Case Law Update: Brown V. University of Windsor (2016 ONCA 431)

January 09, 2017

The Ontario Court of Appeal has recently determined that in a unionized workplace, a dispute about whether the employer has complied with its obligations under the Employment Insurance Premium Reduction Program under the *Employment Insurance Act*, must be determined by an arbitrator appointed under the collective agreement, and not by a court.

This decision reinforces the now well-developed jurisprudence with respect to the exclusive jurisdiction of a labour arbitrator to interpret employment statutes (notably *Weber v. Ontario Hydro*, 1995 CanLII 108 (SCC), [1995] 2 S.C.R. 929, and *Parry Sound (District) Social Services Administration Board v. OPSEU Local 324,* 2003 SCC 42 (CanLII), [2003] 2 S.C.R. 157), and it also overturns existing jurisprudence with respect to the Employment Insurance Premium Reduction Program. Previous court and arbitrator decisions in Ontario had determined that court actions could be brought in disputes about an employer's administration of the Program in unionized environments (*Rathwell v. Hershey Canada* (2001), 152 O.A.C. 1 2001 CanLII 8598 (C.A.), leave to appeal to the S.C.C. denied, (2002) 164 O.A.C. 279, and *Hershey Canada Inc. v. United Steelworkers of Canada, Local 461* (1997), 50 C.L A.S. 249, 1997 CarswellOnt 6984 (Thorne). The Court of Appeal has now clarified this question.

In this case, the Court of Appeal overturned an order by Justice Scott K. Campbell of the Superior Court of Justice who had applied the well-known *Weber* principle, and determined that the essential character of the claim was the employer's alleged misappropriation of, or failure to account for, employment insurance premiums belonging to its employees. Justice Campbell rejected the University's position that the dispute was essentially about compensation, and relied on the previous jurisprudence on point.

In overturning Justice Campbell's decision, the Court of Appeal also applied the *Weber* principle, and adopted the British Columbia Court of Appeal's articulation of the legal test (*Parry Sound* in *British Columbia Teachers' Federation v. British Columbia Public School Employers' Association*, 2005 BCCA 92 (CanLII), 136 L.A.C. (4th) 225, leave to appeal to SCC refused, [2005] S.C.C.A. No. 180):

[The question is] whether there is a real contextual connection between the statute and the collective agreement such that a violation of the statute gives rise, in the context, to a violation of the provisions of the collective agreement.

The Ontario Court of Appeal found that the *Employment Insurance Act* provisions at play are employment related under section 48(12(j) of the *Labour Relations Act*, since under the scheme of the Employment Insurance Premium Reduction Program, the employer is obliged to remit to employees a share of the premium reduction in the form of cash or enhanced benefits. It found that, although the collective agreement did not mention the Program, it does deal with pay and benefits and it would violate the collective agreement to fail to provide employees with the pay or benefits to which they are entitled. It held that the essential nature of the dispute is whether employees have received the full amount of pay or benefits to which they were entitled, as informed by the *Employment Insurance Act*. The matter was therefore found to be within the exclusive jurisdiction of an arbitrator appointed pursuant to the collective agreement and the *Labour Relations Act*.

By

S. Margot Blight

Expertise

Labour & Employment, Employment Disputes

BLG | Canada's Law Firm

As the largest, truly full-service Canadian law firm, Borden Ladner Gervais LLP (BLG) delivers practical legal advice for domestic and international clients across more practices and industries than any Canadian firm. With over 800 lawyers, intellectual property agents and other professionals, BLG serves the legal needs of businesses and institutions across Canada and beyond – from M&A and capital markets, to disputes, financing, and trademark & patent registration.

blg.com

BLG Offices

Calgary
Centennial Place, East Tower
520 3rd Avenue S.W.
Calgary, AB, Canada
T2P 0R3

T 403.232.9500
F 403.266.1395

Ottawa
World Exchange Plaza
100 Queen Street
Ottawa, ON, Canada
K1P 1J9

T 613.237.5160
F 613.230.8842

Vancouver
1200 Waterfront Centre
200 Burrard Street
Vancouver, BC, Canada
V7X 1T2

T 604.687.5744
F 604.687.1415

Montréal
1000 De La Gauchetière Street West
Suite 900
Montréal, QC, Canada
H3B 5H4

T 514.954.2555
F 514.879.9015

Toronto
Bay Adelaide Centre, East Tower
22 Adelaide Street West
Toronto, ON, Canada
M5H 4E3

T 416.367.6000
F 416.367.6749

The information contained herein is of a general nature and is not intended to constitute legal advice, a complete statement of the law, or an opinion on any subject. No one should act upon it or refrain from acting without a thorough examination of the law after the facts of a specific situation are considered. You are urged to consult your legal adviser in cases of specific questions or concerns. BLG does not warrant or guarantee the accuracy, currency or completeness of this publication. No part of this publication may be reproduced without prior written permission of Borden Ladner Gervais LLP. If this publication was sent to you by BLG and you do not wish to receive further publications from BLG, you may ask to remove your contact information from our mailing lists by emailing unsubscribe@blg.com or manage your subscription preferences at blg.com/MyPreferences. If you feel you have received this message in error please contact communications@blg.com. BLG's privacy policy for publications may be found at blg.com/en/privacy.

© 2026 Borden Ladner Gervais LLP. Borden Ladner Gervais LLP is an Ontario Limited Liability Partnership.