

# Ontario Labour Relations Board Sheds Light on Severance Pay Calculation Rules

April 02, 2019

In its December 2018 decision in *Doug Hawkes v. Max Aicher (North America) Limited (Hawkes)*, the Ontario Labour Relations Board (OLRB) addressed the issue of whether an employer's global payroll should be considered in determining an employee's entitlement to severance pay under the *Employment Standards Act, 2000* (the ESA).

As Ontario employers are aware, section 64 of the ESA requires an employer who terminates an employee's employment without cause to provide an employee with severance pay, where the employee has five or more years of service and the employer has a payroll of at least \$2.5 million.

Since the Ontario Superior Court's decision in *Paquette v. Quadraspec Inc. (Paquette)*, there has been some question as to whether, for the purposes of determining the \$2.5 million threshold, the calculation of an employer's payroll should be restricted to its payroll in Ontario or whether the payroll outside of Ontario must also be considered.

*Paquette* had held that the severance pay obligation set out at section 64 of the ESA required a consideration of the employer's national payroll and not just its Ontario payroll in determining whether the employer had met the \$2.5 million threshold. This finding was contrary to a well-established line of case law which had interpreted the \$2.5 million threshold to apply only to an employer's Ontario payroll.

## **The *Hawkes* Decision**

In *Hawkes*, the applicant was a former employee of Max Aicher (North America) Limited (MANA), which had operations in Ontario. MANA was a wholly owned subsidiary of Max Aicher GmbH & Co KG (MAG), a company incorporated in Germany.

In 2015, the applicant's employment was terminated without cause. At the time, he had more than five years of service but was not paid severance pay under the ESA. The applicant filed an ESA complaint seeking unpaid vacation pay, termination pay, and severance pay. The Employment Standards Officer (ESO) determined that the applicant was entitled to vacation pay and termination pay. She concluded, however, that he was not entitled to severance pay, as MANA did not have a payroll of \$2.5 million or more in Ontario. In arriving at this conclusion, the ESO determined that it was only employee

salaries within Ontario that were to be considered in calculating the payroll threshold. The applicant appealed the ESO's decision to the OLRB.

At the OLRB, the question to be considered was whether the payrolls of both MANA and MAG ought to be considered in determining MANA's total payroll for the purposes of calculating severance under section 64 of the ESA.

The applicant relied upon the Ontario Superior Court's decision in *Paquette*, to argue that the OLRB should not restrict the computation of his former employer's total payroll to only its Ontario operations. The applicant argued that the employer in *Paquette* had operations in both Ontario and Québec, and that the Court had determined that it was appropriate to consider the combined payroll in both provinces in determining whether or not the employer had met the \$2.5 million threshold.

The OLRB rejected the applicant's argument that the reasoning in *Paquette* should be applied to the present circumstance to include a related employer's global payroll. In particular, the OLRB found that:

1. The facts of *Paquette* were distinguishable from the present case. In *Paquette*, the employer had operations in both Ontario and Québec. In the present case, the related employer, MAG, did not have any employees in Ontario.
2. *Paquette* did not consider the interaction between sections 3 and 64 of the ESA. Section 3 of the ESA provides that the ESA applies to employees who perform work in Ontario.  
The circumstances of the present case did not warrant a departure from the pre-
3. *Paquette* line of cases, which had held that section 64 must be read in light of section 3 of the ESA, resulting in an interpretation of the severance threshold as applicable only to Ontario payroll.

Notably, the OLRB made the following general finding:

"[W]hile an employer may have operations and payrolls outside Ontario, it is only Ontario-based employment and operations that is captured by section 3 and therefore section 64 of the Act."

On the basis of the above-noted reasoning, the OLRB determined that for the purposes of the severance pay obligation under section 64 of the ESA, only MANA's payroll in Ontario, and not MAG's global payroll, should be considered. As such, the OLRB upheld the ESO's finding that *Hawkes* was not entitled to severance pay at termination.

### **Takeaway for Employers**

The decision in *Hawkes* confirms that an Ontario employer will not be liable for severance payments if the company's Ontario payroll is less than \$2.5 million, even if the Ontario employer's parent company has a global payroll in excess of \$2.5 million. This interpretation of the severance obligations under the ESA is favourable for employers who have operations outside of Ontario. What remains to be seen is whether future adjudicators will follow the OLRB's reasoning in *Hawkes* when confronted with a fact scenario outside of the related employer context similar to that in *Paquette*.

2 [2014] O. J. No. 5484

By

[Maria Gergin Phillips](#)

Expertise

[Labour & Employment](#)

---

## **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](http://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](mailto:unsubscribe@blg.com) or manage your subscription preferences at [blg.com/MyPreferences](http://blg.com/MyPreferences). If you feel you have received this message in error please contact [communications@blg.com](mailto:communications@blg.com). BLG's privacy policy for publications may be found at [blg.com/en/privacy](http://blg.com/en/privacy).

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