No Forced Union Membership or Dues for Politics:

It's a Human Right
The European Experience

Jan Södergren

J. Södergren Advokatbyrå AB

LabourWatch 2007 Speaking Tour

September 27 – October 5, 2007

MEMBER OF WHAT?

- Unionized workplace collective agreement
- Employees are "members" of a bargaining unit
- BUT, are they also "Members" of the union?
- If yes, are they voluntary or forced members by law or collective agreement?

HAS ITS PRIVILEGES!

- To run/vote for union president or other office
 To participate in ratification/strike votes
 To be disciplined/fined (can union collect?)
 To lose "Membership"
 To lose your job for loss of "Membership"
- To lose your job for loss of "Membership" (some provinces have some protections)
- Most allow loss of job for loss of "Membership" for non-payment of dues

UNION DUES

NOT the same issue as membership

Almost all unionized Canadians pay full dues Why?

Dues "check-off" in labour codes and collective agreements

Dues of non-members of union can be used for political & other non-bargaining unit purposes

TERMINOLGY DIFFERENCES "unionized" & "closed shop"

Sweden/"Europe"

Term not really used

If it was: unionized = actual members of the union - only

Not unionized = nonmembers & those not covered by a CA at all Canada/US

Both members & nonmembers covered by a collective agreement

How Canadian labour experts define "closed shop" may NOT be the same as the European Court of Human Rights

SUPREME COURT OF CANADA

2 KEY CASES

Advance Cutting & Coring (2001): Clearly read right of non-association into Charter, said Quebec forced membership a violation but allowed under Sec. 1 of Charter due to history of union violence and vandalism in the Quebec construction sector.

Lavigne (1991): Effectively upheld compulsory dues, used for "non-collective bargaining purposes", including for political purposes as reasonable limits under Section 1 of *Charter*. Membership for Lavigne was voluntary based on a Rand Formula agency shop clause. Existence and scope of freedom to not associate very uncertain.

AGENDA/OBJECTIVES

Overview European political and Court system

Summarize European history of:

End of closed shop – forced membership

NOTE: <u>Definition of closed shop in Canada & Europe</u> not necessarily the same

•End of <u>non-member</u> dues for politics & other non-bargaining purposes

Compare to Canadian situation & Supreme Court cases

SWEDEN, EU & CANADA STATS

EU

CANADA

GDP:

\$290 billion*

\$13.08 trillion*

\$1.181 trillion*

Per Cap:

\$32,200*

\$29,900*

\$35,600*

Pop:

9,031,088**

490,426,060**

33,390,141**

COE Pop:

none

n/a

806,595,500**

11

Provs:

Founded: June 6, 1523

1992 +(Treaty of Maastricht)

1 July 1, 1867 2 December 2, 1981 3 April 17, 1982

CIA World Factbook Data

- 2006 and \$US
- ** 2007
- + EU roots go back to 1951

1 – British North America Act 2 – Repatriation of Canadian Constitution 3 - Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms

BANNED – COUNCIL OF EUROPE (47 member countries)

Closed shops:

Post-entry (working & clause comes in)

Young, James and Webster (1981)

<u>Pre-entry</u> (member before or must join to work)

Sørensen & Rasmussen
 v. Denmark (2006)

Union dues from non-members:

For political purposes & other non-bargaining purposes

 Evaldsson and Others v. Sweden (2007)

"UNIONIZATION" (2005)

Canada

32% - Total

19% - Private sector

71% - Public sector

Sweden

"80%"

Swedes join unions!

Other Countries

90-100% - Austria & Belgium

78% - Denmark

67% - Germany

36% - UK

US - 8% Private - 40% Public Sector

9.6% - France but 90% of workforce impacted by collective bargaining – but not members of unions

Fraser Institute for Canadian and US data Eurofound for European Data

LOSING MEMBERS

Sweden

Denmark

Blue collar unions lost 97,000 & white collar 40,000

Members under age 25:

1994: 77 %

- 2007: 52 %

Decreasing due to government measures re cost of being a union members and end of forced membership Blue collar unions lost 140,000 in last 10 years:

 Membership from 84.6% in 1994 to 81.7% in 2001 to 78.5% in 2005

Workers under 30:

 Since 1995 a 40% drop from 471,000 to 284,000

UK

From 13 million in 1979 to just over 6 million today. Forced membership ended starting in 1981

REFORM IN EUROPE

- Mostly not the result of political will but in spite of
- Litigation by employees 1976 2007, two venues:
- European Court of Human Rights
- European Social Committee
- Role in European judgments of Art. 20 (2) of UN Declaration of Human Rights:
- "No one may be compelled to belong to an association"

EUROPEAN BODIES



COUNCIL OF EUROPE (COE)

Founded '49 - wake of WWII

22 member countries, today 47

Principal focus: Human and social rights

European Convention on Human Rights (1950)

European Court of Human Rights

European Social Charter

Social Committee

EUROPEAN UNION (EU)

Founded '51 - wake of WWII

6 member countries, today 27

Principal focus: trans-border economic activities

Legislative powers

European Court of Justice

EUROPEAN COURT OF HUMAN RIGHTS & THE CONVENTION

THE COURT

THE CONVENTION

Individual & inter-state complaints (collapsing under its success)

Declatory judgments, awarding damages & costs

May order general measures that change national law

Human Rights

- Rights of association, conscience, opinion (Art. 11, 9, 10)
- Right of possession or property rights (Art. 1 of Protocol No. 1)

Labour law a sensitive social area left for member countries to decide – at least 47 labour codes for 47 countries

SOCIAL CHARTER & SOCIAL COMMITTEE

SOCIAL CHARTER

Social and human rights - including:

Express right to organize unions - Art. 5

Social Committee has decided Social Charter Art. 5 also includes right to not associate

SOCIAL COMMITTEE

Rule on collective complaints from NGO's & organizations – actio popularis

NOT a venue for "victims"

Bi-annual reporting

Committee of Ministers adopts resolutions "recommending" measures to achieve compliance

YOUNG, JAMES & WEBSTER v. UK (1981)



Legislation changed to allow post-entry closed shop collective agreements. Employer signs one on a renewal. Some employees opposed to union political agenda. Applicants refused to join; employer fired per union

- Judgment's effect: right of non-association even though it had been specifically considered and left out of Convention.
- Did not rule on all forms of closed shops, just post-entry
- Loss of livelihood struck at the very substance of freedom of association
- Other rights noted as factors: conscience and opinion (Art. 9 and 10)

SIGURJONSSON v. ICELAND (1993)

Taxi driver compelled member of professional organization. Applicant stopped paying membership fees, he did not share view on limiting competition. Expelled and lost license.



- Repetition of *Young* ruling re post-entry, but not a union and not clear cut post-entry; might be pre- entry case
- After adoption of legislation confirming compulsion he rejoined "Frami"
- ECHR no jurisdiction to rule on the issue of expulsion, but could rule on the compulsion to join
- Court found Art. 11 violation since applicant faced the dilemma of joining organization or no work. Also noted right of conscience and opinon (Art. 9 and 10) as factor

SWEDISH LABOUR LAW

Master agreements

Substitute agreements



No domestic statue protecting freedom from forced association

No restrictions on using dues of non-members for political purposes & non-bargaining unit purposes



COUNCIL OF EUROPE SOCIAL COMMITTEE ACTIONS

- Played a key role in the ending of 10,000 to 15,000 Swedish closed shops (in substitute agreements)
- 4 reports of violations in 14 years 1988-2002
- Some closed shops eliminated
- 2002: Collective complaint by the confederation of Swedish Enterprises (employers)
- 2003: Social Committee demands full resolution by next Report in 2005

SWEDISH GOVERNMENT REACTION

- Closed shop issue should be solved through "dialogue"
- 2003: Minister of Industry invited parties for talks - he is "satisfied by the progress"
- 2004: Minister invited again, employer organization refused to attend - further talks "useless", want legislation

· May 30, 2005: Problems solved when Sweden reported that all "15,000" closed shop clauses are gone

Ingen lagstiftning mot Byggnads organisationskra

Arbetslivsministern nöjd med successiv avveckling.

Europarådet klandra svenska byggnadsavta

gens tidning, for-

Svenskt Näringsliv tackar nej till nya samtal med Hans Karisson

SWEDISH GOVERNMENT REACTION

WAGE MONITORING FEES

Minister Karlsson (2003) in med (2003) in med (2003)

ans Karlsgnads har kontroverinnebär att petare kan

for attiett - det gör

lets sociala son lätt på.

rättade i onsdagens tidning, förstår han inte alls.

Europarådets ministerkommitté, som är den slutliga instansen, ville i sitt uttalande från den 24 september inte fälla Sverige för kränkning av de mänskliga rättig-

heterna eftersom arbetet med att rensa ut organisationsklausulerna redan har påbörjats.

Karlsson

Hans Karlsson har haft möten med Byggnads, som gör bedömhandlar om kan bytas ut på två år.

Han anser att facket hade goda skäl för att en gång i tiden införa organisationsklausulerna. De var viktiga för att värna om medlemmarnas jobb och motverka lönedumpning. Men han säger att "normen är en annan nu" och han har också respekt för arbetsgivarnas hållning att klausulerna bör försvinna.

-De har också sina legitima intressen, jag kan inte fördöma det.

Granskningsarvodena, som arbetsgivarna också ifrågasätter, är genom beskedet från Europarådet närmast en icke-fråga, anser arbetslivsministern.

CECILIA JACOBSSON

The issue of monitoring fees, also questioned by the employers, is, after the decision of the Committee of Ministers, is a non-issue

Although *Evaldsson* case on dues pending before the European Court of Human Rights

SØRENSEN & RASMUSSEN v. DENMARK (2006)

Sørensen

- University student applied for job, to last 10 weeks
- Job application required union membership
- Sørensen opposed union's political agenda
- Refused to pay membership fees, lost membership; fired
- Danish Supreme Court had banned post-entry, but not pre-entry
- Sørensen aware of requirement before employment, Danish Court ruled in favour of union pre-entry okay

<u>Rasmussen</u>

- Confederation union member but did not support political affiliations
- Resigned & joined a Christian union
- After period of unemployment offered job conditional on joining Confederation union
- · He took the job, rejoined but still did not support its' political affiliations
- Applies to European Court of Human Rights claiming violation

EUROPEAN COURT OF HUMAN RIGHTS Sørensen Grand Chamber Judgment

- Did not address equality of negative & positive freedom of association; but did not exclude possibility they are equal
- Found no reason to distinguish between post & pre-entry
- Recognised personal autonomy as a principle of Convention's guarantees
- Danish Government argued applicants merely subscribing to a "non-political membership". Court responded:

"...it is to be observed that such "non-political membership" does not entail any reduction in the payment of the membership fee to the specific trade union. In any event, there is no guarantee that "non-political membership" will not give rise to some form of indirect support for the political parties to which the specific trade union contributes financially."

Art. 11 applicable, next question: interference justified?

EUROPEAN COURT Of HUMAN RIGHTS Sørensen Grand Chamber Judgment

Danish Government had a hard time justifying system

Court found little need for closed shops in modern society since trade unions have grown to be strong organizations

"...there is little support . . . for the maintenance of closed shop agreements...and that their use in the labour market is not an indispensable tool for the effective enjoyment of trade-union freedoms."

Conclusion – The end of closed shops in 47 COE countries

EVALDSSON v. SWEDEN (2007)

- Master Agreement, construction sector, union monitored member
 non-member wages for fee of 1.5 %
- Monitored piece-work & time-salary; latter easier less expensive
- 5 unorganized employees (non-members) of 8 total directed employer to stop deductions. Employer complied
- Union claimed violation of Master Agreement
- Employer organization applied to the Swedish Labour Court claiming violation of the right not to associate - Art. 11
- Labour Court cited *Young*, found no compulsion as non-members did not become members merely by paying the monitoring fees
- Labour Court avoided issue of whether the system generated a surplus for the union

EVALDSSON JUDGMENT

Court found violation based on right of possession – (property rights)

Court declined to rule on freedoms: from forced association, conscience & opinion



Court found entitlement to verification that fees or dues collected by union corresponded to union's costs of representation:

"This was even more important as they had to pay the fees against their will to an organization with a political agenda which they did not support."

CONCLUSIONS EVALDSSON

Mere suspicion "dues" used for non-bargaining purposes (political, social, etc) was enough to find violation

Transparent accounting to non-members required if clues imposed on non-members

Lack of information violated human right to Peaceful Enjoyment of Possessions (property rights)

Evaldsson & Sørensen together render union dues imposed on non-members for non-bargaining purposes illegal under European Convention on Human Rights

FINAL REMARKS

UN Declaration of Human Rights not yet a Canadian reality. "No one may be compelled to belong to an association"

Used by SCC & ECHR to read in freedom from forced association

Supreme Court of Canada taking note of European developments prior to *Sørensen* and *Evaldsson* – what will they do with these?

"Special circumstances" in *Advance* justify forced membersip; likley not available to justify provincial laws allowing or requiring "closed shops" or forced membership/conditional employment

Canadian "Rand Formula": union dues for political & nonbargaining purposes imposed on non-members would be struck down in Europe as "disproportionate"

Alberta Labour Code Union Membership and Association

29(1) Subject to subsection (2), nothing in this Act prevents a trade union from continuing an existing collective agreement or entering into a new collective agreement with an employer or employers' organization whereby all the employees or any unit of employees of the employer or of one or more employers represented by the employers' organization are required to be members of a trade union.

Alberta Labour Code Unfair Trade Union Labour Practices

- 151No trade union and no person acting on behalf of a trade union shall...
- (g) require an employer to terminate the employment of an employee because the employee has been expelled or suspended from membership in the trade union for a reason other than a failure to pay the periodic dues, assessments and initiation fees uniformly required to be paid by all members of the trade union as a condition of acquiring or retaining membership in the trade union;...

Alberta Labour Code Unfair Employer Labour Practices

- 149No employer or employers' organization and no person acting on behalf of an employer or employers' organization shall
 - (a) refuse to employ or to continue to employ any person or discriminate against any person in regard to employment or any term or condition of employment because the person...
 - iii. has been expelled or suspended from membership in a trade union for a reason other than a failure to pay the periodic dues, assessments and initiation fees uniformly required to be paid by all members of the trade union as a condition of acquiring or retaining membership in the trade union,

AUPE and the Board of Governors of the Northern Alberta Institute of Technology

UNION MEMBERSHIP AND DUES CHECKOFF

7.01 All Employees covered by this Agreement shall become members of the Union as a condition of employment. An Employee who has a religious objection to becoming a member of the Union shall be permitted to opt out of membership by providing the Union with a signed statutory declaration outlining the objection within sixty (60) consecutive calendar days from the date of commencement of employment, but such Employee shall continue to pay Union dues.

The Governors of the University of Calgary and the AUPE

Union Membership and Dues Check-Off 7.01 Employees must become Members of the Union as a condition of employment.

7.02 The Board will deduct the Union's regular monthly Membership Dues from the pay of each Employee.

7.05 No Employee shall be subject to dismissal from employment as a result of loss of Membership in the Union, notwithstanding anything to the contrary in this Agreement.