

Sorbara, Schumacher, McCann LLP is the Region's largest local law firm with twenty-three lawyers and offices in Kitchener, Guelph and Waterloo specializing in all areas of business law.

THE INSIDE LOOK!

SorbaraLaw Assists Private Equity Firm with Financing of Management Buy-Out pg 2

SorbaraLaw Lawyers Successful in Recent Actions pg 3

Read about some recent, high-profile court judgments obtained by the firm.

Around the Firm pg 4

Learn about the latest news and happenings at SorbaraLaw.

Advisory Panel Recommends Ontario Should Adopt Anti-SLAPP Legislation pg 5

Is a new law necessary to address the use of lawsuits as tools for intimidation?

For Better or Worse: Legal Decisions Receiving Increased Media Attention pg 6

Judges scrutinized for some non-traditional and 'colourful' writing styles in recent court decisions.

SorbaraLaw Closes Share Sale Transaction for Sky Generation Inc. pg 6

OMG, I Hate My Job! pg 7

Facebook postings land employees in hot water.

Divorce Insurance: An Alternative to Marriage Contracts? pg 8

This new tool for managing legal costs may be available in Canada soon.

Changes to Federal Mortgage Rules Now in Effect

Amid concerns over skyrocketing household debt, the Federal Government recently implemented some important changes to the rules governing mortgages.

While the default rate on mortgages in Canada is less than 1%, there are concerns that some homeowners are overextending themselves and borrowing as much as possible. Homeowners who might have stretched their budgets may be particularly vulnerable to defaulting on their mortgages if interest rates increase, if housing prices fall, or if family income drops.

The changes took effect in two stages on March 18 and April 18. The new measures:

- reduced the maximum amortization period (the length of time it will take to pay off the mortgage) for government-backed insured mortgages from 35 to 30 years;
- lowered the maximum amount Canadians can borrow through re-financing transactions from 90% of a home's value to 85%; and
- withdrew government insurance backing on lines of credit secured by homes.

Home buyers who purchase a home with a down payment of less than 20% of the value of the home typically are required to purchase government-backed insurance. Reducing the maximum amortization period that would qualify for government insurance from 35 to

30 years means that fewer home buyers will qualify for such insurance. A longer amortization period sets monthly payments lower but increases the amount of interest paid over the life of a mortgage.

In 2006, the Federal Government increased the maximum amortization period that would qualify for government-backed insurance to 40 years. Some felt that change in legislation was an effort to allow the middle class and new Canadians to enter the housing market more easily. At about the same time, the Federal Government reduced the maximum mortgage amortization period from 40 to 35 years.

In addition, Ottawa is striving to reduce the rise in home equity lines of credit (HELOCs). The popularity of HELOCs in Canada has increased rapidly in the past decade; they now account for almost 12% of household debt. Now, however, homeowners

continued on page 2



www.sorbaralaw.com

| EXPERIENCE. QUALITY. SERVICE. |


Changes to Federal Mortgage Rules Now in Effect continued . . .

will be permitted to refinance only up to 85% of the value of their homes, rather than the former 90% limit. This is the second time this cap has been reduced in just over two years, having dropped from 95% to 90% in February of 2009.

Government insurance will no longer be available on personal lines of credit secured by mortgages on homes, which typically have

lower interest rates than other credit facilities. This move is anticipated to discourage homeowners from using their homes to finance consumer debt, to consolidate bills and higher-interest credit cards, and to pay for home renovations.

The Federal Government hopes that these new guidelines will, in the words of Finance Minister Jim Flaherty, encourage “hard-

working Canadian families to save by investing in their homes and future.” 

Jill Renaud, B.J., LL.B., joined SorbaraLaw in October 2010. Jill works in the corporate/commercial and business law departments, and also provides services in municipal law, residential and commercial real estate transactions, and wills and powers of attorney.

SorbaraLaw Assists Private Equity Fund with Financing of Management Buy-Out

In late 2010, SorbaraLaw partner Mark W. Schumacher and corporate-commercial associate Denise M. Kocher assisted a valued client, NorthSpring Capital Partners (NorthSpring), with the closing of an investment in Pegasus Direct Mail Worx Inc. (Pegasus). Pegasus, based in Hamilton, is a business that helps its clients achieve highly successful direct mail marketing projects by providing single-source, concept-to-mailbox capabilities.

NorthSpring provides risk capital to small and medium-sized companies with the goal of creating value. Investments range between \$250,000 and \$1 million in the form of subordinated debt and/or equity across a variety of traditional industries located in Southern Ontario. NorthSpring takes a flexible approach when reviewing investment opportunities and tailors its investment structure to fit the unique aspects of the business. Funds are available for:

- management buyouts and acquisitions
- growth companies needing capital
- recapitalizing the business
- unlocking the value of SR & ED claims
- turnarounds (in select situations)

As part of the Pegasus transaction, NorthSpring provided \$400,000 of mezzanine financing to enable Dan Schottlander, the former General Manager of Pegasus, and his wife Anne, to complete a management buyout. “We are very excited to be partnering with Dan and his very capable staff,” notes NorthSpring President Brian Hunter. “Pegasus has been a very successful company under Dan’s leadership

and we share his belief that Pegasus and the direct mail industry are poised for strong growth.”

Dan Schottlander adds, “The completion of the sale fulfils both my dream and the long-term vision the former owner and I had nearly six years ago before his untimely passing late last year.”

SorbaraLaw is pleased to have assisted NorthSpring in this transaction and we look forward to the continued success of Pegasus under Dan’s leadership. Visit the SorbaraLaw website for more information on our Corporate Finance and Institutional Lending Practice Group.

We thank Brian Hunter for granting permission to revise and re-print the NorthSpring press release for inclusion in this edition of LegalEase. For more information on NorthSpring, visit www.northspringcapitalpartners.com, or contact Brian Hunter directly at 519-721-7144 or brian@northspringcapitalpartners.com.



Denise M. Kocher, B.A. (Hons.), LL.B., joined SorbaraLaw in 2005. Denise works in the corporate/commercial department, with particular focus on asset and share transactions, and corporate finance and institutional lending.

SorbaraLaw Lawyers Successful in Recent Actions

SorbaraLaw partners Brian McCann and Greg Murdoch, and counsel Steven Kenney, achieved very positive results recently in some significant actions on behalf of valued SorbaraLaw clients.

Significant costs judgment in family law action

Custody disputes in family law matters can be very emotionally charged and psychologically draining experiences. Unfortunately, they can also prove to be extremely costly when one of the parties uses the proceeding as a tool to cause financial hardship to the other.

SorbaraLaw partner Brian McCann recently was involved in such a matter. Mr. McCann represented the mother of three children in a custody dispute with the children's father. The father alleged, wrongly, that the mother had abducted the children from him and had alienated them against him in the face of an order from a U.S. Court granting him joint custody of the children.

During the lengthy proceeding, the parties retained a professional parenting coordinator as well as an additional professional to engage in a "therapeutic reconciliation."

It became clear as the process unfolded that the father was not acting in the children's best interests, but was in fact using the legal process to wage financial warfare on the mother. Among other tactics, after initially agreeing, he subsequently refused to participate in the therapeutic reconciliation process. After much more unnecessary delay and difficulty, the father ultimately agreed to an order that effectively removed all of his rights to custody, access and contact with his children. He was also ordered to continue paying child support.

Because of the financial toll this unnecessarily long and acrimonious proceeding had taken on the mother, Mr. McCann asked the Court to order the father to contribute to the mother's legal costs. Mr. McCann prepared and

submitted a thorough Legal Brief regarding the issue of costs. After reviewing Mr. McCann's submissions, the judge awarded the mother costs in the amount of \$50,000, plus all of her disbursements (totalling \$29,401.37) and applicable taxes (\$3,308.77), for a grand total costs award of \$82,710.14. The award itself is also subject to interest.

While courtroom disputes are not always pleasant or smooth experiences, we are pleased that Mr. McCann was able to achieve this costs result for his client in the face of such unreasonable behaviour by an opposing party.

\$400,000 fraud judgment

SorbaraLaw partner Greg Murdoch went to trial in January 2011 on behalf of the widow of a man (the lender) who had made two loans based on what turned out to be a fraudulent misrepresentation by the borrower.

At the time the loans were secured, the borrower assured the lender that the borrower's wife would co-sign on one loan and would guarantee the other. In fact, however, the borrower's wife was not even aware of the loans and did not agree to be involved in either of them. The borrower had forged his wife's signature on the loan documents.

The borrower later defaulted on the loans. By this time, however, the lender had passed away. Mr. Murdoch thus had the challenge at trial of proving the borrower's fraud without the benefit of the lender's testimony. Mr. Murdoch successfully cross-examined the borrower, demonstrating the weaknesses in his evidence and proving to the judge that the borrower had committed fraud.

The judge ordered the borrower to pay the \$400,000 still outstanding on the loans to the lender's widow, in addition to paying a portion of her legal costs.

Significant medical malpractice trial


In the fall of 2010, Greg Murdoch conducted a trial with SorbaraLaw counsel Steven Kenney in

a tragic medical malpractice action involving the misdiagnosis of a heart condition in a pregnant woman.

The woman had been admitted to hospital with complaints of radiating chest pain. Since she was 32 weeks pregnant at the time, the hospital assigned an obstetrician to be in charge of her treatment. The woman died from a complication of her heart condition nine days later while still under the hospital's care. Fortunately, hospital staff were able to save her child with an emergency C-section procedure.

Mr. Murdoch and Mr. Kenney proved at trial that the obstetrician in charge of the woman's case concerned himself primarily with the woman's obstetrical issues, leaving other specialists to deal with her heart issues. The Court agreed that this specialist in charge of the woman's case should have done more to co-ordinate all of her care, taking a more active role in pursuing and managing the diagnoses and treatments of her heart condition in addition to her obstetrical issues.

Like many medical malpractice cases, this case presented many difficult legal challenges and was defended vigorously by the doctor(s) involved. We are pleased that Mr. Murdoch and Mr. Kenney were able to achieve this substantial judgment in favour of the woman's family and her estate.

The Judgment is currently under Appeal to the Ontario Court of Appeal. 



What's been happening around the firm lately?

Our lawyers and staff have been keeping very busy in the community. In late January, litigation lawyer **Seth Jutzi** and articling students **Jackie Johnson** and **Jessica Freedman** attended the Wilfrid Laurier University Law Society's Industry Night, where they discussed "the ins and outs" of the legal profession with students considering careers in law. We wish the students well in their studies and their future careers.



SorbaraLaw staff entered two teams in the **Big Brothers Big Sisters** Legal Bowling Challenge, as part of the Bowl for Kids Sake Campaign. The teams played on March 24. Though their scores were nothing to cheer about, their participation helped raise funds for a great local organization. And everyone had a great time.

Many staff members and guests attended an exciting hockey game at the Kitchener Auditorium between the **Kitchener Rangers** and the Guelph Storm on February 8. The Rangers won 5-3, but the game gave us more than just a win for the hometown team. A hard check in the corner early in the first period smashed one of the glass panels, causing a significant delay of the game, but giving us more time to socialize and enjoy the hospitality in one of the Aud's luxury boxes.

The game was an aggressive and action-packed performance by both teams. Even Toronto Maple Leafs General Manager Brian Burke was in attendance to observe Rangers winger and Leafs prospect Jerry D'Amigo in action. It was quite a night!



We are very pleased to congratulate partner **Justin Heimpel** and his wife, Doreen Weise, on the birth of their son, Sidney Keith Heimpel, on January 24, 2011. Everyone is happy and healthy, and Sidney is receiving a lot of attention from his big sister, Sophie.



Jim Tait also welcomed a new addition to his family. His granddaughter Lauren Beatrice, was born on January 26. Congratulations and best wishes to Jim and his wife Vikki, and their daughter Suzanne Tait and son-in-law Curtis Davlut. Lauren is the first child for Suzanne and Curtis, and the fifth grandchild for Jim and Vikki.



But that's not all for Jim! We are also pleased to announce that he recently was appointed to the Board of Directors for the **Sunnyside Home Foundation**, a local group that seeks to enhance the well-being and quality of life for the residents and community served by Sunnyside Seniors' Services. We are very proud of Jim and all his work in the local community.

SorbaraLaw partner **Greg Murdoch** was recognized at the **Waterloo Region Volunteer Action Centre's** 6th Annual Volunteer Impact Awards Gala, held at the Kitchener City Hall rotunda on April 12. Greg was awarded the Outstanding Leadership Award in recognition of his work with the region's Nutrition for Learning program. Congratulations, Greg. Thank you for your hard work and dedication to this community.



Finally, it seems that our new office in Waterloo continues to get attention in the community. We are very pleased to be

LegalEase is a seasonal publication and is intended only as a source of general information on a broad range of interesting and important subjects. The views expressed are those of the author and are not intended to constitute legal advice. Before acting on any information contained in *LegalEase*, Sorbara, Schumacher, McCann LLP urges readers to obtain professional legal advice, as each situation has its own unique set of circumstances. For further information on any of the material contained in this issue, please feel free to call or write to us. ©2011 Sorbara, Schumacher, McCann LLP. All rights reserved. Your privacy is very important to us. Your personal information may be used to send you this newsletter. It will also be used for Sorbara, Schumacher, McCann LLP's internal marketing research purposes. We may also use third parties to process some aspect of the personal information for your use, provided that they similarly agree to protect your privacy. If you have a privacy question or do not wish to receive future issues of our newsletter, you may contact Greg Murdoch in writing at: Sorbara, Schumacher, McCann LLP, 31 Union St. East, Waterloo N2J 1B8 or email gmurdoch@sorbaralaw.com.

the Firm

featured in the March/April issue of **Grand Magazine**, Waterloo Region's premier community, style and business publication. The feature article focuses on our new office and our efforts to preserve the history and heritage of the classic Seagram home. Many thanks to reporter Tenille Bonoguore and photographer Mathew McCarthy for visiting



with us and helping to share some of the history of our new home.

We have also been selected to participate in **Doors Open Waterloo Region**, which will give the public a chance to tour the “mansion” and see the renovations we have completed. Dates have yet to be announced; check our website and future issues of *LegalEase* for more information.

Speaking of our website, did you know that www.sorbaralaw.com is now updated monthly with the latest happenings in and around the firm? Check back regularly to see our recent announcements on the home page, or scan the archives on the News and Events page.

It has certainly been an exciting couple of months here at the firm. Tune in next time to see what else we are up to. *LegalEase*



Advisory Panel Recommends Ontario Should Adopt Anti-SLAPP Legislation

In October, 2010, an advisory panel created by Ontario's Attorney General recommended that the province should adopt legislation to combat lawsuits known as “SLAPPs.”

SLAPPs (Strategic Litigation Against Public Participation) are lawsuits brought against people or groups who speak out or take a position on issues of public interest. The intention of a SLAPP is to censor, intimidate and silence opponents by forcing them to redirect their energy and deplete their finances to fight costly and time-consuming court battles.

SLAPPs are most commonly initiated by corporations, real estate developers and government officials against individuals and community groups who oppose them. Environmental activists have long claimed to be victims of SLAPPs, most frequently in the form of defamation lawsuits.

Although most SLAPPs ultimately are unsuccessful from a legal standpoint, the effect is to deter participation and debate on matters of public interest.

It was the task of the advisory panel, chaired by Mayo Moran, Dean of the Faculty of Law at the University of Toronto, to advise the Attorney General on how to prevent the misuse of Ontario's justice system without depriving individuals of their right to litigate – a delicate balance, indeed.

Anti-SLAPP legislation is not new. In 2009, the government of Quebec amended its Civil Code to provide its courts with new powers to dismiss and reject abusive actions and pleadings. Similarly, nearly half of the U.S. states have adopted comparable legislation.

In Ontario, the advisory panel recommended a two-stage procedure. At the first stage, a defendant that feels it is the target of a SLAPP must demonstrate to the court that the lawsuit involves a protected activity of public participation or an expression on a matter of public interest. If the court agrees, the onus then shifts to the plaintiff to prove that its case has merit and that the defendant has no case. The plaintiff must further prove that the harm it has suffered from the defendant's actions outweighs

any public interest that might be achieved by letting the defendant continue its actions.

While the objective of anti-SLAPP legislation is commendable, some legal experts are concerned that “the devil is in the details.” When is a SLAPP truly a SLAPP? “It has a laudable objective in a theoretical sense, but how do you prove that a lawsuit has no merit without a trial?” asks Greg Murdoch, a litigation partner in SorbaraLaw's Waterloo office. “The trial process has costs consequences if a case is found to be without merit. Defendants also have summary judgment procedures available. As is the case with much proposed remedial legislation, there is existing legislation in place to achieve the same end.”

We will continue to monitor the advancement of the advisory panel's recommendations. Look for updates in future issues of *LegalEase* and/or on our regularly updated website, www.sorbaralaw.com. *LegalEase*

Seth Jutzi, B.B.A., LL.B., is a member of SorbaraLaw's litigation group, focusing primarily on employment, construction and commercial disputes.

For Better or Worse: Legal Decisions Receiving Increased Media Attention

In the recent Winter issue of LegalEase, we reported on the controversial family law decision released late last year by Justice Quinn of the Ontario Superior Court of Justice. Justice Quinn was both praised and vilified for his use of some very “colourful” language as he criticized two highly litigious spouses appearing before him. That decision appears to have marked the beginning of a period of heightened media attention on the decisions of the Canadian judiciary.

First, there was coverage of the legal battle over Toronto real estate developer John Kaptyn’s will. Four years after Mr. Kaptyn’s death, his \$75 million estate remains enmeshed in a series of legal motions and applications launched by the two executors of his will, his sons Henry and Simon Kaptyn. In a lengthy 2008 decision, Ontario Superior Court Justice Thomas Lederer found that Mr. Kaptyn had clearly intended his will to skip a generation, distributing his estate to his grandchildren rather than to his sons. Justice David Brown delivered the most recent decision of note in this proceeding, in which he compared the Kaptyns to Charles Dickens’ feuding Jarndyce family from the novel Bleak House. Justice Brown criticized the Kaptyn sons for wasting valuable court time, and in finding in favour of the grandchildren remarked, “Were I to hold otherwise... I have no doubt that John Kaptyn

would be waiting, with the ghosts of other dissatisfied testators, on the other bank of the River Styx, ready to give me an earful when I arrived.”


Then there was the public outcry against a Manitoba Judge who, despite finding an accused man guilty of sexual assault, declined to give him jail time and instead gave him a two-year conditional sentence. However, it was not just the apparently light sentence given to the convicted rapist that led to an uproar across Canada and beyond. Certain comments made by Justice Robert Dewar during sentencing have resulted in international outrage, with Canadians and Americans weighing in equally on the issue. Justice Dewar referred to the accused as “a clumsy Don Juan,” and stated that the victim had sent signals through her suggestive attire and promiscuous conduct that “sex was in the air.”

Most recently, there has been debate over the judicial rulings of Ontario Court of Appeal Justice David Watt, who at one time was known for using complex sentence structure and legalistic embellishment. Now, however, his decisions tend to read more like crime novels, complete with plot lines, atmosphere and characterization. Some members of the Ontario bar applaud Justice Watt’s attempts to move away from impenetrable legal jargon to make

judicial writing more accessible – and possibly more entertaining – to the general population. Others, however, are concerned by his light-handedness, and some argue further that his style of writing serves to sensationalize tragic situations and desensitize the public to those situations, rather than offering a careful and appropriate legal consideration of them.

These recent examples highlight the split in the legal community between those who champion clear writing that is accessible and stripped of “legalese” and those who favour a more traditional style of legal writing.

With the media now giving attention to the more sensational of these decisions, judges and lawyers alike are becoming more aware of the language they use and how it is perceived by the public. This awareness, however, must be balanced carefully with one of the fundamental aspects of our legal system – that judges should be influenced by the facts and law relating to their cases, and not by public opinion.

Finding that balance can be a tricky exercise, as these recent cases suggest. 

Jessica Freedman, B.A. (Hons.), J.D., is currently completing her articling term with SorbaraLaw. She is a graduate of the University of Windsor Law School.

SorbaraLaw Closes Share Sale Transaction for Sky Generation Inc.

SorbaraLaw partners Mark Schumacher and Sam Sorbara and the SorbaraLaw Corporate-Commercial Group recently negotiated and completed a substantial share sale transaction on behalf of our client Sky Generation Inc.

Sky Generation Inc. is in the business of owning and operating wind energy projects in Ontario. It was founded in the early 2000s and erected its first 1.8 megawatt wind turbine on the Bruce Peninsula in 2002. Since that time,

the company has thrived, adding many more turbines to reach a total production of over 21 megawatts of clean wind energy for the people of Ontario.

SorbaraLaw acted on behalf of Sky Generation Inc. in a recent transaction that saw Sky Generation Inc. sell its shares to Sprott Power, a Canadian company dedicated to the development and financing of renewable energy projects. Sprott Power intends to continue to operate the Sky Generation Inc.

turbines to continue to provide this renewable energy source to Ontario consumers.

We are pleased to have been a part of this major transaction on behalf of our valued client. For more information on this transaction, see these press releases from Sprott Power:

http://www.sprottpower.com/press_releases/9
http://www.sprottpower.com/press_releases/4



LegalEase is circulated seasonally to over 2,500 businesses and individuals in and around Waterloo Region and Wellington County. If you would like more information about LegalEase or are interested in contributing to upcoming issues, please feel free to contact Justin Heimpel at our Waterloo office.

OMG, I Hate My Job!

Late last year, in a precedent-setting decision, the British Columbia Labour Relations Board upheld the dismissal of two employees over comments that they had posted on Facebook about their employer.

Prior to their termination, the two employees had been employed in the automotive detailing and accessory shop at West Coast Mazda in Pitt Meadows, B.C. They had both been active supporters of a recent and successful campaign to obtain union certification.

During the course of this campaign, the employees posted on their personal Facebook pages a series of offensive, insulting and disrespectful comments about their supervisors and managers. The posts became increasingly venomous – including homophobic slurs – following the successful certification of the union.

The offending Facebook posts included the following (which have been edited for decency but are otherwise in the form in which they appeared):

Seems my Boss, whos owned the business 25 yrs & is fixed operations director of 2 dealerships as well ... couldnt comprehend my reply?? So its confirmed...HE'S A COMPLETE JACK-ASS... not just Half-a Tard.

west coast detail and accessory is a [expletive] joke.... dont spend your money there as they are [expletive] crooks and are out to hose you... there a bunch of greedy [expletive] low life scumbags... wanna know how I really feel??????

Following an internal investigation, the employer determined that the Facebook comments were inappropriate and insubordinate; they created a hostile work environment for co-workers and supervisors.


The employer further determined that the comments were likely to damage its reputation and business interests. As a result, the employees were terminated “for cause.”

In upholding the employer’s decision, the Labour Relations Board held that the comments about the supervisors were “offensive and egregious.” The comments – coupled with other factors – provided proper cause for the decision to terminate.

The Board held further that, as the comments were made available to approximately 400 of the employees’ Facebook “friends,” they could not claim to have had a serious expectation of privacy in those postings. In essence, these were not private discussions; they were public statements to a significant audience.

This case appears to be the first time a Canadian court or tribunal has expressly held negative comments posted on Facebook to be grounds for termination from employment. Given the pervasive nature of Facebook, Twitter and other forms of social media, it is likely that this will not be the final word on the issue. Indeed, a recent incident in New Jersey in which a teacher was suspended for posting

negative comments about the children in her first-grade class shows just how urgent this issue is becoming.

Though it may seem common sense for many, the West Coast Mazda case emphasizes the need to be careful when using these types of social media. Specifically, employees should refrain from commenting casually about their job or their employers. These postings may be used against them in disciplinary or even court actions. 

Seth Jutzi, B.B.A., LL.B., is a member of SorbaraLaw's litigation group, focusing primarily on employment, construction and commercial disputes..



Divorce Insurance: An Alternative to Marriage Contracts?

Insurance is a natural and normal part of our lives. We obtain insurance to protect us financially against many detrimental events. If we own a home or vehicle, we take out home and auto insurance. In addition, we may obtain disability insurance, life insurance and we may also choose to insure other valuable property, like special items of jewellery. Most people would never consider not having these types of insurance in place. Yet there are some things that, up until now, we have not typically thought about insuring against – like divorce.

That may now be changing, however. John Logan, chairman and CEO of SafeGuard Guaranty Corporation in North Carolina, has created Wedlock Divorce Insurance, providing insurance coverage for the increasing number of Americans interested in this new type of coverage. It is likely that divorce insurance will be coming to Canada in the near future.

Going through a separation can be one of the most difficult circumstances a person can face. In addition to the emotional strain, in many circumstances a separation or divorce can also be a major financial burden.

It is possible that divorce insurance could help. It might assist in removing at least part of the financial burden of a separation or divorce. Often, people with very serious family law issues cannot afford to pay legal counsel to assist them. As a result, they either incur substantial debt from legal fees or they end up essentially giving in to the other side because they cannot afford to continue to protect their rights through legal action. Divorce insurance might be helpful in these situations.

But does divorce insurance really make sense for the average individual? In fact, one of the major disadvantages of divorce insurance is the cost. Wedlock Divorce Insurance is purchased in “units.” One unit costs \$15.99 per month for \$1,250 of coverage. Customers can purchase up to 200 units, or \$250,000, in initial coverage. However, the policy does not mature until the policy-holder has been married for at least four years, which equates to paying more than \$750 per unit before becoming eligible to receive \$1,250 per unit. Thus, someone who would have difficulty paying legal fees in a separation proceeding is also likely to have difficulty affording the divorce insurance premium.


In addition, it is important to read the fine print. In some cases, the policy-holder may make a claim only after the divorce is granted, requiring the policy-holder to cover the initial legal costs up front and then seek reimbursement later.

There is also a legitimate concern that divorce insurance will cause unnecessary legal battles. If cost is no longer an issue (or is less of an issue), prospective litigants may be more inclined to commence and continue unnecessary litigation in order to “get revenge” on a spouse. Such unnecessary legal battles can have very negative impacts on families and, in particular, the children of those families.

Most family law practitioners continue to believe that a well-drafted marriage contract provides the best “insurance” against marriage breakdown. A marriage contract provides a “roadmap” for how matters will be dealt with if and when spouses separate in the future. It is a helpful guide that is assembled beforehand, while the spouses are calm and before their judgment is clouded by the emotions and pressures of a breakdown in their relationship.

But whether the answer is a marriage contract or divorce insurance, it is a difficult conversation for couples to have. A person’s state of mind when preparing to get married is usually one of tremendous optimism for the future. It is important, however, that couples preparing for marriage look beyond that to prepare for the possibility of a future separation. A marriage contract, prepared properly with the help of a lawyer, can go a long way to providing peace of mind for such a future occurrence.

And if the concept of divorce insurance catches on in Canada the way it appears to be doing in the United States, couples may soon have another option to consider.

Contact SorbaraLaw to speak to one of our family law specialists for more information on marriage contracts, divorce insurance or any other family law issue. 

Jennifer Black, B.A. (Hons.), LL.B., joined SorbaraLaw in July 2006. She practices in the area of family law in both of SorbaraLaw’s Kitchener and Guelph offices.

Samuel O. Sorbara
Brian McCann
Mark W. Schumacher
J. Greg Murdoch
Justin J. Heimpel
Peter G. Somerville
Gary A. Keller
Grace Sun
Ronald J. Nightingale
Lisa S. Toner
James Peluch
Denise M. Kocher
Jennifer Black
James Gittens
Cynthia Davis
Jill Renaud
Seth Jutzi
Mervyn J. Villemaire, QC, Counsel
George S. Chris, QC, Counsel
James H. Tait, Counsel
Frederick T. Kirvan, QC, TEP, Counsel
Steven K. Kenney, Counsel for Medical Malpractice and Catastrophic Injury
Susan Liu, International Business Consultant



300 Victoria Street North
Kitchener, ON N2H 6R9
Tel: (519) 576-0460 Fax: (519) 576-3234



457 Woolwich Street
Guelph, ON N1H 3X6
Tel: (519) 836-1510 Fax: (519) 836-9215



31 Union Street East
Waterloo, ON N2J 1B8
Tel: (519) 741-8010 Fax: (519) 742-2442