



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
cmccllland@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:

Blurred Lines: Mobile
Devices in the Workplace
Christopher McClelland

New Mandatory Working
at Heights Training
Maria Kotsopoulos

Proposed Amendment to
Third Party Demand
Provision of the ESA,
2000

Maria Kotsopoulos

Blaneys Blogs
Blaney McMurtry LLP

Blaneys Podcast
Blaney McMurtry LLP

“The blending of work and personal use on a single device raises a number of employment and privacy related issues.”

BLURRED LINES: MOBILE DEVICES IN THE WORKPLACE

Christopher McClelland

As smartphones become increasingly common in the workplace, many employers are recognizing the difficulty of attempting to draw a clear line between a “work device” and a “personal device.” Employers have adapted to this issue in different ways. Some employers permit employees to use their own mobile device to access the employer’s corporate networks and systems (commonly referred to as “Bring Your Own Device” or “BYOD”). Other employers provide employees with mobile devices that contain pre-installed software allowing for the creation of a “personal” profile that is kept separate from the “work” profile. Even in cases where an employer does not specifically address the issue, it is often implicitly recognized that an employee who is carrying a mobile device with them for work purposes will engage in some personal activities on that device, whether that means surfing the internet, checking personal email accounts or using the map function.

The blending of work and personal use on a single device raises a number of employment and privacy related issues. For many employees, their mobile device is one of the primary tools they use to interact with their colleagues and to perform their work. At the same time, personal use of a mobile device will almost inevitably result in the device containing personal information, some

of which may be very sensitive. Employers should therefore regularly review their existing policies to ensure that employees have a clear understanding of the employer’s expectations regarding the use of mobile devices. The following is a list of topics that employers may wish to address in their policies:

Personal Use

It is possible for an employer to prohibit any personal use of corporate-owned mobile devices. However, doing so would require that the employer take specific steps to enforce the policy (including by potentially imposing discipline) and do so consistently. In most cases, the employer will permit limited personal use so long as it does not interfere with the employee’s duties and responsibilities or result in the violation of any other policies. In cases where the employee provides their own personal device the employer retains even less control, making it even more important to have policies in place.

Acceptable Use

Employers should impose explicit acceptable use guidelines that distinguish between using a mobile device for work purposes and personal purposes.

Off-the-Clock Work

Employees that use mobile devices for work are much more likely to review work-related emails and perform work outside of normal office hours. This can create potential difficulties if the

“By allowing an employee to use their corporate mobile device for non-work-related purposes, an employer is implicitly acknowledging that an employee has a reasonable expectation of privacy ...”



Christopher McClelland is a Partner at Blaney McMurtry and a member of the Employment and Labour Group and the Privacy Group. His practice includes labour, employment, human rights and privacy law.

Christopher has been involved in matters before all courts in Ontario, as well as before the Ontario Labour Relations Board, the Canada Industrial Relations Board and the Human Rights Tribunal of Ontario.

Christopher can be reached at 416.597.4882 or cmcclelland@blaney.com.

employee is eligible for overtime or performs work when they are on a leave of absence. The employer’s policies should specifically address these situations.

Information Security Concerns

Employers should provide clear instructions to employees about how they may perform work tasks on their mobile device to ensure that company data, networks and systems are protected. Employers should also explain what will happen to the work information and the personal information on the mobile device if it is lost or stolen (i.e. the employer’s IT department may need to reset or wipe the device).

Employee Privacy

By allowing an employee to use their corporate mobile device for non-work-related purposes, an employer is implicitly acknowledging that an employee has a reasonable expectation of privacy with respect to the personal information contained or stored on the mobile device. It is therefore important for the employer to specifically set out under what circumstances it will monitor or access the information stored on the mobile device.

If the mobile device has a “work profile” and a “personal profile,” the presumption is that the employer will not monitor or inspect the information contained or stored within the personal profile. At the same time, the employer should clarify the extent to which it will monitor or inspect the information contained or stored within the work profile, both during and at the end of the employment relationship.

Termination

Employers should clarify what happens to the information contained or stored on the mobile device when employees are terminated or resign their employment. If the mobile device belongs to the employer, the employee may wish to be given an opportunity to back-up or remove any personal information stored within the personal profile. If the mobile device belongs to the employee, the employer will likely want to ensure that it has the ability and the right to access the device in order to remove any work-related information.

Given the myriad of issues that are unique to the use of mobile devices in the workplace, employers may consider developing a stand-alone mobile device policy. Doing so would make it easier for the employer to respond to the changes in technology that are likely to continue blurring the line between work devices and personal devices. ■

NEW MANDATORY WORKING AT HEIGHTS TRAINING

Maria Kotsopoulos

On April 1, 2015, mandatory working at heights training came into effect under the Occupational Health and Safety Awareness Training Regulation of the *Occupational Health and Safety Act* for workers on construction sites using any of the following methods of fall protection:

- Travel restraint systems;
- Fall restricting systems;
- Fall arrest systems;
- Safety nets; and
- Work belts or safety belts.

EMPLOYMENT UPDATE

“The working at heights training program ... must also be delivered by an approved training provider before workers can work at heights.”



Maria Kotsopoulos is a Partner at Blaney McMurtry and a member of the Employment and Labour Group. Maria practices in all areas of labour, employment and human rights law. She advocates on behalf of employers, not for profit organizations, trade unions, and employees, and has been involved in matters before the Superior Court of Justice, the Federal Court, the Labour Board, the Human Rights Tribunal, the Workplace Safety and Insurance Appeals Tribunal, and other tribunals.

Maria can be reached directly at 416.593.2987 or mkotsopoulos@blaney.com.

The Regulation now requires employers to ensure the completion of a working at heights training program by these employees.

The working at heights training program must be one that is approved by the Chief Prevention Officer. It must also be delivered by an approved training provider before workers can work at heights.

Workers who, prior to April 1, 2015, met the fall protection training requirements in subsection 26.2(1) of the Construction Projects Regulation under the OHSA will have a period of two years to complete an approved working at heights program. Accordingly, these workers will have until April 1, 2017, to complete this new mandatory training in addition to the training requirements of the Construction Projects Regulation. ■

PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO THIRD PARTY DEMAND PROVISION OF ESA, 2000

Maria Kotsopoulos

Bill 85 – otherwise known as the *Strengthening and Improving Government Act, 2015* – received first reading in the legislature on April 2, 2015. The Bill proposes an amendment to the third-party demand section in Part XXIV of the *Employment Standards Act, 2000*.

In its current form, section 125(1) provides that where the Director of Employment Standards suspects a person owes money to, or is holding money for, a person liable to make a payment under the Act the Director may demand that all or part of the money be paid to the Director in trust.

If passed, Bill 85 would go beyond this and permit the Director to make this demand for all or part of the money to be paid to the Director in trust where the Director believes or suspects that a person will within 365 days owe money to or hold money for the employer, director or other person.

We will keep you updated on the progress of this legislation. ■

BLANEYS BLOGS

Blaney McMurtry LLP

Be sure to follow our regularly updated blogs, published by the Firm and individual lawyers, covering a variety of topics:

Blaneys@Work examines recent events and decisions in the world of labour and employment law. [blaneysatwork.com]

Henry J. Chang's Canada-US Immigration Blog covers recent decisions, legislative changes and news related to Canada and US immigration. [www.americanlaw.com/immigrationblog/]

Blaneys Ontario Court of Appeal Summaries (Blaneys OCA Blog) offers weekly summaries of all decisions released by the Court of Appeal for Ontario (other than criminal law decisions). [blaneyscourtsummaries.com]

Blaneys Fidelity Blog provides updates on recent developments in fidelity insurance in Canada and the United States, and covers other topics of interest to fidelity insurers. [blaneysfidelityblog.com]

EMPLOYMENT UPDATE

Blaneys on Target provides general information to creditors and other persons interested in the Target insolvency and its CCAA proceedings. [blaneystargetccaa.com/updates/] ■

BLANEYS PODCAST**Blaney McMurtry LLP**

Blaneys Podcasts are available for download at www.blaney.com/podcast. Topics to date include Powers of Attorney, Canada's Anti-Spam Legislation, Termination of Employment, Workplace Harassment, Family Law and Succession Planning. In the newest podcast, Lou Brzezinski answers questions about the firm's involvement in the Target insolvency proceeding on behalf of unsecured creditors.

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.