 Qualified Bids, the

Monitor, in consultation with FOUR20, may extend the Phase 2 Bid Deadline without Court approval.

27. The Monitor may terminate further participation in the Phase 2 Bid Process by any Qualified Phase 2 Bidder, or modify dates or procedures in this SISP as deemed appropriate or necessary, or terminate the process altogether.
28. The Monitor, in consultation with FOUR20, may aggregate separate bids from unaffiliated Phase 2 Qualified Bidders to create one or more Phase 2 Qualified Bid(s).

Evaluation of Competing Bids

29. A Phase 2 Qualified Bid will be evaluated based upon several factors, including, without limitation, items such as the Purchase Price and the net value and form of consideration to be paid pursuant to such bid (including the extent of value available to creditors of FOUR20), the identity, circumstances and ability of the Phase 2 Qualified Bidder to successfully complete such transactions, including any conditions attached to the bid and the expected feasibility of such conditions, the proposed transaction documents, factors affecting the speed, certainty and value of the transaction, the assets included or excluded from the bid, any related restructuring costs, compliance or eligibility with respect to the applicable federal and provincial legislation requirements, the likelihood and timing of consummating such transactions, and the ability of the bidder to finance and ultimately consummate the proposed transaction within the timeline established by the Monitor, in consultation with FOUR20.

Selection of Successful Bids

30. The Monitor, in consultation with FOUR20, may review and evaluate any or all Phase 2 Qualified Bids with the applicable Phase 2 Qualified Bidders, and such Phase 2 Qualified Bids may be amended, modified or varied as a result of such negotiations.
31. The Monitor, in consultation with FOUR20, will identify the highest or otherwise best bid or bids, including an assessment of the bid(s) to determine whether the bids, or any combination thereof, will allow FOUR20 to achieve its objective of addressing or disposing of all of its assets and liabilities (each, a "**Successful Bid**"), and the Phase 2 Qualified Bidder making such Successful Bid (the "**Successful Bidder**") for any particular Property or the Business in whole or part. The determination of any Successful Bid by the Monitor, in consultation with FOUR20 shall be subject to approval by the Court.
32. The Monitor shall notify the Successful Bidder or Successful Bidders, as the case may be, that their bids constituted the Successful Bid or Bids within ten (10) business days of the date they were notified that their bids constituted Phase 2 Qualified Bids, or at such later time as the Monitor deems appropriate, in consultation with FOUR20.
33. FOUR20 shall have no obligation to select a Successful Bid, and the Monitor, in consultation with FOUR20, reserves the right to reject any or all Phase 2 Qualified Bids. Further, FOUR20 shall have no obligation to enter into a definitive agreement with a Phase 2 Qualified Bidder.

Sale Approval Application

34. FOUR20 shall apply to the Court (the "**Approval Application**") for orders approving any Successful Bid(s) and authorizing FOUR20 to enter into any and all necessary agreements with respect to the Successful Bid(s).
35. The Approval Application will be held on a date to be scheduled by FOUR20 with the Court, in consultation with the Monitor. The Approval Application may be adjourned or rescheduled by FOUR20, in consultation with the Monitor, without further notice, by an announcement of the adjourned date at the Approval Application or in a notice to the service list prior to the Approval Application.
36. All the Phase 2 Qualified Bids other than the Successful Bid(s), if any, shall be deemed rejected by the Monitor on and as of the date of approval of the Successful Bid(s) by the Court, but not before, and shall remain open for acceptance until that time.

Deposits

37. All Deposits shall be retained by the Monitor in a non-interest bearing trust account. If there is a Successful Bid, the Deposit paid by the Successful Bidder whose bid is approved at the Approval Application shall be applied against the purchase price to be paid by the Successful Bidder upon closing of the approved transaction and will become non-refundable. The Deposits of Phase 2 Qualified Bidders not selected as a Successful Bidder shall be returned to such bidders within five (5) business days of the date upon which the Approval Order is granted by the Court. If there is no Successful Bid, all Deposits shall be returned to the bidders within five (5) business days of the date upon which this SISP terminates in accordance with these procedures.

Confidentiality and Access to Information

38. Unless otherwise set out herein, participants and prospective participants in the SISP shall not be permitted to receive any information that is not made generally available to all participants relating to the number or identity of Potential Bidders, Phase 1 Qualified Bidders, LOIs, Phase 2 Qualified Bidders, Phase 2 Qualified Bids, the details of any bids submitted or the details of any confidential discussions or correspondence between the Monitor and such other bidders or Potential Bidders in connection with the SISP. The Monitor may however, with the consent of the applicable participants, disclose such information to other bidders for the purpose of seeking to combine separate bids from Phase 1 Qualified Bidders or Phase 2 Qualified Bidders.
39. The Monitor may consult with any other parties with a material interest in the CCAA Proceedings regarding the status of and material information and developments relating to the SISP to the extent considered appropriate by the Monitor (subject to paragraph 39 and taking into account, among other things, whether any particular party is a Potential Bidder, Phase 1 Qualified Bidder, Phase 2 Qualified Bidder or other participant or prospective participant in the SISP or involved in a bid), provided that such parties shall have entered into confidentiality arrangements satisfactory to the Applicants and the Monitor.

Supervision of the SISP

40. The Monitor shall oversee the conduct of the SISP in all respects. Without limitation to that supervisory role, the Monitor will participate in the SISP in the manner set out in this SISP procedure and the SISP Order and is entitled to receive all information in relation to the

SISP.

41. This SISP does not, and will not be interpreted to create any contractual or other legal relationship between the Monitor and, FOUR20 and any Phase 1 Qualified Bidder, any Phase 2 Qualified Bidder or any other party, other than as specifically set forth in a definitive agreement that may be signed with FOUR20 and approved by the Court. For the avoidance of doubt, the completion of any Sale Proposal or Investment Proposal shall be subject to the approval of the Court and the requirement of approval of the Court may not be waived.
42. Without limiting the preceding paragraph, the Monitor shall not have any liability whatsoever to any person or party, including without limitation any Potential Bidder, Phase 1 Qualified Bidder, Phase 2 Qualified Bidder, Successful Bidder, or any other creditor or other stakeholder of FOUR20, for any act or omission related to the process contemplated by this SISP Procedure, except to the extent such act or omission is the result of gross negligence or willful misconduct of the Monitor. By submitting a bid, each Phase 1 Qualified Bidder, Phase 2 Qualified Bidder, or Successful Bidder shall be deemed to have agreed that it has no claim against, FOUR20 or the Monitor for any reason whatsoever, except to the extent such claim is the result of gross negligence or willful misconduct of the Monitor.
43. Participants in the SISP are responsible for all costs, expenses and liabilities incurred by them in connection with the submission of any LOI, Phase 2 Bid, due diligence activities, and any further negotiations or other actions whether or not they lead to the consummation of a transaction.
44. The Monitor shall have the right, in consultation with FOUR20, to modify the SISP and the deadlines set out herein (including, without limitation, pursuant to the Bid Process Letter) if, in their reasonable business judgment, such modification will enhance the process or better achieve the objectives of the SISP.
45. This SISP shall terminate in the event that: (a) no Phase 2 Qualified Bidder submits a Qualified Phase 2 Bid by the Phase 2 Bid Deadline, and the Phase 2 Bid Deadline is not otherwise extended by the Monitor; or (b) the Monitor, in consultation with FOUR20, determines that none of the Phase 2 Qualified Bids should be accepted as a Successful Bid.
46. The approvals required pursuant to the terms of this SISP are in addition to, and not in substitution for, any other approvals required by applicable law in order to implement a Successful Bid.
47. In order to discharge its duties in connection with the SISP, the Monitor may engage professional or business advisors or agents as the Monitor deems fit in its sole discretion.
48. At any time during the SISP, the Monitor or FOUR20 may apply to the Court for advice and directions with respect to any aspect of this SISP or the discharge of their respective powers and duties hereunder.
49. In the event that there is disagreement as to the interpretation or application of the SISP, the Court will have jurisdiction to hear and resolve such dispute.

TAB 15

CITATION: Canwest Publishing Inc., 2010 ONSC 222
COURT FILE NO.: CV-10-8533-00CL
DATE: 20100118

ONTARIO

**SUPERIOR COURT OF JUSTICE
(COMMERCIAL LIST)**

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

AND IN THE MATTER OF A PROPOSED PLAN OF COMPROMISE OR
ARRANGEMENT OF CANWEST PUBLISHING INC./PUBLICATIONS CANWEST
INC., CANWEST BOOKS INC. AND CANWEST (CANADA) INC.

COUNSEL: *Lyndon Barnes, Alex Cobb and Duncan Ault* for the Applicant LP Entities
Mario Forte for the Special Committee of the Board of Directors
Andrew Kent and Hilary Clarke for the Administrative Agent of the Senior
Secured Lenders' Syndicate
Peter Griffin for the Management Directors
Robin B. Schwill and Natalie Renner for the Ad Hoc Committee of 9.25% Senior
Subordinated Noteholders
David Byers and Maria Konyukhova for the proposed Monitor, FTI Consulting
Canada Inc.

PEPALL J.

REASONS FOR DECISION

Introduction

[1] Canwest Global Communications Corp. ("Canwest Global") is a leading Canadian media company with interests in (i) newspaper publishing and digital media; and (ii) free-to-air television stations and subscription based specialty television channels. Canwest Global, the entities in its Canadian television business (excluding CW Investments Co. and its subsidiaries) and the National Post Company (which prior to October 30, 2009 owned and published the National Post) (collectively, the "CMI Entities"), obtained protection from their creditors in a

*Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act*¹ ("CCAA") proceeding on October 6, 2009.² Now, the Canwest Global Canadian newspaper entities with the exception of National Post Inc. seek similar protection. Specifically, Canwest Publishing Inc./Publications Canwest Inc. ("CPI"), Canwest Books Inc. ("CBI"), and Canwest (Canada) Inc. ("CCI") apply for an order pursuant to the CCAA. They also seek to have the stay of proceedings and the other benefits of the order extend to Canwest Limited Partnership/Canwest Société en Commandite (the "Limited Partnership"). The Applicants and the Limited Partnership are referred to as the "LP Entities" throughout these reasons. The term "Canwest" will be used to refer to the Canwest enterprise as a whole. It includes the LP Entities and Canwest Global's other subsidiaries which are not applicants in this proceeding.

[2] All appearing on this application supported the relief requested with the exception of the Ad Hoc Committee of 9.25% Senior Subordinated Noteholders. That Committee represents certain unsecured creditors whom I will discuss more fully later.

[3] I granted the order requested with reasons to follow. These are my reasons.

[4] I start with three observations. Firstly, Canwest Global, through its ownership interests in the LP Entities, is the largest publisher of daily English language newspapers in Canada. The LP Entities own and operate 12 daily newspapers across Canada. These newspapers are part of the Canadian heritage and landscape. The oldest, The Gazette, was established in Montreal in 1778. The others are the Vancouver Sun, The Province, the Ottawa Citizen, the Edmonton Journal, the Calgary Herald, The Windsor Star, the Times Colonist, The Star Phoenix, the Leader-Post, the Nanaimo Daily News and the Alberni Valley Times. These newspapers have an estimated average weekly readership that exceeds 4 million. The LP Entities also publish 23 non-daily

¹ R.S.C. 1985, c. C. 36, as amended.

² On October 30, 2009, substantially all of the assets and business of the National Post Company were transferred to the company now known as National Post Inc.

newspapers and own and operate a number of digital media and online operations. The community served by the LP Entities is huge. In addition, based on August 31, 2009 figures, the LP Entities employ approximately 5,300 employees in Canada with approximately 1,300 of those employees working in Ontario. The granting of the order requested is premised on an anticipated going concern sale of the newspaper business of the LP Entities. This serves not just the interests of the LP Entities and their stakeholders but the Canadian community at large.

[5] Secondly, the order requested may contain some shortcomings; it may not be perfect. That said, insolvency proceedings typically involve what is feasible, not what is flawless.

[6] Lastly, although the builders of this insolvent business are no doubt unhappy with its fate, gratitude is not misplaced by acknowledging their role in its construction.

Background Facts

(i) Financial Difficulties

[7] The LP Entities generate the majority of their revenues through the sale of advertising. In the fiscal year ended August 31, 2009, approximately 72% of the LP Entities' consolidated revenue derived from advertising. The LP Entities have been seriously affected by the economic downturn in Canada and their consolidated advertising revenues declined substantially in the latter half of 2008 and in 2009. In addition, they experienced increases in certain of their operating costs.

[8] On May 29, 2009 the Limited Partnership failed, for the first time, to make certain interest and principal reduction payments and related interest and cross currency swap payments totaling approximately \$10 million in respect of its senior secured credit facilities. On the same day, the Limited Partnership announced that, as of May 31, 2009, it would be in breach of certain financial covenants set out in the credit agreement dated as of July 10, 2007 between its predecessor, Canwest Media Works Limited Partnership, The Bank of Nova Scotia as administrative agent, a syndicate of secured lenders ("the LP Secured Lenders"), and the predecessors of CCI, CPI and CBI as guarantors. The Limited Partnership also failed to make

principal, interest and fee payments due pursuant to this credit agreement on June 21, June 22, July 21, July 22 and August 21, 2009.

[9] The May 29, 2009, defaults under the senior secured credit facilities triggered defaults in respect of related foreign currency and interest rate swaps. The swap counterparties (the “Hedging Secured Creditors”) demanded payment of \$68.9 million. These unpaid amounts rank pari passu with amounts owing under the LP Secured Lenders’ credit facilities.

[10] On or around August 31, 2009, the Limited Partnership and certain of the LP Secured Lenders entered into a forbearance agreement in order to allow the LP Entities and the LP Secured Lenders the opportunity to negotiate a pre-packaged restructuring or reorganization of the affairs of the LP Entities. On November 9, 2009, the forbearance agreement expired and since then, the LP Secured Lenders have been in a position to demand payment of approximately \$953.4 million, the amount outstanding as at August 31, 2009. Nonetheless, they continued negotiations with the LP Entities. The culmination of this process is that the LP Entities are now seeking a stay of proceedings under the CCAA in order to provide them with the necessary “breathing space” to restructure and reorganize their businesses and to preserve their enterprise value for the ultimate benefit of their broader stakeholder community.

[11] The Limited Partnership released its annual consolidated financial statements for the twelve months ended August 31, 2009 and 2008 on November 26, 2009. As at August 31, 2009, the Limited Partnership had total consolidated assets with a net book value of approximately \$644.9 million. This included consolidated current assets of \$182.7 million and consolidated non-current assets of approximately \$462.2 million. As at that date, the Limited Partnership had total consolidated liabilities of approximately \$1.719 billion (increased from \$1.656 billion as at August 31, 2008). These liabilities consisted of consolidated current liabilities of \$1.612 billion and consolidated non-current liabilities of \$107 million.

[12] The Limited Partnership had been experiencing deteriorating financial results over the past year. For the year ended August 31, 2009, the Limited Partnership’s consolidated revenues decreased by \$181.7 million or 15% to \$1.021 billion as compared to \$1.203 billion for the year

ended August 31, 2008. For the year ended August 31, 2009, the Limited Partnership reported a consolidated net loss of \$66 million compared to consolidated net earnings of \$143.5 million for fiscal 2008.

(ii) Indebtedness under the Credit Facilities

[13] The indebtedness under the credit facilities of the LP Entities consists of the following.

- (a) The LP senior secured credit facilities are the subject matter of the July 10, 2007 credit agreement already mentioned. They are guaranteed by CCI, CPI and CBI. The security held by the LP Secured Lenders has been reviewed by the solicitors for the proposed Monitor, FTI Consulting Canada Inc. and considered to be valid and enforceable.³ As at August 31, 2009, the amounts owing by the LP Entities totaled \$953.4 million exclusive of interest.⁴
- (b) The Limited Partnership is a party to the aforementioned foreign currency and interest rate swaps with the Hedging Secured Creditors. Defaults under the LP senior secured credit facilities have triggered defaults in respect of these swap arrangements. Demand for repayment of amounts totaling \$68.9 million (exclusive of unpaid interest) has been made. These obligations are secured.
- (c) Pursuant to a senior subordinated credit agreement dated as of July 10, 2007, between the Limited Partnership, The Bank of Nova Scotia as administrative agent for a syndicate of lenders, and others, certain subordinated lenders agreed to provide the Limited Partnership with access to a term credit facility of up to \$75

³ Subject to certain assumptions and qualifications.

⁴ Although not formally in evidence before the court, counsel for the LP Secured Lenders advised the court that currently \$382,889,000 in principal in Canadian dollars is outstanding along with \$458,042,000 in principal in American dollars.

million. CCI, CPI, and CBI are guarantors. This facility is unsecured, guaranteed on an unsecured basis and currently fully drawn. On June 20, 2009, the Limited Partnership failed to make an interest payment resulting in an event of default under the credit agreement. In addition, the defaults under the senior secured credit facilities resulted in a default under this facility. The senior subordinated lenders are in a position to take steps to demand payment.

- (d) Pursuant to a note indenture between the Limited Partnership, The Bank of New York Trust Company of Canada as trustee, and others, the Limited Partnership issued 9.5% per annum senior subordinated unsecured notes due 2015 in the aggregate principal amount of US \$400 million. CPI and CBI are guarantors. The notes are unsecured and guaranteed on an unsecured basis. The noteholders are in a position to take steps to demand immediate payment of all amounts outstanding under the notes as a result of events of default.

[14] The LP Entities use a centralized cash management system at the Bank of Nova Scotia which they propose to continue. Obligations owed pursuant to the existing cash management arrangements are secured (the “Cash Management Creditor”).

(iii) LP Entities’ Response to Financial Difficulties

[15] The LP Entities took a number of steps to address their circumstances with a view to improving cash flow and strengthening their balance sheet. Nonetheless, they began to experience significant tightening of credit from critical suppliers and other trade creditors. The LP Entities’ debt totals approximately \$1.45 billion and they do not have the liquidity required to make payment in respect of this indebtedness. They are clearly insolvent.

[16] The board of directors of Canwest Global struck a special committee of directors (the “Special Committee”) with a mandate to explore and consider strategic alternatives. The Special Committee has appointed Thomas Strike, the President, Corporate Development & Strategy Implementation, as Recapitalization Officer and has retained Gary Colter of CRS Inc. as

Restructuring Advisor for the LP Entities (the “CRA”). The President of CPI, Dennis Skulsky, will report directly to the Special Committee.

[17] Given their problems, throughout the summer and fall of 2009, the LP Entities have participated in difficult and complex negotiations with their lenders and other stakeholders to obtain forbearance and to work towards a consensual restructuring or recapitalization.

[18] An ad hoc committee of the holders of the senior subordinated unsecured notes (the “Ad Hoc Committee”) was formed in July, 2009 and retained Davies Ward Phillips & Vineberg as counsel. Among other things, the Limited Partnership agreed to pay the Committee’s legal fees up to a maximum of \$250,000. Representatives of the Limited Partnership and their advisors have had ongoing discussions with representatives of the Ad Hoc Committee and their counsel was granted access to certain confidential information following execution of a confidentiality agreement. The Ad Hoc Committee has also engaged a financial advisor who has been granted access to the LP Entities’ virtual data room which contains confidential information regarding the business and affairs of the LP Entities. There is no evidence of any satisfactory proposal having been made by the noteholders. They have been in a position to demand payment since August, 2009, but they have not done so.

[19] In the meantime and in order to permit the businesses of the LP Entities to continue to operate as going concerns and in an effort to preserve the greatest number of jobs and maximize value for the stakeholders of the LP Entities, the LP Entities have been engaged in negotiations with the LP Senior Lenders, the result of which is this CCAA application.

(iv) The Support Agreement, the Secured Creditors’ Plan and the Solicitation Process

[20] Since August 31, 2009, the LP Entities and the LP administrative agent for the LP Secured Lenders have worked together to negotiate terms for a consensual, prearranged restructuring, recapitalization or reorganization of the business and affairs of the LP Entities as a going concern. This is referred to by the parties as the Support Transaction.

[21] As part of this Support Transaction, the LP Entities are seeking approval of a Support Agreement entered into by them and the administrative agent for the LP Secured Lenders. 48% of the LP Secured Lenders, the Hedging Secured Creditors, and the Cash Management Creditor (the “Secured Creditors”) are party to the Support Agreement.

[22] Three interrelated elements are contemplated by the Support Agreement and the Support Transaction: the credit acquisition, the Secured Creditors’ plan (the “Plan”), and the sale and investor solicitation process which the parties refer to as SISP.

[23] The Support Agreement contains various milestones with which the LP Entities are to comply and, subject to a successful bid arising from the solicitation process (an important caveat in my view), commits them to support a credit acquisition. The credit acquisition involves an acquisition by an entity capitalized by the Secured Creditors and described as AcquireCo. AcquireCo. would acquire substantially all of the assets of the LP Entities (including the shares in National Post Inc.) and assume certain of the liabilities of the LP Entities. It is contemplated that AcquireCo. would offer employment to all or substantially all of the employees of the LP Entities and would assume all of the LP Entities’ existing pension plans and existing post-retirement and post-employment benefit plans subject to a right by AcquireCo., acting commercially reasonably and after consultation with the operational management of the LP Entities, to exclude certain specified liabilities. The credit acquisition would be the subject matter of a Plan to be voted on by the Secured Creditors on or before January 31, 2010. There would only be one class. The Plan would only compromise the LP Entities’ secured claims and would not affect or compromise any other claims against any of the LP Entities (“unaffected claims”). No holders of the unaffected claims would be entitled to vote on or receive any distributions of their claims. The Secured Creditors would exchange their outstanding secured claims against the LP Entities under the LP credit agreement and the swap obligations respectively for their *pro rata* shares of the debt and equity to be issued by AcquireCo. All of the LP Entities’ obligations under the LP secured claims calculated as of the date of closing less \$25 million would be deemed to be satisfied following the closing of the Acquisition Agreement.

LP secured claims in the amount of \$25 million would continue to be held by AcquireCo. and constitute an outstanding unsecured claim against the LP Entities.

[24] The Support Agreement contemplates that the Financial Advisor, namely RBC Dominion Securities Inc., under the supervision of the Monitor, will conduct the solicitation process. Completion of the credit acquisition process is subject to a successful bid arising from the solicitation process. In general terms, the objective of the solicitation process is to obtain a better offer (with some limitations described below) than that reflected in the credit acquisition. If none is obtained in that process, the LP Entities intend for the credit acquisition to proceed assuming approval of the Plan. Court sanction would also be required.

[25] In more detailed terms, Phase I of the solicitation process is expected to last approximately 7 weeks and qualified interested parties may submit non-binding proposals to the Financial Advisor on or before February 26, 2010. Thereafter, the Monitor will assess the proposals to determine whether there is a reasonable prospect of obtaining a Superior Offer. This is in essence a cash offer that is equal to or higher than that represented by the credit acquisition. If there is such a prospect, the Monitor will recommend that the process continue into Phase II. If there is no such prospect, the Monitor will then determine whether there is a Superior Alternative Offer, that is, an offer that is not a Superior Offer but which might nonetheless receive approval from the Secured Creditors. If so, to proceed into Phase II, the Superior Alternative Offer must be supported by Secured Creditors holding more than at least 33.3% of the secured claims. If it is not so supported, the process would be terminated and the LP Entities would then apply for court sanction of the Plan.

[26] Phase II is expected to last approximately 7 weeks as well. This period allows for due diligence and the submission of final binding proposals. The Monitor will then conduct an assessment akin to the Phase 1 process with somewhat similar attendant outcomes if there are no Superior Offers and no acceptable Alternative Superior Offers. If there were a Superior Offer or an acceptable Alternative Superior Offer, an agreement would be negotiated and the requisite approvals sought.

[27] The solicitation process is designed to allow the LP Entities to test the market. One concern is that a Superior Offer that benefits the secured lenders might operate to preclude a Superior Alternative Offer that could provide a better result for the unsecured creditors. That said, the LP Entities are of the view that the solicitation process and the support transaction present the best opportunity for the businesses of the LP Entities to continue as going concerns, thereby preserving jobs as well as the economic and social benefits of their continued operation. At this stage, the alternative is a bankruptcy or liquidation which would result in significant detriment not only to the creditors and employees of the LP Entities but to the broader community that benefits from the continued operation of the LP Entities' business. I also take some comfort from the position of the Monitor which is best captured in an excerpt from its preliminary Report:

The terms of the Support Agreement and SISP were the subject of lengthy and intense arm's length negotiations between the LP Entities and the LP Administrative Agent. The Proposed Monitor supports approval of the process contemplated therein and of the approval of those documents, but without in any way fettering the various powers and discretions of the Monitor.

[28] It goes without saying that the Monitor, being a court appointed officer, may apply to the court for advice and directions and also owes reporting obligations to the court.

[29] As to the objection of the Ad Hoc Committee, I make the following observations. Firstly, they represent unsecured subordinated debt. They have been in a position to take action since August, 2009. Furthermore, the LP Entities have provided up to \$250,000 for them to retain legal counsel. Meanwhile, the LP Secured Lenders have been in a position to enforce their rights through a non-consensual court proceeding and have advised the LP Entities of their abilities in that regard in the event that the LP Entities did not move forward as contemplated by the Support Agreement. With the Support Agreement and the solicitation process, there is an enhanced likelihood of the continuation of going concern operations, the preservation of jobs and the maximization of value for stakeholders of the LP Entities. It seemed to me that in the face of these facts and given that the Support Agreement expired on January 8, 2010, adjourning the

proceeding was not merited in the circumstances. The Committee did receive very short notice. Without being taken as encouraging or discouraging the use of the comeback clause in the order, I disagree with the submission of counsel to the Ad Hoc Committee to the effect that it is very difficult if not impossible to stop a process relying on that provision. That provision in the order is a meaningful one as is clear from the decision in *Muscletech Research & Development Inc.*⁵. On a come back motion, although the positions of parties who have relied bona fide on an Initial Order should not be prejudiced, the onus is on the applicants for an Initial Order to satisfy the court that the existing terms should be upheld.

Proposed Monitor

[30] The Applicants propose that FTI Consulting Canada Inc. serve as the Monitor. It currently serves as the Monitor in the CMI Entities' CCAA proceeding. It is desirable for FTI to act; it is qualified to act; and it has consented to act. It has not served in any of the incompatible capacities described in section 11.7(2) of the CCAA. The proposed Monitor has an enhanced role that is reflected in the order and which is acceptable.

Proposed Order

[31] As mentioned, I granted the order requested. It is clear that the LP Entities need protection under the CCAA. The order requested will provide stability and enable the LP Entities to pursue their restructuring and preserve enterprise value for their stakeholders. Without the benefit of a stay, the LP Entities would be required to pay approximately \$1.45 billion and would be unable to continue operating their businesses.

⁵ 2006 CarswellOnt 264 (S.C.J.).

(a) Threshold Issues

[32] The chief place of business of the Applicants is Ontario. They qualify as debtor companies under the CCAA. They are affiliated companies with total claims against them that far exceed \$5 million. Demand for payment of the swap indebtedness has been made and the Applicants are in default under all of the other facilities outlined in these reasons. They do not have sufficient liquidity to satisfy their obligations. They are clearly insolvent.

(b) Limited Partnership

[33] The Applicants seek to extend the stay of proceedings and the other relief requested to the Limited Partnership. The CCAA definition of a company does not include a partnership or a limited partnership but courts have exercised their inherent jurisdiction to extend the protections of an Initial CCAA Order to partnerships when it was just and convenient to do so. The relief has been held to be appropriate where the operations of the partnership are so intertwined with those of the debtor companies that irreparable harm would ensue if the requested stay were not granted: *Re Canwest Global Communications Corp*⁶ and *Re Lehndorff General Partners Ltd*⁷.

[34] In this case, the Limited Partnership is the administrative backbone of the LP Entities and is integral to and intertwined with the Applicants' ongoing operations. It owns all shared information technology assets; it provides hosting services for all Canwest properties; it holds all software licences used by the LP Entities; it is party to many of the shared services agreements involving other Canwest entities; and employs approximately 390 full-time equivalent employees who work in Canwest's shared services area. The Applicants state that failure to extend the stay to the Limited Partnership would have a profoundly negative impact on the value of the Applicants, the Limited Partnership and the Canwest Global enterprise as a whole. In

⁶ 2009 CarswellOnt 6184 at para. 29 (S.C.J.).

⁷ (1993), 9 B.L.R. (2d) 275 (Ont. Gen. Div.).

addition, exposing the assets of the Limited Partnership to the demands of creditors would make it impossible for the LP Entities to successfully restructure. I am persuaded that under these circumstances it is just and convenient to grant the request.

(c) Filing of the Secured Creditors' Plan

[35] The LP Entities propose to present the Plan only to the Secured Creditors. Claims of unsecured creditors will not be addressed.

[36] The CCAA seems to contemplate a single creditor-class plan. Sections 4 and 5 state:

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

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

[37] Case law has interpreted these provisions as authorizing a single creditor-class plan. For instance, Blair J. (as he then was) stated in *Re Philip Services Corp.*⁸ : " There is no doubt that a debtor is at liberty, under the terms of sections 4 and 5 of the CCAA, to make a proposal to

⁸ 1999 CarswellOnt 4673 (S.C.J.).

secured creditors or to unsecured creditors or to both groups."⁹ Similarly, in *Re Anvil Range Mining Corp.*¹⁰, the Court of Appeal stated: "It may also be noted that s. 5 of the CCAA contemplates a plan which is a compromise between a debtor company and its secured creditors and that by the terms of s. 6 of the Act, applied to the facts of this case, the plan is binding only on the secured creditors and the company and not on the unsecured creditors."¹¹

[38] Based on the foregoing, it is clear that a debtor has the statutory authority to present a plan to a single class of creditors. In *Re Anvil Range Mining Corp.*, the issue was raised in the context of the plan's sanction by the court and a consideration of whether the plan was fair and reasonable as it eliminated the opportunity for unsecured creditors to realize anything. The basis of the argument was that the motions judge had erred in not requiring a more complete and in depth valuation of the company's assets relative to the claims of the secured creditors.

[39] In this case, I am not being asked to sanction the Plan at this stage. Furthermore, the Monitor will supervise a vigorous and lengthy solicitation process to thoroughly canvass the market for alternative transactions. The solicitation should provide a good indication of market value. In addition, as counsel for the LP Entities observed, the noteholders and the LP Entities never had any forbearance agreement. The noteholders have been in a position to take action since last summer but chose not to do so. One would expect some action on their part if they themselves believed that they "were in the money". While the process is not perfect, it is subject to the supervision of the court and the Monitor is obliged to report on its results to the court.

[40] In my view it is appropriate in the circumstances to authorize the LP Entities to file and present a Plan only to the Secured Creditors.

⁹ Ibid at para. 16.

¹⁰ (2002), 34 C.B.R. (4th) 157 (Ont. C.A.), leave to appeal to S.C.C. refused (March 6, 2003).

¹¹ Ibid at para. 34.

(d) DIP Financing

[41] The Applicants seek approval of a DIP facility in the amount of \$25 million which would be secured by a charge over all of the assets of the LP Entities and rank ahead of all other charges except the Administration Charge, and ahead of all other existing security interests except validly perfected purchase money security interests and certain specific statutory encumbrances.

[42] Section 11.2 of the CCAA provides the statutory jurisdiction to grant a DIP charge. In *Re Canwest*¹², I addressed this provision. Firstly, an applicant should address the requirements contained in section 11.2 (1) and then address the enumerated factors found in section 11.2(4) of the CCAA. As that list is not exhaustive, it may be appropriate to consider other factors as well.

[43] Applying these principles to this case and dealing firstly with section 11.2(1) of the CCAA, notice either has been given to secured creditors likely to be affected by the security or charge or alternatively they are not affected by the DIP charge. While funds are not anticipated to be immediately necessary, the cash flow statements project a good likelihood that the LP Entities will require the additional liquidity afforded by the \$25 million. The ability to borrow funds that are secured by a charge will help retain the confidence of the LP Entities' trade creditors, employees and suppliers. It is expected that the DIP facility will permit the LP Entities to conduct the solicitation process and consummate a recapitalization transaction of a sale of all or some of its assets. The charge does not secure any amounts that were owing prior to the filing. As such, there has been compliance with the provisions of section 11.2 (1).

[44] Turning then to a consideration of the factors found in section 11.2(4) of the Act, the LP Entities are expected to be subject to these CCAA proceedings until July 31, 2010. Their business and financial affairs will be amply managed during the proceedings. This is a

¹² Supra, note 7 at paras. 31-35.

consensual filing which is reflective of the confidence of the major creditors in the current management configuration. All of these factors favour the granting of the charge. The DIP loan would enhance the prospects of a viable compromise or arrangement and would ensure the necessary stability during the CCAA process. I have already touched upon the issue of value. That said, in relative terms, the quantum of the DIP financing is not large and there is no readily apparent material prejudice to any creditor arising from the granting of the charge and approval of the financing. I also note that it is endorsed by the proposed Monitor in its report.

[45] Other factors to consider in assessing whether to approve a DIP charge include the reasonableness of the financing terms and more particularly the associated fees. Ideally there should be some evidence on this issue. Prior to entering into the forbearance agreement, the LP Entities sought proposals from other third party lenders for a DIP facility. In this case, some but not all of the Secured Creditors are participating in the financing of the DIP loan. Therefore, only some would benefit from the DIP while others could bear the burden of it. While they may have opted not to participate in the DIP financing for various reasons, the concurrence of the non participating Secured Creditors is some market indicator of the appropriateness of the terms of the DIP financing.

[46] Lastly, I note that the DIP lenders have indicated that they would not provide a DIP facility if the charge was not approved. In all of these circumstances, I was prepared to approve the DIP facility and grant the DIP charge.

(e) Critical Suppliers

[47] The LP Entities ask that they be authorized but not required to pay pre-filing amounts owing in arrears to certain suppliers if the supplier is critical to the business and ongoing operations of the LP Entities or the potential future benefit of the payments is considerable and of value to the LP Entities as a whole. Such payments could only be made with the consent of the proposed Monitor. At present, it is contemplated that such suppliers would consist of certain newspaper suppliers, newspaper distributors, logistic suppliers and the Amex Bank of Canada. The LP Entities do not seek a charge to secure payments to any of its critical suppliers.

[48] Section 11.4 of the CCAA addresses critical suppliers. It states:

11.4(1) On application by a debtor company and on notice to the secured creditors who are likely to be affected by the security or charge, the court may make an order declaring a person to be a critical supplier to the company if the court is satisfied that the person is a supplier of goods and services to the company and that the goods or services that are supplied are critical to the company's continued operation.

(2) If the court declares the person to be a critical supplier, the court may make an order requiring the person to supply any goods or services specified by the court to the company on any terms and conditions that are consistent with the supply relationship or that the court considers appropriate.

(3) If the court makes an order under subsection (2), the court shall, in the order, declare that all or part of the property of the company is subject to a security or charge in favour of the person declared to be a critical supplier, in an amount equal to the value of the goods or services supplied upon the terms of the order.

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

[49] Mr. Byers, who is counsel for the Monitor, submits that the court has always had discretion to authorize the payment of critical suppliers and that section 11.4 is not intended to address that issue. Rather, it is intended to respond to a post-filing situation where a debtor company wishes to compel a supplier to supply. In those circumstances, the court may declare a person to be a critical supplier and require the person to supply. If the court chooses to compel a person to supply, it must authorize a charge as security for the supplier. Mr. Barnes, who is counsel for the LP Entities, submits that section 11.4 is not so limited. Section 11.4 (1) gives the court general jurisdiction to declare a supplier to be a "critical supplier" where the supplier provides goods or services that are essential to the ongoing business of the debtor company. The permissive as opposed to mandatory language of section 11.4 (2) supports this interpretation.

[50] Section 11.4 is not very clear. As a matter of principle, one would expect the purpose of section 11.4 to be twofold: (i) to codify the authority to permit suppliers who are critical to the continued operation of the company to be paid and (ii) to require the granting of a charge in circumstances where the court is compelling a person to supply. If no charge is proposed to be granted, there is no need to give notice to the secured creditors. I am not certain that the distinction between Mr. Byers and Mr. Barnes' interpretation is of any real significance for the purposes of this case. Either section 11.4(1) does not oust the court's inherent jurisdiction to make provision for the payment of critical suppliers where no charge is requested or it provides authority to the court to declare persons to be critical suppliers. Section 11.4(1) requires the person to be a supplier of goods and services that are critical to the companies' operation but does not impose any additional conditions or limitations.

[51] The LP Entities do not seek a charge but ask that they be authorized but not required to make payments for the pre-filing provision of goods and services to certain third parties who are critical and integral to their businesses. This includes newsprint and ink suppliers. The LP Entities are dependent upon a continuous and uninterrupted supply of newsprint and ink and they have insufficient inventory on hand to meet their needs. It also includes newspaper distributors who are required to distribute the newspapers of the LP Entities; American Express whose corporate card programme and accounts are used by LP Entities employees for business related expenses; and royalty fees accrued and owing to content providers for the subscription-based on-line service provided by FPinfomart.ca, one of the businesses of the LP Entities. The LP Entities believe that it would be damaging to both their ongoing operations and their ability to restructure if they are unable to pay their critical suppliers. I am satisfied that the LP Entities may treat these parties and those described in Mr. Strike's affidavit as critical suppliers but none will be paid without the consent of the Monitor.

(f) Administration Charge and Financial Advisor Charge

[52] The Applicants also seek a charge in the amount of \$3 million to secure the fees of the Monitor, its counsel, the LP Entities' counsel, the Special Committee's financial advisor and

counsel to the Special Committee, the CRA and counsel to the CRA. These are professionals whose services are critical to the successful restructuring of the LP Entities' business. This charge is to rank in priority to all other security interests in the LP Entities' assets, with the exception of purchase money security interests and specific statutory encumbrances as provided for in the proposed order.¹³ The LP Entities also request a \$10 million charge in favour of the Financial Advisor, RBC Dominion Securities Inc. The Financial Advisor is providing investment banking services to the LP Entities and is essential to the solicitation process. This charge would rank in third place, subsequent to the administration charge and the DIP charge.

[53] In the past, an administration charge was granted pursuant to the inherent jurisdiction of the court. Section 11.52 of the amended CCAA now provides statutory jurisdiction to grant an administration charge. Section 11.52 states:

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

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

¹³ This exception also applies to the other charges granted.

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

[54] I am satisfied that the issue of notice has been appropriately addressed by the LP Entities. As to whether the amounts are appropriate and whether the charges should extend to the proposed beneficiaries, the section does not contain any specific criteria for a court to consider in its assessment. It seems to me that factors that might be considered would include:

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

This is not an exhaustive list and no doubt other relevant factors will be developed in the jurisprudence.

[55] There is no question that the restructuring of the LP Entities is large and highly complex and it is reasonable to expect extensive involvement by professional advisors. Each of the professionals whose fees are to be secured has played a critical role in the LP Entities restructuring activities to date and each will continue to be integral to the solicitation and restructuring process. Furthermore, there is no unwarranted duplication of roles. As to quantum of both proposed charges, I accept the Applicants' submissions that the business of the LP Entities and the tasks associated with their restructuring are of a magnitude and complexity that justify the amounts. I also take some comfort from the fact that the administrative agent for the LP Secured Lenders has agreed to them. In addition, the Monitor supports the charges requested. The quantum of the administration charge appears to be fair and reasonable. As to the quantum

of the charge in favour of the Financial Advisor, it is more unusual as it involves an incentive payment but I note that the Monitor conducted its own due diligence and, as mentioned, is supportive of the request. The quantum reflects an appropriate incentive to secure a desirable alternative offer. Based on all of these factors, I concluded that the two charges should be approved.

(g) Directors and Officers

[56] The Applicants also seek a directors and officers charge (“D & O charge”) in the amount of \$35 million as security for their indemnification obligations for liabilities imposed upon the Applicants’ directors and officers. The D & O charge will rank after the Financial Advisor charge and will rank *pari passu* with the MIP charge discussed subsequently. Section 11.51 of the CCAA addresses a D & O charge. I have already discussed section 11.51 in *Re Canwest*¹⁴ as it related to the request by the CMI Entities for a D & O charge. Firstly, the charge is essential to the successful restructuring of the LP Entities. The continued participation of the experienced Boards of Directors, management and employees of the LP Entities is critical to the restructuring. Retaining the current officers and directors will also avoid destabilization. Furthermore, a CCAA restructuring creates new risks and potential liabilities for the directors and officers. The amount of the charge appears to be appropriate in light of the obligations and liabilities that may be incurred by the directors and officers. The charge will not cover all of the directors’ and officers’ liabilities in a worse case scenario. While Canwest Global maintains D & O liability insurance, it has only been extended to February 28, 2009 and further extensions are unavailable. As of the date of the Initial Order, Canwest Global had been unable to obtain additional or replacement insurance coverage.

[57] Understandably in my view, the directors have indicated that due to the potential for significant personal liability, they cannot continue their service and involvement in the

¹⁴ Supra note 7 at paras. 44-48.

restructuring absent a D & O charge. The charge also provides assurances to the employees of the LP Entities that obligations for accrued wages and termination and severance pay will be satisfied. All secured creditors have either been given notice or are unaffected by the D & O charge. Lastly, the Monitor supports the charge and I was satisfied that the charge should be granted as requested.

(h) Management Incentive Plan and Special Arrangements

[58] The LP Entities have made amendments to employment agreements with 2 key employees and have developed certain Management Incentive Plans for 24 participants (collectively the “MIPs”). They seek a charge in the amount of \$3 million to secure these obligations. It would be subsequent to the D & O charge.

[59] The CCAA is silent on charges in support of Key Employee Retention Plans (“KERPs”) but they have been approved in numerous CCAA proceedings. Most recently, in *Re Canwest*¹⁵, I approved the KERP requested on the basis of the factors enumerated in *Re Grant Forrest*¹⁶ and given that the Monitor had carefully reviewed the charge and was supportive of the request as were the Board of Directors, the Special Committee of the Board of Directors, the Human Resources Committee of Canwest Global and the Adhoc Committee of Noteholders.

[60] The MIPs in this case are designed to facilitate and encourage the continued participation of certain senior executives and other key employees who are required to guide the LP Entities through a successful restructuring. The participants are critical to the successful restructuring of the LP Entities. They are experienced executives and have played critical roles in the restructuring initiatives to date. They are integral to the continued operation of the business

¹⁵ Supra note 7.

¹⁶ [2009] O.J. No. 3344 (S.C.J.).

during the restructuring and the successful completion of a plan of restructuring, reorganization, compromise or arrangement.

[61] In addition, it is probable that they would consider other employment opportunities in the absence of a charge securing their payments. The departure of senior management would distract from and undermine the restructuring process that is underway and it would be extremely difficult to find replacements for these employees. The MIPs provide appropriate incentives for the participants to remain in their current positions and ensures that they are properly compensated for their assistance in the reorganization process.

[62] In this case, the MIPs and the MIP charge have been approved in form and substance by the Board of Directors and the Special Committee of Canwest Global. The proposed Monitor has also expressed its support for the MIPs and the MIP charge in its pre-filing report. In my view, the charge should be granted as requested.

(i) Confidential Information

[63] The LP Entities request that the court seal the confidential supplement which contains individually identifiable information and compensation information including sensitive salary information about the individuals who are covered by the MIPs. It also contains an unredacted copy of the Financial Advisor's agreement. I have discretion pursuant to Section 137(2) of the *Courts of Justice Act*¹⁷ to order that any document filed in a civil proceeding be treated as confidential, sealed and not form part of the public record. That said, public access in an important tenet of our system of justice.

[64] The threshold test for sealing orders is found in the Supreme Court of Canada decision of *Sierra Club of Canada v Canada (Minister of Finance)*¹⁸. In that case, Iacobucci J. stated that an

¹⁷ R.S.O. 1990, c. C.43, as amended.

¹⁸ [2002] 2 S.C.R. 522.

order should only be granted when: (i) it is necessary in order to prevent a serious risk to an important interest, including a commercial interest, in the context of litigation because reasonable alternative measures will not prevent the risk; and (ii) the salutary effects of the confidentiality order, including the effects on the right of civil litigants to a fair trial, outweigh its deleterious effects, including the effects on the right to free expression, which in this context includes the public interest in open and accessible court proceedings.

[65] In *Re Canwest*¹⁹ I applied the *Sierra Club* test and approved a similar request by the Applicants for the sealing of a confidential supplement containing unredacted copies of KERPs for the employees of the CMI Entities. Here, with respect to the first branch of the *Sierra Club* test, the confidential supplement contains unredacted copies of the MIPs. Protecting the disclosure of sensitive personal and compensation information of this nature, the disclosure of which would cause harm to both the LP Entities and the MIP participants, is an important commercial interest that should be protected. The information would be of obvious strategic advantage to competitors. Moreover, there are legitimate personal privacy concerns in issue. The MIP participants have a reasonable expectation that their names and their salary information will be kept confidential. With respect to the second branch of the *Sierra Club* test, keeping the information confidential will not have any deleterious effects. As in the *Re Canwest* case, the aggregate amount of the MIP charge has been disclosed and the individual personal information adds nothing. The salutary effects of sealing the confidential supplement outweigh any conceivable deleterious effects. In the normal course, outside of the context of a CCAA proceeding, confidential personal and salary information would be kept confidential by an employer and would not find its way into the public domain. With respect to the unredacted Financial Advisor agreement, it contains commercially sensitive information the disclosure of which could be harmful to the solicitation process and the salutary effects of sealing it outweigh

¹⁹ Supra, note 7 at para. 52.

any deleterious effects. The confidential supplements should be sealed and not form part of the public record at least at this stage of the proceedings.

Conclusion

[66] For all of these reasons, I was prepared to grant the order requested.

Pepall J.

Released: January 18, 2010

CITATION: CanWest Global Communications Corp., 2010 ONSC 222
COURT FILE NO.: CV-10-8533-00CL
DATE: 20100118

ONTARIO

**SUPERIOR COURT OF JUSTICE
(COMMERCIAL LIST)**

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

AND IN THE MATTER OF A PROPOSED PLAN
OF COMPROMISE OR
ARRANGEMENT OF CANWEST GLOBAL
COMMUNICATIONS CORP. AND THE OTHER
APPLICANTS LISTED ON SCHEDULE "A"

REASONS FOR DECISION

Pepall J.

Released: January 18, 2010