

OPEN ACCESS

ISSN 2280-4056

*E-Journal of
International and Comparative*

LABOUR STUDIES

Volume 1, No. 1-2 March-June 2012



ADAPT
www.adapt.it
UNIVERSITY PRESS

Scientific Directors

Lauren Appelbaum (USA), Greg Bamber (Australia), Daria V. Chernyaeva (Russia), Richard Croucher (United Kingdom), Maurizio del Conte (Italy), Tomas Davilus (Lithuania), Tayo Fashoyin (Nigeria), József Hajdu (Hungary), Ann Hodges (USA), Richard Hyman (United Kingdom), Maarten Keune (The Netherlands), Chris Leggett (Australia), Shinya Ouchi (Japan), Massimo Pilati (Italy), Michael Quinlan (Australia), Juan Raso Delgue (Uruguay), Raúl G. Saco Barrios (Peru), Alfredo Sánchez Castaneda (Mexico), Malcolm Sargeant (United Kingdom), Jean-Michel Servais (Belgium), Silvia Spattini (Italy), Michele Tiraboschi (Italy), Anil Verma (Canada), Stephen A. Woodbury (USA)

Joint Managing Editors

Malcolm Sargeant (Middlesex University, United Kingdom)
Michele Tiraboschi (University of Modena and Reggio Emilia, Italy)

Editorial Board

Lilli Casano (Italy), Francesca Fazio (Italy), Emanuele Ferragina (United Kingdom), Antonio Firinu (Italy), Valentina Franca (Slovenia), Maria Giovannone (Italy), Erica Howard (United Kingdom), Karl Koch (United Kingdom), Lefteris Kretsos (United Kingdom), Attila Kun (Hungary), Felicity Lamm (New Zealand), Cristina Lincaru (Romania), Nikita Lyutov (Russia), Merle Muda (Estonia), Boaz Munga (Kenya), Eleonora Peliza (Argentina), Daiva Petrylaite (Lithuania), Valeria Pulignano (Belgium), Ceciel Rayer (The Netherlands), Aidan Regan (Ireland), Marian Rizov (United Kingdom), Salma Slama (Tunisia), Francesca Sperotti (Italy), Araya Mesele Welemariam (Ethiopia), Barbara Winkler (Austria), Machilu Zimba (South Africa)

Language Editor

Pietro Manzella (ADAPT Senior Research Fellow)

Book Review Editor

Chris Leggett (James Cook University, Australia)

Digital Editor

Avinash Raut (ADAPT Technologies)

The Right to Strike in Canada: Comment on a Recent Saskatchewan Court Decision

Roy J. Adams *

In the past decade the Supreme Court of Canada (SCC) has handed down a series of labour decisions that have amazed many and have infuriated some.¹ Those decisions have attracted praise in some quarters but much criticism in others. Perhaps the most prevalent condition that they have elicited is confusion or as one SCC judge characterized it: bewilderment.² In his recent decision regarding the Saskatchewan Public Service Essential Service Act, Justice Dennis Ball has done the community a huge service by addressing many of the issues contributing to this turmoil.³ Although Freedom of Association is considered globally to be a human right that, in the context of work, includes the right to organize without interference, the right to bargain collectively and the right to strike, in Canada the latter two rights had no constitutional protection until 2007, when the Supreme Court overturned 20 years of jurisprudence by “constitutionalising” collective bargaining.⁴ However by refusing to accept the common Canadian notion that the term collective bargaining is a process inextricably bound to the Wagner-Act model of labour legislation that prevails across Canada, it left many perplexed. The Supreme Court’s Fraser decision, which split the court in several directions, muddled the

* Roy J. Adams is Ariel F. Sallows Chair of Human Rights Emeritus, University of Saskatchewan and Professor of Industrial Relations Emeritus, McMaster University, Canada.

¹ *Dunmore v. Ontario (Attorney General)*, 2001 SCC 94; *Health Services and Support—Facilities Subsector Bargaining Assn. v. British Columbia*, 2007 SCC 27 and *Ontario (Attorney General) v. Fraser*, 2011 SCC 20.

² In her opinion in *Fraser v. Ontario*, Deschamps, J. declared that the BC Health Services decision “caused some bewilderment” (par. 297).

³ *Saskatchewan Federation of Labour v. Saskatchewan* 2012 SKQB 62.

⁴ R. J. Adams, *From Statutory Right to Human Right: The Evolution and Current Status of Collective Bargaining*, in *Just Labour*, 2008, Vol. 12, 48-67.

water even more. Particularly frustrating to many was the refusal by the SCC to clarify the status of “the right to strike.”

A major device used by Justice Ball to cut through the confusion was to closely tie dissenting opinions issued by then Chief Justice Dickson in the 1980s, to the reasoning of the majority of the present court. In essence Justice Ball treated the Dickson dissents (in the trilogy of cases that addressed the right to strike, of which the most often referred to is the dissent in the Alberta Reference) as if they had become an integral part of the rationale of the present court.⁵ Since the current SCC majority has relied heavily on those dissenting opinions and has, in fact, either used directly or paraphrased many of Justice Dickson’s notions, that is not an unreasonable approach. Had the SCC majority (as constituted during recent cases) squarely addressed the right to strike it most likely, it seems to me, would have reasoned much like Justice Ball.

From the perspective he adopted, Judge Ball was easily able to show us that the right to strike is essential to meaningful collective bargaining. In his Alberta Reference dissent, after an extensive review of the importance of collective bargaining as an essential element of democratic society (using language later paraphrased by the current SCC majority) Dickson CJ said “[...] effective constitutional protection of the associational interests of employees in the collective bargaining process requires concomitant protection of their freedom to withdraw collectively their services, subject to s. 1 of the Charter.”⁶ That statement is crystal clear and free of all ambiguity.

Justice Ball also addresses directly arguments put forth by counsel for the Saskatchewan government in defence of its legislation. Those arguments reflect criticism that has been put forth by various pundits subsequent to the Health Services and Fraser cases.⁷ Justice Ball considers those arguments and effectively refutes them.

Adopting a spin that has been promoted by some government and management-side lawyers, the Saskatchewan Government argued that the Fraser case “represented a substantial retreat” from Health Services and

⁵ The most widely quoted minority opinion of Dickson C.J. was made in Reference to the Public Service Employee Relations Act (Alberta) [1987] 1 S.C.R., 313, 38 D.L.R. (4th) 161. Referred to as Alberta Reference. The other two decisions were Saskatchewan v. R.W.D.S.U., Locals 544, 496, 635 and 955 [1987] 1 S.C.R. 460, 38 D.L.R. (4th) 277 and PSAC v. Canada [1987] 1 S.C.R. 424, 38 D.L.R. (4th) 249.

⁶ Alberta Reference par. 98.

⁷ For an extensive consideration and critique of those positions see A. Bogg and K. Ewing, *A (Muted) Voice at Work? Collective Bargaining in the Supreme Court of Canada*, in Comparative Labor Law and Policy Journal, 2012, forthcoming.

that it replaced “bargaining” in “collective bargaining” with something akin to “listening” or perhaps “consulting.” The government also asserted that “applicants claiming that laws violate s. 2(d)” must demonstrate that the impugned laws make their ability to associate “substantially impossible” rather than meeting the less onerous “substantial interference” standard established in *Health Services*. And finally the government notes that the SCC has never “explicitly recognized a constitutional right to strike” and thus the Saskatchewan court should not do that.⁸

Justice Ball firmly rejected that position. The “Government of Saskatchewan’s interpretation of what was decided in *Fraser*,” he says, “cannot be correct.” If it were “it would mean that the SCC said one thing in *Health Services* and something different in *Fraser*. It would mean that s. 2(d) protections for collective action to achieve work place goals amount to nothing more than meaningless paper rights...” (par. 90)

He goes on unequivocally to state: “I do not accept that in *Fraser* the SCC resiled from its position in *Health Services*, nor do I accept that the decision in *Fraser* is in any way incompatible with recognition of a right to strike as a fundamental freedom under s. 2(d) of the Charter”. He accepts at face value the statement by the SCC majority in *Fraser* that:

Health Services is grounded in precedent, consistent with Canadian values, consistent with Canada’s international commitments and consistent with this Court’s purposive and generous interpretation of other Charter guarantees. (par. 91)

The SCC did not refrain from addressing the right to strike because there was any doubt that it deserved constitutional protection, but rather because it was not at issue in the cases put before it. In both *Health Services* and *Fraser* “the court explicitly states that it was not dealing with the issue of the right to strike” (par. 92).

In effect Justice Ball firmly rejects the minority opinion of Supreme Court Justice Rothstein (supported by Justice Charron) in *Fraser* asserting that *Health Services* was wrongly decided and that the pre-*Health Services* status quo should be reinstated. Without directly confronting the Rothstein opinion, Justice Ball in effect considers the points made in that decision and rejects them.⁹ The Ball decision is thus a setback to those

⁸ SFL v. Saskatchewan 2012 SKQB 62, par. 87.

⁹ The extensive Rothstein dissent in *Fraser v. Ontario (Attorney General)* is presented at paras 119-296.

seeing a ray of hope in Rothstein's opinion that this annoying "human rights" aberration from settled labour policy might go away.

In short, this decision goes a long way in clearing up the "bewilderment" of the Canadian labour community around the implications of recent Supreme Court decisions. If it withstands appeal, the three key aspects of the universal human right to freedom of association at work (the right to organize, the right to bargain collectively and the right to strike) will have become firmly embedded as constitutional rights of all Canadians.¹⁰

Despite its many positives, the Ball decision does not get us all the way down the road to where we need to be. Drawing heavily on Justice Dickson, Judge Ball firmly concluded that the full range of international labour law is applicable to Canada (see par. 100-114). That was the correct conclusion, I believe. The problem is that too few Canadian lawyers, professors, trade unionists or government officials understand international labour law and its implications. Indeed, Justice Ball reveals his own inadequate understanding of that body of law when arriving at his opinion on the constitutional status of the Saskatchewan Trade Union Act.

In rejecting the view that Health Services requires legislatures to enact an "elaborate legislative superstructure" he says "what is required is a rudimentary structure that protects the essential components of collective bargaining". No problem, so far, but he then goes on to say that among the "basic elements" of such legislation would "likely" be "an assessment of the freely expressed wishes of the majority concerning a bargaining representative" and "a requirement that the employer bargain exclusively with that representative". Although Justice Ball weakly says that "these are not necessarily elements derived from a Wagner Act model," he seems to be unaware of the relevant international law (par. 263). That law clearly says that governments may not make majoritarian exclusivity a minimum condition for collective bargaining recognition.¹¹

What this implies, it seems to me, is that a great deal of learning still needs to take place in Canada. Much work needs to be done before we begin to approach a legal environment (as well as an on-the-ground reality) that fully respects the universal human rights of Canadian workers.

¹⁰ The Saskatchewan government appealed the decision on 5 March 2012.

¹¹ See Freedom of Association, Digest of Decision and Principles of the Freedom of Association, Committee of the Governing Body of the ILO, 5th revised edition, International Labour Office, Geneva, 2006, par. 974-980 regarding the Rights of Minority Unions.

Adapt International Network



ADAPT is a non-profit organisation founded in 2000 by Prof. Marco Biagi with the aim of promoting studies and research in the field of labour law and industrial relations from an international and comparative perspective. Our purpose is to encourage and implement a new approach to academic research, by establishing ongoing relationships with other universities and advanced studies institutes, and promoting academic and scientific exchange programmes with enterprises, institutions, foundations and associations. In collaboration with the Marco Biagi Centre for International and Comparative Studies, ADAPT set up the International School of Higher Education in Labour and Industrial Relations, a centre of excellence which is accredited at an international level for research, study and postgraduate programmes in the area of industrial and labour relations. Further information at www.adapt.it.

For further information about the E-journal and to submit a paper, please send a mail to LS@adapt.it.