



Employment Update

EMPLOYMENT AND LABOUR GROUP:

Maria Kotsopoulos
(Co-Editor)
Direct 416.593.2987
mkotsopoulos@blaney.com

Christopher McClelland
(Co-Editor)
Direct 416.597.4882
cmcclelland@blaney.com

William D. Anderson, Chair
Direct 416.593.3901
banderson@blaney.com

Elizabeth J. Forster
Direct 416.593.3919
eforster@blaney.com

Mark E. Geiger
Direct 416.593.3926
mgeiger@blaney.com

David E. Greenwood
Direct 416.596.2879
dgreenwood@blaney.com

Michael J. Penman
Direct 416.593.3966
mpenman@blaney.com

D. Barry Prentice
Direct 416.593.3953
bprentice@blaney.com

Jack B. Siegel
Direct 416.593.2958
jsiegel@blaney.com

IN THIS ISSUE:

Good Faith Obligations
of Employers
D. Barry Prentice
Blaneys Podcast
Blaney McMurtry LLP

“As a general principle, contract law requires good faith in the performance of a commercial contract...”

GOOD FAITH OBLIGATIONS OF EMPLOYERS

D. Barry Prentice

In November 2014, the Supreme Court of Canada articulated the following proposition in *Bhasin v. Hrynew and Heritage Education Funds Inc.*:

Finding that there is a duty to perform contracts honestly will make the law more certain, more just and more in tune with reasonable commercial expectations

The case before the Supreme Court involved a dispute between a company which markets education savings plans (Heritage) and one of its distributors (Bhasin). The contract in question had a three year term, with an automatic renewal unless either party gave six (6) months' written notice to the contrary.

In 1999, a dispute arose between Heritage and Bhasin and, ultimately, Heritage exercised its contractual right to provide notice of non-renewal. As a result, Bhasin lost the value of its business and he sued to recover this amount.

Notwithstanding the right of Heritage to exercise its right of non-renewal, the court found that Heritage had misled Bhasin as to its intentions regarding an ongoing business relationship and had acted dishonestly. Heritage was required to pay damages to Bhasin equal to the

value of his lost business. In doing so, the court formulated the following principles:

1. As a general principle, contract law requires good faith in the performance of a commercial contract;
2. This good faith obligation requires the parties to act honestly and not seek to undermine the legitimate contractual interests of the other party in bad faith;
3. The parties to a commercial contract must not lie or otherwise knowingly mislead each other about matters directly related to performance of the contract.

The purpose of this article is to consider whether there is room for application of these principles to the employment relationship.

References to an employer's obligations of good faith to an employee are not novel. Indeed, it is a rare statement of claim in a wrongful dismissal action that does not reference an alleged breach of good faith by the employer. How is it, then, that the courts deal with such allegations?

In both *Wallace v United Grain Growers* and *Keays v Honda*, the Supreme Court of Canada declared that employers have an obligation of good faith and fair dealing at the time of dismissal. This obligation requires employers to

“It is not yet clear whether the duty of honesty and forthrightness, already applicable to the employment relationship during a termination scenario, will extend to other aspects of the employment relationship...”



D. Barry Prentice is a senior litigation partner in Blaney McMurtry's Employment and Labour practice group. With more than three decades of experience in employment law, Barry acts as counsel for a broad range of clients both inside and outside the courts of Ontario.

Barry may be reached directly at 416.593.3953 or bprentice@blaney.com.

be candid, honest, reasonable, and forthright, and to refrain from bad faith actions, such as being untruthful, misleading, or unduly insensitive in the course of dismissing an employee.

It is not yet clear whether the duty of honesty and forthrightness, already applicable to the employment relationship during a termination scenario, will extend to other aspects of the employment relationship based on the principles laid down in *Bhasin*. While *Bhasin* dealt with a commercial contract, the Supreme Court did say that:

More specific legal doctrines would develop and be given different weight in different situations and, in the context of a long term contract of mutual cooperation, these obligations will be more significant than in that of a more transactional exchange

In many situations an employment relationship can be appropriately described as a “*long term contract of mutual cooperation*.” If so, the groundwork might exist to argue the development of a specific legal doctrine which would require the employee and employer to act honestly and without deception at certain specific stages of the relationship and not just at termination. In fact, while the court has opined on the employee’s vulnerability at the time of termination and has thus exercised a supervisory role, clearly termination is not the only situation in which the employee is vulnerable. It is also obvious that the current state of the law has developed in the context of wrongful dismissal actions, i.e. where the employee has been terminated

and the emphasis is on creating a remedy for that.

Some examples of situations other than dismissal where an obligation of good faith could apply are:

1. Representations as to security of tenure;
2. Providing or withholding information about a possible merger or closure of the business;
3. A description of rights and obligations under an incentive compensation plan.

If a court were prepared to apply an obligation to not mislead in any of these situations, the innocent party would have a claim for breach of contract and would be entitled to be put in the position he/it would have been in had the breaching party complied with its obligation of honesty and forthrightness. For example, in the first example above, if the employee had known that his tenure was insecure he may have moved on to a then available position. If the employer had a duty to disclose this or, at least, not mislead the individual, the employee may be able to recover damages to put him in the position he would have been in had he received the honest information and acted accordingly.

While it is arguable that the same, or similar claims, could be made on the basis of a tort claim for negligent or intentional misrepresentation, this would require proving the essentials of those or other applicable torts. Furthermore, if the court were to acknowledge

EMPLOYMENT UPDATE

this duty of honesty it would satisfy one of the essential elements of proving a misrepresentation claim.

Creative counsel will undoubtedly attempt to extend an employer's obligation to act honestly and in good faith beyond the dismissal setting by arguing that this would be "*just and in tune with reasonable expectations.*" ■

BLANEYS PODCAST

Blaney McMurtry LLP

Blaneys Podcasts are available for download at <http://www.blaney.com/podcast>. Topics to date include Powers of Attorney, Canada's Anti-Spam Legislation, Termination of Employment, Workplace Harassment and Family Law.

New podcasts continue to be posted so check back regularly for the latest topic. Podcasts are also available for download on [iTunes](#). ■

EXPECT THE BEST

**Blaney
McMurtry**
BARRISTERS & SOLICITORS LLP

2 Queen St. East, Suite 1500
Toronto, Canada M5C 3G5
416.593.1221 TEL
416.593.5437 FAX
www.blaney.com

Employment Update is a publication of the Employment and Labour Law Group of Blaney McMurtry LLP. The information contained in this newsletter is intended to provide information and comment, in a general fashion, about recent cases and related practice points of interest. The views and comments contained in this newsletter are those of the author alone, and do not necessarily reflect the views of Blaney McMurtry LLP or other members of the firm. The information and views expressed are not intended to provide legal advice. For specific advice, please contact us.

We welcome your comments. Address changes, mailing instructions or requests for additional copies should be directed to Kelly MacNeil at 416 593.7221 ext. 3600 or by email to kmacneil@blaney.com. Legal questions should be addressed to the specified author.