PUBLIC VERSION

Reference: *B-Filer Inc. et al. v. The Bank of Nova Scotia*, 2006 Comp. Trib. 42
File No.: CT-2005-006
Registry Document No.: 0159

IN THE MATTER OF the *Competition Act,* R.S.C. 1985, c. C-34, as amended;

AND IN THE MATTER OF an application by B-Filer Inc., B-Filer Inc. doing business as GPAY GuaranteedPayment and Npay Inc. for an order pursuant to section 75 of the *Competition Act.*

B E T W E E N :

B-Filer Inc.,
B-Filer Inc. doing business as
GPAY GuaranteedPayment and
Npay Inc.
(applicants)

and

The Bank of Nova Scotia
(respondent)

Dates of hearing: 20060828 to 20060901, 20060905 to 20060908, 20060925 to 20060929, 20061003, 20061005 to 20061006
Before: Dawson J. (presiding), Mr. L. Bolton and Dr. L. Csorgo
Date of Reasons: December 20, 2006
Reasons signed by: Madam Justice E. Dawson, Mr. L. Bolton and Dr. L. Csorgo

PUBLIC VERSION OF CONFIDENTIAL REASONS FOR ORDER

TABLE OF CONTENTS **Paragraph**

I. INTRODUCTION AND SUMMARY OF CONCLUSIONS

[1] The applicants assert that their former banker, The Bank of Nova Scotia, engaged in reviewable conduct by terminating its banking relationship with the applicants, and thus refusing to deal with them. This conduct is said to entitle the applicants to an order pursuant to subsection 75(1) of the *Competition Act*, R.S.C. 1985, c. C-34 (Act). The applicants therefore request that the Competition Tribunal issue an order requiring The Bank of Nova Scotia to supply them with two specific banking services, bill payee services and bank accounts for deposit of e-mail money transfers, that the Bank formerly supplied to the applicants, and which it continues to supply to other banking customers.

[2] In the reasons that follow, the Competition Tribunal finds that:[1]

(1) The applicants have failed to establish that they were substantially affected in their business, or precluded from carrying on business, due to their inability to obtain adequate supplies of a product anywhere in a market on usual trade terms;

(2) The applicants have failed to establish that they were unable to obtain adequate supplies of the product because of insufficient competition among suppliers of the product in the market;

(3) The applicants have failed to establish that the refusal to deal is having, or is likely to have, an adverse effect on competition in a market; and,

(4) Even if the applicants succeeded in establishing all of the constituent elements of subsection 75(1) of the Act, in any event this would not be a proper case for the granting of discretionary relief to the applicants because they are unable to comply with the contractual terms and conditions pursuant to which the banking services they seek are provided to customers of The Bank of Nova Scotia.

[3] It follows that the application will be dismissed.

[4] The issue of costs will be reserved. If the parties are unable to agree on costs, written submissions are to be filed with respect to costs. The parties are also to file submissions with respect to any required redactions in these reasons for the purpose of publishing forthwith a public version, all as described in more detail later in these reasons.

[5] These issues arise in the following factual context. Unless otherwise noted, the following facts are not in dispute.

II. BACKGROUND FACTS

A. The Parties

[6] The corporate applicants, B-Filer Inc. (B-Filer) and NPAY Inc. (NPAY), are federally incorporated and carry on business in Sherwood Park, Alberta. Their president and controlling shareholder is Raymond Grace. B-Filer carries on business under the name GPAY GuaranteedPayment (GPAY).

[7] Effective December 10, 2002, NPAY entered into a joint venture agreement with UseMyBank Services, Inc. (UMB). The president, chief executive officer and founder of UMB is Joseph Iuso. The profits of the joint venture are split equally between the joint venture partners.

[8] The Bank of Nova Scotia (sometimes Bank or Scotiabank) is one of the five major chartered banks in Canada.

B. The Nature of the Applicants' Business

[9] The applicants describe their business as providing an Internet bank card debit payment service that allows customers to make purchases from participating Internet merchants with payments made directly from the customer's existing bank account (GPAY Services). The principal business of the applicants is the provision of the GPAY Services. The applicants receive all of their significant revenue from the joint venture.

[10] Some of the services needed to provide the GPAY Services are provided by the joint venture partner, UMB. Together, the service provided by the joint venture is referred to as the UseMyBank Service. The joint venture agreement, Exhibit CA-2, delineates the responsibilities of the joint venture partners in the following way. UMB is to: provide facilitation services using existing banking payment systems; provide the front-end interface utilizing components from the NPAY website; direct buyers and sellers to the existing NPAY terms and conditions of use; and, bring on and direct all buyers and sellers who wish to use manual bill payment services to NPAY. NPAY (and through it B-Filer) is to: provide the processing, settlement and reconciliation of all payments processed by UMB; and, bring on and direct all sellers and buyers who wish to use automated bill payment services to UMB.

[11] Mr. Iuso explained that UMB handles the marketing of the UseMyBank Service and the processing of the transactions through the banks. NPAY, and through it B-Filer, handles everything to do with the money, more specifically, the interface with the banks and the settlement with the merchants.

[12] During the applicants' opening statement, through their counsel, they acknowledged, for the first time, that they operate a money services business, as that term is defined in regulations enacted pursuant to the *Proceeds of Crime (Money Laundering) and Terrorist Financing Act*, S.C. 2000, c. 17 (PCMLTF Act).

C. How the UseMyBank Service Works

[13] The UseMyBank Service operates as follows:

(i) Online merchants that offer this payment mechanism display the UseMyBank icon on their websites.

(ii) A customer wishing to use the service selects UseMyBank as his or her payment option, and is then transferred to the UseMyBank website.

(iii) There, the customer selects his or her bank from a list of banks.

(iv) To continue, the customer must indicate that he or she has reviewed and agreed to the terms and conditions of use imposed by UseMyBank (whether or not the customer has read those terms and conditions).

(v) The customer then designates the bank account that he or she wishes to debit and enters the user identification and password they have previously established with their bank (together referred to as the customer's electronic signature). All of this is done on the UseMyBank website, which is protected through encryption.

(vi) UMB then uses the customer's electronic signature in order to enter into an online banking session on the customer's bank's website. In order for a bank to learn that its own customer is not conducting the banking session, the bank would have to look at the IP address of the communicating party. If it did this, the bank would see that the transaction comes from UMB. UMB states that the customer's electronic signature is not stored on its server, and the electronic signature never resides on the online merchant's server. While the electronic signature is on the UMB server, it is not encrypted.

(vii) During the course of the online banking session, UMB selects, based on the customer's instructions, which of the customer's bank accounts is to be debited and then directs the payment to GPAY. Where GPAY has bill payee status at the customer's bank (described in more detail below), GPAY is selected as a bill payee and the customer's payment is directed to GPAY as a bill payment. Where GPAY does not have bill payee status, UMB directs an e-mail money transfer (EMT) from the customer's account to one of GPAY's accounts. During the banking session, the UMB server also gathers information from the bank (such as the customer's name, address and telephone number), which GPAY uses for purposes that include the detection of fraudulent transactions.

(viii) Whether by EMT or bill payment, the money is immediately taken out of the customer's account by their bank, and the funds are placed in an internal bank suspense account.

(ix) UMB then notifies the merchant that there is a confirmation of payment. Later, GPAY receives the funds from the bank. Subsequently, GPAY pays the money to its merchant, deducting its fee.

[14] Mr. Iuso stated that this type of transaction is "meant to be [a] real-time payment processing, like [a] credit card". He agreed that the joint venture can only offer what it describes as a real-time money transfer because UMB itself effects the transaction on behalf of GPAY using the bank customer's electronic signature. The joint venture cannot operate this money transfer business unless bank customers disclose their online banking password and bank identification number to it.

[15] Of the transactions processed by the UseMyBank Service, 98% involve payments to "payment processor gateways" that have online gambling casinos for clients. Put more simply, the vast majority of the joint venture's business, 98% of it, is to transfer monies in order to fund online gaming accounts at casinos located outside of Canada.

D. The Banking Relationship Between the Applicants and The Bank of Nova Scotia

[16] In August of 1999, Mr. Grace attended at the Sherwood Park branch of The Bank of Nova Scotia and opened a single, small business account in the name of B-Filer Inc. carrying on business as GPAY Guaranteed Payment. The Application for Business Banking Services form signed by Mr. Grace described GPAY's business to be one of "financial collection" and estimated the annual sales of the business to be $240,000 per year, with a total monthly deposit balance of $10,000. At that time, Mr. Grace signed and was given a copy of the Bank's Financial Services Agreement. This document set out the terms and conditions related to the operation of the business account.

[17] Exhibits A-33 and A-34 reflect that Mr. Grace also applied in August of 1999 for biller status at The Bank of Nova Scotia. Once accepted, GPAY was listed by The Bank of Nova Scotia as a biller so that the Bank's customers could make online bill payments from their bank accounts to GPAY. Bill payee status is specific to each bank in the sense that, for example, Scotiabank deposit customers can only make online bill payments from their Scotiabank accounts to entities that have obtained biller status from The Bank of Nova Scotia. Similarly, for example, customers of the Royal Bank of Canada (RBC) can only make such payments to entities that have obtained biller status from RBC.

[18] It is agreed that, in 1998 and 1999, GPAY obtained status as a bill payee from each of Canada's five largest chartered banks, as well as from the Alberta Treasury Branches (ATB) and the Fédération des caisses Desjardins du Québec. When the UseMyBank joint venture was launched in December 2002, GPAY used these bill payee facilities to operate the UseMyBank Service as described above. It is also agreed that, at all material times, the applicants maintained business accounts at RBC. The significance of those accounts is that The Bank of Nova Scotia and RBC are the only two banks that permit EMTs to be deposited into small business accounts. The Bank of Nova Scotia does not permit EMT deposits into commercial accounts of entities that are not small businesses. EMT deposits are allowed into personal accounts.

[19] In August of 2003, the Canadian Bankers Association forwarded to a number of banks an Internet alert with respect to the UseMyBank website. The alert originated from the Canadian Imperial Bank of Commerce (CIBC). The concern expressed was the potential for fraud that existed as a result of the disclosure of a bank customer's electronic signature. As a result of this notice, the Bank's security group initiated an investigation. While concern was expressed by representatives of the Bank about the risk posed by the disclosure of a customer's electronic signature, the Bank's response to the investigation was to contact all of its customers who had used the UseMyBank Service in order to warn them that they should not be disclosing their electronic signatures. This response was said by the Bank to reflect the low transaction volumes and low number of customers that were involved.

[20] In December of 2003, GPAY lost the biller status that it held at the Toronto-Dominion Bank (TD), CIBC and ATB. As a result, thereafter, when UMB entered into banking sessions on TD and CIBC websites on behalf of a customer, instead of directing payment to GPAY through a bill payment, UMB would instruct that payment be made to GPAY by way of an EMT. These EMT payments were then deposited into the applicants' business accounts either at The Bank of Nova Scotia or RBC (because, as noted above, these were the only banks which permitted EMT deposits into business accounts).

[21] Both RBC and Scotiabank impose limits on the sending and receipt of funds by EMT. For a send transaction, the limit is $1,000 per day and $7,000 over a 30-day rolling period. A recipient is limited to receiving $10,000 per day and $300,000 over a 30-day rolling period. The rolling limits are set by Acxsys Corporation. Acxsys Corporation, an incorporated for-profit division of the Interac Association, developed the e-mail money transfer service.

[22] On April 15, 2004, Mr. Grace opened a second account at the Bank in GPAY's name. This account was a Money Master for Business (Money Master) account. Mr. Grace testified that this second account differed from the existing original account in that there was no bank charge levied for depositing EMTs. There was also no charge for transferring money from the Money Master account to the current account, so long as the transfer was done online. A fee of $0.65 per transaction was applied to EMT deposits made into GPAY's original current account.

[23] Beginning sometime in 2004, the Bank's Sherwood Park branch began receiving notices that some transactions could not be posted into the applicants' account(s).

[24] Mr. Woodrow, the Sherwood Park branch account manager for small business accounts, testified that, as a result of activity in the applicants' accounts, the branch learned in 2004 that, after 100 transactions occurred in a Money Master account, any remaining debits or credits were put into an unpostable suspense account. Mr. Woodrow further recalled that, through the latter part of 2004, unpostable reports showed that the applicants were exceeding the transaction limits on virtually a daily basis.

[25] Mr. Grace agreed that transactions became unpostable after approximately 100 transactions, and agreed that the applicants encountered significant difficulty with this in 2004.

[26] The reason for this increase in unpostable transactions was that, following the loss of biller status at CIBC and TD, for customers of those banks, payments to GPAY were effected by way of EMTs deposited into the applicants' accounts with The Bank of Nova Scotia.

[27] As a result of the unpostable transactions, a number of new accounts were opened by the applicants at The Bank of Nova Scotia during the second half of 2004. Some accounts were opened by Mr. Grace personally at the Sherwood Park branch, while some were opened as a result of telephone calls Mr. Grace placed to the Scotiabank call centre. Exhibit A-35 summarizes the account openings, detailing the date an account was opened, the name of the account holder, whether the account was opened through the branch or the call centre, and the number of accounts opened each day. Exhibit A-35 is reproduced, verbatim, here:

SUMMARY OF ACCOUNT OPENINGS

Date	Plaintiff	Branch	Call Centre	# of Accounts
August 6, 1999	B-Filer as GPay	√		1
April 15, 2004	GPay	√		1
June 11, 2004	GPay	√		6
October 7, 2004	B-Filer	√		5
November 15, 2004	NPay	√		15
February 25, 2005	B-Filer		√	30
March 1, 2005	NPay		√	1
March 3, 2005	NPay		√	22
March 8, 2005	GPay		√	10
March 9, 2005	GPay		√	17

[28] Thus, it can be seen that, from April 2004 to March 2005, Mr. Grace caused 107 accounts to be opened at the Bank in the names of various applicants. Of the 107 accounts, 80 were opened in the period from February 25, 2005 to March 9, 2005.

[29] Exhibit CA-69 shows the number of deposits the applicants made into accounts at The Bank of Nova Scotia in each month during the period from September 2003 to July 2006. Exhibit CA-62 depicts the amount of the deposits to Scotiabank accounts made each month from September 2003 to July 2006. In their Statement of Grounds and Material Facts, at paragraph 10, the applicants state that, from June 1, 2004 to May 31, 2005, they deposited approximately $9,929,881.17 into business bank accounts they held at The Bank of Nova Scotia.

E. The Termination of the Banking Relationship

[30] As a result of being notified of the 15 new accounts opened in the name of NPAY on November 15, 2004, Ms. Parsons, manager of the Sherwood Park branch, became concerned about the number of accounts the applicants were opening. At a meeting with Ms. Gibson-Nault, manager of customer service at Sherwood Park, and Mr. Woodrow, she instructed Mr. Woodrow to find out from Mr. Grace why so many accounts were needed and why there were so many unpostable transactions. She also directed that no new accounts were to be opened for the applicants.

[31] In February 2005, the branch became aware that Mr. Grace was opening accounts through the Scotiabank call centre. As a result, Ms. Gibson-Nault spoke to her contact person at the Bank's Shared Services operation who in turn referred her to the Bank's Security and Investigation division in Calgary. As a result of a conversation with a representative of that department, Ms. Gibson-Nault prepared and forwarded an Unusual Transaction Report. The Unusual Transaction Report referenced the number of accounts opened for GPAY, NPAY and B-Filer, the number of EMTs that exceeded the transaction limits so as to trigger unpostable transactions, and the aggregation and transfer of funds.

[32] Also during February and March of 2005, the Bank received six complaints of fraudulent transactions concerning the applicants' accounts. Mr. Grace explained to Mr. Woodrow that these fraudulent transactions occurred because of one of two possible scenarios. In the first, a customer's account might be compromised by a rogue who would then conduct the transaction. In the second, a person, a spouse for example, would see a transaction on a bank statement and question it. The husband or wife who made the transaction would not wish to admit to it and so would deny the transaction (rather than admit to, for example, Internet gambling). In that instance, the transaction would be reported as fraudulent.

[33] Receipt of the Unusual Transaction Report triggered an internal investigation at the Bank. Further information was sought from the branch by Bank officials in Toronto.

[34] In a two-page memorandum dated March 29, 2005, which reviewed the chronology of events, Ms. Parsons and Ms. Gibson-Nault recommended termination of the banking relationship between the Bank and the applicants. The Bank says that, as a result of its internal investigation, it decided to accept the recommendation and to terminate its banking relationship with the applicants.

[35] By a number of letters dated May 11, 2005, The Bank of Nova Scotia gave written notice to the applicants terminating the banking relationship, effective June 15, 2005. Each letter made reference to clause 12.2 of the Financial Services Agreement which provides that the Bank "may cancel any service to you without a reason by giving you thirty days' written notice". The termination was, in fact, delayed as result of proceedings the applicants brought in the Alberta Court of Queen's bench. After their request for an interim injunction was dismissed by that Court, the applicants' banking services were terminated by the Bank, and their accounts closed on September 28, 2005.

F. Interac Online

[36] On or about May 5, 2005, the Interac Association announced the launch of Interac Online. The service was commenced in June 2005.

[37] Interac Online is a service that also allows customers to purchase products or services through the Internet. If a customer, when on a participating merchant's website, selects Interac Online as the payment option, the customer is directed to an access page which displays the financial institutions that participate in Interac Online. Currently there are three: Scotiabank, RBC and TD. The customer then selects his or her financial institution and is directed to the online banking sign-on page of that financial institution. There, the customer inputs his or her electronic signature. The customer is then directed to a page where he or she selects the account to be debited and confirms the transaction.

[38] Since June 2005, 32 merchants have accepted Interac Online as a payment mechanism.

G. History of this Proceeding and the Relief Sought

[39] This proceeding is brought pursuant to the Tribunal's order of November 4, 2005, which granted the applicants leave to apply for relief under section 75 of the Act. The applicants seek an order requiring Scotiabank to supply them with Scotiabank "Biller Services" and "EMT Business Deposit Accounts". This is the first private application brought before the Tribunal as a result of the amendments to the Act made in 2002, which permitted such private proceedings.

[40] On December 14, 2005, the Tribunal dismissed the applicants' request for interim relief.

III. Applicable Legislation

[41] Subsection 75(1) of the Act contains the refusal to deal provision which is at issue. Subsection 75(1) provides:

<table>
<tr><td>75. (1) Where, on application by the Commissioner or a person granted leave under section 103.1, the Tribunal finds that</td><td>75. (1) Lorsque, à la demande du commissaire ou d'une personne autorisée en vertu de l'article 103.1, le Tribunal conclut :</td></tr>
<tr><td>(a) a person is substantially affected in his business or is precluded from carrying on business due to his inability to obtain adequate supplies of a product anywhere in a market on usual trade terms,</td><td>a) qu'une personne est sensiblement gênée dans son entreprise ou ne peut exploiter une entreprise du fait qu'elle est incapable de se procurer un produit de façon suffisante, où que ce soit sur un marché, aux conditions de commerce normales;</td></tr>
</table>

(*b*) the person referred to in paragraph (*a*) is unable to obtain adequate supplies of the product because of insufficient competition among suppliers of the product in the market,

(*c*) the person referred to in paragraph
(*a*) is willing and able to meet the usual trade terms of the supplier or suppliers of the product,

(*d*) the product is in ample supply, and

(*e*) the refusal to deal is having or is likely to have an adverse effect on competition in a market,

the Tribunal may order that one or more suppliers of the product in the market accept the person as a customer within a specified time on usual trade terms unless, within the specified time, in the case of an article, any customs duties on the article are removed, reduced or remitted and the effect of the removal, reduction or remission is to place the person on an equal footing with other persons who are able to obtain adequate supplies of the article in Canada.

b) que la personne mentionnée à l’alinéa *a*) est incapable de se procurer le produit de façon suffisante en raison de l’insuffisance de la concurrence entre les fournisseurs de ce produit sur ce marché;

c) que la personne mentionnée à l’alinéa *a*) accepte et est en mesure de respecter les conditions de commerce normales imposées par le ou les fournisseurs de ce produit;

d) que le produit est disponible en quantité amplement suffisante;

e) que le refus de vendre a ou aura vraisemblablement pour effet de nuire à la concurrence dans un marché,
le Tribunal peut ordonner qu’un ou plusieurs fournisseurs de ce produit sur le marché en question acceptent cette personne comme client dans un délai déterminé aux conditions de commerce normales à moins que, au cours de ce délai, dans le cas d’un article, les droits de douane qui lui sont applicables ne soient supprimés, réduits ou remis de façon à mettre cette personne sur un pied d’égalité avec d’autres personnes qui sont capables de se procurer l’article en quantité suffisante au Canada.

[42] Subsection 75(1) was amended in June 2002 to allow private access to the Tribunal when leave is granted under section 103.1 of the Act. The amendment made in 2002 also added paragraph (e) to the Act. This is the first case brought before the Tribunal since paragraph (e) was added to subsection 75(1).

[43] For the purpose of this application, subsections (3) and (4) of section 75 are also relevant. Subsection (3) defines the phrase "trade terms", found in subsection 75(1), to mean "terms in respect of payment, units of purchase and reasonable technical and servicing requirements". Subsection (4) precludes the Tribunal from drawing any inference from the fact that the Commissioner has, or has not, taken any action in respect of the matter raised by the application. This provision has some relevance because, in January 2004, the Commissioner closed her investigation into the applicants' allegation that the refusal of CIBC, TD and ATB to allow GPAY to receive bill payments from their customers contravened sections 75 and 79 of the Act. The Tribunal has given no weight to the fact that the Commissioner's investigation was discontinued. The Commissioner did note that private access to the Tribunal might be available to the applicants.

[44] Section 75 of the Act is set out in its entirety in Schedule A to these reasons.

IV. ONUS AND STANDARD OF PROOF

[45] It is common ground among the parties that the applicants bear the onus of establishing each constituent element contained in paragraphs (a) through (e) of subsection 75(1) of the Act.

[46] The standard of proof to be applied is the civil standard: proof on a balance of probabilities.

V. THE WITNESSES PRESENTED BY EACH PARTY

[47] Before turning to the substance of the analysis of subsection 75(1) of the Act and its constituent elements, it is helpful to identify the witnesses called by each party. A description of the general nature of the testimony they presented in chief is contained in Schedule B to these reasons.

A. The Expert Witnesses

[48] Six individuals testified as experts before the Tribunal, two on behalf of the applicants and four on behalf of the Bank. The applicants' experts were Mr. Jack Bensimon and Dr. Lawrence Schwartz. The Bank's experts were Mr. Christopher Mathers, Dr. James Dingle, Mr. David Stewart and Dr. Frank Mathewson.

(1) The Applicants' Experts

[49] With the parties' agreement, the Tribunal accepted Jack Bensimon as an expert qualified to give opinion evidence with respect to anti-money laundering programs and policies, and compliance with anti-money laundering regulations in both Canada and the United States. After hearing examination and cross-examination with respect to his qualifications, he was also found by the Tribunal to be qualified to give opinion evidence with respect to anti-fraud programs and policies.

[50] With the parties' agreement, Dr. Lawrence Schwartz was qualified as an "expert economist with respect to competition economics, in particular to market definition, to the impact on competition and impact on the business of GPAY, at least insofar as an economic matter."

(2) The Bank's Experts

[51] Christopher Mathers was tendered as an expert in matters related to anti-money laundering, fraud, and anti-terrorist financing, particularly in the context of the online gaming industry. His qualification to provide such opinions was accepted by the applicants.

[52] Dr. James Dingle is a retired employee of the Bank of Canada, where he, among other positions, served as the Deputy Chairman of the board of directors of the Canadian Payments Association. He was tendered and accepted as an expert "in respect of matters relating to Canadian chartered bank operations and risks relating to their day-to-day operations, particularly as relating to payment flows and issues relating to electronic banking" as set out in his report.

[53] David Stewart is an attorney practicing in Washington, D.C. He was tendered, and accepted by the applicants, as an expert in United States gaming law, including the federal law of the United States as it relates to Internet gambling. His qualifications to opine on matters relating to state law were put in issue by the applicants, but, after hearing examination and cross-examination on his qualifications, his expertise in this area was accepted by the Tribunal.

[54] Dr. Frank Mathewson is a professor of economics and the Director of the Institute for Policy Analysis at the University of Toronto. His qualifications were conceded as an expert economist, with expertise in industrial organization, and in particular with expertise on matters relating to market power and vertical restraints.

B. The Lay Witnesses

[55] Twelve other individuals testified before the Tribunal.

[56] The applicants called Mr. Joseph Iuso, Mr. Raymond Grace, Mr. Ryan Woodrow, and Mr. Darren Morgenstern. The Bank called Ms. Margaret Parsons, Ms. Sharon Gibson-Nault, Ms. Susan Graham-Parker, Mr. Colin Cook, Mr. Douglas Monteath, Mr. Robert Rosatelli, Mr. Ronald King, and Mr. David Jones.

(1) The Applicants' Lay Witnesses

[57] Joseph Iuso is the President, Chief Executive Officer, and founder of UMB.

[58] Raymond Grace is the President of both GPAY and NPAY.

[59] Ryan Woodrow is an employee of The Bank of Nova Scotia who at all material times was the account manager for small business accounts at the Bank's branch in Sherwood Park, Alberta. He was the officer responsible for the applicants' accounts.

[60] Darren Morgenstern is the owner of the Ashley Madison Agency, an online dating service that caters to the niche market of people who are in a relationship but are "seeking alternative options".

(2) The Bank's Lay Witnesses

[61] Margaret Parsons was at all material times the manager of the Sherwood Park branch of The Bank of Nova Scotia.

[62] Sharon Gibson-Nault was at all material times the manager of customer service at the Sherwood Park branch.

[63] Susan Graham-Parker is Senior Vice President of Retail and Small Business Banking for Ontario for The Bank of Nova Scotia.

[64] Colin Cook is Vice President, Commercial Banking at The Bank of Nova Scotia.

[65] Douglas Monteath is an assistant general manager of the Shared Services operation of the Bank.

[66] Robert Rosatelli is Vice President, Self-Service Banking at The Bank of Nova Scotia.

[67] Ronald King is Vice President and Chief Anti-Money Laundering Officer of the Scotiabank group of companies.

[68] David Jones is Director of Web Business at WestJet.

VI. THE ELEMENTS OF SECTION 75 AND THE ISSUES TO BE DETERMINED

[69] Having set forth the necessary background facts, discussed the applicable legislation, the onus and standard of proof, and identified the witnesses tendered by the applicants and the Bank, we turn to the analysis of whether the applicants have met their onus to establish all of the required elements contained in subsection 75(1). Each element has been put in dispute by the parties. We deal first with paragraph 75(1)(*a*) of the Act.

A. Have the applicants established that they are substantially affected in their business due to their inability to obtain adequate supplies of a product anywhere in a market on usual trade terms?

[70] There is no suggestion that the applicants have been precluded from carrying on their business. Thus, it is only necessary to consider whether they have been substantially affected in their business. At the outset, we must determine what test the Tribunal should apply in order to define the relevant product market under paragraph 75(1)(*a*). Before doing so, we note that both the applicants and the Bank addressed the issue of "usual trade terms" under paragraph 75(1)(*c*) rather than under 75(1)(*a*). We also address usual trade terms when we consider paragraph 75(1)(*c*).

(1) The Test to Define the Product Market

[71] The parties disagree on the proper approach for defining the product market under paragraph 75(1)(*a*). In Dr. Schwartz's opinion, the correct approach is the hypothetical monopolist test. Dr. Schwartz stated that he favours this test because it generally avoids the problem of defining markets overly broadly. Dr. Mathewson defines the market based upon the approach adopted by the Tribunal in *Canada (Director of Investigation and Research) v. Chrysler Canada Ltd.* (1989), 27 C.P.R. (3d) 1, aff'd (1991) 38 C.P.R. (3d) 25; [1991] F.C.J. No. 943 (QL) (C.A.). In Dr. Mathewson's view, "the operative principle is that other products are substitutes if the purchaser's business is not substantially affected by switching to these other services." Dr. Mathewson testified that he prefers this test because "[i]n refusal to deal cases, and the abuse cases events have already occurred. And so we do have evidence about how the market has responded. We don't have to be hypothetical. It seems to me if we're hypothetical, we're ignoring information; information that's at our fingertips, through the evidence of how the market has actually functioned. And thus the words, functional interchange in terms of substitution, are the operative words in my view."

[72] We find that the proper test is that identified by the Tribunal in *Chrysler* and applied by Dr. Mathewson. We so conclude because this approach is consistent with precedent, and, in our view, is better suited to address the concerns of paragraph 75(1)(*a*) than the hypothetical monopolist test. Our reasons for these conclusions follow.

(a) Precedent

[73] As the Tribunal noted at page 103 in *Canada (Director of Investigation and Research) v. Xerox Canada Inc.* (1990), 33 C.P.R. (3d) 83, "[w]hile the process of product market definition is clearly founded on economic analysis, the question of the 'relevant' market for the purposes of section 75 depends largely on the construction of section 75 and the identification of its objectives within the context of the *Competition Act* as a whole."

[74] The Tribunal had previously considered the proper approach to the definition of product market in the context of paragraph 75(1)(*a*) in *Chrysler*. There, the Tribunal wrote, at page 10, that:

> Products and markets can only be meaningfully defined in a particular context and for a particular purpose. The approach to defining these terms may be entirely different where, as in the case of a merger, the ultimate test is whether the merger will substantially lessen competition and the definition must be consistent with the attempt to determine whether the merger will result in an increase in prices or in other effects consistent with a lessening of competition. <u>In the case of paragraph 75(1)(a), the ultimate test concerns the effect on the business of the person refused supplies</u>.
>
> [underlining added]

[75] The Tribunal expressly rejected the expert evidence that market definition should be determined from the position of whether Chrysler, the respondent, had substantial market power. Indeed, the Tribunal found that a broad consideration of Chrysler's market power was not required when looking at any specific element of section 75 of the Act.

[76] In *Xerox*, the Tribunal again found, at page 116, that the respondent's market power is not an element that need be established to obtain a section 75 order.

[77] Since the Tribunal's decisions in *Chrysler* and *Xerox*, subsection 75(1) has been amended to include paragraph 75(1)(*e*), which requires a determination of whether the refusal to deal is having, or is likely to have, an adverse effect on competition in a market. Given this amendment, it is necessary to consider whether the addition of paragraph 75(1)(*e*) has changed the context and purpose of section 75 such that the test for markets articulated in *Chrysler* is no longer appropriate for the purposes of 75(1)(*a*).

[78] In our view, while the addition of paragraph 75(1)(*e*) changes the context and purpose of section 75 to the extent that there is now a focus on determining whether refusals to deal result in adverse effects on competition, this amendment does not change the ultimate concern of 75(1)(*a*). That concern, as stated in *Chrysler*, is the effect on the business of the person refused supply. Since the market of concern under 75(1)(*e*) need not be the market of concern in paragraphs 75(1)(*a*) and 75(1)(*b*), the market that best suits the particular context and purpose of 75(1)(*e*) can be separately considered when considering that paragraph of the Act.[2]

[79] For purposes of clarity, we articulate the "*Chrysler* test" as follows: For the purposes of 75(1)(*a*), products are substitutes, and so are included in the same market, if a person is not substantially affected in his business (or if the person is not precluded from carrying on business) as result of switching to these other products.

[80] In regard to the meaning of "substantially" as used in paragraph 75(1)(*a*), as noted by the Tribunal in *Chrysler* at page 23, "[t]he Tribunal agrees that 'substantial' should be given its ordinary meaning, which means more than something just beyond *de minimis*. While terms such as 'important' are acceptable synonyms, further clarification can only be provided through evaluations of actual situations." In our view, for example, a person would be considered substantially affected in his business or precluded from carrying on business if switching to other products resulted in the person's business moving out of the market in which it currently participates.

(b) The Appropriateness of the *Chrysler* Test

[81] In our view, the *Chrysler* test is better suited than the hypothetical monopolist test to address the concerns of 75(1)(*a*) for two reasons. First, the *Chrysler* test deals directly with the particular person and the business at issue. Second, the *Chrysler* test deals with the effects of a refusal to deal on the affected business rather than the possible effects of a hypothetical price increase in the refused product. Contrary to Dr. Schwartz's opinion, in our respectful view, there is little risk of defining the market overly broadly because the test does not allow for the inclusion of substitutes that have a substantial effect on the business.

[82] Both of these points are elaborated upon below.

(i) Particular Person and the Business at Issue

[83] Dr. Schwartz testified that he relies on the hypothetical monopolist approach to market definition contained in the merger guidelines of the enforcement agencies in Canada and the United States. The *Merger Enforcement Guidelines* of the Canadian Competition Bureau (Bureau) indicate that "a relevant market is defined as the smallest group of products, including at least one product of the merging parties, and the smallest geographic area in which a sole profit-maximizing seller (a hypothetical monopolist) would impose and sustain a significant and non-transitory price increase above levels that would likely exist in the absence of the merger" (Canada, Competition Bureau, 2004, at paragraph 3.4). The *Merger Enforcement Guidelines* state, at paragraph 3.1, that "[t]he overall objective of market definition in merger analysis is to identify a set of buyers that could potentially face increased market power due to the merger."

[84] However, for the purposes of paragraph 75(1)(*a*), what is of concern is not a set of buyers but a particular buyer.[3] The hypothetical monopolist test is capable of dealing with a particular buyer but doing so requires markets to be defined with reference to the characteristics of that buyer or to the particular locations of that buyer (see *Merger Enforcement Guidelines* at paragraph 3.9). In the case of 75(1)(*a*), since the only buyer of concern is the one that has been refused supply, in this case B-Filer, there is no need to define a relevant market with reference to the possible particular characteristics of that buyer. In our opinion, it is more appropriate to focus directly and immediately on the buyer that has been refused supply.

(ii) Effects of a Refusal to Deal

[85] The hypothetical monopolist test is ultimately concerned with exercises in market power. To determine the set of products and geographic areas over which a hypothetical monopolist would have market power, a system of determining which products and geographic areas have price constraining effects on each other is carried out. The mechanism is to ask whether a hypothetical monopolist over a postulated candidate market would be able to impose a significant and non-transitory price increase. If yes, the postulated market is not considered the relevant market, and the exercise is repeated with an expanded candidate market. According to the *Merger Enforcement Guidelines*, at paragraph 3.4, "[i]n most cases, the Bureau considers a five per cent price increase to be significant and a one-year period to be non-transitory."

[86] Dr. Schwartz notes that a refusal to supply is akin to an infinite price increase. He is of the further view that defining markets based on switching observed in response to a refusal to deal, or an infinite price increase, is inappropriate because it can lead to overly broad markets because it can include products that were not good substitutes prior to termination. However, not only is the refusal to supply and the effect of the refusal on the business the concern of 75(1)(*a*), rather than the effect of a significant and non-transitory price increase, but the test used in *Chrysler*, as described above, does not run the risk of finding overly broad markets.

[87] In Dr. Schwartz's view, "when the current product or service is withdrawn completely and no longer available for choice, it is not surprising or helpful to market definition to observe that the buyer chose another alternative." However, this is not the whole of the test. The use of alternatives by the refused business is insufficient to conclude that these alternatives are in the same product market as the refused product. The *Chrysler* test properly applied requires that the use of these alternatives not substantially affect the business at issue. If their use does in fact result in a substantial effect, and they are nonetheless included in the relevant market for purposes of 75(1)(*a*), the market would be overly broad. The correct application of the test does not allow for this possibility.

[88] Consequently, for the above reasons, we conclude that the correct test for defining markets for the purposes of 75(1)(*a*) is the *Chrysler* test as we have articulated it at paragraph 79.

(2) The Relevant Product Market

[89] Having determined the appropriate test for the determination of the product market, in our view, application of that test to the evidence before us leads to the conclusion that the relevant product market is comprised of biller status at the Bank and deposit accounts **[CONFIDENTIAL]** that allow for the deposit of EMTs. Our reasons for this conclusion follow.

[90] The starting point of market definition for the purposes of 75(1)(*a*) is to determine a set of candidate substitutes for the products that have been refused. In this case, the two products that have been refused (and which the applicants seek) are biller status at the Bank and EMT deposit accounts at the Bank. Having determined the set of candidate substitutes, one then determines whether the use of the substitutes by the applicants results in a substantial effect on the applicants' business. If yes, the candidate substitute is not included in the product market.

[91] The set of candidate substitutes raised by the applicants in regard to biller status at the Bank are (i) biller services at other financial institutions, and (ii) EMTs into deposit accounts (other than Scotiabank deposit accounts since these are unavailable to the applicants), without distinguishing between **[CONFIDENTIAL]** deposit accounts. The applicants argue that neither of these candidate substitutes is acceptable.

[92] The Bank counters that "the relevant product market is at least as broad as the "Biller Services" of the five major chartered banks (it also includes the Biller Services of Alberta Treasury Branches and the Fédération des caisses Desjardins du Québec) and, in addition, includes EMT payments." Its expert, Dr. Mathewson, concludes that "Scotiabank Biller Services is not a product market, and the market that includes Biller Services also includes EMT **[CONFIDENTIAL]** deposit accounts."

[93] We note that Dr. Mathewson did not opine or testify that biller services at other banks are part of the relevant market. Rather, he appears to conclude that it remains an open question due to a lack of evidence. We also note that Dr. Mathewson clarifies that EMT deposit accounts include **[CONFIDENTIAL]**.

[94] For the purpose of our analysis we consider each of the following candidate substitutes for biller status at the Bank:[4]

(i) Biller status at financial institutions other than Scotiabank;

(ii) EMT business deposit accounts at RBC; and,

(iii) **[CONFIDENTIAL]**.

[95] In our analysis, we include a candidate substitute in the relevant product market if, and only if, in our opinion its use does not substantially affect the applicants' business. Both parties consider "substantially affected" in regard to the entirety of the applicants' business.

(a) Biller Status at Financial Institutions Other Than Scotiabank

[96] The applicants contend that biller status at "banks that continue to provide that status to B-Filer is not a good substitute for biller status at Scotiabank. Biller status at those other banks allows B-Filer to process payments for those banks' depositors but does not allow it to process payments for Scotiabank depositors." Put more succinctly, the applicants argue that "[t]he fact that GPay has Biller Services from Royal Bank does not assist it in processing bill payments for customers of Scotiabank."

[97] The applicants' argument is essentially that biller status at other financial institutions is not functionally interchangeable for biller status at Scotiabank. We accept this; however, it is hypothetically possible that the Bank's depositors could make use of existing bank accounts or open new bank accounts at other financial institutions where the applicants have biller status and use those accounts, such that the applicants are not substantially affected in their business.[5]

[98] In Dr. Schwartz's view, this type of "shift is unlikely" due to additional inconvenience, additional record-keeping, and increased bank fees. As such, he states that "[i]t is more likely than not that the Scotiabank depositor would choose to bear the price increase that Scotiabank imposes on GPAY Service debit transactions than maintain dual accounts at separate financial institutions." Similarly, he finds it highly unlikely that Scotiabank depositors would close their Scotiabank accounts and switch to another financial institution.

[99] In response, Dr. Mathewson finds that there is no hard evidence of any potential response by consumers: "As any consumer response to a price hike remains an open and unanswered empirical matter, a categorical conclusion which removes all other financial institutions from the market seems unwarranted."

[100] We agree with Dr. Mathewson that consumer response is an open and unanswered question. Consequently, contrary to the Bank's position, due to this lack of information, we find that the relevant product market does not include biller status at other financial institutions. We now turn to the next potential substitute.

(b) EMT [CONFIDENTIAL] Deposit Accounts

[101] In our analysis, we consider EMT business accounts at RBC **[CONFIDENTIAL]**.

[102] Dr. Schwartz concludes that, in regard to the relevant market "in relation to the means of providing online debit payment to Scotiabank depositors", the market includes Scotiabank biller status but excludes business accounts that accept deposits by EMTs. He concludes this on the basis of the hypothetical monopolist test in that "it appears that if Scotiabank had raised the price of biller status to B-Filer by a small but significant amount, B-Filer would have borne this increase rather than switch to processing by way of EMTs because of the costs and disadvantages thereof in comparison to biller processing." While we find that the *Chrysler* test rather than the hypothetical monopolist test is the right one, costs and disadvantages of a candidate substitute are still relevant as these might result in a substantial effect on the business. Consequently, we consider the costs and disadvantages noted by the applicants.

[103] The costs and disadvantages are said by the applicants to be:

(i) Scotiabank charges $1.50 to its depositors per EMT;

(ii) There is a maximum EMT transaction amount of $1,000 and a further aggregate limit of $1,000 per day per depositor;

(iii) There is a 30-minute holding period following an EMT during which a depositor may cancel the EMT;

(iv) Large volumes of EMTs can cause processing problems. There were processing problems with the Scotiabank accounts that the applicants used for processing EMTs; and,

(v) Receipt of EMTs is highly constrained in that only Scotiabank and RBC small business accounts can receive them, and there are daily, monthly, and annual limits on EMT deposits. The daily limit is $10,000.

[104] In contrast, Dr. Mathewson concludes that "Scotiabank Biller Services is not a product market, and the market that includes Biller Services also includes EMT **[CONFIDENTIAL]** deposit accounts." He acknowledges that there are differences between processing payments via Scotiabank biller services and EMTs, the primary differences being the $1.50 fee associated with EMTs, and the $1,000 per day limit on sending EMTs versus the $49,999 payment limit applicable to the Bank's bill payee service. He finds, however, that the effects of the use of EMTs **[CONFIDENTIAL]** by the applicants cannot be said to be substantial.

[105] We agree with both Dr. Schwartz and Dr. Mathewson that there are differences between Scotiabank biller services and EMTs. The costs and disadvantages asserted by the applicants above are largely not in dispute, with the exception of the asserted disadvantage of the effective degree of constraint on the receipt of EMTs (item v above). With respect to the allegation that large volumes of EMTs can cause processing problems (item iv above), we find that there is no evidence to support this statement other than the evidence of the processing problems that the applicants experienced at Scotiabank. We find that the applicants did experience EMT processing problems in regard to the Money Master accounts that they held at Scotiabank but, on the totality of the evidence, the applicants failed to establish that large volumes of EMTs can cause processing problems more generally.

[106] As noted above, the applicants claim that the receipt of EMTs is highly constrained. It is common ground that there are daily, monthly, and annual limits on the value of EMT deposits that can be received. Those limits are: $10,000 per day; $70,000 per seven day period; and $300,000 per thirty day period. Mr. Grace acknowledged that, since the Scotiabank termination, the applicants have been receiving EMTs, as at June/July 2006, into **[CONFIDENTIAL]**. Mr. Grace agreed on cross-examination that the use of these **[CONFIDENTIAL]** accounts has associated with it a capacity to receive EMT deposits of **[CONFIDENTIAL]** annually, replacing the **[CONFIDENTIAL]** in capacity the applicants had at the Bank prior to termination. Not only does this represent a **[CONFIDENTIAL]** increase in deposit capacity, there is some evidence to suggest that this capacity may be greater. Mr. Grace testified that since June/July 2006 he has opened "a few more accounts". Dr. Mathewson also indicated in his report that "[t]here is no evidence on the record that indicates that there are any limits to the number of profiles under GPay's control for receipt of EMT transfers. GPay can increase its capacity to accept EMTs **[CONFIDENTIAL]**." This evidence was not disputed. Consequently, we do not find that "the receipt of EMTs is highly constrained" because of the receiving limits.

[107] Of the differences asserted by the applicants between biller services and EMTs, listed at paragraph 103 above, we find these to be significant only if, as a result of the use of EMTs, the applicants' business is substantially affected. We turn now to the analysis of that issue.

[108] The applicants claim that their business has been substantially affected in two ways. They say they have reduced growth in their revenues and they say there has been a fundamental change in their growth opportunities.

(i) Reduced Growth in Revenues

[109] In regard to the claim of reduced growth in revenues, the applicants note that in the month following the Bank's termination, the applicants experienced a 48% (or $350,000) decrease in the dollar value of the transactions they processed as compared to the month in which the termination took place, i.e., September 2005. The applicants argue that since termination the monthly transaction value for Scotiabank has risen but not surpassed the level in September 2005. By comparison, the applicants assert that the value of transactions from the other five financial institutions have increased markedly since September 2005. In particular, the applicants argue that Bank of Montreal (BMO) dollar value transactions grew at roughly the same rate as those of the Bank prior to the Bank's termination. Since the time of the Scotiabank termination, the transaction values from BMO are said to have grown by 118% relative to September 2005, and by 169% relative to August 2005. By contrast, transaction values from Scotiabank are said to have fallen by 18% as compared to September 2005, and risen by only 13% relative to August 2005.

[110] In his analysis of these same data, Dr. Mathewson notes that the value of Scotiabank transactions in September 2005 was anomalous. He finds, comparing the applicants' average monthly Scotiabank payments from the three month period June-August 2005 to the three month period April-June 2006, that GPAY's Scotiabank payments have now fully recovered their pre-termination levels.

[111] In order to analyse these conflicting submissions, we first consider whether the use of EMT deposit accounts **[CONFIDENTIAL]** to effect transactions by Scotiabank depositors affected the applicants' business by reducing growth in the dollar value of the applicants' transactions. We then consider whether such use substantially affected the business.

[112] For the reasons that follow, we conclude that, post-termination, the applicants did experience an initial decrease in the total dollar value of their Scotiabank transactions. We find this to have been the case regardless of whether the basis for comparison is September 2005, the month in which the termination took place, or some combination of the months immediately before the termination. Since the dollar value of transactions exhibit volatility from month to month (see Exhibits CA-62 and CA-69), absent further analysis it cannot be known what portion of the observed decline can be attributed to the Scotiabank termination. We find that it is possible that some portion of the observed decline was compensated for by Scotiabank depositors availing themselves of bank accounts at other financial institutions. This, however, might not fully explain the observed period of decline in Scotiabank transactions since there is also evidence of some decline in total transactions. We find, however, that, since the overall decline appears to be limited, and given the aforementioned data volatility, we are unable, on the evidence before us, to conclude what portion of the observed decline is attributable to the Scotiabank termination.

(1) The Applicants experienced an initial decrease in the total dollar value of their Scotiabank transactions post-termination

[113] If September 2005 is used as the base for comparing subsequent monthly dollar values of Scotiabank transactions, then, as at July 2006, the applicants were yet to achieve similar transaction values.

[114] However, we accept Dr. Mathewson's evidence that September 2005 was an anomalous month. The value of transactions in that month was 15.1% higher than the highest previous month (July 2005), or 29.8% higher than the average of the three previous months (June-August 2005). Month-over-month increases of this size are observed in the data: for example, the payment values of RBC transactions increased by 37.8% from July to August 2005, and the payment values of BMO's transactions increased 23.7% from August to September 2005. However, there is the evidence that one Scotiabank customer accounted for $141,159, or 20.7%, of the total value of September 2005 Scotiabank transactions. This individual's set of transactions also accounted for 63.4% of the total value of Scotiabank transactions that were over $1,000 in September 2005. The evidence is that in no previous month for which data are available (June 2004 to September 2005) were Scotiabank transactions for all individuals carrying out transactions over $1,000 even close to the value of transactions carried out by this one individual in September 2005. The closest monthly transaction total for all individuals who carried out transactions over $1,000 was $71,317.57 in August 2005. This is about half the value of the transactions carried out by this one individual in September 2005. Consequently, the evidence establishes in our view that the value of transactions carried out by this one individual in September 2005 was unusual. Since the individual accounted for 20.7% of total transactions in September 2005, we find the total Scotiabank transactions in September to be anomalously high.

[115] Even if we had not found the Scotiabank September transactions to be anomalously high, we would consider comparisons to more than this one month to be informative.

[116] If August 2005 is used as the base for comparing subsequent monthly dollar value of Scotiabank transactions, post-termination, the applicants had lower Scotiabank transaction values each month until and including January 2006. The percentage decline in transaction values comparing October 2005 (the month following termination) to August 2005 is 29.4%. If the three month average transaction value prior to September 2005 is the base for comparison, as was done by Dr. Mathewson, the applicants had lower Scotiabank transaction values each month until and including February 2006. The percentage decline in transaction values comparing October 2005 to the three month average of June-August 2005 is 32.9%.

(2) Since the dollar value of transactions exhibit volatility from month to month, it cannot be known absent further analysis what portion of the observed decline can be attributed to the Scotiabank termination

[117] The business of the applicants is nascent with an established track record that only dates back to September 2003. While the business has exhibited steady, overall growth since that time, the value of transactions at individual financial institutions exhibit significant volatility including significant decreases in dollar value of transactions. For example, transaction values at RBC decreased 29.4% between October and November 2005. Scotiabank itself experienced a 15.7% decrease in the month-over-month value of transactions in the month prior to termination (July to August 2005).

[118] We, thus, find that it is possible that some portion of the observed decline in Scotiabank transactions after September 2005 was attributable to causes other than Scotiabank's termination of the applicants' banking services.

(3) It is possible that some portion of this decline was compensated for by Scotiabank depositors availing themselves of bank accounts at other financial institutions

[119] Mr. Grace testified on cross-examination (without giving the exact number) that as many as half of the Scotiabank customers who transferred more than $1,000 in September 2005 had accounts at more than one bank, and that there was one Scotiabank customer who used the applicants' service who opened a new account after September 2005 at a bank other than Scotiabank.

[120] A table containing information on the applicants' top 20 customers by total paid in May 2006 indicates that one of these customers had bank accounts at Scotiabank and RBC. This customer had $65,815 in transactions at RBC and one $1,000 transaction at Scotiabank in that month.

[121] While there is no direct evidence that any of the Scotiabank depositors who use the applicants' service availed themselves of other bank accounts in response to the Scotiabank termination, we infer from the above evidence that there was a possibility of such action for some unknown portion of Scotiabank depositors. Consequently, we agree with Dr. Mathewson that there is evidence to suggest that "[s]ome customers with an account at both a 'biller services bank' and an 'EMT bank' make GPay payments from both accounts, suggesting that the EMT limits on GPay payments at EMT banks need not have a large negative effect on the total value of GPay payments."

(4) It is possible that Scotiabank depositors availing themselves of other bank accounts might not fully explain the observed period of decline in Scotiabank transactions since there is also evidence of some decline in total transactions over the relevant period

[122] Using September 2005 as the basis for comparison, we find that the applicants experienced a decline in the total dollar value of their transactions, that is, a decline in the total value of transactions processed through all financial institutions, up to December 2005. After that, for each month for which we have data, the total dollar value of the transactions was greater than the total dollar value of transactions in September 2005.

[123] While we have found that September 2005 was an anomalous month in regard to Scotiabank transactions, there is no evidence to suggest this month was anomalous in regard to the applicants' total transactions, and no party suggested any such anomaly. Even though September 2005 was not generally anomalous, it is informative to compare total monthly values post-Scotiabank termination to periods in addition to September 2005. If the comparison is made to August 2005, the only month since the Scotiabank termination that had lower total dollar value transactions was November 2005. If the comparison is made to the three month average of July-September 2005, it remains the case that the only month since the Scotiabank termination that had lower total dollar value transactions was November 2005.

(5) Since the overall decline appears to be limited and given that the data exhibit volatility, we cannot conclude what portion of the observed decline is attributable to the Scotiabank termination

[124] We cannot distinguish between decreases in the dollar value of Scotiabank transactions that are attributable to the Scotiabank termination and those that are attributable to other causes, including fluctuations for which there are no apparent explanations. Nor can we determine the portion of the decrease in Scotiabank transactions that might have been compensated for by Scotiabank depositors availing themselves of accounts at other banks.

[125] As noted above, the applicants' business is a nascent one with little track record and with volatility in growth across financial institutions. In such situations, more analysis is generally required in order to help determine the effect of an inability to obtain supplies of a product.

[126] Analyses that may have shed light on the above were not carried out by the applicants. Such analyses need not be restricted to regression analysis. In this regard, we note that Mr. Grace had the ability to specifically identify and name customers and identify whether they had accounts at more than one financial institution. However, no such evidence was submitted. We agree with Dr. Mathewson that such information would have been valuable. Information that might have proven helpful to the Tribunal includes information on the use of accounts at other banks by Scotiabank depositors to carry out GPAY transactions, any information on regular users who may have stopped using the applicants' services post-termination either permanently or for a significant period of time, or who may have decreased the size of their transactions post-termination. In this regard, information on the average size and distribution of transactions of Scotiabank depositors pre- and post-transactions may have been informative.

[127] For the reasons described in the preceding paragraphs, we find that the applicants' business may not have been affected in regard to reduced growth in the dollar value of transactions due to their inability to obtain Scotiabank biller services and EMT business deposit accounts at Scotiabank. If they were affected, we find that the decline in the dollar value of transactions was temporary. The total dollar value of transactions processed on a monthly basis was as high as pre-termination (i.e., September 2005) by at least January 2006.

[128] It is possible that the observed decline has had longer term ramifications in that the total value of transactions would have been higher even after December 2005 but for the Scotiabank termination. However, we find that there is insufficient evidence on this point. To indicate that, since Scotiabank termination, transaction values have grown at more rapid rates at other financial institutions, with particular comparison made to BMO, is insufficient to make this point because, as noted above, it is possible that Scotiabank depositors availed themselves of accounts at other banks to make their transactions. Moreover, we agree with Dr. Mathewson's analysis that growth in the applicants' transaction values at bill payee banks is not a good predictor of the growth rates from Scotiabank accounts. Dr. Mathewson compares the monthly growth rate of payments from Scotiabank accounts from January 2004 to August 2005 to that from BMO accounts over the same period. He carries out this comparison through the use of a simple linear regression. We are persuaded by his finding that the estimated coefficient on BMO accounts is statistically insignificant, which implies that growth in transaction values from BMO accounts are associated with zero changes in transaction values from Scotiabank accounts. We also note Mr. Grace's testimony on cross-examination that the applicants did not turn away any transactions post-termination, except in the first two days after termination. Despite this, it is possible that Scotiabank account holders wishing to carry out transactions with the applicants in amounts greater than $1,000 did not do so. We do not, however, have any evidence of this.

[129] In considering whether the applicants were substantially affected in their business due to reduced growth, assuming that there was at least some initial impact, the evidence that the applicants turned away no transactions other than those over a two-day period is relevant. Moreover, the applicants have, without doubt, experienced considerable growth in their transactions since termination. On this last point, Mr. Grace testified on cross-examination that for the 2006 calendar year, he expected that the applicants would process more than $60 million in transactions. This expectation is an increase of about $28 million over the $32.2 million in transactions the applicants processed in 2005. The basis for Mr. Grace's projection is that, as of June 30, 2006, the applicants had already processed transactions ($29.4 million) almost equal to the value of the transactions they processed in all of 2005.

[130] We also note that even if the applicants had experienced a temporary decrease in transactions, Mr. Grace testified that the joint venture earns about 6% on these in revenue, when earnings are calculated to include both foreign exchange and merchant fee revenues. If only merchant fee revenues are included, Mr. Grace testified that the joint venture's revenues are about 3% of the value of transactions. Once expenses are deducted, the remaining profit is split equally between the joint venture partners. The applicants adduced no evidence concerning the likely impact of any temporary reduction in growth in transactions on profit once all of the above calculations are taken into account.

[131] For the reasons expressed above, we conclude that, on a balance of probabilities, the applicants have not been substantially affected in their business through reduced growth in revenues. We examine next whether they were substantially affected as a result of a fundamental change in growth opportunities.

(ii) Changes in Growth Opportunities

[132] The applicants claim that the termination of their banking services by The Bank of Nova Scotia has substantially affected their business by fundamentally changing their growth opportunities. The applicants argue that they are substantially affected in their growth opportunities because of the $1,000 limit on EMT transfers from Scotiabank (as well as TD and CIBC). The applicants claim that this limitation prevents them from being a viable payment processor for major online merchants, effectively confining them to their present merchant customer base. The applicants concede that, to date, they have been unsuccessful in signing up any significant number of merchants, apart from online casinos and, to a lesser extent, online dating sites. They attribute their initial lack of success to being a new business. They attribute their subsequent lack of success, at least in part, to the TD and CIBC terminations in December 2003, and also the subsequent Scotiabank termination in September 2005 that is the subject of this application.

[133] Mr. Iuso testified that, prior to the termination of biller services by TD and CIBC in December of 2003 (and so prior to the imposition of the $1,000 transaction limit), UMB made marketing approaches to Grocery Gateway, 407 ETR, Air Transat, Red Seal Vacations, Soft Voyage, Rogers, Air Canada, WestJet, Hudson's Bay Company, Sears, Canadian Tire, Fido and LavaLife. None signed up for the UseMyBank Service. On the evidence before us, we find that the applicants' lack of success in gaining "major" online merchants prior to the termination of banking services by CIBC and TD in December 2003 is likely attributable to a variety of reasons. One reason may well be a lack of a track record as a new business. In this regard, we rely upon the evidence of Mr. Jones that his company, WestJet, would consider the length of time a potential supplier had been in business when considering alternate suppliers. At least one potential merchant client, the Government of Canada, advised that it would not use a payment mechanism that required a payor to disclose his or her confidential electronic signature to the payment service provider. The TD and CIBC terminations may have also played a role after December 2003. Again, we rely upon the evidence of Mr. Jones on this point. Mr. Jones' evidence is that WestJet would wish a payment processor to "handle all transactions", suggesting that once the applicants were limited in processing payments over $1,000 at even one bank, their services would become unattractive to a major merchant such as WestJet. This evidence is consistent with that of Mr. Iuso. He testified that, after the TD and CIBC terminations, the UseMyBank Service became less attractive to merchants that sold products or services valued at more than $1,000. The applicants adduced no evidence as to how the Scotiabank termination worsened this situation. Consequently, it is not clear how the Scotiabank termination exacerbated this pre-existing situation such that there was a "fundamental change" in the applicants' growth opportunities caused by the Bank's termination of banking services.

[134] The applicants rely upon the Federal Court of Appeal decision in *Chrysler* to argue that the fact that other factors may have prevented the applicants from attracting major merchants initially does not mean that the applicants' forced reliance on EMTs after the Bank's termination has not substantially affected their business. In this regard, the Federal Court of Appeal wrote, at page 29, that:

> It is not a requirement of the provision that the refusal to trade and the resulting inability to obtain adequate supplies be the only factor substantially affecting the business: it is sufficient that it have a substantial effect whatever the impact of other factors.

[135] We, of course, accept this to be a binding statement of legal principle. We take from this, that for the purposes of paragraph 75(1)(*a*), the factor of concern is an inability to obtain adequate supplies, and whether this has had a substantial effect on the business.

[136] In the present case, we find that there is no evidence to suggest that the inability to obtain adequate supplies of Scotiabank biller services has substantially affected the applicants' business by fundamentally changing their growth opportunities.

(iii) Conclusion Regarding the Substitutability of EMTs **[CONFIDENTIAL]**

[137] To summarize, we find that the use of EMTs **[CONFIDENTIAL]** by the applicants did not substantially affect the applicants in their business either in terms of revenue growth or growth opportunities. Consequently, we agree with Dr. Mathewson that, by application of the test established in *Chrysler*, deposit accounts **[CONFIDENTIAL]** that allow for the deposit of EMTs are in the same product market as Scotiabank biller services. **[CONFIDENTIAL]**.

[138] **[CONFIDENTIAL]**. A substantial increase in the risk to a business can result in a substantial effect on that business.

[139] **[CONFIDENTIAL]**.

[140] **[CONFIDENTIAL]**.

[141] **[CONFIDENTIAL]**.

(3) Conclusion in Regard to 75(1)(*a*)

[142] In sum, in regard to 75(1)(*a*), we conclude that the appropriate test for defining markets is that found by the Tribunal in *Chrysler*. In this matter, we find, as a fact, that the relevant product market is biller status at the Bank and deposit accounts **[CONFIDENTIAL]** that allow for the deposit of EMTs. Upon termination of banking services by the Bank, the applicants replaced these services with EMTs into **[CONFIDENTIAL]** deposit accounts at other banks, such that, we find, they were not substantially affected in their business either from the perspective of reduced growth in revenues or a change in growth opportunities. It follows that they failed to demonstrate that they are substantially affected in their business due to their inability to obtain adequate supplies of a product anywhere in a market on usual trade terms as paragraph 75(1)(*a*) of the Act requires.

[143] As noted above, the applicants are required to establish that they meet each requirement of subsection 75(1). Thus, the finding that the applicants were not substantially affected in their business as a result of the Bank's termination of banking services is fatal to the applicants' claim.

[144] However, the parties adduced evidence relevant to the other requirements and made submissions with respect to the remaining requirements. In light of that, and in the event we are wrong in our conclusions with respect to paragraph (a), we continue with our analysis.

B. Have the applicants met the onus to establish that they were unable to obtain adequate supplies of the product because of insufficient competition?

[145] As a matter of law, paragraph 75(1)(*b*) of the Act contains two requirements. First, there must be insufficient competition among suppliers of the product at issue. Second, the inability of the refused party to obtain adequate supplies of the product must result from that insufficient competition. In the present case, the material consideration is, in our view, whether the refusal of the Bank to provide the applicants with bill payee status and accounts to receive EMTs was because of insufficient competition.

[146] This causal requirement was considered by the Tribunal in *Xerox*, cited above. There, the Tribunal concluded, at page 116, that insufficient competition must be the "overriding reason" for the refusal to deal. The Tribunal also considered that the "conduct of the complainant or the administrative burden or other costs placed upon a supplier" might well lead it to conclude that the inability to obtain the refused product did not result from insufficient competition, but "rather for objectively justifiable business reasons".

[147] We agree that, as a matter of law, any inference that insufficient competition led to a refusal to deal may be rebutted by evidence that shows an objectively justifiable business reason.

[148] Turning to the evidence before us, for the reasons that follow, we are satisfied, and find as a fact, that the Bank's decision to terminate the applicants' banking services was motivated by objectively justifiable business reasons. Those reasons were:

(i) The use of the UseMyBank Service required the Bank's depositors to violate their Cardholder Agreements. Irrespective of this, the disclosure of a customer's electronic signature exposed the Bank to legal and reputational risks;

(ii) The applicants at all material times failed to meet all of the obligations imposed upon them as a money services business by the PCMLTF Act and associated regulations. This put the Bank at regulatory and reputational risk; and,

(iii) The provision of accounts for EMT deposits to the applicants would likely result in the Bank violating Rule E2 of the Canadian Payments Association. This again posed regulatory and reputational risk to the Bank.

[149] Each reason is considered in turn.

(1) The applicants require disclosure of each customer's electronic signature

[150] As noted above, the applicants require disclosure of each customer's electronic signature. Mr. Iuso agreed on cross-examination that such disclosure gave UMB access to all of the banking services that are accessible online to that customer. This could include access to lines of credit, credit cards and all of the customer's bank accounts. Where, for example, the customer had not identified GPAY as a bill payee, UMB would do so on the customer's behalf.

[151] The ScotiaCard Cardholder Agreement provides:

> You are responsible for the care and safety of the card and your electronic signature. <u>You will keep your electronic signature confidential; secure from all persons without exception</u> and apart from the card at all times. You are liable for all card transactions incurred using your electronic signature.
>
> [underlining added]

[152] Advice provided to cardholders on Scotiabank's website, on a page dealing with the Bank's online security, is as follows:

> Your Scotia OnLine password is confidential and must never be shared with any outside person or company, including:
>
> …
>
> • Services that collect your card number and password, or any other confidential information, to perform transactions on your behalf or to collect payment from you.

> …
>
> In divulging your password, you contravene the terms of your ScotiaCard Cardholder Agreement and you will be fully liable for any unauthorized access to your accounts and all associated losses arising from these disclosures.

[153] These provisions, and other steps the Bank takes, as described in more detail by Mr. Rosatelli, reflect the importance to the Bank of keeping a customer's electronic signature confidential. We accept without reservation Mr. Rosatelli's evidence that:

(i) In the absence of face-to-face transactions and a signature, the password used in conjunction with the ScotiaCard number acts as the authentication of a customer.

(ii) This method of customer authentication is fundamental to the electronic banking system because it is what ensures the security of customer accounts.

(iii) If passwords are compromised, there would be a decrease in customer confidence in the electronic payment system.

(iv) The Canadian Payments Association reports that 20 million electronic payments are processed daily in Canada. Those payments account for approximately $164 billion being exchanged daily through the electronic network.

[154] Confirmatory evidence of the importance of keeping electronic signatures secure was given by Ms. Graham-Parker and by the applicants' expert Mr. Bensimon. On cross-examination Mr. Bensimon agreed that a breach of confidentiality in respect of banking card customer passwords would result in a significant reputational and legal risk for the Bank.

[155] The applicants argue that the evidence does not support the Bank's assertion that it is a breach of the Cardholder Agreement for a customer to voluntarily disclose his or her electronic signature because:

(i) The Cardholder Agreement "acknowledges and permits that there may be authorized uses of the cardholder's electronic signature by others".

(ii) The Bank became aware in 2003 that electronic signatures were being used in the UseMyBank Service, yet it continued to supply banking services to the applicants.

(iii) The Bank has not barred RBC from receiving bill payments from Scotiabank customers, despite the fact that RBC's account aggregation service, CashEdge, also requires disclosure of a customer's electronic signature.

[156] We deal with each submission in turn. In our view, as a matter of law, the Cardholder Agreement, properly interpreted, does not authorize disclosure of a customer's electronic signature. In arguing the contrary, the applicants rely upon the portion of the Cardholder Agreement that deals with the cardholder's responsibility for account activity. That portion provides, in material part:

> You are liable for all debts, withdrawals and account activity resulting from:
>
> • Authorized use of the card by persons to whom you have made the card and/or electronic signature available.
>
> • Unauthorized use of the card and/or electronic signature, where you have made available for use the card and electronic signature by keeping them together or in such a manner as to make them available for use, until we have received notice of loss, theft or unauthorized use.
>
> You will not be liable for losses in circumstances beyond your control. Such circumstances include:
>
> • Technical problems and other system malfunctions.
> • Unauthorized use of a card and PIN
> - after the card has been reported lost or stolen;
> - the card is cancelled or expired or
> - you have reported the PIN is known to another person.
>
> You will be considered as contributing to the unauthorized use of the card and/or electronic signature and will be fully liable for all debts, withdrawals and account activity where:
>
> • The electronic signature you have selected is the same as or similar to an obvious number combination such as your date of birth, bank account numbers or telephone numbers.
>
> • You write your electronic signature down or keep a poorly disguised written record of your electronic signature, such that it is available for use with your card, or
>
> • You otherwise reveal your electronic signature, resulting in the subsequent unauthorized use of your card and electronic signature together.

[157] In our view, this wording is insufficient to contradict the express admonition to keep the electronic signature confidential and secure from "all persons without exception". What the provision does is to make it clear that where the cardholder acts contrary to that obligation, the cardholder will be liable for all resulting transactions, whether specifically authorized or not.

[158] Whether or not, as a matter of law, cardholders indeed breached the terms of the

Cardholder Agreement when authorizing UMB to access their online accounts, the Tribunal, relying upon the evidence of Mr. Rosatelli, Ms. Graham-Parker, and Mr. Bensimon, concludes that the Bank viewed such conduct to pose a material risk to the security of its electronic banking system. The evidence of these witnesses is consistent with the alert issued by the Canadian Bankers Association, referred to above at paragraph 19.

[159] Further support for the view that the Bank had objective and *bona fide* concerns with the applicants' mode of doing business is also found in the potential for fraud in the applicants' accounts. Mr. Grace acknowledged that one potential source of fraud in the applicants' accounts arises when an individual compromises a customer's confidential banking identification and then uses that information to perpetuate frauds through the applicants' accounts.

[160] The legitimacy of the Bank's concern with respect to the potential for fraud is supported by a policy statement of the Canadian Payments Association, approved on December 1, 2004. There, the association noted:

> Fraud perpetrated in the on-line environment has the potential to profoundly impact consumers' financial well-being, create lasting negative public opinion of financial institutions and the payments system overall and to ultimately subject the payment system and its participants to possible legal challenges.

[161] The Tribunal accepts the evidence of Messrs. Monteath, Rosatelli and King that the risk the Bank was exposed to as a result of the disclosure of its customers' electronic signatures (including the risk of fraud) constituted an objectively justifiable business reason that led the Bank to terminate the applicants' banking services.

[162] As to the fact that the Bank learned in 2003 that some customers were using the UseMyBank Service and thus compromising their electronic signatures, we accept Mr. Rosatelli's explanation (which was not significantly impugned on cross-examination) that due to the relatively small number of customers and transactions, the Bank chose at that time to deal with the matter by communicating directly with each customer. Such a response does not, in our view, diminish the genuine and serious nature of the Bank's concern.

[163] We acknowledge that the Bank's witnesses agreed that the Bank had not barred RBC from being a bill payee, notwithstanding the Bank's knowledge that RBC's CashEdge service requires disclosure of a customer's banking number and password. However, the evidence is unchallenged that the Bank has written three cease and desist letters to RBC with respect to the use of electronic signature, and that the Bank is searching for a technical solution so as to block the ability of Scotiabank customers to access their Scotiabank accounts through CashEdge. In those circumstances, we find that the Bank's knowledge of how CashEdge works is an insufficient evidentiary basis upon which to conclude that the Bank was not motivated by objectively justifiable business reasons when it relied upon the disclosure of confidential customer information as one reason for terminating the applicants' banking services.

(2) Ability to Meet Legislative and Regulatory Obligations

[164] It is not in dispute that, in regard to money laundering and terrorist financing, the following legislation is applicable to the Bank and the applicants:

(i) The PCMLTF Act (legislation that is primarily concerned with the disguising of illegitimate funds for use in criminal or terrorist financing);

(ii) The PCMLTF Regulations, SOR/2002-184;

(iii) Financial Transactions and Reports Analysis Centre (FINTRAC) interpretative guidelines as they relate to the PCMLTF Act, which, among other things, set out the reporting and record-keeping requirements of financial institutions and money services businesses;

(iv) Office of the Superintendent of Financial Institutions (OSFI) guidelines, which, among other things, identify some of the steps that federally regulated financial institutions should take to assist their compliance with the various legal requirements related to deterring and detecting money laundering and terrorist financing.

[165] The Bank argues that doing business with the applicants would result in the violation of the following regulations:

(i) The third party determination rule as contained at section 5.1 of FINTRAC Guideline 6G: this rule provides that when a bank determines its account holders are acting on behalf of a third party, the bank must keep a record that sets out the third party's name, address and the nature of the principal business or occupation of the third party. The Bank contends that its consequent record-keeping obligations would be beyond the scope and ability of its existing systems. In particular, the Bank contends that it would be obliged to keep the name, address, and principal occupation for all customers transferring funds to the applicants through the bill payment system, all of the banking customers sending EMTs to the applicants, and all the merchant clients to whom funds are directed. In regard to this last alleged obligation, the Bank argues that it would be impossible for it to do so since the applicants themselves do not have this information.

(ii) The PCMLTF Regulations and the Guidelines as they relate to money services businesses, in particular FINTRAC Guideline 6C which sets out the record-keeping and client identification requirements of a money services business: the Bank argues that the applicants, who admitted to being a money service business only at the commencement of this hearing, are unaware of their consequent reporting and record-keeping obligations. The Bank also argues that the reports the applicants currently make to FINTRAC do not come close to meeting their obligations. In particular, the Bank argues that the applicants are non-compliant because they do not identify banking customers by reviewing an original piece of identification, do not keep a large transaction record when someone is transferring – either receiving or sending – $10,000 or more using the applicants' services, and do not meet their third party record-keeping obligations. The Bank argues that any failure of the applicants to meet their record-keeping obligations would prevent the Bank from complying with its own record-keeping obligations.

[166] We begin consideration of the above and related issues by reviewing the evidence of the applicants' anti-money laundering expert. Mr. Bensimon provided his opinion that:

(i) The applicants' business is a money services business as defined in the regulations to the PCMLTF Act.

(ii) As a money services business, the FINTRAC rules require the applicants to conduct reasonable due diligence in verifying customer identity, to have appropriate compliance policies and procedures, and to develop, implement and maintain an effective anti-money laundering program.

(iii) The applicants had several anti-money laundering regulatory compliance gaps relating to the following: the lack of a designated compliance officer; the need for enhanced compliance policies and procedures; the need for independent testing of those policies and procedures; and, the need for an ongoing compliance training program.

(iv) The risks that the Bank is exposed to if it does business with the applicants include: deploying resources to regularly monitor the account for suspicious activity; ensuring the applicants have strong internal compliance controls to mitigate the risk of its employees abusing their access to customer bank card numbers and passwords; and taking reasonable steps to ensure the applicants are complying with FINTRAC requirements as a money services business.

(v) On balance, "the MSB [money services business] account of the Applicant represents a low inherent risk for the bank as far as AML [anti-money laundering] risk exposure is concerned."

[167] Mr. Bensimon's opinion was, however, in our view, substantially modified on cross-examination. There he agreed that:

(i) In addition to complying with the PCMLTF Act and regulations, the applicants were obliged to follow other applicable guidelines as they relate to money services businesses.

(ii) Pursuant to Guideline 6C, the applicants had record-keeping and client identification obligations. (We note that Mr. Grace had acknowledged in cross-examination that he was not aware of what the reporting and record-keeping obligations of a money services business were.)

(iii) When the applicants transfer $10,000 or more to one of their merchant customers they are obliged to keep a large cash transaction record, identify the recipient and make a third party determination. (We note that there was no evidence that they do so.)

(iv) Mr. Bensimon had seen no evidence that the applicants complied with their obligation as to proper identification of an individual as articulated in section 4.4 of Guideline 6C.

(v) When the applicants send $10,000 or more out of Canada to a merchant customer, they are required to make a report to FINTRAC. (We note that Mr. Grace testified that such an obligation was only imposed upon the bank that transmitted the funds.)

(vi) For money that is being sent by the applicants to payment processors (which accounts for 98% of the applicants' transactions), the applicants are obliged to record the third party's name, address and principal business or occupation (i.e., to record information with respect to the party to whom the applicants' merchant customer is ultimately transmitting the funds). Mr. Bensimon saw no evidence that the applicants were compliant with this requirement. (We note that Mr. Grace acknowledged on cross-examination that he did not know where the money is sent after it is received by the overseas payment processors.)

(vii) A money services business should have general familiarity with the watch list of non-cooperative countries and territories published by the Financial Action Task Force on Money Laundering, particularly where the business is transmitting millions of dollars offshore. (We note that on discovery, Mr. Grace had testified that it did not matter to the joint venture in which jurisdiction a merchant management company was incorporated, and that he had never been provided with a copy of the watch list.)

(viii) The gaps he identified with respect to the applicants' anti-money laundering regime were consistent with a company or companies that really do not understand or take responsibility for their anti-money laundering obligations.

(ix) If a customer of the Bank did not accept that it was a money services business, and if the customer did not comply with its own anti-money laundering obligations, the Bank could not comply with its own record-keeping and reporting obligations.

(x) With respect to his opinion that the applicants posed a low risk to the Bank if it continued providing services to the applicants, Mr. Bensimon admitted that:

- In preparing his opinion, he had proceeded on the basis that the average transaction processed by GPAY was $82. He was unaware that RBC customers could transfer up to $100,000 at a time. This was a material consideration to his opinion.

- He was unaware that U.S. residents with Canadian bank accounts could use the applicants' service. This was a relevant factor he had not considered. The relevance was that the applicants would also have to contend with the U.S. anti-money laundering regime.

- He was not aware that, until his report was received, the applicants had denied that they carried on a money services business. This elevated the risk to the Bank.

- He was unaware that the applicants had not initially responded to the Bank's request for a copy of the joint venture agreement. Not having the joint venture agreement created an elevated risk exposure to the Bank.

- He was unaware that at times Mr. Grace had been unwilling to disclose the identity of the applicants' merchant customers to the Bank, and instead took the position that the Bank's interest should only be with what happens to the money flowing from the Scotiabank accounts. Mr. Bensimon agreed that Mr. Grace's position was contrary to the Bank's legislated obligation to have a verifiable audit trail.

- He did not know that the applicants had refused to produce to the Bank the contracts with their merchant clients. This provided an elevated risk exposure to the Bank.

- He was unaware that Mr. Grace had no idea where the money went after it was sent by the applicants to their merchant customers. This too provided an elevated risk exposure and cause for concern for the Bank.

- He was unaware that the applicants did not know who owned the payment processing companies to which the applicants sent funds, and did not know the actual business of the payment processors. This was a material gap in the applicants' anti-money laundering plan and it too elevated the risk to the Bank.

[168] In our view, Mr. Bensimon's initial view that the applicants' business represented an overall low risk to the Bank was substantially discredited by the admissions he made during his cross-examination. As well, in our view, he confirmed the veracity of the Bank's concerns in regard to FINTRAC Guidelines 6C and 6G. We give particular weight to his admission that if a Bank's customer does not comply with its own anti-money laundering obligations, the Bank cannot comply with its record-keeping and reporting obligations.

[169] The evidence of the Bank's anti-money laundering expert, Mr. Mathers, also confirmed the legitimacy and *bona fides* of the Bank's stated concerns. We found Mr. Mathers to be a knowledgeable witness. His opinion was cogent, consistent with the regulatory scheme, and was not significantly impugned on cross-examination.

[170] We accept Mr. Mather's opinion that:

(i) Mr. Grace had provided false information to the Bank when he answered the money laundering question in the course of an account opening. When asked "And will this account be used to conduct business on behalf of someone other than the named account holder?" Mr. Grace had responded "No". (We note that on cross-examination Mr. Bensimon also agreed that this answer was incorrect.) This answer prevented the Bank from meeting its own obligations under the PCMLTF Act and Regulations.

(ii) The products and services of online gaming websites that offer casino gaming and sports wagering can be, and frequently are, used by criminals to launder the proceeds of crime.

(iii) The applicants' business model allows customers to transfer funds to unknown entities and, in part, entities that have not been vetted by the Bank. If the Bank allows such transactions to take place, it may be allowing inappropriate or illegal transactions in violation of the PCMLTF Act.

(iv) Because the applicants' merchant customers are not required to disclose sufficient information to comply with the PCMLTF Act requirements, and because no steps are taken to verify the accuracy of the information provided, the applicants and UMB are at risk of assisting money laundering.

(v) If the applicants operated accounts at the Bank, both UMB and its customers who used the service to transfer funds, would fall within the definition of a third party in the applicable legislation. As a result, the Bank would be obliged to comply with sections 9 and 10 of the regulations to the PCMLTF Act relating to client identification, third party determination and record-keeping (all as described in FINTRAC Guidelines 6C and 6G as discussed above). In order to comply with those provisions, the Bank would be obliged to obtain information and keep records about all of the applicants' customers, including: the banking customers' name, address, occupation (or the nature of their principal business); and, the nature of the relationship between the banking customer and the applicants.

(vi) The applicants are a very high risk banking client for any Canadian Schedule 1 Chartered Bank.

[171] Mr. Ronald King, the Chief Anti-Money Laundering Officer for the Scotiabank group of companies also testified in regard to regulatory and legislative issues. His evidence was supported by the contents of the Bank's Anti-Money Laundering Handbook, the PCMLTF Regulations, and FINTRAC and OSFI Guidelines. The Anti-Money Laundering Handbook confirms, in our view, that the Bank takes its regulatory obligations seriously and demonstrates that the Bank has developed a standard approach to all businesses that seek its services. As much of Mr. King's evidence was grounded in the Handbook and the regulatory scheme, we accept it as being cogent and credible. As well, we were impressed by Mr. King's obvious knowledge of the regulatory environment, his professionalism, and the balance or fairness he showed in his evidence. His evidence was not significantly modified on cross-examination and we accept his evidence that:

(i) The design of the applicants' business model facilitates anonymity in that the applicants remit bulk payments to a third party which often is a money services business. Because the applicants do not transmit funds to the ultimate beneficiary, the audit trail is severed.

(ii) The Bank's Anti-Money Laundering and Anti-Terrorist Financing Handbook sets out the standards the Bank is expected to apply.

(iii) Even where a potential customer is a high risk customer, and not a restricted or prohibited customer, the Handbook requires that the Bank not enter into a banking relationship where the legitimacy of the source or ultimate destination of funds passing through an account cannot be determined.

(iv) There were a number of factors that caused the Bank concern about continuing a relationship with the applicants. In his words:

> They involve such things as the nature of the business model, that it involved offshore payments; the nature of the business model and that it seemed to have a high percentage of Internet gambling payments that were of grave concern to us. <u>It was also a concern that their process afforded anonymity to the remitter of the funds which would make it attractive and potentially something that could be abused by the money laundering - - a person wishing to launder money. We were also concerned that the seeming weakness in compliance structure within UseMyBank would make it very difficult for them to effectively manage their risks or meet their compliance obligations</u>.

[underlining added]

(v) In the course of the 2005 investigation the Bank conducted in connection with the applicants' business, it was the recommendation of the anti-money-laundering group that the Bank terminate its relationship with the applicants.

[172] From all of this evidence, we take the following: the applicants were not compliant with their anti-money laundering obligations when the Bank decided to terminate the banking relationship; in consequence, the Bank probably could not, and it believed it could not, discharge its own legislated and regulated compliance obligations. We, thus, find that the Bank was motivated by an objectively justifiable business reason, namely a concern that it would not be able to meet its regulatory obligations when it decided to terminate the applicants' banking services.

(3) Rule E2 of the Canadian Payments Association

[173] Dr. James Dingle, a former Deputy Chairman of the Board of Directors of the Canadian Payments Association, testified in connection with Rule E2 of the Canadian Payments Association. His evidence was objectively grounded in the contents of Rule E2 and other Canadian Payments Association documentation, and was presented cogently and with consistency. Because of that, and his significant experience, the Tribunal found him to be a knowledgeable, credible and reliable witness. His evidence was not, in our view, diminished in any significant way on cross-examination. We accept his expert testimony that:

(i) Pursuant to the *Canadian Payments Act*, R.S.C. 1985, c. C-21, the Bank must be a member of the Canadian Payments Association and must adhere to its rules. Those rules govern the exchange, clearing and settlement of various types of payment items.

(ii) Rule E2 of the Canadian Payments Association, implemented February 3, 2005, deals with the exchange, clearing and settlement of electronic online payment items, including EMTs. Section 5(a) of the Rule states:

> In all matters relating to the Exchange, Clearing and Settlement of On-line Payment Items for the purposes of Clearing and Settlement, each Member shall respect the privacy and confidentiality of the Payor and Payee personal and financial information in accordance with applicable Canadian provincial and federal legislation governing the treatment of personal and financial information.
>
> […]
>
> For greater clarity, the Payor's [i.e. the banking customer's] personal banking information, such as but not limited to the authentication

> information (e.g., user identification and password) and account balance, shall not be made available at any time to the Acquirer and/or Payee [i.e. the applicants] during the On-line Payment Transaction session

(iii) If the Bank were required to continue to offer banking services to the applicants, the Bank either would have to clear the EMTs received from other members of the Canadian Payments Association in breach of Rule E2, or not clear any of the EMTs transferred into the applicants' accounts at the Bank.

(iv) Breach of Rule E2 would expose the Bank to both regulatory and reputational risk, including the risk of compliance proceedings for breach of Rule E2.

(v) The Canadian Payments Association has defined a reputational risk as follows:

> Reputational Risk is the risk of significant negative public opinion that results in a critical loss of funding or customers. This risk may involve actions that create a lasting negative public image of, or loss of public confidence in, the overall operations of a Financial Institution or the payments system…

[174] The applicants do not appear to challenge this evidence. In closing argument they simply observe, correctly, that this rule, while applying to EMTs, does not apply to bill payments that are processed within the Bank. That is bill payments that move from the Bank's customer to the Bank's bill payee, without entering the Canadian Payments Association's Inter Member Network.

[175] Messrs. Monteath, Rosatelli and King testified that the fact the applicants' business requires disclosure of customers' ScotiaCard number and password was one of the reasons the Bank decided to terminate the applicants' banking services. As set out above, we have accepted that evidence and found that to have been the case. Further, Dr. Dingle's opinion provides objective, independent confirmation of the importance to the Bank of the protection of the confidentiality of its customers' electronic signature. His evidence supports the *bona fides* of the Bank's concern about the disclosure of its customers' private banking information and it goes to establishing to our satisfaction that the decision to terminate the applicants' banking services was based upon an objectively justifiable business reason.

(4) Other Business Justifications Raised by the Bank

[176] The Bank also argues that the following objectively justifiable business reasons existed for terminating the applicants' banking services: the applicants' business is likely in breach of section 202 of the *Criminal Code*, R.S.C. 1985, c. C-46 (relating to illegal gambling) and it is probable that the Bank would in turn be in breach of the *Criminal Code* if it is required to provide accounts and services to the applicants; online gambling is prohibited by the laws of the

United States and this too exposes the Bank to the risk of prosecution; and, the Bank is exposed to reputational risk and potential class actions because the applicants receive a profit on foreign exchange that they do not disclose to either the bank customers for whom they are agents, nor the payment processor companies for whom they are trustees.

[177] We deal with the issue of U.S. law below in the context of the discretionary nature of the relief sought.

[178] With respect to the effect of the *Criminal Code* and foreign exchange profit, we do not find the Bank's arguments to be as cogent as those discussed above. However, we do not find it necessary to reach any final conclusion with respect to these two arguments.

(5) Conclusion with Respect to Paragraph 75(1)(*b*)

[179] In our view, the impact, or potential impact, upon the Bank caused by the disclosure of its customers' confidential banking information, and the related potential for fraudulent transactions in the applicants' accounts, the regulatory concerns we have found to exist, and the impact of Rule E2 are such that we are satisfied that the Bank's refusal to supply any services and accounts to the applicants was not due to insufficient competition among suppliers in the market. Rather, the termination of banking services was the result of objectively justifiable business reasons.

[180] In concluding our analysis of this issue, we observe that we have been mindful throughout of the timing of the termination of the applicants' services in light of the launch of Interac Online. Aside from the coincidence of timing, we have found no evidence that would enable us to conclude that the existence or pending status of Interac Online was at all a relevant consideration when the decision was made to terminate the applicants' banking services. Rather, we find as a fact that the termination was done for valid business reasons.

C. Have the applicants established that they are able to meet the usual trade terms?

[181] The Bank argues that the applicants are not able to meet the usual trade terms on which EMT accounts and/or bill payee services are offered. Specifically, the Bank argues that:

(i) EMT accounts are only offered by Scotiabank to small businesses, and the applicants are not now, and at the time of termination were not, a small business.

(ii) The applicants cannot comply with the terms of the Bank's Bill Payment Agreement.

[182] The applicants argue, correctly, that the expression "trade terms" is defined precisely and restrictively for the purposes of section 75 in subsection 75(3). For ease of reference that subsection provides:

(3) For the purposes of this section, the expression “trade terms” means terms in respect of payment, units of purchase and reasonable technical and servicing requirements.	3) Pour l’application du présent article, « conditions de commerce » s’entend des conditions relatives au paiement, aux quantités unitaires d’achat et aux exigences raisonnables d’ordre technique ou d’entretien.

[183] In response, the Bank argues that restricting EMTs to small businesses, and the terms found in its Bill Payment Agreement are “reasonable technical and servicing requirements”.

[184] There are, in our view, two significant difficulties with this submission. First, it is a principle of statutory interpretation that bilingual legislation may be construed by determining the meaning shared by the two versions of a provision. Once a common meaning is found, one must then confirm that such meaning is consistent with the purpose and scheme of the Act. (See Pierre-André Côté, *The Interpretation of Legislation in Canada*, 3d ed. (Toronto: Carswell, 2000) at pages 324, 326-329; Ruth Sullivan, *Sullivan and Driedger on the Construction of Statutes*, 4th ed. (Toronto: Butterworths, 2002) at pages 80-81.)

[185] Dictionaries generally define the word “entretien” as “maintenance” or “upkeep”. See, for example:

- *Le Robert & Collins Dictionnaire Français-Anglais – English-French* defines entretien as :
 (a) (*conservation*) [*jardin, maison*] upkeep; *[route]* maintenance, upkeep; *[machine]* maintenance […]
 (b) (*aide à la subsistance*) *[famille, étudiant]* keep, support; *[armée, corps de ballet]* maintenance, keep […]
 (c) *(discussion privée)* discussion, conversation […]”
 [4th ed., s.v. “entretien”]

- The *Larousse French English/ English French Dictionary* sets out the following definitions:

 “servicing” *n.* 1. [of heating, car] entretien *m.* 2 [by transport] desserte *f.*

 “entretien” *nm*. 1. [maintenance] maintenance, upkeep […] 2. [discussion – entre employeur et candidat] interview – [colloque] discussion [...]
 [2003 ed, s.v. “entretien” and “servicing”].

[186] Thus, adopting the shared meaning principle of statutory interpretation, one could reasonably conclude that the terms “servicing” and “entretien” refer to the upkeep or maintenance requirements that a supplier imposes on a purchaser so as to ensure that proper services are available to the ultimate purchaser with respect to the product purchased. We find nothing in that interpretation that is *per se* inconsistent with the scheme or purpose of the Act.

[187] However, that more restrictive interpretation would not, in our view, be broad enough to include the contractual type limitations that the Bank imposes upon its customers by, for example, restricting EMTs to small businesses.

[188] Second, the more restrictive interpretation argued by the applicants appears to be consistent with the legislative history of the provision. We note, parenthetically, that the legislative history, Parliamentary debates, and similar material may properly be considered when interpreting a statute, so long as the history is relevant, reliable and not assigned undue weight. (See Reference re: *Firearms Act (Canada)*, [2000] 1 S.C.R. 783 at paragraph 17; and *Rizzo & Rizzo Shoes Ltd. (Re)*, [1998] 1 S.C.R. 27 at paragraph 35.)

[189] We find the following comments of the then Ministers of Consumer and Corporate Affairs to be relevant:

- On April 30, 1974, Herb Gray, the then Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs, appeared before the Standing Committee on Finance, Trade and Economic Affairs with respect to Bill C-7 (*An Act to amend the Combines Investigation Act and the Bank Act and to repeal an Act to amend an Act to amend the Combines Investigation Act and the Criminal Code*, 2nd Sess., 29th Parl., 1974). The following was said with respect to “usual trade terms”:

> **Mr. Atkey:** Another concern is with the term “usual trade terms”, which appears in proposed Section 31.2(b) on page 16. You made reference in an earlier section to the fact that the “usual trade terms” demanded by a distributor or a manufacturer might not only include aspects of price, it might also involve aspects of technical services as a requirement.
>
> **Mr. Gray:** That is right.
>
> **Mr. Atkey:** You say that that would be a reasonable interpretation of the term “usual trade terms”. Would you be willing to consider an amendment to specifically provide that that is what it means, because I would suggest there have been some concerns expressed that where distributors or manufacturers are concerned about selling their product or making it available to various retail outlets that service, the extent and the quality of service that is provided in respect to the sale of that product is sometimes as important, or more important, than the actual price, and there is a great fear abroad right now that the phrase “usual trade terms” only refers to price and if there was a broader definition I think it might allay some of those fears, so that the service element which I would suggest to you is of equal concern to the consumer today would be taken into account by the RTPC by virtue of statutory directives.

Mr. Gray: Frankly, I think the type of thing you are talking about is covered in the present wording of proposed Section 31.2(b):

(b)…<u>is willing and able to meet the usual trade terms of the supplier or suppliers of such product in respect of payment, units of purchase and otherwise…</u>
[underlining added]

However, I would be happy to receive suggestions from the Committee if it is felt that this could be further clarified.

I think one would have to be careful not to insert words that might be considered to be unduly remedying and would prevent the Commission from taking into account what might otherwise be considered to be acceptable definitions of the term "usual trade terms" but would not be covered by it. After all, one of the benefits that I think comes from using a form of civil jurisdiction is that there is the potential for flexibility in looking at the vast range of situations that can arise in an economy as complex as our own. But, as I say, I would be happy to have the views or the suggestions of the Committee on this.

[…]

Mr. Jarvis: […] Can I go on, for a minute, to usual trade terms? Again, I will relate it to the furniture industry; I think it is a good example because it is a highly competitive industry and generally composed of small businesses even at the manufacturing level:

Often a requirement of a furniture manufacturer is not only usual trade terms in respect of payment units of purchase.

I do not know what "and otherwise" might mean, but it may mean the training of that retailer salesman by the manufacturer's marketing staff; it may mean an undertaking by the retailer to supply so many square feet of display room; it may also mean his undertaking to warehouse a certain number of units in various colours. My question is: in the opinion of the Minister and his officials, do the words "and otherwise" as purportedly they modify usual trade terms cover that type of conditions of sale, which is a vital thing in many consumer products?

Mr. Gray: In my view they could cover the type of things you mentioned provided, of course, that on the facts they are usual in that market, strictly as a matter of fact.

> **Mr. Jarvis:** My question is dictated, Mr. Minister, because remembering the interpretation of many of these clauses at law, the words “and otherwise” are often taken – I forget the Latin maxim for this – *ejusdem generis.* I have not heard that since law school, *ejusdum generis*. In other words, the words “and otherwise” can only be taken within the context of respect of payment and units of purchase. You cannot go beyond that in a legal interpretation of those words. That is what I am afraid we might be faced with in so far as the Commission is concerned with the words “and otherwise” here.
>
> **Mr. Gray:** I raised this with our legal draftsmen and they have told me this is not the case. As far as I am concerned, this is an area I am examining for possible clarifying amendment because I personally do not intend the clause to be interpreted in the *ejusdem generis* sense.
>
> [Canada, House of Commons, Minutes of Proceedings and Evidence of the Standing Committee on Finance, Trade and Economic Affairs, Issue no. 9, April 30, 1974, 2nd Sess., 29th Parl., p. 9:24-25, 9:31-32.]

- When André Ouellet, the then Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs, appeared before the Standing Committee on Finance, Trade and Economic Affairs on December 3, 1974, he stated as follows with respect to the refusal to deal clause found in Bill C-2 (*An Act to amend the Combines Investigation Act and the Bank Act and to repeal an Act to amend an Act to amend the Combines Investigation Act and the Criminal Code*, 1st Sess., 30th Parl., 1974):

> I should like also to remind you that many representations have been made to the effect that a manufacturer may legitimately claim the right to refuse to supply a customer if the latter is not in a position to distribute the product adequately from all points of view. We have therefore made an amendment to recognize this right. The commission will not be able to force a supplier to supply a customer if the latter does not satisfy all professional and other requirements that usually govern the marketing of the article concerned.
>
> […]
>
> [Canada, House of Commons, Minutes of Proceedings and Evidence of the Standing Committee on Finance, Trade and Economic Affairs, Issue no. 15, December 3, 1974, 1st Sess., 30th Parl., p. 15:12.]

[190] The proposed provision underlined above was ultimately not enacted. This shows an intent to strictly limit what was meant by trade terms. The definition of trade terms is restricted and provides that the phrase “trade terms” “means”, as opposed to “includes”, the three things articulated in the definition.

[191] We take from the debates set out above that the parliamentarians' attention appears to have been focused upon the situation prevailing between manufacturers and dealers. However, in subsection 2(1) of the Act, "product" is defined to include an article and a service. In our view, the case may be made that the restrictive definition of "trade terms" in subsection 75(3) of the Act is not appropriate where the product at issue is a service. For example, having regard to the use of the word "entretien" in the French version, it is at least arguable that in the context of the provision of services such as banking services the concept of "units of purchase" and "technical and servicing requirements" have little obvious application. Put another way, in the context of the provision of services, it may be unrealistic and not commercially sound to restrict "trade terms" to those relating to payment, units of purchase and the services that surround those units of purchase.

[192] It may be that this is an issue that should be considered if amendments to the Act are contemplated in the future. For our purpose, in view of our findings with respect to paragraphs 75(1)(*a*) and (*b*), it is not necessary to reach a final decision on this point.

[193] All of this is not to say that a failure by a person to meet other usual contractual terms that do not fall within the definition of trade terms is irrelevant. Such a failure may establish that the inability to obtain a product is not a result of "insufficient competition" within the meaning of paragraph 75(1)(*b*). It may also be relevant to the discretionary nature of the relief available under section 75. In the present case, we deal below with the Bank's restrictions upon EMT accounts and bill payee status when we discuss the exercise of discretion.

[194] It is not necessary for us to consider, and we do not, whether the services are in ample supply as required by paragraph 75(1)(*d*). We do however wish to turn to the final required element found at paragraph 75(1)(*e*).

D. Have the applicants established that the refusal to deal is having, or is likely to have, an adverse effect on competition in a market?

[195] We address this requirement first by considering what is meant by "an adverse effect on competition in a market". We then consider whether the applicants have established that the Bank's refusal to provide them with bill payee status and EMT deposit accounts is having, or is likely to have, an adverse effect on competition in a market.

(1) The Meaning of an Adverse Effect on Competition in a Market

[196] Because paragraph 75(1)(*e*) is new, we find it of assistance in interpreting the phrase "competition in a market" as used in paragraph 75(1)(*e*) to consider how paragraph 79(1)(*c*) of the abuse provisions of the Act has been interpreted. Paragraph 79(1)(*c*) requires consideration of whether the impugned conduct "has had, is having or is likely to have the effect of preventing or lessening competition substantially in a market". This provision was considered by the

Federal Court of Appeal in *Canada (Commissioner of Competition) v. Canada Pipe Corporation Ltd.*, 2006 FCA 233, leave to appeal to the Supreme Court of Canada requested. There, at paragraph 36, the Federal Court of Appeal wrote:

> [t]wo aspects of the scope of paragraph 79(1)(c) are immediately evident from the wording. First, the effect on competition is to be assessed by reference to up to three different time frames: actual effects in the past or present, and likely effects in the future. Second, the effect on competition which must be proven to ground an order prohibiting an abuse of dominance is one of substantial preventing or lessening. The requisite assessment is thus a relative one […].

[197] The similar wording in 75(1)(*e*) in regard to time frames, albeit limited to two rather than three time frames, and the concern with the effect on competition also suggest, in our view, that the paragraph demands a relative and comparative assessment of the market with the refusal to deal and that same market without the refusal to deal.

[198] Comparative analysis in regard to competition in a market requires consideration of relative competitiveness: "… the Tribunal must compare the level of competitiveness in the presence of the impugned practice with that which would exist in the absence of the practice …" (See *Canada Pipe*, cited above, at paragraph 37). This relative comparative assessment was, as noted by the Federal Court of Appeal at paragraph 43, also articulated by the Tribunal in *Canada (Director of Investigation and Research) v. NutraSweet Co.* (1990), 32 C.P.R. (3d) 1; *Canada (Director of Investigation and Research) v. Laidlaw Waste Systems Ltd.* (1992), 40 C.P.R. (3d) 289 and *Canada (Director of Investigation and Research) v. The D&B Companies of Canada Ltd.* (1995), 64 C.P.R. (3d) 216 (Nielsen).

[199] The *Laidlaw* decision is particularly clear on this point. At page 346, the Tribunal wrote: "[…] the substantial lessening which is to be assessed need not necessarily be proved by weighing the competitiveness of the market in the past with its competitiveness at present. Substantial lessening can also be assessed by reference to the competitiveness of the market in the presence of the anti-competitive acts and its likely competitiveness in their absence."

[200] Thus, we conclude that paragraph 75(1)(*e*) of the Act similarly requires an assessment of the competitiveness or likely competitiveness of a market with, and without, the refusal to deal. This raises the question of what is meant by "competitiveness".

[201] The "competitiveness" of a market under both the abuse and merger provisions of the Act refers to the degree of market power that prevails in that market. In *NutraSweet*, cited above, the Tribunal wrote, in the context of a section 79 matter, (at page 47) that: "[t]he factors to be considered in deciding whether competition has been or is likely to be substantially lessened are similar to those that were discussed in concluding that [Nutrasweet] has market power. In essence, the question to be decided is whether the anti-competitive acts engaged in by [Nutrasweet] preserve or add to [Nutrasweet's] market power."

[202] In *Nielsen*, cited above, the Tribunal similarly noted, at pages 266 and 267, that: "to paraphrase the words of the Tribunal in *NutraSweet*, in essence, the question to be decided is whether the anti-competitive acts engaged in by Nielsen preserve or add to Nielsen's market power."

[203] In regard to mergers, the Tribunal indicated in *Canada (Director of Investigation and Research) v. Hillsdown Holdings (Canada) Ltd.* (1992), 41 C.P.R. (3d) 289, at page 314, that:

> [i]n assessing the likely effects of a merger, one considers whether the merged firm will be able to exercise market power additional to that which could have been exercised had the merger not occurred. A merger will lessen competition if it enhances the ability of the merging parties to exercise "market power" by either preserving, adding to or creating the power to raise prices above competitive levels for a significant period of time. One considers the degree of any such likely increase and whether by reference to the particular facts of the case it should be characterized as substantial.

[204] This approach was confirmed in other merger decisions including *Canada (Commissioner of Competition) v. Superior Propane Inc.* (2000), 7 C.P.R. (4th) 385, rev'd 2001 FCA 104, leave to appeal to S.C.C. refused, [2001] 2 S.C.R. xiii. There, however, at paragraph 302, the Tribunal took issue with whether a merger that merely preserved market power lessened competition.

[205] Aside from the jurisprudence cited above, which indicates that a relative assessment of market competitiveness has to do with an assessment of market power, and how it may have changed, this is also suggested by the very nature of the various means by which firms compete.

[206] Adverse effects in a market are generally likely to manifest themselves in the form of an increase in price, the preservation of a price that would otherwise have been lower, a decrease in the quality of products sold in the market (including such product features as warranties, quality of service and product innovation) or a decrease in the variety of products made available to buyers. The question to be answered is whether any of these or other competitive factors can be adversely affected absent an exercise of market power.

[207] Product variety (including variety in terms of differing geographic locations in which the product is sold) in a market characterized by differentiated products is the most obvious potential factor that might be adversely affected in the absence of an exercise of market power. A business' product can be eliminated or made less commonly available through a refusal to deal without the remaining market participants exercising market power. However, in a market that remains competitive subsequent to a refusal to deal, the effect of the disappearance of one firm's product on consumers is negligible. This is the very nature of competitive markets: no single seller has any influence over price or any other factor of competition, including variety. In such a market, one less firm selling a product in a relevant market will either go unnoticed or will allow for a profitable opportunity for entry.

[208] This is similarly the case in regard to the impact of a refusal to deal on price, product quality, and any other factor of competition. Consequently, in our view, for a refusal to deal to have an adverse effect on a market, the remaining market participants must be placed in a position, as result of the refusal, of created, enhanced or preserved market power**.**

[209] We also note that both Dr. Mathewson and Dr. Schwartz assess the effect on competition as a result of the Scotiabank termination in terms of market power. Dr. Mathewson opined that "[i]n analyzing the potential effect on competition of Scotiabank's terminating GPay's banking services, consideration was given to the possible impact of termination on any hypothetical market power accruing to Scotiabank, in particular to its Interac Online Service." Dr. Schwartz meanwhile noted that the effect of the termination will be insufficient competition and, thus, likely higher merchant fees.

[210] Thus, paragraph 75(1)(*e*) does not differ from what is contemplated in paragraph 79(1)(*c*), section 92 (merger provision) and other sections of the Act. The difference lies in the degree of the effect. Under section 75, the effect must be adverse, while under other provisions the effect must be substantial.

[211] From the plain meaning of the words used by Parliament, we find that "adverse" is a lower threshold than "substantial". As for the requirement that the refusal to deal "is likely to have" such adverse effect, at paragraphs 37 and 38 in *Air Canada v. Canada (Commissioner of Competition*, [2000] C.C.T.D. No. 24; aff'd [2002] F.C.J. No. 424 (FCA), the Tribunal found that a relatively high standard of proof is required to establish the "likely" occurrence of a future event. The Tribunal found that the terms "likely" and "probable" were synonymous. On the basis of the plain meaning of the word "likely", and on the basis of the Tribunal's reasoning in *Air Canada*, we find the requirement to establish the likelihood of an adverse effect requires proof that such an event is "probable" and not merely possible.

[212] However, as noted by the Tribunal in *Hillsdown*, at page 314, one cannot consider the degree of any likely increase in market power without reference to the particular facts of a case (including consideration of any facts that may be relevant under section 1.1 of the Act). We now turn to that.

(2) The Effect of Scotiabank's Refusal to Deal

[213] At the outset we observe that for the purpose of paragraph 75(1)(*e*), the market at issue need not be, and, in this case, is not the market of concern in paragraphs 75(1)(*a*) and (*b*). The market of concern under 75(1)(*e*) is the market in which the applicants participate. That said, we are satisfied that, in this case, that market need not be defined. We need first only decide whether Scotiabank's online debit product, Interac Online, and the UseMyBank Service are currently in the same market and/or are likely to be in the same market for future transactions. Absent such actual or expected competition, it is impossible for the refusal to deal to have an adverse effect on competition.

[214] As we stated above, an adverse effect on competition requires that Interac Online's market power be created, enhanced or preserved. If the two services do not compete, and are unlikely to compete, any market power Interac Online may have will be unaffected by any impact a refusal to deal has on the UseMyBank Service. In this regard, we agree with Dr. Mathewson that "[f]or Scotiabank to enhance its market power (with respect to Interac Online) by weakening GPay, GPay must be an effective competitor to begin with, and it must be a more effective competitor than other suppliers of substitute services, such as credit cards. If these two things do not hold, then Scotiabank's refusal cannot increase any hypothetical market power."

[215] We first address the issue of current competition and then turn to potential future competition.

(a) Current Competition

[216] While the applicants concede that a difference between the two services is their respective merchant bases, they contend for the following reasons that Interac Online and GPAY compete:

(i) The UseMyBank Service and Interac Online are functionally nearly identical; and,

(ii) There is no technical or operational characteristic pertaining to the UseMyBank Service that would limit its use to online gaming.

[217] In response to the applicants' submissions on functional substitutability, we note that while functional substitutability is often, if not almost always, a characteristic of products that are in the same product market, functional substitutability alone is not sufficient to support a finding that products compete in the same market. That said, we agree that the UseMyBank Service and Interac Online have at least the potential to compete for at least some subset of merchants. These merchants would have to be Canadian based because, as Mr. Rosatelli testified, Interac Online is only available to such merchants. As to whether Interac Online and the UseMyBank Service currently compete in the same market, both expert economists agree that they do not. We accept that conclusion.

[218] In Dr. Schwartz's view, as set out in his first report, "[t]he major effect on competition arising from Scotiabank's terminations relates to the future market for online debit payment service". In his second report, Dr. Schwartz notes that he agrees "with Professor Mathewson that the GPAY Service and Interac Online are not close "substitutes" currently (although Interac Online's merchants could switch because GPAY is functionally similar) because of the lack of overlap in their respective merchant bases." We agree that Interac Online and the UseMyBank Service do not currently compete and so are not in the same market.

(b) Future Competition

[219] The only competition at issue is future competition. Further, it appears from the applicants' submissions that only a portion of that future competition is at stake: that is competition for merchants whose transactions include transactions that are over $1,000 (hereafter referred to as “high-value transaction merchants”).

[220] The applicants argued in their closing submissions that a major effect on competition “relates to the future market for online debit payment services. The various limitations that using EMTs impose on GPAY constrain its ability to participate in the growing online marketplace. The $1,000 cap that Scotiabank’s termination imposes on payments processed by GPAY makes it unlikely to be adopted by major online merchants such as airlines. The limitations on EMT deposits will ultimately prevent GPAY from increasing its processing capacity.”

[221] Not all merchants are likely to find the $1,000 limit to be a constraint; for example, the applicants’ witness, Mr. Morgenstern of the Ashley Madison Agency, testified that the agency’s average ticket sale was $77 and the lifetime revenue per paid member was $147. Moreover, the applicants did not argue that they are constrained as a result of the Scotiabank termination in their ability to pursue merchants who are unlikely to find the $1,000 EMT limit to be a constraint. Consequently, in this decision, we limit ourselves to addressing the potential competition between the UseMyBank Service and Interac Online for high-value transaction merchants.

[222] The applicants assert that the consequence of the $1,000 limit and the associated prevention of competition is likely higher merchant fees.

[223] In response, the Bank argues that “[t]here is no evidence that the payment transfer limit of $1,000 per day for EMT transfers has had any impact on the Applicants’ ability to attract main stream merchants. Rather, the evidence is that many merchant prospects declined to subscribe to the Applicants’ service because of concerns about the fact that the Applicants’ business is premised on disclosure of a banking customer’s confidential Internet password and card number. Merchants do not wish to be affiliated with a payment processing service that operates in that manner.” Consequently, the Bank contends that it is unlikely that Interac Online and the UseMyBank Service will ever compete, and so it is unlikely the refusal to deal will have an adverse effect on competition.

[224] We find there is no evidence to suggest that the applicants are prevented from competing with Interac Online for high-value transaction merchants as a result of the refusal to deal. As such, the refusal to deal is not likely to have an adverse effect on competition.

[225] In regard to this lack of evidence, Dr. Schwartz noted that “it is not important whether GPAY turns out to be successful or not; competition in the marketplace will decide its future success. The relevant question is whether Scotiabank’s termination has an adverse effect on that competition.” The applicants further argue that “the purpose of the *Competition Act* is to foster the competitive process, not to pick winners or losers. It may well be that GPAY will not succeed in attracting major merchants even if the cap is removed. But it is clear that with the cap in place, it is very unlikely that GPAY would be attractive to any merchant that regularly has transactions worth over $1,000.”

[226] We agree that the purpose of the Act is not to pick winners and losers, and, in particular, that the purpose of paragraph 75(1)(*e*) is not to determine whether one party has been wronged by way of a refusal to deal, but rather to determine whether as a consequence of that refusal there is or is likely to be an adverse effect on competition. While evidence on the likelihood of success of a particular participant in a market may not always be necessary for such a determination, we do find that evidence on the likelihood of participation is necessary. It is not sufficient merely to assert an intent to so participate.

[227] We find that there is no evidence to suggest that the applicants are actively seeking new Canadian based merchants whose transactions would likely include transactions valued at more than $1,000. Nor is there evidence to suggest that the applicants would be actively seeking such merchants but for the Scotiabank termination. We take from Mr. Iuso's cross-examination that there is evidence to suggest that the applicants were seeking such merchants prior to the termination of biller services by TD and CIBC in December 2003. If the Scotiabank termination made a critical difference to whether such merchants continued to be sought, one would expect the applicants to have continued to pursue, at least to some extent, such merchants after the TD and CIBC terminations but not after the Scotiabank termination. As stated earlier in this decision at paragraph 133, there is nothing to suggest that the Scotiabank termination has in any way exacerbated a pre-existing situation.

[228] [CONFIDENTIAL].

[229] To the extent that our finding may be incorrect and Interac Online and the UseMyBank Service would in fact likely compete for large-value transactions but for the refusal to deal, it remains to be shown that they are close competitors in that an important price constraining effect on Interac Online would come from the UseMyBank Service. Out of the possible set of competitors, including credit cards and electronic wallets (such as PayPal), Interac Online and the UseMyBank Service are arguably functionally the most similar but for the important caveat that the UseMyBank Service system requires the disclosure of confidential information. As noted above, not only is functional similarity insufficient to conclude that two products constrain each others' prices, an important functional difference could prove critical to a finding that they do not. We further note Dr. Mathewson's observation that virtually all Interac Online participating merchants accept credit cards. In this context, we observe that the questionable viability of Interac Online suggests the possibility that Canadian Internet merchants are satisfied with these payment means and that these means compete with Interac Online.

(3) Conclusion in Regard to 75(1)(*e*)

[230] In sum, we find that since Interac Online and the UseMyBank Service are not currently in the same market and they are not, on a balance of probabilities, likely to be in the same market in the future in regard to large-value transaction merchants, the refusal to deal is not likely to have an effect on competition. Since the refusal is not likely to have an effect, it is not likely to have an adverse effect.

E. The Discretionary Nature of the Relief Sought

[231] We have determined that the applicants failed to establish that they are substantially affected in their business due to their inability to obtain adequate supplies of a product. They also failed to establish that any such inability was because of insufficient competition among suppliers of the product, and, that the refusal to deal is having, or is likely to have, an adverse effect on competition. It follows that the application should be dismissed.

[232] However, even if the applicants had succeeded in establishing all of the elements contained in subsection 75(1), we are satisfied that this is not a proper case for the granting of discretionary relief.

[233] The discretionary nature of relief under section 75 was considered by the Tribunal in *Chrysler*, where the Tribunal identified a number of factors relevant to the exercise of that discretion. One factor identified by the Tribunal was the reasons for the supplier's decision to discontinue dealing. In our view, this is the most relevant factor to the proper exercise of discretion in this case.

[234] We have previously found that the Bank's refusal to deal was based upon the legal or reputational risks posed by the disclosure of the Bank's customers' electronic signature, the consequent likelihood of Rule E2 of the Canadian Payments Association being breached, and other regulatory concerns.

[235] In our view, the above risks are legitimate and continue. It would neither be commercially reasonable nor consistent with the purpose of the Act to require the Bank to provide banking services to the applicants when to do so would expose it to such risks.

[236] Further, while the applicants seek biller status and EMT deposit accounts, we are satisfied that they do not comply with the reasonable terms that the Bank imposes upon all of its customers as a condition for receipt of those services. In that circumstance, it would be unreasonable to require the Bank to deliver services other than on the commercially reasonable terms it generally imposes.

[237] In respect of biller status, the conditions found in the Scotiabank Electronic Bill Payment Service Agreement include the following:

> (i) The bill payee shall not require Bank customers to divulge their ScotiaCard number and/or personal identification number, and/or electronic signature.
>
> (ii) The services provided cannot be used, directly or indirectly, to conduct or act on behalf of a money services business.

[238] The applicants have conceded that they cannot operate their business without bank customers disclosing their confidential banking password and bank card number, that they operate a money services business, and that they act on behalf of other money services businesses. They cannot, therefore, comply with the terms of the Bill Payment Service Agreement.

[239] We acknowledge that the terms of this agreement have been significantly amended since the applicants first received biller status at the Bank. However, we find that the Bank's amendment of this agreement was not done in any way to target the applicants. We reach this conclusion because we accept as truthful Mr. Rosatelli's evidence that: the agreement was re-drafted in order to allow the Bank to comply with the regulations and additional reporting requirements associated with the new anti-money laundering regulations; the drafting of the new agreement began in late 2003 or early 2004 (significantly before the termination of the applicants' banking services); a number of existing bill payee companies have since been terminated by the Bank because they are not in compliance with the new agreement; and, a number of potential bill payee companies have been declined as a result of being unable to meet the terms of the new agreement.

[240] With respect to EMT deposit accounts, the Bank's evidence that such accounts are only offered to businesses that meet its definition of a small business was not challenged. That definition is a business that does not exceed $5 million in annual deposits or $400,000 in monthly deposits, and does not exceed more than 150 transactions through its accounts in a month.

[241] The reason for these limits was explained by Ms. Graham-Parker, who testified on cross-examination that commercial clients are larger than small businesses, are more complex, with more transactions and larger transaction amounts. EMTs in those circumstances are much harder to control, especially with "the number of employees that would need access". The existence of difficulty in allowing businesses to receive and send EMTs even into small business accounts is supported by the fact that RBC is the only other bank to allow this.

[242] Mr. Grace admitted on cross-examination that the applicants are no longer a small business. They cannot, therefore, qualify for the accounts they seek on the terms the Bank generally imposes.

[243] There is a final factor that militates against the exercise of any discretion in the applicants' favour, and that flows from the fact that about 50,000 Bank customers are residents of the United States. Mr. Iuso agreed that U.S. residents with Canadian bank accounts can and do use the UseMyBank Service, and the Bank has affiliated entities with assets in the U.S. These facts make relevant Mr. Stewart's opinion that:

(i) Online gambling violates both U.S. federal law and the laws of each of the 50 States.

(ii) The U.S. Justice Department had, in July 2006, arrested a British national and executive of an offshore online sports book when the executive made a stopover at a U.S. airport. The executive has since been indicted for violation of U.S. law by accepting bets from Americans.

(iii) Any business that knowingly permits its services to be used for the purposes of online betting by residents of the U.S. is at risk of being charged with illegally aiding and abetting Internet gambling.

(iv) If the Bank were to receive funds into its accounts held in the name of the applicants from American residents to be used for the purpose of online gambling, the Bank would be committing an offense in the U.S. and would be exposed to the possibility of prosecution.

[244] Mr. Stewart's evidence was not diminished on cross-examination and we accept that requiring the Bank to provide banking services to the applicants would put the Bank at some risk for aiding and abetting acts that are in violation of U.S. law.

[245] As a final observation on this point, during final argument the applicants tendered an extensive two-page undertaking to the Tribunal. The undertaking is attached as Schedule C to these reasons. In it, the applicants undertake, among other things:

(i) To comply with all applicable anti-money laundering legislation in Canada.

(ii) To submit to periodic audits (not more than annually) upon the request of the Bank, such audits to be conducted by a mutually acceptable anti-money laundering expert. They would remedy any differences found on the audit.

(iii) To remedy any deficiencies in their computer security procedures identified by any periodic computer security audit requested by the Bank.

(iv) Not to have biller status with respect to Bank customers not resident in Canada.

(v) To block payments to online casinos or their management companies where the applicants are able to determine that the account holder is resident in the U.S.

[246] As the undertaking was presented only in final argument, there was no evidence with respect to, for example, the feasibility of not having bill payee status with respect to the Bank's U.S. resident account holders, or to the feasibility of blocking certain online payments. Further, the timing of the presentation of the undertaking does, at least, suggest that the undertaking implicitly recognizes the legitimacy of the Bank's concerns about these matters.

[247] Given the timing of the presentation of the undertaking, and the lack of an evidentiary underpinning for it, we are not inclined to give any weight to it. Our view in this regard also recognizes some degree of prior recalcitrance on the part of the applicants that, in our view, casts at least some doubt on whether the undertaking would be effective. We refer here to the applicants' refusal until their opening statement before us to acknowledge that they are a money services business, and the position they took in this litigation with respect to the relevance of Bank inquiries that were relevant to money laundering and other regulatory concerns.

[248] In sum, the undertaking does nothing to change our view that this is not an appropriate case for the granting of discretionary relief.

[249] We now turn to the reasons for two evidentiary rulings that were dealt with in writing and to certain procedural and closing remarks.

VII. THE RULING IN RESPECT OF THE PROPOSED EVIDENCE OF STANLEY SADINSKY

[250] Rule 47(1) of the *Competition Tribunal Rules*, SOR/94-290 (Rules) requires every party who intends to introduce expert evidence to serve an affidavit of each proposed expert on the other party at least 30 days before the commencement of the hearing. Pursuant to this rule, and the Tribunal's scheduling order, the Bank served the affidavit of Professor Stanley Sadinsky upon the applicants.

[251] In response, the applicants filed a notice of motion, in advance of the commencement of the hearing, in which they sought an order declaring Professor Sadinsky's affidavit to be inadmissible, and awarding them costs. By the agreement of the parties, the motion was dealt with in writing by the presiding judicial member. An order issued, for reasons to be delivered with the Tribunal's final reasons, providing that the affidavit would not be admitted in evidence as the evidence of an expert witness. The issue of costs was reserved until the Tribunal generally addresses costs. What follows are the reasons for that ruling.

[252] After setting out his qualifications, the documentation he had reviewed and the facts that were relevant to his opinion, Professor Sadinsky swore that:

> 14. In the balance of the Affidavit, I provide my expert opinion with respect to the following overarching issue, namely, whether Scotiabank would be in breach of the *Criminal Code* if it were required to provide banking services to the Applicants. In considering this opinion, it is first necessary for me to consider two preliminary issues:
>
> (a) Is it illegal for Canadians located in Canada to place bets with off-shore internet gambling sites?
>
> (b) Is the activity being conducted by the Applicants and their joint venture partner, UseMyBank, in breach of the provisions of the *Criminal Code*?

[253] It was the position of the applicants that this opinion was inadmissible because opinion evidence concerning the interpretation and application of domestic law is inadmissible in Canadian courts on the ground that it fails to meet the requirement that, to be admissible, expert evidence must be necessary to assist the trier of fact (see *R. v. Mohan*, [1994] 2 S.C.R. 9 at page 20).

[254] In response, the Bank argued that the applicants had failed to cite any authority to support the assertion that the principles articulated in *Mohan* apply to Tribunal proceedings. The Bank submitted that the rules of evidence that apply in court proceedings do not apply in proceedings before an administrative tribunal unless expressly prescribed. The Bank asserted that, for administrative tribunals, relevant expert evidence is admissible, subject to considerations of weight. Further, the Bank argued that, by failing to object to Professor Sadinsky's affidavit when it was filed and considered on the application for interim relief (and by instead producing at that time its own competing expert affidavit), the applicants had waived their right to object. Finally, the Bank argued that the exclusionary rule in *Mohan*, if applicable, did not apply to exclude Professor Sadinsky's affidavit because the Tribunal will admit expert evidence on matters of law when it is logically probative, helpful and will not cause prejudice. Professor Sadinsky's affidavit was said to be helpful because it serves to demonstrate the impact of pertinent provisions of the *Criminal Code* upon the Bank.

[255] Each submission made by the Bank was considered.

[256] As to the applicability of the rules of evidence with respect to the admissibility of expert evidence, the legislative history of the Tribunal reflects an intention to judicialize to a substantial degree the processes of the Tribunal. This is reflected in the Tribunal's establishment as a "court of record" by virtue of subsection 9(1) of the *Competition Tribunal Act*, R.S.C. 1985, c. C-19 (2nd Supp.), the requirement that a judicial member preside over the Tribunal's hearings, and the presence of appeal rights to the Federal Court of Appeal as if a decision of the Tribunal was a judgment of the Federal Court. See, in this regard, the discussion of the Tribunal in *Canada (Director of Investigation and Research) v. Air Canada* (1988), 32 Admin. L.R. 157 rev'd on other grounds [1989] 2 F.C. 88 (C.A.); aff'd [1989] 1 S.C.R. 236. In *Chrysler Canada Ltd. v. Canada (Competition Tribunal)* (1990), 111 N.R. 368; rev'd [1992] 2 S.C.R. 394 both the Federal Court of Appeal and the Supreme Court of Canada confirmed the Tribunal to be an inferior court of record.

[257] Thus, in a number of decisions the Tribunal has applied the principles articulated by the Supreme Court in *Mohan* when considering the admissibility of expert evidence. For example, in *Canada (Commissioner of Competition) v. Canada Pipe Co.* (2003), 28 C.P.R. (4th) 335 at paragraph 36, the Tribunal rejected expert evidence that consisted essentially of legal argument on the ground that the evidence was not necessary as required by the *Mohan* test. See also the rulings of the Tribunal on March 28, 2006 in *United Grain Growers Limited v. The Commissioner of Competition* and on May 9, 10, and 11, 2006 in *La Commissionaire de la Concurrence v. Gestion Lebski Inc. et al*.

[258] The Tribunal therefore rejected the Bank's assertion that, as an administrative tribunal, the Competition Tribunal is precluded from applying the principles of evidence that would apply to court proceedings. Such submission is inconsistent with the judicialized nature of this tribunal, and inconsistent with prior jurisprudence of the Tribunal dealing with the receipt of expert evidence. The fact that the Tribunal is directed in the *Competition Tribunal Act* to deal with proceedings before it "as informally and expeditiously as the circumstances and considerations of fairness permit" is, by itself, insufficient to preclude application of rules of evidence that have evolved, at least in part, so as to ensure fairness. This direction is, rather, consistent with the fact that the Tribunal is not precluded from departing from a strict rule of evidence when it considers that to be appropriate.

[259] Having regard to Professor Sadinsky's characterization of the overarching issue and the two preliminary issues, as quoted above at paragraph 252, the Tribunal was satisfied that the opinion was in substance an opinion with respect to a matter of domestic law. Thus, the Tribunal was not satisfied that the opinion was necessary, as required by the *Mohan* test. The interpretation of domestic law is within the competence of the Tribunal's judicial members.

[260] Alternatively, even if a more relaxed standard of admissibility was applied, the Tribunal was not satisfied that the evidence contained in the affidavit would be helpful. There is, apparently, no relevant jurisprudence on the points opined upon by Professor Sadinsky. He therefore couched his opinions in terms that "in my opinion, there is a very strong argument that …". Such views would not be sufficiently probative or helpful to warrant their admission into evidence.

[261] With respect to the Bank's submission that the applicants had waived any right to object to the admissibility of the opinion, the Bank cited no authority to support the view that a failure to object to evidence on an interlocutory motion operates to preclude any objection at trial. Such a result is inconsistent with the fact that the admissibility of evidence is always a matter to be determined by the presiding judicial officer who may raise, on his or her own motion, concerns with respect to the admissibility of evidence.

[262] For these reasons, the evidence of Professor Sadinsky was not received by the Tribunal.

VIII. THE MOTION BY THE BANK TO AMEND ITS RESPONSE TO THE AMENDED NOTICE OF APPLICATION

[263] Prior to the commencement of the hearing, the Bank served the expert affidavit of David Stewart upon the applicants. In this affidavit Mr. Stewart opined that "off-shore on-line gambling violates both federal and state laws in the United States" and that "any business that knowingly permits its services to be used for the purposes of online betting by residents of the United States is at risk of being charged, at a minimum, with illegally aiding and abetting Internet gambling."

[264] In response, also prior to commencement of the hearing, the applicants sought an order declaring the affidavit to be inadmissible on the basis that it was not relevant to an issue pleaded by the Bank in its response. The Bank took the position that the affidavit was admissible, but it also filed a notice of motion in which it sought leave to amend its response to the applicants' amended application in two respects. The first was to amend paragraph 19 of the Bank's response to read as follows:

> 19. Scotiabank has serious and valid concerns about the legality of the activities of the "vast majority" of the users of the service provided by the Applicants. It is not willing to allow its facilities to be used for activities that could be illegal in Canada, or in any other jurisdiction, in particular the U.S.A., where Scotiabank has a business presence and/or where residents of that jurisdiction have Scotiabank accounts that can be used to transfers *[sic]* funds using the Applicants' services. The association of the Scotiabank brand with the activities of the Applicants could be interpreted by Scotiabank customers as an endorsement of the Applicants' service or suggest legitimization offshore on-line gambling.

[265] The second, but unrelated, amendment sought (foreign exchange profit amendment) was to add as paragraph 21 to the Bank's response the following:

> 21. The Applicants state that they act as agent for the banking customer for the transfer from the banking customer's account to the Applicants' account through either the Bill Payment System or through EMT. The Applicants state they are a trustee of the monies received into their accounts for the merchant customers, who are the beneficiaries of these funds. The Applicants derive a profit on the conversion from Canada funds into U.S. funds of the monies transferred from the bank accounts of Canadian banking customers. The Applicants do not disclose the fact that they make a profit on the conversion of Canadian funds into U.S. Funds to either their banking customer principals or their merchant customer beneficiaries. Scotiabank cannot continue to offer banking services to the Applicants knowing that the Applicants are making an undisclosed profit in these circumstances.

[266] The parties filed written submissions and advised that they did not wish to make oral submissions. Accordingly, the Bank's motion was dealt with in writing by the presiding judicial member. An order issued, for reasons to be delivered with the final reasons, granting leave to the Bank to amend its response as requested. Thus the evidence of Mr. Stewart would be relevant to the amended pleading and admissible. The issue of costs was reserved until the Tribunal generally addresses costs. These are the written reasons for that ruling.

[267] In approaching the issues raised by the parties, the Tribunal assumed, without deciding, that the evidence of Mr. Stewart was not admissible in the absence of the requested amendment to paragraph 19. The issue then became whether the amendments should be allowed.

[268] All parties agreed that the applicable legal principle was that articulated by the Federal Court of Appeal in *Canderel Ltd. v. Canada*, [1994] 1 F.C. 3 (C.A.) at pages 9 and 10. There, the Court wrote:

> […] while it is impossible to enumerate all the factors that a judge must take into consideration in determining whether it is just, in a given case, to authorize an amendment, the general rule is that an amendment should be allowed at any stage of an action for the purpose of determining the real questions in controversy between the parties, provided, notably, that the allowance would not result in an injustice to the other party not capable of being compensated by an award of costs and that it would serve the interests of justice.

[269] With respect to the requested amendment to paragraph 19 to expressly plead a breach of American law, the Bank submitted that the amendment did not alter the nature of its defence but rather better particularized its pleading. The applicants responded that the amendment expanded the Bank's defence and that non-compensable prejudice would result if the Bank was allowed to amend its response.

[270] The applicants filed no affidavit evidence establishing prejudice.

[271] Paragraph 19 of the Bank's response, as originally filed, set forth its concerns with respect to potential illegality generally. Evidence filed by the Bank on the motion to amend established that the Bank's concern with respect to American legislation was not new, and ought not to take the applicants by surprise. This is seen from the fact that in response to the applicants' request for leave to bring this proceeding, Mr. Rosatelli had sworn an affidavit that stated that the Bank had branches and employees worldwide, that its securities traded on United States securities exchanges, and so the Bank was subject to a wide variety of American legislation.

[272] Mr. Stewart's affidavit was served on the applicants in accordance with the timetable agreed to by counsel. When the applicants raised their concerns with respect to the relevance of the affidavit, the Bank offered the applicants an extension of three weeks in order to allow the applicants to obtain and file a responding affidavit.

[273] Applying the principle that amendments should be allowed at any stage for the purpose of deciding the real questions and controversies, provided that the amendment does not result in non-compensable prejudice and would serve the interests of justice, it was the view of the Tribunal that the amendment would facilitate the admission of relevant evidence. Given that the applicants sought an order requiring the Bank to provide services to them, the interests of justice would not be served if the Tribunal considered making such an order without knowing whether the order would expose the Bank to criminal liability in the United States.

[274] There was no evidence of non-compensable prejudice to the applicants and an adjournment could have been sought by the applicants to allow them to obtain any responding evidence.

[275] In those circumstances, the Tribunal concluded that the interests of justice required that leave be granted to amend paragraph 19 of the Bank's response.

[276] With respect to the foreign exchange profit amendment, the Bank again argued that the amendment simply particularized its defence. The applicants again argued that the Bank had known of the issue since June 22, 2006 so that the requested amendment was sought too late.

[277] The Bank's evidence established that on June 22, 2006 the applicants delivered to it a supplementary affidavit of documents that disclosed the 2004 financial statements for NPAY and GPAY, that they were reviewed by counsel on June 24, 2006, after the Bank filed its response to the amended application on June 22, 2006, that Mr. Grace was examined on these documents on June 27 and 28 of 2006, and that, prior to the hearing, the Bank advised the applicants of the Bank's intent to assert at the hearing that the applicants could not make an undisclosed profit in their capacity as agent of the Bank's customers and trustee to the applicants' own merchant customers.

[278] The amendment raised an issue that was seen to be relevant by the Tribunal and there was no evidence or proper articulation as to what prejudice would flow to the applicants if the amendment was permitted. The amendment was, therefore, allowed.

IX. THE CHESS CLOCK PROCEDURE

[279] This is the first proceeding in which the chess clock procedure with respect to hearing time management was employed by the Tribunal.

[280] The process takes its name from the manner in which the length of play is timed in certain games of chess. Generally, parties are allocated a fixed amount of time in order to present their case and are then timed to ensure that they do not exceed their allotted time. A significant benefit that flows from this type of time management is that hearings will conclude in the time allotted. This better allows the parties to know in advance the cost of the hearing, and avoids the delay and additional expense caused by the extension of hearings beyond their original end dates.

[281] In the present case, as part of the case management process, the parties agreed that each side would be given 45 hours in which to present their case. Specifically, each side had 45 hours for their opening statement, direct, cross- and re-examinations, objections to evidence, oral motions, and closing argument. The parties' consent to this time allocation was embodied in a pre-hearing order of the Tribunal.

[282] During the hearing, the court reporter kept track of the time expended by counsel. Each morning the parties received a statement of the time each side had expended up to the end of the prior day, expressed on both a daily and cumulative basis. The Tribunal advised that any dispute with respect to time allocation had to be raised immediately. There were no such disputes.

[283] In the view of all members of the Tribunal, the procedure worked well. The presiding member is not confident that the hearing would have finished on time in the absence of the use of the chess clock procedure. We have recommended the procedure to other members of the Tribunal.

X. DIRECTIONS TO THE PARTIES REGARDING PUBLIC REASONS

[284] These reasons are confidential. To enable the Tribunal to issue a public version of these reasons, the parties shall meet and endeavour to reach agreement upon the redactions that must be made to these confidential reasons in order to protect properly confidential evidence. The parties are to jointly correspond with the Tribunal by no later than the close of the Registry on Friday, January 12, 2007 setting out their agreement and any areas of disagreement concerning the redaction of these confidential reasons. (The Tribunal does not anticipate there will be any significant disagreement.)

[285] If there is any disagreement, the parties shall separately correspond with the Tribunal setting out their respective submissions with respect to any proposed, but contested, redactions from these reasons. Such submissions are to be served and filed by the close of the Registry on Friday, January 19, 2007.

XI. COSTS

[286] The issue of costs is, as the parties requested, reserved. The parties are to meet and endeavour to reach agreement with respect to costs. On or before Friday, January 19, 2007, they should communicate with the Registry in order to advise as to whether they require any further time in order to attempt to agree costs. If costs cannot be agreed, the Tribunal will receive written submissions as to costs, as it will more particularly direct.

[287] Once the issue of costs has been dealt with, an order will issue dismissing the application and dealing with costs as agreed or as determined by the Tribunal.

DATED at Ottawa, this 20th day of December 2006

SIGNED on behalf of the Tribunal by the panel members

(s) Eleanor R. Dawson

(s) Lorne R. Bolton

(s) Lilla Csorgo

***

[1] We note that, where the words “Tribunal” or “we” are used and the decision relates to a matter of law alone, that decision has been made solely by the presiding judicial member.

[2] Paragraph 75(1)(*e*) refers to “a market” while paragraph 75(1)(*b*) refers to “the market”. This suggests that while the market considered under 75(1)(*b*) is that which is defined in 75(1)(*a*), the market considered under 75(1)(*e*) need not be.

[3] The Tribunal indicated in *Chrysler*, at page 10, that “[w]here products are purchased for resale, the effect on the business of the person refused supply will depend on the demand of the person’s customers and whether substitutes are acceptable to them. Therefore, the starting point for the definition of “product” under section 75 is the buyer’s customers”. We note that this statement was made specifically in the context of products that are purchased for resale. That said, the manner in which an output product may be altered as a result of a change in an input and the consequent impact it may have on demand by the buyer’s customers is always relevant to the extent that it affects the buyer’s business. What is ultimately of concern under 75(1)(*a*) is the buyer of the product that has been refused.

[4] Neither the applicants nor the Bank propose any candidate substitutes for EMT deposit accounts that are different to those proposed for biller status. Consequently, we do not separately consider candidate substitutes for EMT deposit accounts.

[5] We note here that this contemplates switching, not directly by the applicants, but by the applicants’ customers. This type of switching by the applicants’ customers, however, would allow the applicants to make greater use of its bill payee status at other banks in order to serve customers who are, or originally were, Scotiabank depositors.

[288] <u>SCHEDULE A</u>

Section 75 of the *Competition Act*:

75. (1) Where, on application by the Commissioner or a person granted leave under section 103.1, the Tribunal finds that

75. (1) Lorsque, à la demande du commissaire ou d’une personne autorisée en vertu de l’article 103.1, le Tribunal conclut :

(*a*) a person is substantially affected in his business or is precluded from carrying on business due to his inability to obtain adequate supplies of a product anywhere in a market on usual trade terms,

a) qu’une personne est sensiblement gênée dans son entreprise ou ne peut exploiter une entreprise du fait qu’elle est incapable de se procurer un produit de façon suffisante, où que ce soit sur un marché, aux conditions de commerce normales;

(*b*) the person referred to in paragraph (*a*) is unable to obtain adequate supplies of the product because of insufficient competition among suppliers of the product in the market,

b) que la personne mentionnée à l’alinéa *a*) est incapable de se procurer le produit de façon suffisante en raison de l’insuffisance de la concurrence entre les fournisseurs de ce produit sur ce marché;

(*c*) the person referred to in paragraph (*a*) is willing and able to meet the usual trade terms of the supplier or suppliers of the product,

c) que la personne mentionnée à l’alinéa *a*) accepte et est en mesure de respecter les conditions de commerce normales imposées par le ou les fournisseurs de ce produit;

(*d*) the product is in ample supply, and

d) que le produit est disponible en quantité amplement suffisante;

(*e*) the refusal to deal is having or is likely to have an adverse effect on competition in a market,

e) que le refus de vendre a ou aura vraisemblablement pour effet de nuire à la concurrence dans un marché,

the Tribunal may order that one or more suppliers of the product in the market accept the person as a customer within a specified time on

le Tribunal peut ordonner qu’un ou plusieurs fournisseurs de ce produit sur le marché en question acceptent cette personne comme client dans usual trade terms unless, within the specified time, in the case of an article, any customs duties on the article are removed, reduced or remitted and the effect of the removal, reduction or remission is to place the person on an equal footing with other persons who are able to obtain adequate supplies of the article in Canada.

un délai déterminé aux conditions de commerce normales à moins que, au cours de ce délai, dans le cas d'un article, les droits de douane qui lui sont applicables ne soient supprimés, réduits ou remis de façon à mettre cette personne sur un pied d'égalité avec d'autres personnes qui sont capables de se procurer l'article en quantité suffisante au Canada.

(2) For the purposes of this section, an article is not a separate product in a market only because it is differentiated from other articles in its class by a trade-mark, proprietary name or the like, unless the article so differentiated occupies such a dominant position in that market as to substantially affect the ability of a person to carry on business in that class of articles unless that person has access to the article so differentiated.

2) Pour l'application du présent article, n'est pas un produit distinct sur un marché donné l'article qui se distingue des autres articles de sa catégorie en raison uniquement de sa marque de commerce, de son nom de propriétaire ou d'une semblable particularité à moins que la position de cet article sur ce marché ne soit à ce point dominante qu'elle nuise sensiblement à la faculté d'une personne à exploiter une entreprise se rapportant à cette catégorie d'articles si elle n'a pas accès à l'article en question.

(3) For the purposes of this section, the expression "trade terms" means terms in respect of payment, units of purchase and reasonable technical and servicing requirements.

3) Pour l'application du présent article, « conditions de commerce » s'entend des conditions relatives au paiement, aux quantités unitaires d'achat et aux exigences raisonnables d'ordre technique ou d'entretien.

(4) In considering an application by a person granted leave under section 103.1, the Tribunal may not draw any inference from the fact that the Commissioner has or has not taken any action in respect of the matter raised by the application.

4) Le Tribunal saisi d'une demande présentée par une personne autorisée en vertu de l'article 103.1 ne peut tirer quelque conclusion que ce soit du fait que le commissaire a accompli un geste ou non à l'égard de l'objet de la demande.

[289] <u>SCHEDULE B</u>

The Applicants' Experts

Mr. Jack Bensimon

Jack Bensimon was an expert qualified to give opinion evidence with respect to anti-money laundering programs and policies, and compliance with anti-money laundering regulations in both Canada and the United States. After hearing examination and cross-examination with respect to his qualifications, he was also found by the Tribunal to be qualified to give opinion evidence with respect to anti-fraud programs and policies. Having reviewed the nature of the applicants' business, Mr. Bensimon confirmed that the applicants are operating a money services business as defined in the PCMLTF Regulations. Significant aspects of Mr. Bensimon's opinion were that:

(i) Overall, the risk posed to The Bank of Nova Scotia through the operation of the applicants' accounts is relatively low;

(ii) Notwithstanding, there are material gaps in the anti-money laundering policies and procedures of the applicants that need to be remediated as soon as possible; and,

(iii) The Bank was required, in his view, to take reasonable steps to ensure that the applicants had a basic framework of policies and procedures in place in order to meet the requirements of FINTRAC.

Dr. Lawrence Schwartz

Dr. Lawrence Schwartz was qualified as "an expert economist with respect to competition economics, in particular to market definition, to the impact on competition and impact on the business of GPAY, at least insofar as an economic matter."

In order to determine the relevant product market, the approach used by Dr. Schwartz was the hypothetical monopolist test. He did not prepare his report on the basis that the market referred to in paragraph 75(1)(*a*) of the Act was, or could possibly be, different from the market contemplated in paragraph 75(1)(*e*) of the Act.

In Dr. Schwartz's view, there were three product markets where an adverse effect on competition could occur as a result of the Bank's termination of the applicants' banking services. Dr. Schwartz was of the opinion this termination could result in an inadequate supply due to insufficient competition among suppliers. Those product markets were:

(i) The market for online debit payment service for Scotiabank depositors who purchase at merchant websites, consisting of the UseMyBank Service and Interac Online;

(ii) The market for merchants, where the applicants compete with Interac Online transaction acquirers to offer payment processing services; and,

(iii) In relation to the means of providing online debit payment to Scotiabank depositors, biller status at Scotiabank but excluding business accounts that accept deposit by EMTs.

In his initial report, Dr. Schwartz did not carry out an analysis as to whether the applicants' business had been substantially affected by the termination of banking services by the Bank. He disagreed with Dr. Mathewson's approach to this issue because the applicants' behavior after the banking services were terminated is not information to be considered in the hypothetical monopolist approach to market definition. However, even on the approach used by Dr. Mathewson, Dr. Schwartz concluded that the applicants were substantially affected by the termination because GPAY's total payment value did not surpass its September 2005 level until January 2006. This suggested to him that GPAY's business from other banks did not offset the losses of payment volumes from Scotiabank depositors following termination. Scotiabank payment levels had not yet recovered to September 2005 levels up to and including the last month for which data are available.

The Bank's Experts

Mr. Christopher Mathers

Christopher Mathers was qualified as an expert in matters related to anti-money laundering, fraud, and anti-terrorist financing, particularly in the context of the online gaming industry. Mr. Mathers was of the opinion that the applicants, together with their joint venturer UMB, were operating a money services business.

Mr. Mathers described the three stages of money-laundering and the frequent use of online gaming sites to launder the proceeds of crime. He described some sample money-laundering mechanisms that could be applied to online gaming sites. He described an actual situation, recently identified by the Bank, where there was no apparent connection between the source of a Scotiabank customer's winnings and the online betting site where the winning wager was placed. Mr. Mathers provided comments with respect to Mr. Bensimon's report, described his own experience with offshore Internet casinos, and gave his view with respect to the risk posed to The Bank of Nova Scotia if it provides banking services to the applicants.

Dr. James Dingle

Dr. James Dingle is a retired employee of the Bank of Canada, where he, among other positions, served as the Deputy Chairman of the board of directors of the Canadian Payments Association. He was qualified as an expert in respect of matters relating to Canadian chartered bank operations and risks relating to their day-to-day operations, particularly as relating to payment flows and issues relating to electronic banking as set out in his report. Dr. Dingle testified as to the purpose and importance of the regulatory mechanisms in place for Canadian banks and gave his view that the manner in which the applicants conducted their business was capable of eroding prudent behavior by bank depositors. He provided his view as to the regulatory risks to which the Bank was exposed as a result of the applicants' business model. Dr. Dingle spoke with respect to the development of Rule E2 by the Canadian Payments Association and gave his opinion that such rule would be breached if payments to the applicants pass through the clearing system. He gave his opinion with respect to the risks arising from the OSFI Guidelines on money laundering, the PCMLTF Act, the *Criminal Code*, and risks to which the Bank was exposed if it dealt with the applicants. He also spoke of the reputational risks to the Bank arising from unauthorized or fraudulent transactions.

Mr. David Stewart

David Stewart is an attorney practicing in Washington, D.C. He was accepted as an expert in United States gaming law, including the federal law of the United States as it relates to Internet gambling. His qualification to opine on matters relating to state law was also accepted by the Tribunal. In Mr. Stewart's opinion, online gaming violates the United States federal law and the laws of each of the 50 states. In his further view, any business that knowingly permits its services to be used for the purpose of facilitating online betting by a resident of the United States is at risk of being charged, at a minimum, with illegally aiding and abetting Internet gambling.

Dr. Frank Mathewson

Dr. Frank Mathewson is a professor of economics and the Director of the Institute for Policy Analysis at the University of Toronto. He was qualified as an expert in industrial organization, and in particular with expertise on matters relating to market power and vertical restraints.

In order to determine the relevant product market, Dr. Mathewson applied the test first described by the Competition Tribunal in the *Chrysler* case. In respect of paragraph 75(1)(*a*) of the Act, he determined that the relevant market is biller services at Scotiabank and EMT deposits **[CONFIDENTIAL]**. In respect of paragraph 75(1)(*e*) of the Act, he opined that the UseMyBank Service and Interac Online are not in the same product market, and products such as credit cards and Interac Online e-wallets are likely to be closer substitutes for Interac Online than the UseMyBank Service.

The Applicants' Lay Witnesses

Mr. Joseph Iuso

Joseph Iuso is the President, Chief Executive Officer, and founder of UMB. He identified the joint venture agreement entered into between UMB and NPAY, and described the respective roles of UMB and the applicants. He explained the technical aspects of UMB pushing payment from a customer's bank account to GPAY's account, the security features in place at UMB, the fraud detection system UMB has in place and the steps taken by UMB to market its services to various merchants.

Mr. Raymond Grace

Raymond Grace is the President of both GPAY and NPAY. He testified with respect to his dealings with The Bank of Nova Scotia, including the various bank account openings, obtaining biller status, GPAY's experience with EMT deposits at The Bank of Nova Scotia (particularly the difficulty caused when payment items could not be posted to an account when the quantity of payments exceeded 100 transactions) and the termination of banking services. He confirmed the terms of the joint venture agreement between NPAY and UMB, and the responsibilities of his companies under the joint venture agreement. He described the banking services his companies enjoyed with other banks, as well as the termination of banking services by TD and CIBC. He described the relationship between the customer (the buyer of goods or services), the joint venture's client (the merchant or seller) and the joint venture, and how payment is effected to merchant clients. He described the nature of the security checks that the joint venture conducts in respect of the transactions and the joint venture's experience with fraudulent transactions. He explained how transactions were conducted when merchant clients were to receive monies in U.S. funds and the resulting foreign exchange profit. He described his involvement in marketing on behalf of the joint venture, his involvement in reporting transactions to FINTRAC, and how his companies deal with anti-money laundering concerns. Finally, he discussed the conduct of the joint venture's business since the termination of banking services by The Bank of Nova Scotia.

Mr. Ryan Woodrow

Ryan Woodrow is an employee of The Bank of Nova Scotia who at all material times was the account manager for small business accounts at the Bank's branch in Sherwood Park, Alberta. He was the officer responsible for the applicants' accounts. He testified with respect to the account opening procedure generally applicable for small business accounts, how that procedure was followed in August of 1999, October of 2004 and November of 2004 for the accounts of GPAY, B-Filer, and NPAY. He described the nature of the privileges associated with the accounts operated by the applicants, the transaction limits relevant to EMT payments and receipts, and the practical consequences of exceeding a certain number of EMT transactions per month. He also described the criteria the Bank applied in order to determine whether any particular venture was a small business. He testified about the decision not to open any more accounts for the applicants because they no longer qualified as a small business, and the subsequent inquiry concerning Mr. Grace and his accounts conducted by the head-office of The Bank of Nova Scotia in Toronto.

Mr. Darren Morgenstern

Darren Morgenstern is the owner of the Ashley Madison Agency, which is an online dating service that caters to the niche market of people who are in a relationship but are "seeking alternative options". Since July or August of 2003, the Ashley Madison Agency has used

UseMyBank as a payment option, in addition to credit card and direct deposit payment mechanisms. He explained that the decision to add UseMyBank as a payment option reflected the desire of his company to offer as many payment options as possible. Mr. Morgenstern testified that when his company adopted UseMyBank as a payment option there was an almost instant increase in its sales, so that now approximately 23% of all of Ashley Madison's Canadian online services are paid for through UseMyBank. In his experience, while credit card fraud is "rampant" in online transactions, his company has had little or no fraudulent transactions processed through UMB.

The Bank's Lay Witnesses

Ms. Margaret Parsons

Margaret Parsons was at all material times the manager of the Sherwood Park branch of The Bank of Nova Scotia. She testified with respect to the organization of the branch, the Bank's criteria as to what qualified for service as a small business, and the concept of the "connection" between a small business or businesses and its owner/proprietor. She testified with respect to meeting with Mr. Grace when he first wished to open an account and that she referred Mr. Grace to Mr. Woodrow. She testified that she approved the documentation with respect to the opening of an account in the name of B-Filer, carrying on business as GPAY. She testified that she learned in March or April of 2004 of the number of items that were not postable to the applicants' accounts. She also explained that she learned in November of 2004 of the quantity of new account openings by the applicants and described her resulting concern that led to a meeting with Mr. Woodrow and another Bank employee, Ms. Sharon Gibson-Nault. As a result of the meeting she instructed Mr. Woodrow to find out "what [was] going on", specifically why there were so many items that could not be posted to the applicants' accounts and why the applicants were opening so many accounts. She also instructed Mr. Woodrow that there would be no further account openings for the applicants. Later, she learned that, while she was on vacation, Mr. Grace caused 30 new accounts to be opened through a telephone call centre and that a total of 80 new accounts had been opened in a two-week period. As a result, she and Ms. Gibson-Nault prepared a memorandum recommending that the Bank terminate its relationship with Mr. Grace and his businesses. Finally, she testified that when she made this recommendation she did not know what Interac Online was.

Ms. Sharon Gibson-Nault

Sharon Gibson-Nault was at all material times the manager of customer service at the Sherwood Park branch. She testified with respect to her responsibility to review new account openings, her experience in early 2004 with a number of transactions that could not be posted to the applicants' accounts, her concern in November of 2004 with the number of new accounts the applicants were opening and her resulting conversation with Ms. Parsons. She testified that while Ms. Parsons was on vacation, the issue of the significant number of new account openings was referred by her to the Bank's Shared Services operation and that an investigation was commenced. Finally, she testified as to her role in the recommendation made to terminate the Bank's relationship with the applicants.

Ms. Susan Graham-Parker

Susan Graham-Parker is Senior Vice President of Retail and Small Business Banking for Ontario for The Bank of Nova Scotia. She testified with respect to the regulatory environment in which the Bank functions, and her view of the trust that such an environment engenders in banking customers. She testified with respect to the criteria for small business status at the Bank, and how the criteria applied on a per-connection basis. She described the nature of the Money Master accounts that the applicants operated. She explained the required due diligence at a branch when accounts were opened. She described the transaction limits for sending and receiving EMTs, and testified that for businesses that did not qualify as small businesses, there was no facility for receiving EMTs. She explained the process that is followed when an entity exceeds the small business criteria and how the customer is referred to commercial banking services. She testified with respect to a number of customer security issues, identifying the Scotiabank Cardholder Agreement and the obligation it imposes on customers with respect to the protection of their electronic signatures. She described other documents in which the Bank stresses this obligation to customers. She explained the process when a person holding a valid, written power of attorney seeks electronic access to accounts belonging to the principal. Finally, she expressed her view as to the Bank's concerns with respect to the nature of the business operated by the applicants and the Bank's concerns with the account aggregation service known as CashEdge.

Mr. Colin Cook

Colin Cook is Vice President, Commercial Banking at The Bank of Nova Scotia. He testified as to the process followed when a customer is referred to commercial banking, the criteria that apply to determine when commercial banking services are appropriate, the account opening requirements for a commercial client, and he noted the non-availability of EMT facilities for commercial banking clients. He spoke of his involvement in the development of a project that would enable the Bank to better comply with its Know Your Customer requirements and the due diligence obligations upon the Bank in the ongoing business relationship with a client. He spoke about the flags that should alert the Bank to money laundering concerns, and the nature of the concerns raised by the applicants' business model and their manner of opening accounts. He spoke of the importance of trust in the banking relationship and the key elements of the Know Your Customer rule, identified the Bank's Anti-Money Laundering Handbook and described the Know Your Customer's Customer rule. He concluded by stating that in his view, the applicants would not be accepted as commercial banking clients of the Bank either as of the date of termination, or as of the date of the hearing.

Mr. Douglas Monteath

Douglas Monteath is an assistant general manager of the Shared Services operation of the Bank. He testified as to the nature of the services provided by Shared Services, the involvement of

Shared Services in the decision to terminate the applicants' banking services, the investigation that took place in 2005 into the applicants' business, the concerns that arose as result of that investigation and the factors that led the Bank to its decision to terminate the applicants' banking privileges.

Mr. Robert Rosatelli

Robert Rosatelli is Vice President, Self-Service Banking at The Bank of Nova Scotia. He testified with respect to the significance of the ScotiaCard in electronic banking, described the two constituent elements of a customer's electronic signature, and the steps taken by the Bank to explain to its customers the significance of their electronic signature and the importance of keeping it confidential. He testified with respect to the function of the Interac Association, its network and the security features the network applies to a customer's electronic signature. He testified as to the Bank's efforts to enhance the security applicable to Internet banking, and the steps that the applicants had taken, in his view, to frustrate those enhanced security features. He reviewed the Bank's experience with respect to a number of fraudulent EMT transfers in the applicants' accounts. His testimony then went on to describe the role of CertaPay and Acxsys Corporation with respect to EMTs, the introduction by Acxsys of a 30 minute hold on EMT transactions, and the purpose of this hold. He reviewed the sending and receipt limits applicable to EMTs. Mr. Rosatelli also testified with respect to the development of Interac Online, how it functions from a customer's perspective, the flow of funds, the applicable transaction limits, how Interac Online differs from the UseMyBank Service, and the profitability to date of Interac Online. He identified the merchants that currently use Interac Online as a payment mechanism. He reviewed what is involved in obtaining bill payee status at the Bank, bill payee transaction limits, and he identified both the former and the current Bill Payment Service Agreements, explaining the purpose of the revision to the form of agreement. He described the flow of funds in a bill payment transaction and how, in his view, the applicants are not able to comply with the provisions of the new Bill Payment Service Agreement. Finally, he testified as to his involvement with respect to the applicants' banking services, the investigations of the applicants' accounts that occurred in 2003 and 2005 and the results of those investigations.

Mr. Ronald King

Ronald King is Vice President and Chief Anti-Money Laundering Officer of the Scotiabank group of companies. He testified about the historic money laundering legislative context in Canada, and how money launderers have in the past worked in order to avoid detection. He discussed the creation of the Financial Action Task Force, its annual listing of countries and territories that do not cooperate with anti-money laundering efforts, and the role of OSFI in anti-money laundering efforts. He identified and discussed a number of OSFI and FINTRAC Guidelines. He also described in some detail the Bank's Anti-Money Laundering Handbook, the Know Your Customer's Customer rule, the Bank's obligation to terminate banking relationships in certain circumstances, and the Anti-Money Laundering Handbook's provisions as they apply to money services businesses, unusual transaction reports and suspicious transaction reports. He discussed the role of the Bank's anti-money laundering group in the decision to terminate the applicants' accounts, and his money laundering concerns with the applicants' business. He concluded with comments on Mr. Bensimon's report and expressed his view that the applicants are not compliant with their own anti-money laundering obligations under the applicable legislation.

Mr. David Jones

David Jones is Director of Web Business at WestJet. He testified with respect to the average dollar purchase of WestJet tickets, the factors that his company would weigh when considering partnering with new payment providers, and his opinion that it would be a "non-starter" for WestJet to partner with an entity that admits that there are periods when the banking customer's password is not encrypted.

[290] SCHEDULE C

Undertaking

The applicants undertake that, as a condition of Scotiabank supplying bill payee status, associated bank accounts, and/or accounts for depositing EMTs:

A. Money laundering

1. The applicants will comply with all applicable anti-money laundering legislation in Canada.

2. The applicants will remediate all deficiencies in their anti-money laundering procedures identified by Mr. Bensimon.

3. The applicants will provide copies of all written manuals, procedures, etc, relating to their anti-money laundering procedures to Scotiabank.

4. The applicants will provide the Scotiabank with a list of all current active Merchant Clients.

5. The applicants will provide the Scotiabank with copies of contracts with all new Merchant Clients and the associated industry code and due diligence.

6. The applicants will provide the Scotiabank with a report of the volume of funds sent to each Merchant Client on a frequency to be determined but not more than monthly.

7. The applicants will provide the Scotiabank with annual Financial Statements.

8. The applicants will not process funds where there is reason to believe the funds are destined for a country on the NCCT list.

9. The applicants will submit to periodic audits (not more than annually) upon request of Scotiabank, by an anti-money laundering expert acceptable to both the applicants and Scotiabank.

10. The applicants will remediate any deficiencies in compliance with anti-money laundering legislation identified by such an audit, and, in addition, will adopt any reasonable best practices recommended by such an audit.

10. The applicants will remediate any deficiencies in compliance with anti-money laundering legislation identified by such an audit, and, in addition, will adopt any reasonable best practices recommended by such an audit.

B. <u>Computer security</u>

11. The applicants will submit to periodic computer security audits (not more than annually) upon request of Scotiabank, by a computer security expert acceptable to both the applicants and Scotiabank.

12. The applicants will remediate any deficiencies in their computer security procedures identified by such an audit, and, in addition, will adopt any reasonable best practices recommended by such an audit.

C. <u>Blocking access by persons present in the United States</u>

13. The applicants agree that they will not have bill payee status with respect to customers of Scotiabank that are not resident in Canada.

14. The applicants will block payments to online casinos or their management companies where it is able to determine from the account holder's profile on the Scotiabank online banking website that the account holder is resident in the United States.

<u>General</u>

15. Information provided to Scotiabank by the applicants or UseMyBank is provided on the condition that it be kept confidential by Scotiabank.

DATED AT OTTAWA, ONTARIO this 5th Day of October 2006

B-Filer Inc.	NPAY Inc.	B-Filer Inc cob GuaranteedPayment GPAY
Per: (s) Raymond Grace	Per: (s) Raymond Grace	Per: (s) Raymond Grace
Raymond F. Grace, Pres.	Raymond F. Grace, Pres.	Raymond F. Grace, Pres.

APPEARANCES:

For the applicants:

B-Filer Inc., B-Filer Inc. doing business as GPAY GuaranteedPayment and Npay Inc.

Michael Osborne
Sharon Dalton
Jennifer Cantwell

For the respondent:

The Bank of Nova Scotia

Paul Morrison
Lisa Constantine
Ben Mills
Tanya Pagliaroli