



LE REGISTRAIRE DES MARQUES DE COMMERCE
THE REGISTRAR OF TRADEMARKS

Citation: 2019 TMOB 133
Date of Decision: 2019-11-29

IN THE MATTER OF AN OPPOSITION

Hilton Worldwide Holding LLP

Opponent

and

**Solterra (Hastings) Limited
Partnership**

Applicant

Application

**1,649,073 for WALDORF
RESIDENCES**

Introduction

[1] Hilton Worldwide Holdings LLP (the Opponent) is the owner of the trademark WALDORF-ASTORIA used with the WALDORF-ASTORIA brand of hotels around the world, including the original WALDORF-ASTORIA in Manhattan, New York. The Opponent opposes Solterra (Hasting) Limited Partnership's (the Applicant) application for the trademark WALDORF RESIDENCES for planning, designing, development, construction, sales, management, leasing and operation of residential and commercial real estate projects, and residential and commercial real estate properties (the Services) on the basis that the use of this mark is likely to create confusion in the marketplace.

[2] For this opposition to be rejected, the Applicant must show that there is not a reasonable likelihood of confusion within the meaning of section 6 of the *Trademarks Act* RSC 1985, c T-13

(the Act). The test under section 6(2) of the Act does not concern confusion of the marks themselves, but rather confusion of goods or services from one source as being from another. Confusion will only be found if a link or association is likely to arise in the consumer's mind between the source of the services associated with the WALDORF-ASTORIA brand and those associated with the trademark WALDORF RESIDENCES. If there is no likelihood of a link, there can be no likelihood of a mistaken inference, and no confusion within the meaning of the Act [*Mattel, Inc v 3894207 Canada Inc*, [2006] 1 SCR 772 (SCC) at para 6].

[3] After a review of all of the surrounding circumstances including those enumerated in section 6(5) of the Act, I conclude that the Applicant has not demonstrated that there is not a reasonable likelihood of confusion. Based on the evidence of record, a consumer encountering the trademark WALDORF RESIDENCES is likely to infer that the the Services are related to the WALDORF-ASTORIA brand of the Opponent.

File History

[4] On October 23, 2013, the Applicant filed an application to register the trademark WALDORF RESIDENCES (the Mark) in association with the Services. The application was filed on the basis of the Applicant's proposed use in Canada. The application was advertised for opposition purposes in the *Trademarks Journal* of December 31, 2014.

[5] On May 28, 2015, Hilton Worldwide Holding LLP (the Opponent) filed a statement of opposition. The statement of opposition raises the following three grounds of opposition under section 38 of the Act, which was amended on June 17, 2019. All references are to the Act as amended, with the exception of references to the grounds of opposition which refer to the Act as it read before it was amended (see section 70 of the Act which provides that section 38(2) of the Act as it read prior to June 17, 2019 applies to applications advertised prior to that date).

- (a) The trademark is not registrable, pursuant to section 12(1)(d) of the Act, because the Mark is confusing with the Opponent's trademark WALDORF-ASTORIA registered under No. TMA337,529.
- (b) Contrary to section 16(3)(a) of the Act, the Applicant is not the person entitled to registration of the Mark since the application is confusing with the

Opponent's trademark WALDORF ASTORIA, which is also sometimes used as WALDORF-ASTORIA or WALDORF=ASTORIA, which has been previously used in Canada by the Opponent and its predecessors-in-title in association with hotel services, specifically hotel reservation, booking and payment services and hotel management and development services.

- (c) The Mark is not distinctive, pursuant to section 2 of the Act, because the Mark does not distinguish and is not adapted to distinguish the Services of the Applicant from the Services of the Opponent because of the Opponent's and its predecessors-in-title's prior use of its trademark WALDORF ASTORIA, also sometimes used as WALDORF-ASTORIA or WALDORF=ASTORIA.

I consider the presence or absence of a “-“ or “=” in the trademark WALDORF ASTORIA to be an immaterial deviation and for ease of reference will refer to WALDORF-ASTORIA throughout the decision.

[6] The Applicant filed and served a counter statement in which it denied the Opponent's allegations. In support of its opposition, the Opponent filed the affidavits of Christian Eriksen and Dane Penney. The Applicant did not file any evidence. Both parties filed a written argument and attended a hearing.

Onus and Material Dates

[7] The Applicant bears the legal onus of establishing, on a balance of probabilities that its application complies with the requirements of the Act. However, there is an initial evidential burden on the Opponent to adduce sufficient admissible evidence from which it could reasonably be concluded that the facts alleged to support each ground of opposition exist [see *John Labatt Limited v The Molson Companies Limited* (1990), 30 CPR (3d) 293 (FCTD) at 298].

[8] The material dates with respect to the grounds of opposition are:

- sections 38(2)(b)/12(1)(d) of the Act - the date of my decision [*Park Avenue Furniture Corporation v Wickes/Simmons Bedding Ltd and The Registrar of Trade Marks* (1991), 37 CPR (3d) 413 (FCA)];

- sections 38(2)(c)/16(3) of the Act - the filing date of the application; and
- sections 38(2)(d)/2 of the Act - the date of filing of the opposition [*Metro-Goldwyn-Mayer Inc v Stargate Connections Inc* (2004), 34 CPR (4th) 317 (FC)].

Summary of the Opponent's Evidence With Respect to the WALDORF-ASTORIA Brand

Affidavit of Christian Eriksen

[9] Mr. Eriksen is the Senior Counsel, Brands & Intellectual Property of Park Hotels & Resorts Inc. f/k/a Hilton Worldwide, Inc. Mr. Eriksen's evidence is that the trademark WALDORF-ASTORIA is owned by the Opponent in Canada (para 16). The Opponent and its predecessors-in-title authorize Hilton Worldwide Manage Limited to act as its agent and to sublicense the WALDORF-ASTORIA trademark to any other companies in the Hilton group of companies (para 21) including, for example, the company that operates the reservation system (Hilton Reservations Worldwide, L.L.C). Further, by virtue of this authorization, Hilton Worldwide Manage Limited is required to control the character and quality of the associated services (para 21). Further, with respect to use of the trademark WALDORF-ASTORIA in Canada, Mr. Eriksen states that all sales and marketing materials must be approved by the Opponent and the trademark owner supervises how (*sic*) the mark is used in Canada (para 18). In the absence of cross-examination, I accept that the Opponent's evidence meets the requirement of section 50(1) of the Act and use of the WALDORF-ASTORIA trademark by others in the Hilton group of companies enures to the Opponent.

WALDORF-ASTORIA Hotels are Located Around the World

[10] Mr. Eriksen explains that in 1949, Hilton Hotels Corporation purchased the WALDORF-ASTORIA hotel in New York which continues to be one of New York City's most beloved and utilized institutions (para 9). In January 2006, Hilton announced the launch of a luxury brand called THE WALDORF-ASTORIA COLLECTION, subsequently WALDORF-ASTORIA HOTELS AND RESORTS, branded after the original WALDORF-ASTORIA hotel in New York (para 13). As of January 2015, along with the original WALDORF-ASTORIA in New York, several hotels were operated in association with this trademark in the United States as well as in China, Germany, France, Israel, Italy, Netherlands, Panama, Puerto Rico, Saudi

Arabia, Scotland, and United Arab Emirates (para 14). As of 2016 there were on-going negotiations regarding the development of a WALDORF-ASTORIA hotel in Canada (para 38).

Hotel Reservation, Booking and Payment Services

[11] During the period January 2013 to August 2016, over 3.5 million reservations were made for stays at WALDORF-ASTORIA hotels around the world with total revenues in excess of \$2.9 billion (para 15).

[12] In Canada, reservations can be made through travel agent booking systems, Hilton's websites and apps, direct hotel bookings where the guest contacts the specific hotel at issue, reservation centres including Canadian toll free numbers 1-800-WALDORF and 1-800-HILTONS, and other channels including staff bookings and guests walking in to the front desk of a hotel (para 20). The trademark WALDORF-ASTORIA appears on the website when booking and paying for hotel reservations and on email confirmations to the customer (para 22). The screenshots and confirmation attached to Mr. Eriksen's affidavit as Exhibits C, D, and E are representative of how the trademark WALDORF-ASTORIA appeared to Canadian customers in Canada between 2006 and 2016 (para 22). During the period January 2013 – August 2016, over 56,000 Canadian customers stayed at WALDORF-ASTORIA hotels and total room revenue for Canadian customers was approximately \$65 million (para 24).

[13] The Hilton Group of companies also offers customers membership in the HILTON HHONORS guest loyalty program (para 26). The webpage for this program displays the trademark WALDORF-ASTORIA (para 27, Exhibit F). In excess of 400,000 Canadians enrolled in the HILTON HHONORS guest loyalty program during the period 2011-2014 and approximately 48% of reservations made at WALDORF-ASTORIA hotels were by members using the HILTON HHONORS loyalty program (para 27).

Montreal WALDORF-ASTORIA

[14] Hilton Worldwide advertises its Hotel Construction & Developments Services on its website in association with the trademark HILTON WORLDWIDE (Exhibit J). In July 2007, Hilton Worldwide, Inc. entered into a negotiation with Monit Investments Inc. for the

development of a WALDORF-ASTORIA hotel in Canada (para 28). An agreement was reached between the parties in 2008 and the planned opening of the hotel was set for 2011. The developer was unable to construct the hotel within the timeframes agreed upon and this agreement was terminated in December 16, 2013 (para 37). While the planned opening was reported by a few Canadian sources in 2008 (Exhibit G), I consider that this evidence does not assist the Opponent in demonstrating the reputation of the trademark WALDORF-ASTORIA in Canada as it is too remote in time considering that the earliest material date for any of the grounds of opposition is October 25, 2013.

Evidence of Dane Penney - Reference to WALDORF-ASTORIA in Canadian Publications

[15] The affidavit of Dane Penney, a Trademark Search Specialist employed by the Opponent's agent, attaches over 330 full text articles located in a search of Canadian newspapers for references to WALDORF-ASTORIA published after January 1, 2011 (paras 1 and 6, Exhibit E). A sampling of articles are attached as Schedule A. I am prepared to take judicial notice of the fact that the Toronto Star, National Post, and The Globe and Mail have wide circulation in Canada, and that papers such as the Vancouver Sun, Winnipeg Free Press, Montreal Gazette, Vancouver Province, and Calgary Herald have significant circulation in their respective areas [*Milliken & Co v Keystone Industries (1970) Ltd* (1986), 12 CPR (3d) 166 (TMOB) at 168-169]. I infer from this media attention that the Opponent has acquired a reputation in its trademark WALDORF-ASTORIA in Canada for the reservation for stays at and operation of WALDORF-ASTORIA hotels in New York and further abroad.

Section 16(3)(a) Ground of Opposition

[16] The Opponent pleads that contrary to section 16(3)(a) of the Act, the Applicant is not the person entitled to registration of the Mark since the application is confusing with the Opponent's trademark WALDORF-ASTORIA previously used in Canada by the Opponent and its predecessors-in-title in association with hotel services, specifically hotel reservation, booking and payment services and hotel management and development services.

[17] The Opponent meets its evidential burden of showing that it had used the trademark WALDORF-ASTORIA prior to October 23, 2013 in association with hotel reservation, booking

and payment services and that it had not abandoned its trademark prior to the date of advertisement of the subject application (December 31, 2014) [see sections 4(2), 16(3)(a), 16(5) and 17(1) of the Act]. Mr. Eriksen's evidence provides that approximately 20,000 customers with Canadian addresses made reservations at WALDORF-ASTORIA hotels from October 2011 to the end of 2012 (para 24). The WALDORF-ASTORIA trademark appears on the HILTON and WALDORF-ASTORIA websites when making and prepaying for hotel reservations along with the email confirmation to the customer (Exhibits C-E). Further, the WALDORF-ASTORIA trademark appears on the HILTON HHONORS guest loyalty website (para 27). Over 400,000 Canadians enrolled in this program between 2011-2014 and approximately 48% of reservations at WALDORF-ASTORIA hotels were made by members using this program (Eriksen affidavit, para 27, Exhibit F). Mr. Eriksen's evidence is that 1,300 Canadians did receive a benefit in Canada between 2011-2014 through the ability to pre-book and pay for a room in exchange for a discounted room rate (para 25) and as such the Opponent has demonstrated use in Canada [*Hilton Worldwide Holding LLP v Miller Thomson*, 2018 FC 895 at para 100].

[18] I now have to determine, on a balance of probabilities, if the Mark is likely to cause confusion with the Opponent's trademark WALDORF-ASTORIA used in association with hotel services, specifically, reservation, booking and payment services.

[19] The test to determine the issue of confusion is set out in section 6(2) of the Act where it is stipulated that the use of a trademark causes confusion with another trademark if the use of both trademarks in the same area would likely lead to the inference that the goods and services associated with those trademarks are manufactured, sold or leased by the same person, whether or not the goods and services are of the same general or Nice class. In making such an assessment, I must take into consideration all the relevant surrounding circumstances, including those listed in section 6(5): the inherent distinctiveness of the trademarks and the extent to which they have become known; the length of time the trademarks have been in use; the nature of the goods and services or business; the nature of the trade; and the degree of resemblance between the trademarks in appearance, or sound or in the ideas suggested by them.

[20] These criteria are not exhaustive and different weight will be given to each one in a context specific assessment [see *Mattel, Inc supra* at para 54]. I also refer to *Masterpiece Inc v*

Alavida Lifestyles Inc, (2011), 92 CPR (4th) 361 (SCC) at para 49, where the Supreme Court of Canada states that section 6(5)(e), the resemblance between the marks, will often have the greatest effect on the confusion analysis.

Inherent Distinctiveness of the Trademarks

[21] I find that the WALDORF-ASTORIA and WALDORF RESIDENCES trademarks both have a fair degree of inherent distinctiveness. While WALDORF and ASTORIA may have surname significance as the evidence is that these names are the last name or a deviation of the last name of the two original hotel proprietors (Eriksen affidavit, para 6 discussing William Waldorf Astor and John Jacob Astor IV), there is no evidence to suggest that either is a common surname in Canada or that the surname significance is understood by Canadians.

Extent Known and Length of Time in Use

[22] This factor favours the Opponent whose evidence demonstrates that the trademark WALDORF-ASTORIA discussed in paragraphs 12-13 and 15 and with a sampling of articles attached at Schedule A of this decision (excluding those articles that post-date the material date) has become known in Canada and been in use in association with hotel reservation, booking and payment services since at least 2011 in connection with booking stays at the WALDORF-ASTORIA in New York and abroad. In contrast, there is no evidence that the Applicant has commenced use of the Mark.

Nature of the Services, Business or Trade

[23] These factors favour the Opponent. The description of the Applicant's services which is set out below is broad enough to include hotels as these fall under "commercial real estate projects" and "commercial real estate properties".

planning, designing, development, construction, sales, management, leasing and operation of residential and commercial real estate projects, and residential and commercial real estate properties

In the absence of evidence from the Applicant, I decline to find that it is unlikely that the operation of a hotel is not contemplated by these services. First, there is a link between hotels

and residences, namely, that both may be included in the same project (see, for example, Eriksen affidavit, Exhibit G). Second, should the Applicant wished to clarify that its planned trade did not include hotel services it could have stated its services to exclude these services.

[24] Even though I have found that the Opponent has met its burden with respect to the Opponent's trademark WALDORF-ASTORIA in association with hotel reservation, booking and payment services, I am of the view that the potential planning, designing, development, management, and operation of a hotel and other residential and commercial projects are related to the Opponent's services which furthers the overlap in the nature of the trade and business of the parties. The Opponent's uncontroverted evidence is that the Opponent and its licensees operate WALDORF-ASTORIA hotels around the world (para 14), that hotels may include various residential and commercial aspects including condominiums, restaurants, bars, spas and golf courses (para 31, Exhibit G and Penney affidavit, Exhibit E) and that the Opponent's licensee has previously entered negotiations for the development and operation of a WALDORF-ASTORIA hotel in Canada including residences (Exhibit G). Finally, Mr. Eriksen's evidence is that Hilton Worldwide, Inc. provides real estate property development services, property management services, architecture and construction services to hotels that will be managed by the Hilton group of companies (para 39, Exhibit J).

Degree of Resemblance Between the Trademarks

[25] The degree of resemblance between the trademarks will often have the greatest effect on the confusion analysis. When considering the degree of resemblance, the law is clear that the trademarks must be considered in their totality. The appropriate test is not a side by side comparison but a consumer with an imperfect recollection of the Opponent's trademark who does not pause to give the matter any detailed consideration or scrutiny, nor to examine closely the similarities and differences between the marks [*Veuve Clicquot Ponsardin v Boutiques Cliquot Ltée et al*, 2006 SCC 23 at para 20].

[26] With respect to the degree of resemblance between the trademark WALDORF-ASTORIA and WALDORF RESIDENCES, there is a high degree of resemblance in appearance and sound suggested between the marks in issue. When considering what the dominant or striking part of each mark is, I find that the components WALDORF and ASTORIA are each

striking components of the Opponent's trademark and in cases where a mark is composed of surnames only, the first is generally the more striking [*De Grandpré Joli-Coeur c. De Grandpré Chait*, 2011 QCCS 2778 at para 74 citing *Masterpiece; Condé Nast Publications inc. v. Union des Éditions Modernes*, [1980] 46 CPR (2d) 183 (FC) at 188]. As the Applicant has incorporated the entirety of a dominant and striking part of the Opponent's trademark WALDORF-ASTORIA, as the first component of the Mark, I consider there to be a high degree of resemblance in sound and appearance. The second component in the Mark RESIDENCES does not meaningfully diminish the resemblance in appearance and sound between the Mark and the Opponent's trademark WALDORF-ASTORIA as it appears to be suggestive of the Services (specifically, that they may involve a commercial real estate project including residences). In the absence of evidence that WALDORF or ASTORIA have any significance other than surname significance, I find that the Opponent's trademark suggests a surname or two surnames and the Mark suggests one of the same surnames and that the associated services involve residences. As such the ideas suggested between the marks, are also similar.

Conclusion

[27] The test to be applied is a matter of first impression in the mind of a casual consumer somewhat in a hurry who sees the trademark WALDORF RESIDENCES in association with the Services at a time when he or she has no more than an imperfect recollection of the Opponent's trademark WALDORF-ASTORIA and does not pause to give the matter any detailed consideration or scrutiny [*Veuve Clicquot, supra*].

[28] Having considered all of the surrounding circumstances, I find that the Applicant has not established, on a balance of probabilities, that there is not a reasonable likelihood of confusion between the trademarks WALDORF RESIDENCES and WALDORF-ASTORIA. I reach this conclusion primarily because there is a high degree of resemblance between the marks, the Opponent's mark has acquired a reputation in Canada not only for hotel reservation, booking and payment services but also the operation of hotels abroad and, in the absence of evidence from the Applicant, I find that the nature of the services would be seen as overlapping by consumers.

Section 2 Ground of Opposition

[29] The section 2 ground of opposition also turns on a determination of the likelihood of confusion between the Mark and the Opponent's trademark WALDORF-ASTORIA.

[30] There is an initial burden on the Opponent to establish that, as of May 28, 2015, the trademark WALDORF-ASTORIA was known to such an extent that it could negate the distinctiveness of the Mark. The following propositions summarize the relevant jurisprudence on distinctiveness [*Bojangles' International, LLC v Bojangles Café Ltd* 2006 FC 657, 48 CPR (4th) 427 (FC) at para. 33].

- The evidential burden lies on the party claiming that the reputation of its mark prevents the other party's mark from being distinctive;
- However, a burden remains on the applicant for the registration of the trademark to prove that its mark is distinctive;
- A mark should be known in Canada to some extent at least to negate another mark's distinctiveness;
- Alternatively, a mark could negate another mark's distinctiveness if it is well known in a specific area of Canada; and
- A foreign trademark owner cannot simply assert that its trademark is known in Canada, rather, it should present clear evidence to that effect.

[31] Finally, an attack based on non-distinctiveness is not restricted to the actual performance of services or sales of goods in Canada. It may also be based on evidence of knowledge or reputation of the Opponent's trademark spread by means of word of mouth and evidence of reputation and public acclaim and knowledge by means of newspaper or magazine articles as opposed to advertising [*Motel 6, Inc v No 6 Motel Ltd* 1981 CanLII 2834 (FC), 56 CPR (2d) 44 (FCTD) at 58-59].

[32] I am satisfied that the Opponent has met its evidential burden of demonstrating a sufficient reputation in association with hotel reservation, booking and payment services due to the number of reservations made by Canadians and the references in Canadian publications (see the articles up to the material date some of which are excerpted in Schedule A to this decision). As the Applicant has not filed any evidence, it fails to meet its burden of proving that the Mark is

distinctive or is adapted to distinguish the Services for the same reasons as set out with respect to the section 16(3) ground of opposition.

Section 12(1)(d) Ground of Opposition

[33] I have exercised my discretion and checked the Register to confirm that the registration relied on by the Opponent and set out below is extant [*Quaker Oats Co Ltd of Canada v Menu Foods Ltd* (1986), 11 CPR (3d) 410 (TMOB)]. Therefore, the Opponent has met its initial burden with respect to this ground of opposition

Registration No.	Trademark	Services
TMA337,529	WALDORF-ASTORIA	Hotel services

[34] This registration is the subject of a section 45 proceeding at the request of the Applicant’s agent. In *Miller Thomson LLP v Hilton Worldwide Holding LLP*, 2017 TMOB 19, the Registrar held that the owner had failed to show evidence of use of the trademark WALDORF-ASTORIA in association with hotel services in Canada and ordered the registration expunged. In *Miller Thomson v Hilton Worldwide Holding LLP* 2018 FC 895, the Federal Court found that hotel services include hotel reservation and booking services and overturned the Registrar’s decision to expunge the registration. Justice Pentney explains at para 76:

I find that – viewed from the perspective of the provider of the service as well as the customer – the ordinary understanding of the term “hotel services” would include the provision of a room as the primary service. It would also include a number of ancillary or incidental services, such as reservation or booking services, the regular cleaning of the hotel room, as well as related services delivered at the hotel, such as parking, dry cleaning of clothes, room service for food and beverages, and the temporary storage of luggage following check-out. These services would commonly be understood to be included in the scope of the term “hotel services”, as part of the ordinary expectation of what is involved in the performance of hotel services, and they all go beyond the physical bricks and mortar hotel, or hotel room.

[35] At the hearing, the Applicant submitted that I could find that the Opponent’s evidence was not sufficient to find that it had used its trademark WALDORF-ASTORIA with hotel

services. I decline to do so as I find that Mr. Eriksen's evidence is sufficient to find that the hotel reservation, booking and payment services offered a benefit to Canadians specifically a discounted room rate (para 25 and *Miller Thomson v Hilton Worldwide Holding LLP, supra* at paras 95 and 100). As such, for the reasons set forth with respect to the section 16(3) ground of opposition, the same result follows, that is, the balance of probabilities between finding that there is no reasonable likelihood of confusion and finding that there is a reasonable likelihood of confusions, falls in favour of the Opponent. This ground of opposition succeeds.

Disposition

[36] In view of the foregoing, pursuant to the authority delegated to me under section 63(3) of the Act, I refuse this application pursuant to section 38(12) of the Act.

Natalie de Paulsen
Member
Trademarks Opposition Board
Canadian Intellectual Property Office

**TRADEMARKS OPPOSITION BOARD
CANADIAN INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY OFFICE
APPEARANCES AND AGENTS OF RECORD**

HEARING DATE: 2019-07-16

APPEARANCES

Jonathan Colombo and Amrita V. Singh

FOR THE OPPONENT

David Reive

FOR THE APPLICANT

AGENTS OF RECORD

Bereskin & Parr LLP/S.E.N.C.R.L., S.R.L.

FOR THE OPPONENT

Miller Thomson LLP

FOR THE APPLICANT

SCHEDULE A

Date	Publication Title	Article Title (Bold Text Denotes Emphasis Added)
October 11, 2014	Victoria Times Colonist	WALDORF-ASTORIA sold
October 7, 2014	Montreal Gazette (Canada)	N.Y.'s WALDORF-ASTORIA hotel fetches record \$1.95 billion for Hilton
October 7, 2014	National Post (Canada)	Hilton sells WALDORF-ASTORIA to Chinese insurance group; US \$1.95B deal
May 3, 2014	Calgary Herald	The yang and the yin of luxe lodgings in Maui Her first stay, at the Grand Wailea, a big WALDORF-ASTORIA resort hotel in the chichi master-planned area of Wailea on the southwest side of the island ...
March 6, 2014	Toronto Star	Vacations to unwind at the spa with yoga and quiet time by the pool ... 3. Guerlain Spa, WALDORF-ASTORIA , New York. Retreat from the hustle and bustle of the Big Apple into the historic House of Guerlain. ...
November 30, 2013	Vancouver Sun	Travel industry offering variety of deals for Cyber Monday Destinations range from big cities and beaches to spas and ski resorts, including Manhattan's WALDORF-ASTORIA
October 5, 2013	Toronto Star	Panama City's new-found vitality... ... I could barely find a hotel room. Now major hotes with names such as WALDORF-ASTORIA , Trump, Riu and Westin have sprung up ...
September 21, 2013	Toronto Star	Latin America hospitality ...

Date	Publication Title	Article Title (Bold Text Denotes Emphasis Added)
		... One of its newest highrises, the Waldorf-Astoria Panama, opened in March, combining the efficiency and meeting space of a business hotel with urban resort features ...
September 20, 2013	Regina Leader Post	The perils of losing a passport in New York City ... But just after 3 p.m., near the Walford Astoria Hotel, as I put my iPhone back in my pocket yet again, there was no passport. It was gone. ...
August 11, 2013	Vancouver Province	For as little as Key West's Casa Marina: A Waldorf-Astoria Resort (casamarinaresort.com) and Sand-Isle are offering guests sand sculpting classes...
July 19, 2013	Globeandmail.com	Travel deals of the week: Jordan, Arizona and more The buy: Arizona Biltmore, a WALDORF-ASTORIA Resort, has a summer golf package with two rounds of golf and accomodations, rates starting at \$159 a room, per night, based on double occupancy.
June 22, 2013	Globe and Mail	Some like it hot (and sweaty) WALDORF-ASTORIA Rome Cavalieri, Rome ... Who knew running around in a traditional Roman tunic and wielding a wooden training sword would work up a sweat like no other? ...
June 17, 2013	Calgary Herald	Putin denies Super Bowl ring theft .. Putin was reacting Sunday through a spokesman to a New York Post story quoting remarks made by Kraft at an awards gala at the Walford-Astoria hotel on Thursday.
June 15, 2013	Globe ad Mail	Go for the Open, stay for the sights ... Far more likely to still have rooms available during the Open are hotels in downtown Edinburgh. A local landmark is the Caledonian, a refurbished former Victoria railway hotel but now part of the WALDORF-ASTORIA chain.

Date	Publication Title	Article Title (Bold Text Denotes Emphasis Added)
April 15, 2013	Globe and Mail	<p>Paying homage to the hotel; Leonard Cohen called it a – breathing spot, ‘a temple of refuge’</p> <p>...The WALDORF-ASTORIA is built on to a Manhattan-shaped island; ...”</p>
December 15, 2012	National Post	<p>Once we dressed up to fly ...</p> <p>... Better to spend it at the WALDORF-ASTORIA, away from prying eyes...</p>
December 3, 2012	Toronto Star	<p>Top sun desintations: Experts pick their favourite winter escapes ...</p> <p>... Key West ...</p> <p>... There are fabulous resorts, including the Casa Marina, a Waldorf-Astoria property. ...</p>
November 8, 2012	Toronto Star	<p>Miami’s Art Deco delights...</p> <p>... Fletcher points out the Hotel Victor, designed by a fellow who helped with the WALDORF-ASTORIA in New York. ..</p>
October 27, 2012	Winnipeg Free Press	<p>Punting the parks – Plenty to do in Orland outside of Disney, SeaWorld mega-sites</p> <p>... So far, we’ve avoided costumed characters of any kind by staying at the WALDORF-ASTORIA Orlando. ...</p>
October 20, 2012	Victoria Times Colonist	<p>Pilfered pieces fascinating stories; WALDORF-ASTORIA Hotel’s amnesty program prompts return of dozens of small items</p>
October 3, 2012	National Post	<p>Noodle bars to business class flights for Redford; Expenses Released</p> <p>... There was also an expensive two-night stay at the WALDORF-ASTORIA in New York. ...</p>
September 28, 2012	Toronto Star	<p>Stephen Harper chooses the Waldorf over the UN in New York</p> <p>There’s a couple of ways to get from the Walforf Astoria on Park</p>

Date	Publication Title	Article Title (Bold Text Denotes Emphasis Added)
		Avenue in New York, over to United Nations headquarters on 42 nd
June 7, 2012	Globe and Mail	A honey of an urban hotel tale New York's Waldorf-Astoria has been a retreat for celebrities. Now, thousands of buzzing