

A national occupational health & safety (OHS) and workers' compensation law newsletter



June of 2006 brings us the end of another school year, the beginning of summer and a flurry of activity by OHS Regulators, Workers Compensations Boards, and courts across Canada.

This edition of the OHSLAW™ Report covers a record number of court decisions, OHS regulatory initiatives, and record fines in OHS prosecutions across Canada. It looks like it is going to be a busy summer. To help clients deal with increased challenges, Gowlings' OHS Team has added a lawyer in Vancouver, Eric Wredenhagen, and welcome Kim Nutz back from maternity leave in Calgary.

We have also launched, on our website, our OHS Practice Referral Program, providing a "one-stop" referral service for occupational health and safety and Workplace Safety Insurance Board technical, engineering, and related services that are not provided by Gowlings' OHS Consultants. We welcome further inquiries from organizations who seek to join this program. For more information on the Referral Program, visit our website at www.gowlings.com/ohslaw.

We hope you have a very safe summer.

Norm Keith, B.A., LL.B., CRSP
Partner, Gowlings

Alberta Imposes Highest Fine Ever for Non-Fatal Incident

By Shana Wolch, B.A., LL.B.

Alberta employers are now facing higher penalties for work-related injuries, pursuant to the *Occupational Health and Safety Act* ("OHSA").

Cloverdale Paint has been ordered to pay \$75,000.00 in fines for failing to maintain a safe worksite after a 19 year old employee lost his arm while mixing paint. This is the highest fine levied in Alberta for a workplace accident that did not result in a fatality. Cloverdale pleaded guilty to a charge of failing to ensure the employee's safety by not providing him with formal training in the manufacturer's specifications on how to safely clean the dissolver.

The employee of nine (9) months had been instructed to mix a batch of ingredients in order to make industrial paint without supervision. The employee con-

tacted his supervisor by phone because he was having difficulties mixing the paint. The supervisor advised the employee to thin the paint by adding solvent.

Before adding the solvent, the employee stood on a pail to remove excess paint ingredients from the shaft of the 2,200 litre tank. The employee applied a rag with his gloved right hand to the spinning shaft and was instantly caught in the machine, which pulled him around the circumference of the vat multiple times. The employee ended up losing his entire right arm above the elbow.

This offence was the first for the company and it is likely that the fine would have been even greater had Cloverdale not entered an early guilty plea. Since the incident, Cloverdale has updated its procedures for safe operation of its paint-making facilities. ■

Ontario Police Officer Compensated for Onset of Delayed Stress

By Goldie Bassi, B.A., LL.B., LL.M.

The Workplace Safety and Insurance Tribunal (the "Tribunal") held that a long-term police officer was entitled to benefits for injuries related to post-traumatic stress disorder as a result of violent incidents suffered over a gradual period of time in relation to his policing duties dur-

ing the 1980's and 1990's. The traumatic incidents suffered by the officer included: discriminatory conduct from fellow officers; collision during a high-speed chase; chest injury inflicted by a knife; attack by a hostile crowd; and other high-stress events related to the performance of his duties.

continued on p. 3

Also in this OHSLAW™ Report

- New Brunswick Introduces Demerit System for OHS Violations, p. 2
- Bystanders Exposed to Asbestos are Being Affected, p. 3
- Ergonomic Injury Prevention Program Law in Ontario, p. 4
- Health and Safety Protection for Temporary Workers, p. 4
- Ontario Government Combating Underground Economy in Construction, p. 5
- Director and Company Fined for OHS Violation, p. 6
- Toronto Property Management Company Fined \$300,000, pg. 6
- Ontario MOL Reviewing Treatment of Firefighter Cancer Claims, p. 7

New Brunswick Introduces Demerit System for OHS Violations

By Elizabeth Rankin, B.A.Sc.

Imagine that an OHS officer enters your workplace and observes one of your employees working near the top of a 20 foot extension ladder without fall protection. It is the second time within one year he has seen this sort of infraction; he already issued an Order to the company a few months before. He immediately issues a stop work order and a compliance order to the company.

About two months later, the company receives notice that it has been assessed an Occupational Health and Safety ("OHS") Demerit in the amount of \$5,000, payable to the Workplace Health Safety and Compensation Commission ("WHSCC") immediately. No one was injured. No charges were laid. No court was involved.

Different jurisdictions across Canada are moving towards alternative means of enforcing OHS legislation. In New Brunswick, the WHSCC now has the authority, under the new OHS Demerits Policy, No. 2P-210 (the "policy"), which came into effect January 1, 2006, to issue an OHS Demerit to an employer in violation of its OHS legal responsibilities under the *Occupational Health and Safety Act* ("OHS").

The demerit is an additional assessment to an employer's WCB account and can range from a minimum of \$1,250 to a whopping \$25,000, based on the employer's assessable payroll. While no changes have been made to the *OHS Act* or regulations, the WHSCC can utilize the demerit

system to strictly enforce its zero tolerance policy, which requires strict interpretation of the legislation and increased use of stop work orders.

According to Michael McGovern, Legal Counsel for the WHSCC, the application of the demerit policy is given a very narrow window. Field staff have been given a written directive to bring forward certain kinds of cases to the attention of the Commission's Accident Review Committee (the "Committee"). In particular, cases where:

- the employer performs an unsafe work practice and there is a high risk of injury, illness or death under specific sections of the *OHS Act* and regulations regarding trenching, fall protection and lock out; or
- the employer engages in continued non-compliance with any section of the *OHS Act* for which an order has been issued within a 12-month period. The Committee determines whether to recommend prosecution, demerit or other action. Prosecution is considered where the infraction results in a fatality, serious injury or occupational disease. The Committee considers a number of factors:
 - whether the employer has an effective OHS program;
 - whether the employer has exercised due diligence with respect to the infraction;
 - whether the infraction was committed by a worker who has been properly instructed, trained and supervised;

- the potential seriousness and likelihood of the actual or potential injury or illness;
- the employer's past accident and compliance history;
- duration between non-compliance incidents and corrective action implemented;
- employer awareness of the hazard or non-compliance; and
- whether the employer knowingly or with reckless disregard violated one or more sections of the *OHS Act* or the Regulations.

The last point aligns somewhat with the test for criminal OHS liability under the Bill C-45 *Criminal Code* amendments.

If the Committee determines that a demerit is warranted, the employer is notified in writing and payment is deducted from the employer's WCB account in the full amount the following month. Failure to pay the demerit as required may result in collection via the regular collection stream, including interest. Continuing non-payment may result in judgement or seizure of assets. An employer who disagrees with the Committee's decision may appeal to the Tribunal and then to the Court of Appeal.

Currently, British Columbia is the only known province to issue OHS demerits. Gowlings will continue to monitor the use of these demerit systems, their effect on employers' compliance, and the potential effect they may have on OHS enforcement in other provinces and territories. ■

GOWLINGS

OHS PROFESSIONAL SERVICES REFERRAL PROGRAM

Your "one-stop" referral service for OHS and Workplace Safety and Insurance Board matters

Categories of Member Expertise

- Audiometric Testing
- Drug and Alcohol Testing
- Emergency Response Planning
- Engineering Services
- Environmental Services, Phase 1, 2, & 3
- Ergonomic Products & Services
- First Aid Training
- Hazard Specific Training & Services
- Hazardous Material Disposal
- Industrial Hygiene Services
- Personal Protective Equipment
- Pre-Start Health and Safety Reviews ("PSRs")
- Soil Remediation Services
- WHMIS Training and Related Services
- Workplace Harassment & Respect Training

www.gowlings.com/ohslaw

Police Officer Compensated for Stress

continued from p. 1

By the early 1990's, the officer was experiencing problems sleeping, which were exacerbated by re-occurring nightmares causing him to question his ability to remain on as patrol officer. Although the officer sought treatment for his condition, he did not communicate his problems to his employer. In 1994, the situation improved somewhat when the officer was moved from patrol work to community service.

In late 1999, the officer's problems re-emerged when he was advised that he would be reassigned to patrol work. Fearful of the violence and other problems associated with patrol work, the officer fell ill with severe psychological symptoms of post-traumatic stress disorder and filed a claim with the Workplace Safety Insurance Board (the "Board") for benefits in 2000 when he was unable to return to work.

As the traumatic events largely took place prior to the implementation of the new legislation, the *Workplace Safety and Insurance Act* ("WSIA"), the officer's claim was processed under the predecessor legislation, the *Worker's Compensation Act* ("WCA"). Unlike its successor, the WCA allowed entitlement to benefits for mental stress. However, the Board's operational policy 15-02-02 under the WSIA purported to be retroactive to January 1, 1989 and does not allow for benefits for gradual mental stress due to regular workplace conditions.

Policy 15-02-02 limits entitlement to benefits for stress-related injuries resulting from a series of events to those caused by "sudden and unexpected traumatic events", and where a worker has "an acute reaction to the most recent unexpected traumatic event". The officer's employer argued that the officer was not suffering from post-traumatic stress disorder, but rather from his unwillingness to do patrol work. The Board denied the officer's request for benefits.

The officer appealed to the Tribunal arguing that policy 15-02-02 could not retroactively apply to injuries predating the passage of the WSIA. The Tribunal allowed the appeal holding that there is "nothing in the legislation that explicitly authorizes the retroactive application of Board policy to the pre-1997 WCA". The Tribunal further held that the Board's attempt to retroactively apply the policy to the WCA was akin to amending the WCA after it had already been repealed. Since the WCA did not place a limit on claims for stress-related injuries, "policy cannot operate so as to achieve a different result from that set out under the applicable legislation."

Ultimately, the Tribunal ruled that the events suffered by the officer in the course of his employment were "sudden and unexpected traumatic events", and thus, he was entitled to compensation not only under the WCA, but also under Policy 15-02-02. ■

Bystanders Exposed to Asbestos are Being Affected

By Adam Neave, B.A.Sc.

Nine years ago, Tom O'Donnell's father died of lung cancer at the age of 76. This was the result of 25 years of asbestos exposure, at the now defunct Johns-Manville plant in Toronto.

Tom, now only 48 years old, is dying of mesothelioma, a form of lung cancer that targets the lining of the chest wall, whose only known cause is exposure to asbestos. His older sister and brother succumbed to the same disease in their 50's. The problem is, the O'Donnell children never worked with asbestos. Their only exposure to the harmful substance was the fibrous asbestos unknowingly carried home on their father's work clothes.

Bystander asbestos cases are becoming more frequent in Canada. As a result of the 35 to 40 year latency period associated with asbestos-related lung cancers, these children and spouses of asbestos workers of the 60's and 70's are now falling ill.

Jim Brophy, Executive Director of the Occupational Health Clinic for Ontario Workers ("OHCOW") in Sarnia, Ontario, is attempting to track the magnitude of the problem. According to Brophy, Canada is one of the few industrialized nations that does not have a national registry of workers with asbestos-related diseases. In Sarnia alone, OHCOW has tracked 109 people since 1998 who have shown signs of asbestos exposure, but for whom no workplace exposure existed.

There are likely to be bystander cases in Quebec, where asbestos has been mined, and in British Columbia and Alberta, where asbestos was used in industries ranging from petrochemical to shipping.

Unfortunately, there is little financial compensation for the growing group of bystander cases. Because their illness was not a result of workplace exposure as an employee, respective workers compensation schemes render these victims un-eligible for benefits. ■

FAQ

Ask the
OHS Legal Expert

You asked. We answered.

Q

I thought the new Confined Space Regulations applied to all workplaces in Ontario starting on September 30, 2006, but your article about Confined Space Regulations in OHS Canada states that it does not apply to diving operations, farms, or to workplaces governed by the four sector regulations. I'm confused, please help!

A

Read the answer at www.gowlings.com/ohslaw

Ergonomic Injury Prevention Program Law in Ontario?

By Elizabeth Rankin, B.A.Sc.

In an attempt to reduce the economic impact of ergonomic injuries to Ontario industry, Minister of Labour Steve Peters introduced the "Pains and Strains Campaign" at a press conference on January 26, 2006. The campaign came into effect April 1, 2006.

The initiative arose from recommendations of the MOL's Ergonomic Advisory Panel, which consisted of representatives from business and labour. The goal of the campaign is to reduce the high rate of injuries, lost time claims, and absenteeism related to musculoskeletal disorders ("MSDs") suffered in the workplace. The expected results are increased productivity and a strengthened economy.

Ontario Ministry of Labour ("MOL") inspectors will now focus on risk factors that lead to MSDs during inspections of high risk workplaces in the industrial and health care sectors. Later this year, inspectors will receive training in recognition of ergonomic risk factors and control methods. Inspectors will review an employer's WSIB claims experience with pains and strains and the preventative measures

taken. Inspectors will provide employers with an information sheet to outline ways to identify and prevent ergonomic injuries.

Considering that British Columbia and Saskatchewan are the only provinces that currently have ergonomic regulations, it will be interesting to see how the campaign will be enforced. While it is expected that the campaign is an awareness raising exercise, employers are expected to take reasonable precautions for the protection of a worker, as prescribed by section 25(2)(h) of the *Occupational Health and Safety Act* ("OHS"). With increased focus on the risk factors, enforcement may follow. The MOL information sheet notes, "Having a program to prevent MSDs in the workplace is not only the right thing to do; it's also the law."

The financial impact of ergonomic injuries to industry is staggering. The Bureau of Labour Statistics in the U.S. reported that ergonomic injuries accounted for four out of every ten work related lost-time injuries, at a cost of \$1.7 million per year. Similarly, a study of 28,000 working adults by the Journal of the American Medical Association ("JAMA") found that workers who suffered MSDs were not

recovering from their injuries at home. They were often at work, but suffered lost productivity due to common pains, resulting in losses of \$61.2 billion/year. An average loss of 4.6 hours/week was logged as reduced performance.

In Canada, Dr. Heather Tick, Clinical Director of the RSI Clinic in Toronto, stated in an article in Canadian OHS Magazine that the best way to combat the hidden costs of musculoskeletal pain is to fix problems in the workplace.

According to the MOL Information Sheet, MSDs account for 42% of all lost time claims, 42% of all lost time costs, and 50% of all lost time days. Between 1996 and 2004, the WSIB approved more than 382,000 MDS related claims, which accounted for 27 million lost time days and direct costs of more than \$3.3 billion.

Gowlings OHS consultants can assist in reviewing your company's current ergonomic injury prevention program to ensure it meets a reasonable standard of due diligence and can provide recommendations that can help cut your company's financial losses related to MSDs. ■

Health and Safety Protection for Temporary Workers

By Kathryn Fisher, B.A.Sc.

Numerous accidents involving temporary workers have prompted Manitoba's Workplace Safety and Health Division ("WSHD") to reiterate the responsibility placed upon employers to take precautions to protect the health and safety of these workers.

Temporary workers are usually hired on a short-term basis (days, weeks or months at a time) and may be needed on short notice, such as to replace a sick employee, cover vacation time, or to meet increased production demands. It has been found that some temporary workers are not receiving adequate instruction, training and supervision for the work they have been hired to complete.

Not surprisingly, the lack of knowledge of the hazards workers may face and

what they should and should not do in the workplace has led to accidents. The temporary placement agencies that provide the temporary workers and the companies who hire them both have a responsibility as the employers to ensure workers are fully equipped to carry out the intended job safely.

Manitoba's WSHD says that temporary placement agencies must provide a safety orientation to workers, instruct workers on their health and safety rights and responsibilities and the importance of receiving training prior to completing a task, and must ensure workers are capable of carrying out the assigned job (i.e. no physical restrictions).

Agencies must also ensure the company where the temporary worker is assigned to provide a workplace orientation and job-specific training. The companies that hire the temporary workers are

required to provide a workplace-specific orientation, task-specific training, provide necessary personal protective equipment and materials, ensure competent supervision is provided, and ensure workers understand the expectations and limitations of carrying out the job. Often times workers are told what to do but not told what not to do, and the act they should not have done is what causes the accident.

Temporary placement agencies should not rely on the hiring companies to bear the burden of providing workers with the tools and information to complete the job safely and vice versa. Although it may be considered time consuming and costly to ensure these requirements are met for workers that may be gone in a few weeks or months and there is an urgency to fill the position, it may be more costly if an accident and/or prosecution results. ■

Ontario Government Combating Underground Economy in Construction

By David Marchione, B.A.

The Ontario government has released a consultation paper to help uncover the underground economy and promote health and safety in the construction industry. The consultation paper proposes an extension of mandatory workplace safety and insurance coverage to most people who work in construction. The government has stated its commitment to levelling the playing field for business and protecting the health and safety of workers.

Currently, all construction companies who hire workers must register with the Workplace Safety and Insurance Board ("WSIB") in Ontario and pay premiums on behalf of their workers. Independent operators, sole proprietors, partners and executive officers may choose whether they want coverage. This represents a significant portion of the overall workforce in the construction industry.

It is a common practice in the construction industry for persons to self-declare independent operator status, and decline optional coverage under the *Workplace Safety and Insurance Act* ("WSIA") to avoid paying premiums. By doing this, employers are relieved of WSIB costs, and may also avoid adhering to other employer obligations under the *Employment Standards Act*, including contributions to the Canada Pension Plan and Employment Insurance, and administering source deductions

under the *Income Tax Act*. In case of a workplace injury, however, many who have declared themselves as independent operators may claim for WSIB benefits, although no premiums have been paid on their behalf.

The current system creates opportunities for those who do not register with the WSIB to undercut legitimate businesses who register and pay premiums on behalf of their workers. Those who do register and pay premiums, fund the costs of paying for accidents sustained by those for whom premiums were not paid. As well, it puts workers at risk, as those employers who avoid paying premiums, taxes and other fees may be cutting other corners as well.

The government is considering introducing a Bill that, if passed, would amend the WSIA to extend mandatory coverage to all independent operators, sole proprietors, partners in a partnership and executive officers of a corporation carrying on business in construction. This mandatory coverage would not extend to "handypersons" doing work on a periodic or casual basis at a private residence.

The Bill would set out the potential liability and obligations for a "principal" (i.e. the person engaging the services of a contractor or subcontractor to do construction work). The principal may be liable for the payment obligations of those contractors and subcontractors who work for the principal, unless he or she obtains a clear-

ance certificate issued by the WSIB showing that the contractor or subcontractor has registered and complied with the payment obligations under the WSIA. This liability would not apply to construction work being done at a private residence, if it is occupied, or will be occupied by the person who hires a contractor to do construction work (i.e. a homeowner) or their family members.

The proposed Bill would also require employers in construction to provide the WSIB with detailed information about their workers, similar to a 'named insured' registration system. This system would require all persons working in construction to be identified to the WSIB, either as a worker on an employer's payroll, or as an independent operator with the WSIB, and to have an approved identification card available for inspection while at work.

The government is requesting comments, suggestions and input about the proposed Bill. For more information, or to provide any input, visit the Ministry of Labour website at www.labour.gov.on.ca. Gowlings lawyers and consultants are available to assist. ■



NEW!



A Practical Guide to Occupational Health and Safety Compliance in Ontario, Third Edition

Norman A. Keith and Elizabeth Rankin

Updated to include new legislative changes, case law, Bill C-45 and occupational health and safety professional practice

Order your copy today!

Approx. 200 pp • April 2006 • \$69

For more information or to order, visit www.gowlings.com/ohslaw

Director and Company Fined for OHS Violation

By Kathryn Fisher, B.A.Sc.

Premier Pallet Repair Ltd., an Ontario-based company that manufactures wooden pallets, was recently convicted under the *Occupational Health and Safety Act* ("OHSA") for a non-accident health and safety violation. Somewhat surprisingly, a director of the company was also convicted for the violation.

The charges stemmed from an Order that was issued to the company by a Ministry of Labour ("MOL") Inspector when the Inspector discovered during his inspection of the plant that the company did not have any documented inspection logs for two of its forklifts. According to Ontario's Regulation for Industrial Establishments, forklifts must be inspected at least annually and inspection records must be maintained. The Order that was issued required an inspection to be completed by a specified date. The forklifts had not been inspected at the time of the follow-up inspection by the MOL, which subsequently resulted in the charges.

The company plead guilty to failing to ensure the forklifts were inspected as required by the regulation and failing to comply with the MOL Order. The director plead guilty to failing to take all reasonable care to ensure the company complied with the Order, one of the duties for directors and officers under the OHSA. The fines for the company and director were \$22,500 and \$2,500, respectively.

Prosecutions against corporations for conditions that have not resulted in injury or illness are becoming more commonplace. This seems to be keeping with Ontario MOL's plan to reduce workplace accidents by 20% as of 2008. The fact that the director of the company was also charged and convicted further demonstrates the aggressive stand the MOL is taking. Corporations should ensure all levels of personnel, including senior management, are familiar with their duties and responsibilities under the OHSA. ■

Toronto Property Management Company Fined \$300,000 for Health and Safety Violation

By David Marchione, B.A.

GWL Realty Advisors ("GWL") was fined \$300,000 on April 18, 2006 for a violation of Ontario's *Occupational Health and Safety Act* ("OHSA"), which resulted in the death of a worker.

GWL manages a property at 200 University Avenue in Toronto, on behalf of the building's owners. GWL hired a company, Trade Services Inc., to paint doors and trim. Trade Services Inc., hired three independent contractors to complete the work. On December 18, 2003, a painter was seen painting an entrance door to a loading dock a short time before a loud noise was heard from a nearby elevator shaft. The painter was found on a metal floor in the basement at the bottom of the shaft, one story below the loading dock area. The painter was taken to the hospital with a serious head injury and died the following day.

The Ministry of Labour investigation found that the elevator shaft was no longer in use. Normally, a double set of doors to the shaft were kept locked with a dead-bolt lock. However, two days prior to this accident, a maintenance contractor had unlocked and opened them. The doors had been relocked afterwards, but it is possible that the doors were not closed properly. When the painter was found in the shaft, the doors were opened. The deadbolt was sticking out from the side of the elevator as though it had been previ-

ously locked. There was no indication that the doors had been forced open.

The Ministry of Labour also found that there was no guardrail in the doorway of the elevator shaft, and no signs on or near the elevator doors warning of the decommissioned elevator.

GWL pleaded guilty, as an employer, to failing to take all reasonable precautions reasonable in the circumstances for the protection of a worker, contrary to section 25(2)(h) of the OHSA. The \$300,000 fine is also subject to a 25 percent victim fine surcharge, as required under the *Provincial Offences Act*.

Companies or individuals who contract for the services of others are defined as employers under the OHSA, and are responsible for the health and safety of the contractors they employ. It is recommended that any company that hires contractors have a written Control of Contractors policy and procedure in place. This procedure should define roles and responsibilities for the hiring, supervision and training of contractors, in order to minimize the risk of exposure under the OHSA.

The maximum fine for a corporation under the OHSA is \$500,000. For individuals, the maximum penalty is a fine of \$25,000 and/or 12 months imprisonment. Gowlings OHS Consultants are available to assist in reviewing and creating Control of Contractors procedures. ■

GOWLINGS

FREE BREAKFAST SEMINAR

Confined Spaces

MOL's New Regulatory Requirements

June 21, 2006 • 8:30 am - 9:45 am

Gowlings Office, Bay St. & King St. W, Toronto, Ontario

Hear from **Norm Keith**, B.A., LL.B., CRSP and **Elizabeth Rankin**, B.A.Sc.
and learn about your new duties, obligations and liabilities

Space is limited. Register online at www.gowlings.com/ohslaw

Ontario MOL Reviewing Treatment of Firefighter Cancer Claims

By Elizabeth Rankin, B.A.Sc.

Ontario Minister of Labour, Steve Peters, has directed his parliamentary assistant, Mario Racco, to undertake a comprehensive review of the Workplace Safety and Insurance Board's policies dealing with treatment of firefighter cancer claims and to compile an inventory of the most up to date scientific literature.

Mr. Racco will meet with officials from the Occupational Disease Research and Policy Branch of the WSIB, the chair and members of the Research Advisory Council of the WSIB, employer representatives and representatives of the Professional Firefighters' Association.

His report is expected to be delivered on July 15, 2006. ■

Your
One-Stop
for
OHS & WSIB
Professional
Services



GOWLINGS

Training Services

- Scheduled Public Courses
- In-House Courses

Consulting Services

- Workwell Audit Assistance
- Compliance Audits, Assessments and Evaluations
- Workers' Compensation Claims Management
- Policy & Program Development
- Policy & Program Implementation
- Emergency Response
- General Consulting

Legal Services

- Legal defence of charges under OHS law across Canada
- Counsel and advice during an OHS Regulatory incident investigation
- Appeal of OHS Regulatory Inspector's Orders
- Labour Relations Board safety and related hearings
- Arbitration of OHS matters relating to work refusals and worker discipline

www.gowlings.com/ohslaw

The Gowlings National OHS Team

Legal Inquiries:

Norm Keith, B.A., LL.B., CRSP
Partner
1-866-862-5787 ext. 85699
norm.keith@gowlings.com

Training & Consulting Inquiries:

Olga Jordache, B.B.A.
OHS Practice Coordinator
1-866-862-5787 ext. 83580
olga.jordache@gowlings.com

Subscriptions:

To start receiving this free electronic newsletter, please visit our website and subscribe online.

Website:

www.gowlings.com/ohslaw

Goldie Bassi, B.A., LL.B., LL.M.
Associate, Toronto

Thierry Carriere, B.C.L.
Associate, Montreal

Kathryn Fisher, B.A.Sc.
OHS Consultant, Toronto

Edward Majewski, B.A., LL.B.
Associate, Waterloo

David Marchione, B.A.
OHS Consultant, Toronto

Adam Neave, B.A.Sc.
OHS Consultant, Toronto

Kim Nutz, B.A., LL.B.
Associate, Calgary

Elizabeth Rankin, B.A.Sc.
OHS Consultant, Toronto

Elisa Scali, LL.B.
Associate, Ottawa

Shana Wolch, B.A., LL.B.
Associate, Calgary

Eric Wredenhagen, B.A., M.A., LL.B.
Partner, Vancouver