

IN-DEPTH

# Acquisition And Leveraged Finance

CANADA



LEXOLOGY

# Acquisition and Leveraged Finance

EDITION 13

Contributing Editor

**Tracy Liu**

Latham & Watkins LLP

---

In-Depth: Acquisition and Leveraged Finance (formerly The Acquisition and Leveraged Finance Review) provides a practical overview of the most common structures and methods used to finance acquisitions in major jurisdictions worldwide, along with the most salient features of the relevant legal and regulatory frameworks. With a focus on recent trends and developments, it offers incisive legal and commercial analysis for practitioners and market operators.

---

**Generated: October 23, 2026**

The information contained in this report is indicative only. Law Business Research is not responsible for any actions (or lack thereof) taken as a result of relying on or in any way using information contained in this report and in no event shall be liable for any damages resulting from reliance on or use of this information. Copyright 2006 - 2026 Law Business Research



Explore on **Lexology** 

# Canada

David Nadler, Dan Dedic, Caroline Descours, Cathy Costa Faria, Keyvan Nassiry, Chris Baxter, Zhiyao Chen, Kyle Gerow and Michael Hassar

Goodmans LLP

## Summary

INTRODUCTION

YEAR IN REVIEW

REGULATORY AND TAX MATTERS

SECURITY AND GUARANTEES

PRIORITY OF CLAIMS

JURISDICTION

ACQUISITIONS OF PUBLIC COMPANIES

OUTLOOK AND CONCLUSIONS

ENDNOTES

## Introduction

Leveraged lending is used by Canadian borrowers to fund a number of activities, including acquisitions, capital expenditures, dividend recapitalisations, refinancing of existing debt and ongoing operations. Following a gradual increase in 2024 and a multi-year high in 2025, acquisition activity opened on a firm footing in the first quarter of 2026, consistent with the levels seen in the last quarter of 2025, as a result of dealmakers acclimating to increased geopolitical uncertainties and conflict; however, it then noticeably decreased through the second quarter as a result of the conflict in the Middle East driving higher energy prices, inflation concerns and continued uncertainty around global trade policy. Consequently, Canadian acquisition activity in the second quarter of 2026 fell to its lowest quarterly level since the fourth quarter of 2023. As this decline reflects deal processes already in motion before the second quarter of data was released, it is difficult to gauge the full impact of external market forces on the remainder of 2026. Nevertheless, announced deal value rose significantly despite low transaction volume, underscoring the resilience of Canadian M&A activity amid ongoing external market pressures, including the continued uncertainty around US trade and tariff policy.

### Recent Canadian acquisition activity

The second half of 2025 represented a strong rebound in the Canadian mergers and acquisitions market, with two consecutive quarters of growth in announced transactions.-

<sup>[1]</sup> The last three quarters of 2025 were particularly strong, with 21 mega-deal transactions (deals valued above C\$1 billion) announced in the second quarter alone, totalling C\$97 billion in value.<sup>[2]</sup> Notable mega deals of Canadian companies in 2025 included:

1. Anglo American's C\$38.4 billion merger with Teck Resources, one of the largest mining deals in Canadian history;
2. Sunoco's acquisition of Parkland Corporation for US\$9.1 billion; and
3. Salesforce's acquisition of Informatica, a portfolio company of the Canada Pension Plan Investment Board, for approximately US\$8 billion.<sup>[3]</sup>

Despite the political and economic uncertainty associated with US tariff volatility, M&A activity in the first quarter of 2026 increased from the previous quarter, continuing the upward trajectory observed over the prior eight quarters.<sup>[4]</sup> While the deal value of announced deals in the first quarter of 2026, totalling approximately C\$76 billion in value, declined by a total of 24.75%, mostly as a result of the unusual amount of mega deals seen in the fourth quarter of 2025, deal count increased by 1.19% from the fourth quarter of 2025.<sup>[5]</sup> Fifteen mega-deal transactions were announced in the first quarter of 2026, and mid-market transactions (deals valued below C\$250 million) accounted for 86% of deals with disclosed values.<sup>[6]</sup>

Midway through the second quarter of 2026, events in the Middle East raised inflation concerns through higher oil prices and increased transportation and input costs. While it is difficult to gauge the full impact of such geopolitical uncertainty on the remainder of 2026, market conditions remain generally constructive for M&A, supported by central banks

holding rates steady, buoyant valuations in most sectors and favourable public markets.<sup>[7]</sup> M&A deal volume in the second quarter of 2026 reached the lowest quarterly count since the fourth quarter of 2023, with 600 deals announced compared to 680 the prior quarter. However, robust mega-deal activity, with 23 deals announced, drove announced deal value up 51% from the previous quarter to C\$114.5 billion, one of the largest quarterly totals of the past decade.<sup>[8]</sup>

Although final figures for the third quarter of 2026 have yet to be confirmed and the fourth quarter of 2026 will just have commenced at the time of our submission, market analysts expect continued opportunities for strategic transactions while remaining cautious about execution risk amid heightened regulatory scrutiny and geopolitical volatility.<sup>[9]</sup>

## Canadian financing sources

Canadian companies financed their acquisitions in recent months in various ways. In many cases, a significant portion of the consideration for the acquisitions was funded through different types of debt obtained from numerous sources, including senior secured credit facilities provided by domestic and foreign financial institutions, private lenders and hedge funds, second-lien credit facilities, unsecured credit facilities, streaming arrangements, senior secured bonds, high-yield notes and mezzanine debt.

For example, Brookfield Wealth Solutions secured approximately £2.4 billion in new debt financing, comprising a term financing and bridge financing component, provided by a syndicate of lenders led by Royal Bank of Canada in connection with its outbound acquisition of Just Group plc.<sup>[10]</sup> The acquisition of First Capital REIT for approximately C\$9.4 billion by KingSett Capital on behalf of KingSett Real Estate Growth LP No. 8 and other investors, on one side, and Choice Properties REIT, on the other, will be funded in-part by fully underwritten debt financing from TD Securities Inc and Desjardins Group on the KingSett Capital side and the assumption of First Capital's C\$2.3 billion of outstanding unsecured debentures and C\$400 million in existing in-place mortgages as well as a possible new issuance of unsecured debentures on the Choice Properties side.<sup>[11]</sup> Repay Holdings Corporation received financing of a US\$500 million senior secured term loan along with a US\$100 million undrawn revolving credit facility in connection with its acquisition of Kubra Data Transfer Ltd.<sup>[12]</sup>

Also of note is the growth in Canadian dollar corporate bond issuance, driven in part by the rise of "Maple bonds" issued by foreign borrowers in the Canadian market. Canadian dollar corporate issuance was approximately 50% ahead of 2025 levels through August 2026, with Maple bonds representing roughly 30% of total volume.<sup>[13]</sup> While this issuance is mostly tied to refinancing and general corporate purposes or, in the case of the largest Maple bonds, US "hyperscalers" reported to be funding AI data centre investment, the depth the market has demonstrated may still be relevant to Canadian M&A. Acquirers that rely on committed bridge financing typically look to the bond market for the permanent take-out, and a market capable of absorbing record issuance makes that path more dependable. That being said, heavy supply has also put pressure on spreads, and increased competition for investor capacity could raise the cost of acquisition-related issuance. For now, any such link remains prospective, as we are not aware of a 2026 Canadian transaction to date in which this issuance was expressly tied to an acquisition.

## Year in review

Despite the tariff shock and geopolitical uncertainty, M&A activity held up in the first half of 2026. Although deal volume slowed in the second quarter, activity was concentrated in higher-value transactions. Data for the second half is not yet available, but some commentators expect Canadian deal activity to strengthen through the remainder of 2026, citing strategic consolidation and private equity capital awaiting deployment against a backdrop of stable interest rates and supportive public markets.<sup>[14]</sup> However, this outlook remains sensitive to trade policy developments, including the CUSMA review.<sup>[15]</sup>

## Regulatory and tax matters

### Regulatory matters

#### Lender-related regulatory requirements

Canadian borrowers regularly obtain acquisition financing and leveraged finance products from a broad range of lenders, including domestic and foreign financial institutions, private equity and hedge funds, and through the issuance of public debt, including high-yield debt. Canadian and foreign banks are very active in this area and provide a wide variety of debt products to Canadian borrowers. The key regulatory issue for foreign lenders dealing with Canadian borrowers is whether the lender would be considered a bank for Canadian regulatory purposes. The activities of Canadian banks and foreign lenders affiliated with foreign banks that are carrying on banking business in Canada are subject to regulation under the federal Bank Act. Lenders that are banks or affiliated with foreign banks must obtain the necessary approvals under the Bank Act to establish a presence in Canada and must comply with the operational requirements of the Bank Act on an ongoing basis.

Foreign lenders affiliated with foreign banks that do not have a presence in Canada may lend to Canadian borrowers without obtaining regulatory approvals from federal banking regulators if the lending relationship is established in a way that would not involve the lender being viewed as carrying on business in Canada. Generally, a loan that is made by a lender located outside of Canada and that is approved, negotiated and documented outside of Canada, with payments being made to an entity outside of Canada, should satisfy this test.

In the absence of a connection with a bank, foreign and other lenders that are not otherwise regulated as financial institutions in Canada (eg, insurance companies, trust companies and credit unions) do not require any special licences or regulatory approvals to make a loan to a Canadian borrower. These lenders will, however, be subject to laws of general application that apply to the taking and enforcement of security in certain provinces. For example, a lender may require an extra-provincial licence under provincial legislation to hold and enforce a mortgage on real estate in that province. Lenders that lend on the security of real property may also need to obtain a mortgage brokerage licence under provincial legislation if they are not a financial institution exempted from compliance.

## Anti-money laundering and sanctions

Canada's federal anti-money laundering and sanctions laws are designed to protect against the laundering of funds to feed criminal activity and to address international security concerns and foreign corruption. Financial institutions are required to conduct regular risk assessments in respect of their customers and to implement due diligence procedures designed to prevent the transfer of funds or property, and the provision of certain services, to prohibited countries and persons.

## Withholding tax

Under the Income Tax Act, interest paid by a Canadian-resident debtor to an arm's-length non-resident creditor will not generally be subject to the Canadian withholding tax, provided that the interest is not participating (eg, contingent or dependent on the use of or production from property in Canada or computed by reference to revenue, profit, cash flow, commodity price or similar criteria, or by reference to dividends paid or payable). Where interest is subject to withholding tax under the provisions of the Income Tax Act (either because it is paid to a non-arm's length creditor or is participating), the terms of an applicable bilateral tax treaty may apply to reduce the rate of withholding tax from the Canadian domestic rate of 25%. Under the provisions of the Canada-US Income Tax Treaty, where applicable, the rate is reduced to 15% if the interest is participating, or otherwise to 0%. Most other treaties reduce the rate of withholding tax on interest to 10%.

Under Canada's "back-to-back" rules, additional withholding tax may apply where an intermediary is interposed between a foreign lender and a Canadian borrower, and a higher rate of Canadian withholding tax would otherwise apply in respect of payments to the foreign lender.

## Interest deductibility

Interest is only deductible to a Canadian-resident debtor where it meets certain technical requirements set out in the Income Tax Act. Interest (not in excess of a reasonable amount) is generally deductible on:

1. borrowed money used for the purpose of earning income from a business or property; or
2. an amount payable for property that is acquired for the purpose of gaining or producing income from a business or property.

Interest payable on financing incurred to fund the acquisition of an asset to be used in the debtor's business should generally be deductible. Similarly, interest payable on financing incurred to fund the acquisition of shares of a company (where there is a reasonable expectation of income from the shares) should also generally be deductible. Where the Canadian-resident debtor incurs debt to finance the acquisition of shares, and it then amalgamates with or winds up the target company, the interest payable on that debt will generally continue to be deductible (on the basis that the income-producing shares are now replaced with income-producing assets).

## Thin capitalisation rules

Under the Income Tax Act, interest payable by a Canadian-resident debtor may not be deductible to the debtor, and may be subject to Canadian withholding tax on an accrual basis, if the Canadian thin capitalisation rules apply. These rules generally apply where:

1. a non-resident creditor owns (or has a right to acquire or is non-arm's length with a person who owns or has the right to acquire) shares of the debtor representing 25% or more of the votes or value of the debtor's capital stock; and
2. the debt-to-equity ratio of the debtor in respect of such creditors exceeds 1.5:1.

The thin capitalisation rules may apply in a situation where acquisition financing is undertaken by a non-resident parent corporation that then lends funds to its Canadian subsidiary, which acquires the target assets or shares.

Under Canada's "back-to-back" rules, the thin capitalisation rules may apply where an intermediary is interposed between a non-resident creditor and a Canadian borrower, and the thin capitalisation rules would otherwise apply in respect of payments to the non-resident creditor.

## EIFEL rules

Canada's interest deductibility rules (ie, EIFEL rules) are broadly in line with OECD BEPS Action 4 and introduce a limit on the amount of interest and financing expenses that resident and non-resident corporations and trusts can deduct in computing income. More specifically, the basic regime under the EIFEL rules generally limits the deduction of interest and financing expenses to 30% of the taxpayer's "adjusted taxable income" (ie, tax EBITDA). Interest and financing expenses that exceed the applicable limit in a particular year will not be deductible in that year, but generally may be carried forward and deducted in those future years (subject to the application of the EIFEL rules in those years). Certain Canadian corporations and trusts that do not exceed their applicable limit in a particular year generally will be permitted to transfer all or a portion of their "excess capacity" to other Canadian corporations and trusts within their group. Furthermore, taxpayers generally may carry forward for up to three years their "excess capacity" to be utilised in those future years (subject to the application of the EIFEL rules in those years).

Members of certain groups of corporations and trusts may be permitted to effectively opt out of the basic regime in a particular year and elect into an alternative (and potentially more favourable) regime under the EIFEL rules for that year. Where applicable, this alternative regime may permit members of the group to deduct interest and financing expenses beyond the 30% limit where the overall group has a higher "group ratio" of net third-party interest expense to earnings.

The EIFEL rules do not apply to:

1. groups of corporations and trusts whose aggregate net interest expense among their Canadian members does not exceed C\$1 million;
- 2.

certain Canadian-resident corporations and trusts (and groups consisting of Canadian-resident corporations and trusts) that carry on substantially all of their business in Canada (provided that certain other requirements are met); or

3. Canadian-controlled private corporations that have (together with any associated corporations) taxable capital employed in Canada of less than C\$50 million.

Individuals are also exempt from the EIFEL rules.

## Recent amendments

### Criminal rate of interest

In May 2024, the Governor in Counsel of Canada announced changes to the criminal rate of interest that took effect on 1 January 2025.

Section 347 of the Criminal Code makes it an offence for a person to enter into an agreement or arrangement to receive or actually receives interest at a criminal rate.<sup>[16]</sup>

Starting 1 January 2025, the criminal rate was reduced to 35% annual percentage rate (APR) and exempts certain lending agreements, the new rate being a decrease from the previous 60% on an effective annual rate basis, equivalent to 48% APR.<sup>[17]</sup>

Notably, lenders are exempt from the criminal rate of interest provisions under section 347 of the Criminal Code when entering into loan agreements or arrangements where:

1. the borrower is not a natural person;
2. the borrowing is made for a business or commercial purpose; and
3. the amount of credit advanced under such agreement or arrangement is greater than C\$500,000.<sup>[18]</sup>

As such, while the criminal rate of interest has decreased, the new exemptions will mean that the vast majority of lenders providing leveraged finance should no longer be subject to the criminal rate of interest provisions under the Criminal Code. However, due to the drafting of the revised provisions, there remains some uncertainty as to the treatment of commercial loans with availability in excess of C\$500,000 but where the outstanding drawn amount is C\$500,000 or less.

### Anti-hybrid rules

In June 2024, the first package of anti-hybrid rules was enacted to apply to payments made on or after 1 July 2022. These rules broadly align with OECD Base Erosion and Profit Shifting (BEPS) Action 2 and generally apply to hybrid financial instruments. Under these rules, certain payments made by Canadian taxpayers under hybrid mismatch arrangements generally will not be deductible (and, in the case of interest payments, may be subject to Canadian withholding tax) to the extent that the payments are not included in the income of a non-resident recipient (a “deduction non-inclusion mismatch”). Similarly, where a payment by a non-resident is deductible for foreign income tax purposes, these

rules generally will include an amount in a Canadian recipient's income to the extent not otherwise included (a "double deduction mismatch") or, in the case of a dividend payment that is deductible by the non-resident, restrict the Canadian recipient's ability to deduct the dividend received in computing its income (to the extent otherwise deductible).

In January 2026, a second package of anti-hybrid rules was released (with revised draft legislation released in July of 2026). These proposals would apply to payments made on or after 1 July 2026 and have not yet been enacted. The second package of anti-hybrid rules are generally intended to prevent deduction non-inclusion mismatches or double deduction mismatches that arise due to the hybrid nature of entities.

## Consolidation issues

Canadian-resident corporations do not file consolidated tax returns (unlike in certain other jurisdictions, such as the United States). As a result, interest payable by a Canadian-resident corporation is only deductible by that particular corporation and can only offset income earned by that particular corporation. Where the taxable income of the debtor corporation is insufficient to offset the interest deductions, other transactions may need to be undertaken to efficiently use the interest deductions in the corporate group. In particular, when an acquirer incurs debt to finance the acquisition of a target corporation, additional steps (such as the amalgamation of the acquirer with the target) may need to be undertaken to facilitate the deduction of interest on the acquisition financing against the target's operating income.

## Stamp and documentary taxes

There are no stamp or other documentary taxes in Canada to which loan or securitisation documentation or loan-trading documentation might be subject.

## Foreign Account Tax Compliance Act

Under the US Foreign Account Tax Compliance Act (FATCA), payments made to foreign creditors under Canadian financing or leveraged finance arrangements may, in certain circumstances, be subject to a 30% US withholding tax. Where there is a risk of FATCA withholding, the applicable loan or debt financing instrument will typically require the foreign creditor to provide such documentation as may be necessary for the debtor to comply with its obligations under FATCA and to determine whether the creditor has complied with its obligations under FATCA, or to determine the amount of FATCA withholding tax that will be deductible from payments made under the instrument. A Canadian debtor will typically not provide a gross-up to the foreign creditor for amounts deducted because of FATCA withholding tax.

## Security and guarantees

Secured loans are often used in Canada to finance acquisitions. The forms of security and guarantees most commonly used in the Canadian market to secure personal and real property assets, as well as the regime for taking security under the Civil Code of Québec

(CCQ) and the common law applicable in the other provinces and territories, are discussed below.<sup>[19]</sup>

## Security

### Personal property and tangible property

#### Common law provinces

Each of the common law provinces and territories in Canada has a personal property security act (collectively, PPSAs) that is modelled on article 9 of the Uniform Commercial Code in the United States.

Security in personal property is created under the PPSAs when a debtor grants to the creditor a security interest in that property. The granting clause in the security agreement will expressly describe the collateral to which the security interest attaches. Quite often, secured creditors are given a general security interest that secures all of the debtor's existing and after-acquired personal property, both tangible and intangible.

For secured financings in the Canadian market, tangible property normally means goods that are equipment or inventory. A security interest in goods must be perfected if a creditor is to have priority over the interests of other creditors and third parties. Registration of a financing statement in each province or territory where such tangible assets are physically located is necessary to perfect a security interest in those assets. The PPSA registries are publicly accessible, searchable databases, and a registered financing statement serves as notice that a debtor's assets have been encumbered in favour of a secured creditor.

Chattel paper,<sup>[20]</sup> instruments, money, documents of title and goods can also be perfected by a secured party by possession.

#### Quebec

Security over tangible movable property in Quebec is created by a hypothec. Registration at the Register of Personal and Movable Real Rights (RPMRR) perfects the hypothec. Applications for registration at the RPMRR must be drawn up exclusively in French. The foregoing implies that deeds of hypothec in English typically include collateral set out in French and English. No written agreement is needed where a hypothec is taken with delivery (ie, a pledge). Perfection occurs when the pledged collateral is physically delivered to the pledgee. The Charter of the French Language may impact domestic and foreign lenders, including banks and financial institutions. Before a "contract of adhesion" and related (or ancillary) documents may be drawn up in English, a French version of the contract must have been remitted to the adhering party before execution. A contract in which the essential stipulations were imposed or drawn up by one of the parties, on its behalf or upon its instructions, and were not negotiable is a contract of adhesion. If it is possible for the debtor to freely negotiate with the creditor the essential clauses of the contract (regardless of whether such negotiations actually occur), the contract should not be deemed a contract of adhesion. In all cases, loan agreements as well as contracts used in "relations with persons outside Quebec" are exempted from the rule.

## Federal jurisdiction

Security in aircraft, ships and most railways is governed in Canada by federal legislation. While security interests in these types of assets can be taken under the PPSAs or the CCQ, secured parties are well advised to consider any applicable federal legislation and to take the additional steps prescribed therein to establish a first-ranking claim on these assets.

## Personal property and intangible property

### General – common law provinces

Intangible personal property commonly dealt with in the Canadian market includes claims and receivables, contractual rights and intellectual property (IP) rights.<sup>[21]</sup> Generally, creditors secure intangibles similarly to tangibles, by way of a security agreement and perfection by registration under the PPSAs.<sup>[22]</sup> The law of the jurisdiction where the debtor is located<sup>[23]</sup> at the time the security interest attaches governs the validity, perfection and priority of a security interest in intangible personal property. Accordingly, the secured party must file under the PPSA in the province or territory where the debtor is located to perfect against intangible personal property. Secured parties must also file in the jurisdiction the debtor is located to perfect non-possessory interests in certain collateral such as instruments, negotiable documents of title, money and chattel paper.

While IP ownership rights are governed by federal legislation in Canada, security in these intangibles is governed by the PPSAs. A security interest is created in IP rights through a grant of security under a security agreement and is perfected by registration under the PPSAs. In addition, it is common practice for secured creditors with a security interest in Canadian IP such as trademarks, copyright or patents to file a copy or notice of the security agreement with the Canadian Intellectual Property Office.

### General – Quebec

Under the CCQ, the law of the jurisdiction where the grantor is domiciled (ie, where its registered office is located) governs the validity and perfection of security over intangibles. Intangibles (incorporeal movable property) such as claims, receivables, contractual rights and IP rights owned by a debtor domiciled in Quebec are secured under the CCQ by way of a hypothec that is perfected by filing in the RPMRR. A hypothec on monetary claims is perfected by obtaining control over the claim (eg, in the case of a deposit account, by the secured party entering into a control agreement with the financial institution holding the account).

## Investment property

Financial assets such as shares and other securities are considered investment property under the PPSAs. All of the common law provinces and territories in Canada have a Securities Transfer Act (STA) or similar legislation that is based on revised article 8 of the Uniform Commercial Code. The STAs work together with the PPSAs to govern the

creation and perfection of security interests in investment property. The CCQ also contains provisions specific to investment property that are generally similar to the STAs.

Investment property under the PPSAs and STAs includes securities (uncertificated and certificated), securities entitlements, securities accounts, futures contracts and futures accounts. In secured financings in Canada, the type of investment property seen most often is certificated securities. A borrower or guarantor would typically pledge the certificated shares it holds directly in a subsidiary to a lender to secure its obligations owing to that lender.

In addition to execution of a security agreement and filing under the PPSAs to perfect an interest in investment property, secured creditors can also establish “control” or possession over such property. Control is the preferred method for perfecting such an interest as it gives the secured party a higher priority than a security interest perfected by registration alone.

Where investment property is held directly by a debtor, a secured party obtains control of certificated securities by taking possession of the certificates and either taking an endorsement or having the securities registered in its name. For uncertificated securities, control is achieved by either registering the securities in the name of the secured party or by obtaining a control agreement from the issuer of the securities. A control agreement is a tripartite agreement among the issuer, the debtor and the secured party, and provides that the issuer agrees to comply with instructions from the secured party with respect to the securities without the debtor’s further consent.

Where the investment property consists of securities entitlements held indirectly by the debtor through a securities intermediary, the secured party obtains control by:

1. arranging for the securities intermediary<sup>[24]</sup> to record the secured party as the entitlement holder;
2. obtaining a control agreement from the securities intermediary; or
3. having a third party obtain control on its behalf.

## Real property

The most common forms of security over real estate in the Canadian market are mortgages, debentures, hypothecs and trust deeds. Real estate in the common law provinces and territories includes land (together with buildings and fixtures), airspace above land, crops, forests, non-navigable waters, easements, sub-surface land rights, rental income and other profits derived from land and leasehold interests. Real estate under the CCQ includes land, any constructions and works of a permanent nature located on the land and anything forming an integral part of the land, plants and minerals that are not separated or extracted from the land, personal property that is permanently physically attached and joined to an immovable and that ensures its utility and real rights in immovable property, as well as actions to assert these rights or to obtain possession of immovables.

Each province and territory in Canada has a real property title registration system. Secured creditors perfect interests in real property by filing their mortgage, debenture, hypothec

or trust deed against the title to the debtor's real property. The filing of hypothecs at the Quebec Land Registry Office must be made exclusively in French. Generally, registration fees for real property mortgages are nominal. However, in several provinces and territories (Alberta, Newfoundland and Labrador, Northwest Territories, Yukon and Nunavut) registration costs can be higher as they are calculated based on varying formulas that take into account the principal amount of the mortgage that is being registered. Lastly, there are some special statutes in Canada that govern most federally regulated facilities such as airports, prisons and major shipping ports, and these should be assessed when taking security involving these types of facilities.

## Guarantees

Guarantees are a common feature of secured lending structures for acquisition and other types of financings in the Canadian market. Typically, a guarantor (eg, a parent or corporate affiliate of the borrower) will enter into a stand-alone guarantee with a lender that guarantees the obligations of the borrower to the lender. In the acquisition context, it is not uncommon for the obligations of a sole-purpose acquisition entity to be guaranteed by an equity sponsor or controlling parent company. In Quebec, suretyships are used frequently in secured lending.

## Guarantee limitations

### Financial assistance

Corporate legislation in Canada has eliminated outright restrictions on financial assistance. It is permitted without restrictions of any kind in several provinces, including Ontario and Nova Scotia. In other provinces and territories, financial assistance is also permitted generally but is subject to a solvency test or disclosure requirements. The more relaxed regime has provided increased flexibility to lenders in Canada when structuring security packages that include guarantees.<sup>[25]</sup>

### Corporate benefit

There is no corporate benefit requirement under Canadian corporate law statutes. However, a financing transaction that does not provide any apparent benefit to a corporation may be challenged as oppressive by creditors or minority shareholders or may result in an allegation that the fiduciary duties of the corporate directors approving the transaction have been breached. Guarantees supporting the debt of affiliated entities are generally enforceable and valid in Canada as long as the debt is of benefit to the corporate group as a whole.

## Agency concept

The concept of agency is recognised in all Canadian jurisdictions and is commonly used in secured loan structures in Canada. Agents are often used to represent lenders in a syndicate or to hold collateral on behalf of lenders.

## Challenging security under Canadian law

Under Canadian law, there are several ways that a creditor or court-appointed officer could challenge security both before and after the commencement of insolvency or restructuring proceedings. Remedies for “reviewable transactions” are available under federal insolvency legislation and provincial legislation.

In the context of insolvency proceedings, a trustee in bankruptcy<sup>[26]</sup> can challenge preferences and other transactions at undervalue under Canada’s Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act (BIA). Under section 95 of the BIA, a trustee in bankruptcy can challenge a preference, namely a transaction with a debtor or payment made by a debtor that has the effect of preferring one creditor over another and that was entered into within prescribed time periods before insolvency proceedings in respect of the debtor were commenced. If the preference is proven, the transaction or payment is void against the trustee in bankruptcy. Under section 96 of the BIA, a trustee in bankruptcy can attack transactions between the debtor and persons who gave inadequate consideration for assets, goods or services provided by the debtor within prescribed time periods before insolvency proceedings in respect of the debtor were commenced. Courts can order that transfers at undervalue are void against the trustee in bankruptcy or, alternatively, that the parties to the transfer pay to the debtor’s estate the difference between the consideration received by the debtor and the consideration given by the debtor. To the extent that transactions are rendered void as against a trustee in bankruptcy and the property in question has been further transferred, the BIA provides that the proceeds from the transfer of the property are deemed to be the property of the trustee. These sections of the BIA also apply (with any necessary modifications) to proceedings under Canada’s other major insolvency and restructuring statute, the CCAA.<sup>[27]</sup>

Finally, in almost all Canadian provinces and territories, creditors may use the oppression remedy under corporate law to challenge security given by a corporation. This would involve a transaction where the corporation or its directors effected a result or acted in a manner that was oppressive, unfairly prejudicial to or unfairly disregarded the interests of certain parties (including creditors). Where oppressive conduct is found, Canadian courts have broad discretion to grant any remedy they deem appropriate in the circumstances. Provincial legislation is also available to creditors or trustees to attack preferential transactions. While there are differences among the various provincial statutes, most provinces allow a creditor to attack fraudulent conveyances and unjust preferences.<sup>[28]</sup>

In general terms, fraudulent conveyances are transactions where conveyances of real or personal property are made with the intent to defeat, hinder, delay or defraud creditors or others. Unjust preferences are preferential payments or transactions made when the debtor was in insolvent circumstances, unable to pay its debts or knew it was on the brink of insolvency. Transactions found to be fraudulent conveyances or unjust preferences can be voided as against creditors.

## Priority of claims

### Priority claims

In Canada, the priority of a claim of a creditor of an insolvent corporation will depend upon the nature of the claim and the insolvency proceedings applicable to the borrower. The enforcement of security may occur in the context of a proceeding under the CCAA or the BIA. An insolvent corporate borrower may reorganise itself under the CCAA or the BIA, or petition itself into bankruptcy under the BIA.

In a Canadian insolvency proceeding, certain claims may be afforded priority over a secured lender pursuant to a court order and the priority of these claims will be determined by the court based on the facts of each case. The court may, for example, grant a charge in priority to the security of existing lenders in the debtor's assets to secure, among other things, claims of, or in respect of, critical suppliers, debtor-in-possession lenders, directors' corporate indemnities, key employee retention payments and professional administration fees.

In addition, certain statutory claims will continue to have priority over a secured lender's claim in an insolvency proceeding. In a bankruptcy scenario, these include:

1. claims for unremitted employee source deductions;
2. certain employee claims that are paid by the Canadian federal government under the Wage Earner Protection Program Act; and
3. certain employee and employer pension plan contributions that are due and unpaid.<sup>[29]</sup>

In a CCAA restructuring or a BIA proposal, generally the restructuring plan or proposal for the insolvent borrower must provide for the payment of certain employee and other claims unless otherwise agreed by the relevant parties. In liquidating restructuring proceedings under the CCAA or the BIA, an individual is eligible to receive a payment under the Wage Earner Protection Program Act provided the court is satisfied that all employees have been terminated, other than any retained employees to wind down the former employer's business operations, in which case such amounts may have priority over a secured lender's claim.

Certain pension claims may also rank in priority to a lender's security in the event of a borrower's insolvency, including claims in respect of:

1. unpaid normal cost contributions;
2. special payments required to be paid to liquidate an unfunded liability or solvency deficiency; and
3. any amount required to liquidate any other unfunded liability or solvency deficiency of the pension fund.<sup>[30]</sup>

The priorities in respect of (b) and (c) were enacted in 2023 pursuant to the Pension Protection Act.<sup>[31]</sup> They apply to pension plans created on or after 27 April 2023. For pension plans established before 27 April 2023, there is a four-year integration period before the priority will take effect on 27 April 2027.

Notably, the Supreme Court of Canada decision in *Indalex Limited (Re)*<sup>[32]</sup> created some doubt as to the priority afforded to the amount of any funding deficiency arising in

connection with the wind-up (a wind-up deficiency) of a borrower's defined benefit pension plan. Before this decision, it was generally thought that the deemed trust provisions of the applicable pension legislation would not apply to a wind-up deficiency. Although the Supreme Court made it clear that a deemed trust could apply to a wind-up deficiency and that the claim for that amount would be subordinate to a court-ordered charge securing debtor-in-possession financing for the insolvent borrower, the court did not opine on the relative priority of liens on the accounts receivable and inventory securing indebtedness existing at the time a CCAA order is made.<sup>[33]</sup> Lenders providing financing to a Canadian borrower that has a defined benefit plan registered in Canada or to acquire a target with such a plan should determine whether a deemed trust could apply to a wind-up deficiency under the applicable pension legislation, and consider the impact on their security position in the event of an insolvency.

Also notable, a number of the Canadian federal and provincial statutory deemed trusts that can prime a lender's security outside a bankruptcy or CCAA proceeding for unpaid amounts, such as sales taxes, will be reversed in a bankruptcy or CCAA proceeding of the insolvent borrower.<sup>[34]</sup> However, where a statutory trust satisfies the general principles of trust law for creating a true trust, the assets impressed with the trust would be excluded from any distribution to the insolvent borrower's secured creditors in the bankruptcy proceedings.<sup>[35]</sup>

Lenders should also be aware of a decision of the Supreme Court of Canada, *Orphan Well Association et al v Grant Thornton Limited et al (Redwater)*,<sup>[36]</sup> which considered Alberta's provincial regulatory regime regarding abandonment and reclamation obligations (or end-of-life obligations) with respect to abandoned oil wells.<sup>[37]</sup> The Alberta Energy Regulator issued orders under the provincial regulatory regime requiring Redwater Energy Corporation, an insolvent oil and gas company, to fulfil its end-of-life obligations.

The majority of the Supreme Court held that, for a number of reasons, the regulator's use of its provincial statutory powers to enforce compliance with end-of-life obligations under Alberta's provincial legislation does not create a conflict with the BIA and therefore does not trigger the doctrine of federal paramountcy.<sup>[38]</sup> This meant that the Alberta regime, which was binding on receivers and trustees, could be enforced against Redwater's trustee in bankruptcy such that Redwater's end-of-life obligations for its inactive oil and gas wells were to be satisfied from the insolvent estate, notwithstanding the impact on secured lender recovery.<sup>[39]</sup>

The treatment of environmental obligations in insolvency is an evolving issue,<sup>[40]</sup> and the applicable provincial regulatory regime will factor significantly into a court's determination.<sup>[41]</sup>

Lenders will want to ensure they understand the applicable provincial regulatory regime and its application in a potential insolvency, and ensure that lending values account for such risks where a Canadian borrower has potential environmental liabilities.

## Equitable subordination

Under the US Bankruptcy Code, the doctrine of equitable subordination allows courts to subordinate creditor claims to those of lower-ranking creditors. This extraordinary remedy is typically reserved for situations of egregious conduct on the part of creditors, because it supplants negotiated contractual arrangements between parties. For a claimant to

succeed in subordinating a creditor claim, it must demonstrate that the creditor engaged in inequitable conduct, that the conduct harmed other creditors of the bankrupt company or that an unfair advantage was conferred on the creditor, and that the subordination is consistent with the remainder of the US Bankruptcy Code.

Although there is no equivalent legislative provision in Canada, Canadian courts have suggested that the doctrine of equitable subordination could potentially be adopted in certain circumstances. In *Indalex*, the Supreme Court of Canada affirmed the “wait and see” approach it espoused in *Canada Deposit Insurance Corp v Canadian Commercial Bank*,<sup>[42]</sup> whereby, rather than ruling one way on the doctrine’s applicability, it declared that the facts at hand did not give rise to a claim for equitable subordination and left its determination for a later date.<sup>[43]</sup> In its subsequent decision in *US Steel Canada Inc (Re)*,<sup>[44]</sup> the Ontario Court of Appeal ruled that the CCAA court does not have the jurisdiction under the CCAA to grant the remedy of equitable subordination. The Ontario Court of Appeal, however, left the door open for equitable subordination to apply in a BIA context on the basis that the BIA provides the court with express jurisdiction in equity. Leave to appeal to the Supreme Court of Canada was granted in respect of the Ontario Court of Appeal’s decision in *US Steel*; however, the appeal was discontinued, and the Ontario Court of Appeal decision remains the authority in Canada.

## Second lien financings

As noted above, a Canadian borrower may incorporate several types of indebtedness (including second lien loans) in its capital structure. Second lien loans are an increasingly popular source of financing in Canada for acquisitions, recapitalisations and restructurings. Non-bank entities such as hedge funds, private equity funds and distressed debt funds, particularly those based in the United States, are typically the providers of second lien loans to Canadian borrowers. As second lien loans are secured by a lien on all or a portion of the borrower’s assets, these loans are generally considered to be a lower risk alternative to mezzanine loans and, accordingly, are less costly than mezzanine or other junior unsecured debt. Often these loans are provided in US dollars and are particularly attractive to Canadian borrowers with significant US-dollar cash flows that provide a natural hedge to currency exchange fluctuations that could otherwise affect their ability to make loan payments in US dollars.

The respective rights of the first lien lenders and the second lien lenders are set forth in an intercreditor agreement. A first lien-second lien intercreditor agreement will certainly include a contractual subordination of the second lien lender’s lien to the rights of the first lien lender and restrictions on the ability of the second lien lender to enforce its lien against the common collateral for the loans. The intercreditor agreement may also include provisions addressing the issues set out below.

## Intercreditor agreements

Lenders have made a broad variety of debt products available to borrowers to finance their operations, acquisitions and other activities. As a result, many borrowers have complex capital structures with several layers of debt secured by liens on the same collateral. For example, a borrower may have a senior term and operating credit facility, hedging obligations, cash management obligations and a second lien term loan or notes

secured by liens on the borrower's assets. Lenders in these circumstances typically enter into an intercreditor agreement that delineates their respective rights, remedies and priorities, particularly in a default situation. Canadian courts generally treat an intercreditor agreement as an enforceable contract between the lenders and uphold its provisions. However, if the borrower in question is subject to an insolvency proceeding, it is possible that the court supervising the proceeding may make an order that is not consistent with the provisions of the applicable intercreditor agreement in exercising its jurisdiction over the matter.

The terms of any particular intercreditor agreement are influenced by the borrower's creditworthiness and capital structure, the type and terms of the relevant debt, the lenders' preferred exit strategies and the general economic environment. The primary purpose of an intercreditor agreement from a senior lender's perspective is to ensure that it is in a position to control the enforcement proceedings with respect to a defaulting borrower until the senior lender is repaid in full or is no longer prepared to continue. Intercreditor agreements also typically include provisions that deal with:

1. the relative priority of liens on the collateral;
2. the application and turnover of proceeds derived from the collateral, payment restrictions or blockage periods with respect to junior debt payments;
3. restrictions on the type and amount of senior debt that ranks prior to more junior debt;
4. standstill periods and other restrictions on enforcement proceedings by holders of junior debt;
5. access rights to certain collateral;
6. restrictions on certain modifications to the terms of each lender's credit documentation;
7. refinancing rights; and
8. the right of junior debt holders to purchase the senior debt.

Triggers for junior debt payment blockages, the frequency and length of payment blockage periods as well as the right to make catch-up payments once a payment blockage has ceased are often heavily negotiated. The elements and amount of senior debt (including interest rate and fee increases, over-advances, prepayment premiums and hedging obligations) that ranks in priority to the junior secured debt are also frequently the subject of much discussion.

## Jurisdiction

It is not uncommon for acquisitions in Canada to be financed by foreign lenders based in the United States, England or other countries. This occurs most often when the buyer is a foreign entity or the Canadian target is part of a larger cross-border or international corporate structure, but also more recently in largely Canadian-based transactions. Foreign lenders often expressly choose to have their principal financing agreement governed by the

law of their home jurisdiction and to stipulate that any resulting disputes will be governed by that law. In these circumstances, foreign lenders need to understand how choice of law and foreign judgments are treated in Canada and whether consent to jurisdiction clauses are enforceable.

### Choice of law

Generally, in a proceeding in Canada to enforce a foreign law-governed document, Canadian courts will, with limited exceptions, apply the law expressly chosen by the parties, as long as the choice of the foreign law in the agreement is bona fide, legal and not contrary to public policy. Canadian courts will apply local law to procedural matters and apply local laws that have overriding effect. In addition, Canadian courts will not apply foreign law if to do so would have the effect of enforcing a foreign revenue, expropriation or penal law.

In the unlikely event that the parties do not expressly choose a system of law to govern the primary financing agreement, Canadian courts will apply the law that has the closest and most real and substantial connection to the agreement.

### Enforcement of foreign judgments

Without reconsidering the merits, and subject to certain defences, Canadian courts generally will issue judgments in Canadian dollars based on final and conclusive foreign judgments rendered against the person for a specified amount if the action in Canada is brought within any applicable limitation period. Under certain circumstances, Canadian courts have the discretion to stay or decline to hear an action based on a foreign judgment. These actions may also be affected in the courts by bankruptcy, insolvency or other similar laws affecting creditors' rights.

Certain defences are available to debtors in Canada to prevent recognition and enforcement of a foreign judgment against them. The foreign judgment cannot have been obtained by fraud or in a manner contrary to natural justice. In addition, the foreign judgment cannot be for a claim that under Canadian law would be characterised as being based on a revenue, expropriatory or penal law, nor can the foreign judgment be contrary to public policy. Finally, Canadian courts will not enforce the foreign judgment if it has already been satisfied or is void or voidable under the foreign law.

### Submission to jurisdiction clauses

Agreements to submit all disputes related to the financing transaction to a specified jurisdiction are common in commercial financing and can be exclusive or non-exclusive. Under Canadian law, non-exclusive jurisdiction clauses have historically been held to be enforceable. Canadian case law, including decisions from the Supreme Court of Canada, has strongly supported enforcement of exclusive jurisdiction clauses to increase predictability and certainty in the Canadian market.<sup>[45]</sup>

## Acquisitions of public companies

In Canada, acquisitions of public companies are generally implemented through:

1. takeover bids pursuant to which the acquirer bids for the shares of the target (and that may or may not be followed by a compulsory acquisition of those shares that are not tendered into the bid or a second stage going private transaction);
2. a plan of arrangement (whereby a company can pursue a broad range of fundamental changes under a single transaction that is court approved); or
3. an amalgamation of the target company with the acquirer.

In each of the foregoing cases, where the consideration to be paid for the shares of the target will be satisfied in whole or in part in cash, an acquirer will generally incur as much debt as possible (often using the assets and credit rating of the target company as collateral) to finance the going private transaction. In recent years, there has been a resurgence in acquisitions being financed by more significant amounts of debt and a rejuvenation of the highly leveraged buyout market.

There are several issues that are unique to the financing of acquisitions of public companies in Canada. While many of these issues vary based on the specific provincial corporate and securities laws that are applicable in any given transaction, the general approach and issues raised are common in all Canadian jurisdictions.<sup>[46]</sup>

### Conditionality and availability of funds

Canadian securities laws establish an “availability of funds” requirement for takeover bids of Canadian public companies. In this regard, section 2.27 of National Instrument 62-104 (Take-Over Bids and Issuer Bids) states that where a bid provides that the consideration for the securities deposited under such bid is to be paid, in whole or in part, in cash, “the offeror must make adequate arrangements before the bid to ensure that the required funds are available to make full payment for the securities that the offeror has offered to acquire”.<sup>[47]</sup>

In addition, the financing arrangements can be subject to conditions only if, at the time the bid is commenced, “the offeror reasonably believes the possibility to be remote that, if the conditions of the bid are satisfied or waived, the offeror will be unable to pay for the securities deposited under the bid due to a financing condition not being satisfied”.<sup>[48]</sup>

In practice, the “adequate arrangement” test is generally satisfied by the offeror obtaining a binding commitment letter from its financing source that typically contains SunGard-type limited conditionality provisions. Conditions that are viewed as generally being acceptable include those that mirror the conditions in favour of the offeror contained in the bid documents or that are otherwise reasonably easy for the offeror to satisfy (such as the completion of a definitive credit agreement and related loan documents). Conditions that would be unacceptable in this context would include conditions that are in the discretion of the lenders, such as satisfactory due diligence or satisfaction with the capitalisation or ownership of the target following completion of the bid.

### Two-stage transaction

Generally, acquisition financings are secured by, among other things, the collateral of the target company. In fact, the credit rating and the value of the assets owned by the target company are significant components in the lenders' analysis of the amount of credit they are willing to provide to finance an acquisition. In connection with an acquisition where the offeror aims to acquire all of the outstanding shares of the target company, the minimum tender condition is generally set at approximately 66.67%. This allows the offeror to achieve a certain level of security regarding the outcome of the bid.

If an offeror acquires 90% or more of the securities subject to the bid (excluding those previously held by it), both Canadian federal and provincial legislation provides for a procedure for the compulsory acquisition of the balance of the shares within a certain period. If less than 90% but more than approximately 66.67% of the outstanding securities are acquired, the offeror can complete the acquisition of 100% of the securities of the target company by means of a subsequent going-private transaction. In this circumstance, the offeror can vote the shares that were tendered to it under the bid. Because the voting threshold under applicable law for approval of a going-private transaction is approximately 66.67% (75% for some jurisdictions) of the shares voting at the shareholders' meeting called to approve the transaction, the offeror can be assured that the transaction will be approved.

The foregoing has a direct impact on a lender's ability to take security over the assets of the target company. This security cannot be granted until the offeror acquires 100% of the shares of the target. The lenders will have to advance funds under the credit agreement at such time as the minimum bid condition is satisfied to enable the offeror to acquire the number of securities tendered but before it is able to obtain a security interest in the assets of the target. However, it is essentially a certainty that once such minimum number of shares is tendered to the bid, the offeror will be able to acquire 100% of the target in due course.

## Disclosure requirements

There are disclosure requirements under Canadian securities laws with respect to the terms of a financing related to the acquisition of a public company. In the context of a takeover bid where a financing is involved, the takeover bid circular must state the name of the lenders, the terms and conditions precedent to the financing, the circumstances under which the loan must be repaid and the proposed method of repayment.<sup>[49]</sup> These disclosure requirements are easily satisfied by including a summary of the terms and conditions of the financing in the circular, which must be in the form prescribed.<sup>[50]</sup>

## Outlook and conclusions

The acquisition financing market has remained active in 2026, supported by steady M&A activity through the first half of the year. We expect trade and tariff concerns to persist; however, several factors are supportive. The Canadian federal government has continued to expand the lending available to affected companies, including through enhancements to the Large Enterprise Tariff Loan facility as well as other targeted programmes. In addition, the Canadian bond market has been very active, including Canadian-dollar

denominated “Maple bonds” issued by foreign entities. Finally, in our experience, strong M&A activity in the resources sector, both within Canada and by Canadian companies pursuing opportunities abroad, has driven steady demand for resource-related acquisition financing, in particular through the third quarter of 2026.

## Endnotes

- 1 Crosbie & Company, M&A Quarterly Reports, online:  
<https://www.crosbieco.com/who-we-are/m-a-publications>. The figures provided are a compilation from the 2023–2026 quarterly reports. ^ [Back to section](#)
- 2 *ibid.* ^ [Back to section](#)
- 3 *ibid.* ^ [Back to section](#)
- 4 *ibid.* ^ [Back to section](#)
- 5 *ibid.* ^ [Back to section](#)
- 6 *ibid.* ^ [Back to section](#)
- 7 *ibid.* ^ [Back to section](#)
- 8 *ibid.* ^ [Back to section](#)
- 9 "M&A in Canada: What to expect in 2026" (25 March 2026),  
<https://www.lexpert.ca/news/legal-insights/ma-in-canada-what-to-expect-in-2026/394057>. ^ [Back to section](#)
- 10 "Royal Bank of Canada finances 2.4 billion acquisition of Just Group by Brookfield Wealth Solutions", (10 April 2026),  
<https://www.goodmans.ca/expertise/case/royal-bank-of-canada-provides-financing-on-24-billion-recommended-offer-for-just-group-by-brookfield-wealth-solutions>. ^ [Back to section](#)
- 11 "First Capital REIT enters into agreement to be acquired by KingSett Capital and Choice Properties REIT in \$9.4 Billion Transaction", (16 April 2026), <https://www.kingsettcapital.com/post/first-capital-transaction->  
<https://www.choicereit.ca/wp-content/uploads/2026/04/2026-Transformational-Acquisition-EN-AODA.pdf>. ^ [Back to section](#)
- 12 "Repay Completes Acquisition of Kubra", (1 June 2026),  
<https://investors.repay.com/news-releases/news-release-details/repay-completes-acquisition-kubra>. ^ [Back to section](#)

- 13 "August 2026: Canadian Monthly Corporate Bond Watch" (August 2026), <https://www.slcmanagement.com/ca/en/solutions/retirement-plan-solutions/canadian-monthly-corporate-bonds-watch/>. ^ [Back to section](#)
  
- 14 "Canada's Middle Market M&A Update – Q2 2026", <https://www.mnp.ca/en/services/corporate-finance/mergers-and-acquisitions/on-update/canadas-middle-market-ma-update>. ^ [Back to section](#)
  
- 15 "2026 mid-year Canadian M&A update", (23 June 2026), <https://www.pwc.com/ca/en/services/deals/trends/mid-year-update.html>. ^ [Back to section](#)
  
- 16 Criminal Code, RSC 1985, Chapter C-46, section 347. ^ [Back to section](#)
  
- 17 Criminal Interest Rate Regulations, SOR/2024-114. ^ [Back to section](#)
  
- 18 Regulations under the Criminal Code will also maintain the previous criminal rate of 48% APR (as opposed to the new criminal rate of 35% APR) in cases of lending agreements or arrangements where: (1) the borrower is not a natural person; (2) the borrowing is made for a business or commercial purpose; and (3) the amount of credit advanced is between C\$10,000 and C\$500,000. ^ [Back to section](#)
  
- 19 The common law provinces and territories in Canada are British Columbia, Alberta, Saskatchewan, Manitoba, Ontario, New Brunswick, Nova Scotia, Prince Edward Island, Newfoundland and Labrador, Nunavut, the Yukon Territories and the Northwest Territories. ^ [Back to section](#)
  
- 20 In recent years, provinces such as Ontario, Alberta and Saskatchewan have modernised their PPSAs to recognise both tangible, "wet ink" chattel paper and electronic chattel paper. The updated PPSAs in these provinces allow for electronic chattel paper to be perfected by control. Related harmonising changes have been made to the PPSA conflict of laws and the priority rules in a number of provinces. Given the recognition of electronic chattel paper in the United States under the Uniform Commercial Code and the Ontario, Saskatchewan and Alberta PPSAs, we expect that, in time, the PPSAs in the other Canadian provinces and territories will be updated with similar changes. ^ [Back to section](#)
  
- 21 The PPSAs expressly exclude an interest in or claim under any insurance policy or annuity contract from their scope. Secured debtors must take steps outside of the PPSAs to secure an interest in an insurance policy. The PPSAs do, however, provide that a previous security interest in other secured personal property assets extends to the proceeds of insurance on the assets. In Quebec, insurance policies can be charged by a hypothec (with a special perfection regime for hypothecs over life insurance policies). ^ [Back to section](#)

- 22** Certain government receivables payable by the federal government of Canada and the provincial and territorial governments cannot be assigned or transferred as security unless secured parties comply with certain conditions prescribed by statute. [^ Back to section](#)
- 23** Generally, under the PPSAs, a debtor is located at its place of business or if a debtor has more than one place of business where it has its chief executive office. However, in Ontario, British Columbia and Saskatchewan, deeming rules for determining a debtor's location more easily and with more certainty have recently been enacted. We expect the balance of provinces and territories to implement similar rules over the next several years. The updated rules determine a debtor's location based on what type of entity the debtor is. For example, in Ontario, provincial corporations are deemed to be located in the province or territory of incorporation or organisation. [^ Back to section](#)
- 24** For example, a clearing house, retail investment broker or bank. [^ Back to section](#)
- 25** Certain provisions of the Corporations Act (Newfoundland and Labrador) restrict the ability of a corporation to provide financial assistance to related persons where the assistance would jeopardise the solvency of the corporation. In addition, section 78 of the Corporations Act (Newfoundland and Labrador) prohibits a corporation from giving financial assistance, which may be a loan, guarantee or some other structure, to certain blacklisted persons when "circumstances prejudicial to the corporation exist". The blacklist includes shareholders, directors, officers or employees of the corporation, and associates of these persons. It is a wide net that catches most entities in the same corporate organisation. As expected, these provisions are usually encountered in financing transactions where corporate guarantees are required or in intercompany loan situations. Although there are exceptions set out in the statute (the most commonly relied upon exceptions are the giving of assistance by a wholly owned subsidiary to its parent corporation or by a corporation to a subsidiary), when these exceptions are unavailable, a full analysis is required to determine whether the provisions are applicable and what course of action is the most appropriate to ensure that the assistance can be provided. [^ Back to section](#)
- 26** Where a trustee refuses or neglects to take proceedings after being requested to do so by a creditor, that creditor may make an application to the court for an order authorising it to take the proceedings in question in its own name and at its own expense and risk, on notice being given to the other creditors of the contemplated proceeding, and on such other terms and conditions as the court may direct. [^ Back to section](#)
- 27** In which case, a CCAA court-appointed monitor could challenge preferences and other transactions at undervalue. See section 36.1(1) of the CCAA. [^ Back to section](#)
- 28** Court-appointed officers and other parties seeking to challenge a transaction or grant of security may rely on these provincial statutes both within insolvency proceedings under the BIA or the CCAA and outside the proceedings. [^ Back to section](#)

- 29** The BIA also provides for certain limited statutory protections and priorities for, among other things, unpaid suppliers, and farmers, fisherman and aquaculturalists. Recent amendments to the CCAA and BIA have also created a deemed trust in favour of suppliers of perishable fruits or vegetables for use in a purchaser's business. [^ Back to section](#)
- 30** "Unfunded liability" is the additional amount required to ensure plan assets meet the plan liabilities. "Solvency deficiency" is the additional amount required to ensure the fund meets its obligations if it were to be wound up. [^ Back to section](#)
- 31** SC 2023, c6. [^ Back to section](#)
- 32** 2013 SCC 6 (Indalex). [^ Back to section](#)
- 33** See also *Grant Forest Products Inc v The Toronto-Dominion Bank*, 2015 ONCA 570 (*Grant Forest*). In *Grant Forest*, the Ontario Court of Appeal confirmed that a judge presiding over CCAA proceedings has the discretion to permit a creditor to petition the debtor company into bankruptcy, even when the transition to bankruptcy results in a loss of the pension deemed trust and an altering of priorities in favour of a secured creditor. In addition, the Ontario Court of Appeal, although not explicitly upholding the ruling of the lower court that a wind-up deemed trust does not prevail when a wind-up is ordered after the commencement of CCAA proceedings, did distinguish the facts from the *Indalex* case (the wind-up deemed trust under consideration in *Indalex* arose before the CCAA proceedings commenced, whereas in *Grant Forest* neither of the pension plans were wound up until after the CCAA proceedings commenced). [^ Back to section](#)
- 34** In *Callidus Capital Corp v Canada*, 2018 SCC 47, the Supreme Court of Canada denied a taxing authority's efforts in the bankruptcy proceedings of the debtor to have its deemed trust for unremitted taxes upheld as against a secured creditor who, before the insolvent debtor's bankruptcy, received proceeds from the insolvent debtor that were deemed to be held in trust for the taxing authority. [^ Back to section](#)
- 35** In *The Guarantee Company of North America v Royal Bank of Canada*, 2019 ONCA 9, the Ontario Court of Appeal held that Ontario's Construction Lien Act (now Construction Act) impresses a true trust on the funds owing to or received by a bankrupt contractor, preserving those assets from distribution to the bankrupt contractor's creditors. In *UrbancorpCumberland 2 GP Inc (Re)*, 2020 ONCA 197, in the context of a CCAA proceeding, the Ontario Court of Appeal found that Ontario's Construction Lien Act (now the Construction Act) creates a valid trust pursuant to general trust law, and this statutory provincial trust can be effective in an insolvency to the extent it does not conflict with a specific priority under federal law. To that point, the Court in *Waygar Capital Inc v Quality Rugs of Canada Limited*, 2024 ONSC 2486 held that a court-ordered debtor-in-possession charge can take priority over a statutory trust created under Ontario's Construction Act. The priority created by the provincial legislation conflicted with a court-ordered priority under the CCAA. [^ Back to section](#)
- 36** 2019 SCC 5. [^ Back to section](#)

- 37** These obligations refer generally to responsibilities for plugging and capping oil wells to prevent leaks, dismantling surface structures and restoring the surface to its previous condition. [^ Back to section](#)
- 38** The doctrine of federal paramountcy establishes that where there is a conflict between valid provincial and federal laws, the federal laws will prevail and the provincial laws will be inoperative to the extent they conflict with the federal laws. [^ Back to section](#)
- 39** See also *Manitok Energy Inc (Re)*, 2022 ABCA 117. [^ Back to section](#)
- 40** Notably, in *Mantle Materials Group, Ltd*, 2023 ABCA 339, the Court of Appeal of Alberta held that the interests of secured creditors are subordinate to environmental obligations pursuant to Alberta's Environmental Protection and Enhancement Act, confirming that the priority of environmental obligations set out in *Redwater* applies beyond the oil and gas industry. Leave to appeal to the Supreme Court of Canada was refused. In *Qualex-Landmark Towers Inc v 12-10 Capital Corp*, 2024 ABCA 115, the Court of Appeal of Alberta limited the application of *Redwater* to regulators inside formal insolvency proceedings such that it does not apply to create a common law super priority for environmental obligations in favour of private parties. More recently, in *AlphaBow Energy Ltd (Re)*, 2025 ABKB 622, the Alberta Court of King's Bench, in the context of AlphaBow's CCAA proceedings, refused to stay the AER's request for a security deposit in connection with a licence transfer application made by AlphaBow. The Court held that the AER's requirement for a security deposit was a condition to the transfer of AlphaBow's licences and was not an enforcement of the AER's rights as a creditor. Citing *Redwater*, the Court held that payments of this nature are public duties owed, not to a creditor, but to "fellow citizens". Therefore, they are not provable claims. The enforcement of such public duty, the Court held, did not alter the priority scheme among AlphaBow's creditors, even if it effectively prioritised end-of-life obligations over creditor rights. [^ Back to section](#)
- 41** See, for example, *British Columbia (Attorney General) v Quinsam Coal Corporation*, 2020 BCSC 640, where the British Columbia Supreme Court distinguished *Redwater* on the basis that the Alberta regime regulating the abandonment, closure and reclamation of oil and gas wells is different from British Columbia's Mines Act and allowed certain sale proceeds to be paid to the secured creditor while there remained unfulfilled regulatory obligations, including reclamation obligations imposed under the Mines Act. See *Eye Hill (Rural Municipality) v Saskatchewan (Minister of Energy)*, 2023 SKKB 52, where the Saskatchewan Court of King's Bench applied *Redwater* on the basis that Saskatchewan's regulatory regime is based on Alberta's regime. The Court held that the Minister of Energy and Natural Resources' claims for end-of-life environmental obligations had priority over the claims of various municipalities for unpaid municipal taxes. The decision was affirmed by the Saskatchewan Court of Appeal in 2023 SKCA 120. [^ Back to section](#)
- 42** [1992] 3 SCR 558, paragraph 44. [^ Back to section](#)
- 43** *Indalex*, note 29 at paragraph 77. [^ Back to section](#)

- 44** 2016 ONCA 662 (*US Steel*). ^ [Back to section](#)
- 45** *ZI Pompey Industries v Ecu-Line NV* [2003] 1 SCR 450. ^ [Back to section](#)
- 46** We have focused on the laws of the province of Ontario in our analysis of these issues below. ^ [Back to section](#)
- 47** National Instrument 62-104 – (Take-Over Bids and Issuer Bids) (2016), 39 OSCB (Supp-1) 63, section 2.27(1). ^ [Back to section](#)
- 48** *ibid.*, section 2.27(2). ^ [Back to section](#)
- 49** National Instrument 62-104 – (Take-Over Bids and Issuer Bids), Form 62-104F1 – Take-Over Bid Circular at item 12. ^ [Back to section](#)
- 50** See prescribed form in National Instrument 62-104 – (Take-Over Bids and Issuer Bids), Form 62-104F2 – Issuer Bid Circular. ^ [Back to section](#)

## Goodmans<sup>LLP</sup>

**David Nadler**

dnadler@goodmans.ca

**Dan Dedic**

ddedic@goodmans.ca

**Caroline Descours**

cdescours@goodmans.ca

**Cathy Costa Faria**

ccostafaria@goodmans.ca

**Keyvan Nassiry**

knassiry@nassirylaw.com

**Chris Baxter**

cbaxter@goodmans.ca

**Zhiyao Chen**

zchen@goodmans.ca

**Kyle Gerow**

kgerow@goodmans.ca

**Michael Hassar**

mhassar@goodmans.ca

Goodmans LLP

Read more from this firm on Lexology