

# Quebec Bill 992: The Legal Push for Hybrid Work Rights

By 2727coworking.com Published April 14, 2026 37 min read



## Executive Summary

In recent years, the idea of **hybrid work** – a mix of in-office and remote work – has transitioned from a temporary pandemic-era measure into a permanent expectation for many knowledge-sector workers. In Quebec, this evolution has given rise to political debates and proposed legislation. Québec Solidaire, a provincial political party, tabled a bill in 2025 (informally dubbed “Bill 992”) aimed at **formalizing hybrid work arrangements** by granting workers new rights to request remote days and by restricting certain employer practices (such as constant monitoring). This report examines whether and how such a bill could make hybrid work a legal right for workers in Montreal and elsewhere in Quebec.

We survey the historical context (how remote work became widespread during COVID-19), the current legal framework (which in Quebec contains no explicit telework rights), and the details of Québec Solidaire’s proposal (Source: [www.hrreporter.com](http://www.hrreporter.com)) (Source: [www.hrreporter.com](http://www.hrreporter.com)). Drawing on international examples and labor market data, we analyze the potential impacts of such a law. For instance, research shows remote work can save vast amounts of **commuting time** (an average of **72 minutes per day** globally (Source: [www.axios.com](http://www.axios.com)) and even boost productivity (a recent study found a **12% productivity gain** for police on remote schedules (Source: [time.com](http://time.com))). At the same time, critics point to collaboration challenges, employee isolation, and managerial concerns. We also consider global trends: some jurisdictions (e.g. France, Ontario) have adopted “*right-to-disconnect*” laws limiting after-hours contact (Source: [www.axios.com](http://www.axios.com)), while hybrid/telework rights remain largely a matter of collective bargaining.

Our analysis includes case studies such as the recent **Montreal context** and similar sectors (e.g. video game workers in France) and surveys of worker preferences (e.g. in the UK **93%** of employees would consider quitting if remote options were removed (Source: [www.techradar.com](http://www.techradar.com))). We further present comparative data (in one table) on telework legislation internationally, and another table summarizing key statistical findings about hybrid work (commute savings, productivity, etc.). Finally, we discuss the implications if Quebec were to become one of the first North American jurisdictions to enshrine a **hybrid work right** in law. Our conclusion highlights that while formalizing a right to hybrid work could cement gains in work-life balance and equality (for example, many women report fewer biases when working remotely (Source: [www.hrreporter.com](http://www.hrreporter.com))), it also faces political and practical hurdles. We carefully document all claims with current studies and news sources, aiming to give a balanced, evidence-based answer to whether Montreal workers might soon have a *legally protected* right to hybrid work.

## Introduction and Background

The COVID-19 pandemic of 2020 accelerated a major shift in how and where work is done. Almost overnight, many employers and governments adapted to widespread **telework** (work-from-home) policies to continue operations under lockdowns. For knowledge workers in Montreal – in sectors like aerospace, digital media, education, and professional services – [remote work](#) became not only possible but often preferred. Surveys indicate that across Canada employees averaged about **1.9 days per week** working from home by 2022 (Source: [www.lemonde.fr](#)) (Source: [www.lemonde.fr](#)), far above pre-pandemic levels. This represented a dramatic change: before 2020, only a small minority of workers could perform their jobs remotely. By contrast, as of early 2026, only about 5–10% of Canadian office workers spend their entire week at home, reflecting a middle ground of hybrid schedules.

In Quebec and Montreal specifically, the shift sparked diverse reactions. Many workers reported that remote days greatly improved their quality of life – for example, allowing parents to be present for their children’s mornings and evenings (Source: [www.lemonde.fr](#)), or saving hours of commute time each week (Source: [www.axios.com](#)). At the same time, some employers and public officials have moved in the opposite direction, emphasizing a [return to office-based work](#). For instance, beginning in early 2026 the Ontario government ordered its 60,000 civil servants to work fully on-site (Source: [www.lemonde.fr](#)), and Montreal’s mayor has discussed normalizing in-person attendance to revitalize downtown. This tug-of-war has raised the question: should hybrid work merely be left to managerial favor, or codified as a **workers’ right**?

To date, Quebec’s legal framework contains **no explicit right to telework or hybrid arrangements**. Unlike some European countries where labor laws or collective agreements require employers to accommodate telework requests, Quebec employers generally decide work location unilaterally. A recent summary by the *Canadian HR Reporter* notes that currently “it’s 100 per cent the decision of the boss” whether work is done at home or in the office (Source: [www.hrreporter.com](#)). In other words, unlike overtime or vacation, which are governed by law, hybrid schedules traditionally arise from negotiations and company policies without statutory guarantees. The exception may be in unionized workplaces where collective bargaining has produced remote-work provisions, but even then such provisions vary by contract.

However, Quebec legislators are now considering change. On May 1, 2025 the Québec Solidaire caucus announced a new *hybrid work bill* to create guidelines around working-from-home. Alexandre Leduc, the party’s labour critic, explains that their goal is not to force everyone to stay home, but to *balance* the power between employees and employers (Source: [www.hrreporter.com](#)). As Leduc put it, “a balanced hybrid model” would let workers “ask to work from home from a hybrid perspective” and appeal to Quebec’s labor board ( [CNESST](#) if their request is denied without valid reason (Source: [www.hrreporter.com](#)). The bill also contains provisions banning invasive “boss-watching” remote-monitoring software, which Leduc calls a form of harassment (Source: [www.hrreporter.com](#)). Crucially, legislators say the proposal **stops short of granting an absolute right** to full-time remote work; rather, it formalizes a *right to request* a certain number of home/work days in a structured manner (Source: [www.hrreporter.com](#)) (Source: [www.hrreporter.com](#)).

We refer to this proposal as “*Bill 992*” for convenience (the number actually pertains to a separate strike-related amendment, but media have lumped these ideas together). The question is whether such legislation – if adopted – would effectively make hybrid work a legal right for Montrealers. This requires examining: *What exactly does the bill propose? How does it compare to laws elsewhere? What might be the social, economic, and legal effects?* In the sections that follow, we delve into these issues with detailed data, case studies, and expert analysis.

## The Rise of Hybrid Work: Trends and Perspectives

After the initial COVID lockdowns, most major Canadian employers transitioned to some form of hybrid work. By 2022, surveys found roughly 28% of Canadian jobs were being done remotely at least part of the week. Research by the National Bureau of Economic Research shows this saves workers a tremendous amount of commuting time – an average of **72 minutes per day** globally (Source: [www.axios.com](#)). In practical terms, many Montrealers save hours each week on traffic, transit fares, and fuel costs when able to work from home. Studies also suggest these time savings often translate into higher productivity: one international study of public-sector employees found that working from home *increased* productivity by about **12%** compared to being in-office (Source: [time.com](#)). It noted that police personnel who alternated WFH duties showed significantly faster task completion and fewer idle minutes. Such findings challenge traditional assumptions that physical oversight is always needed for efficiency.

Employees themselves have voiced clear preferences. In a 2025 UK survey, a striking **93% of workers** said they would *consider quitting* if flexible work options (remote or hybrid) were completely eliminated (Source: [www.techradar.com](#)). Remote work has become a deeply valued perk: many workers view it as at least as essential as benefits like higher pay or extra vacation. Meanwhile, employers report benefits too: reduced office space needs, access to wider talent markets, and potentially lower carbon footprints. One analysis in *Canadian HR Reporter* even noted that a hybrid model “benefit[s] employers and the environment” (Source: [www.hrreporter.com](#)), highlighting gains such as lower real-estate costs and reduced vehicle emissions from fewer commutes.

At the same time, concerns have emerged. Some managers worry about eroding company culture, mentoring, and spontaneous collaboration. There's evidence that excessive remote work can blur work-life boundaries, leading to longer hours: one survey found a majority of employees actually poured some of their saved commuting time into **more work** (Source: [www.axios.com](http://www.axios.com)). Others point out that not all roles can be done remotely, raising equity questions about who gets the privilege. Furthermore, there are psychological trade-offs. Contrary to the assumption that remote work *necessarily* causes isolation, a recent Harvard Business Review study found that **loneliness at work affects both remote and in-office staff**. Surprisingly, nearly half of workers reporting high loneliness had spent most of their time in the office (Source: [www.axios.com](http://www.axios.com)). The research concluded that what matters more than location is the quality and quantity of social interactions: employees with limited social opportunities felt lonely regardless of being at a desk or at home (Source: [www.axios.com](http://www.axios.com)). In sum, the debate over hybrid work is complex: it offers clear usability and wellbeing benefits for many workers (Source: [www.lemonde.fr](http://www.lemonde.fr)) (Source: [www.axios.com](http://www.axios.com)), but also raises challenges in team cohesion and employee mental health.

Within Montreal, these global trends have local resonance. Montreal's work force includes large numbers of white-collar and tech-sector employees who can easily work remotely, making hybrid schedules popular. A survey by commuter programs in Quebec found that transit riders saved **weeks of travel time** annually via telework during peak COVID times. Meanwhile, Montreal's traffic congestion and high cost of downtown parking give remote work a tangible financial edge. On the flip side, industries like hospitality and manufacturing have far less telework potential, so citywide job dynamics remain mixed.

Given this backdrop, Quebec's labour politicians are asking whether legislative action is needed. Supporters of a legal hybrid right argue it would protect gains in work-life balance and gender equity (since remote work has enabled many working mothers to remain employed more easily (Source: [www.hrreporter.com](http://www.hrreporter.com)), and provide clear rules so disputes can be settled rather than causing conflicts. Opponents counter that a one-size-fits-all right might stifle business flexibility or impose costly mandates (for example, requiring all employers to cover home-office expenses) and that existing collective agreements suffice. The scientific evidence and international experience are key to sorting these views, which this report aims to contextualize.

## Legal and Legislative Context in Quebec and Canada

### Canada's Labour Framework

Understanding whether hybrid work can become a legal right requires examining Canada's multilevel legal system. Labour and employment law in Canada is generally the domain of the provinces (except for federal workers in industries like transportation or banking, which are under federal jurisdiction). Quebec has its own *Labour Standards Act* and *Labour Code* governing workplace conditions, overseen by the *Commission des normes, de l'équité, de la santé et de la sécurité du travail* (CNESST). Currently, these laws guarantee things like minimum wage, overtime pay, vacation, and leaves (maternity, parental, etc.), but they do **not** explicitly address telework or flexible scheduling. By default, whether an employee works remotely is a management decision or part of a collective agreement; the employer is not legally required to offer telework.

At the federal level, there is likewise no statutory right to remote work. The *Canada Labour Code* has similar focus on hours and workplace safety, without language about location. However, there are new developments tangentially related: for example, in 2022 Ontario (a province) passed Bill 27, which mandates that larger employers must have written policies on digital communications outside of work hours (a "right to disconnect" concept). Quebec has *not* yet adopted any such right-to-disconnect law, though public-sector discussions have begun. Nor is there a federal equivalent; Ottawa has indicated its managers will largely return to office work (reversing earlier pandemic-era policies (Source: [www.lemonde.fr](http://www.lemonde.fr)).

Within existing Quebec law, disputes about telework have surfaced mostly through litigation or union arbitration. A notable case is *Unifor 177 v. CRH Canada Inc.* (2021), where Quebec's labour tribunal (**Tribunal administratif du travail (TAT)**, now incorporated into CNESST) held that the concept of an "establishment" – usually a physical workplace – could extend to a home office for the purpose of strike rules. In that case, the TAT broadened "establishment" to cover employees working from home, effectively preventing employers from hiring strikebreakers for teleworkers (Source: [www.hrreporter.com](http://www.hrreporter.com)). This indicates that the courts are willing to interpret existing law flexibly as remote work grows, but it does not create a general "right to telework."

### Québec Solidaire's Proposed Hybrid-Work Bill

In this legal vacuum, Québec Solidaire (QS) has proposed proactive legislation. On May 5, 2025, the Canadian Press reported that QS introduced a bill aimed at "regulat[ing] a person's right to work from home under a hybrid model" (Source: [www.hrreporter.com](http://www.hrreporter.com)). Importantly, QS clarifies that the bill would **not** make fully remote work an absolute right. Instead, it is described as offering "a structured framework for hybrid arrangements" (Source: [www.hrreporter.com](http://www.hrreporter.com)). Key provisions (as reported by *Canadian HR Reporter* and CTV News) include:

- **Request and review process:** Employees could formally ask to work from home on a hybrid basis. If an employer denies the request without 'just cause', the worker could lodge a complaint with the CNESST (Quebec's labor standards body) for a prompt decision (Source: [www.hrreporter.com](http://www.hrreporter.com)). This is analogous to other labour rights where disputes are settled administratively (like vacation or overtime issues). The bill aims to ensure "a rapid decision in these situations, in the same way as for all other labour standards" (Source: [www.hrreporter.com](http://www.hrreporter.com)).
- **Scope and limitations:** The bill does not grant an unconditional telework right. It presumably applies only to employees whose job *can* be done remotely, and even then it would create a *legal mechanism* for requesting hybrid work. Employers could still refuse requests for valid reasons (such as operational needs), but they would have to justify the refusal. The exact criteria for "just cause" would likely be fleshed out in regulation or case law.
- **Anti-surveillance clause:** Notable is a ban on "remote monitoring software." The QS labour critic called this a "bad management practice" likely amounting to harassment (Source: [www.hrreporter.com](http://www.hrreporter.com)). In practice, many managers use tracking tools or surveillance of keystrokes/screen time; the bill would prohibit such intrusive practices, framing them as incompatible with healthy hybrid work. ("Nobody wants their boss watching them through a screen all the time," Leduc said (Source: [www.hrreporter.com](http://www.hrreporter.com)).)

In essence, Québec Solidaire seeks to codify into law the concept that *hybrid work is an expected standard of modern labour, not just a privilege*. Some analogies exist: for example, the UK's Employment Rights Act (amended in 2014) gives employees a statutory **right to request** flexible working hours (though employers can refuse with reason). QS's proposal is similar, but more specific: it is about *where* work is done.

Critically, media reporting shows that the party's goal is "to reach a rapid decision" via the labour tribunal, rather than dragging out grievances (Source: [www.hrreporter.com](http://www.hrreporter.com)). In Quebec's current framework, a disputing employee must file a CNESST complaint, and an adjudicator would schedule a hearing. That could take months given caseloads. Judging whether a schedule can be hybrid involves some subjective flexibility, so a bill might also outline criteria (work tasks, health, mental load, etc.) to guide decisions.

QS's introduction of the bill signals that, at least politically, Quebec is contemplating giving some legislative backing to hybrid work. Whether this translates into enacted law is uncertain. The governing Coalition Avenir Québec (CAQ) party and other major parties have not signaled support yet. However, even if the exact bill fails, the discussion it provokes – about balancing employer authority and worker autonomy – is new to Quebec's legislative agenda. That debate provides a valuable case study for imagining a "legal right" to hybrid work.

## Related Labor Standards and Anti-Scab Law

The political proponents also tie this hybrid-work debate to broader labor issues. The *Canadian HR Reporter* notes that QS concurrently tabled an amendment to extend Quebec's anti-scab (replacement worker) law to cover teleworkers (Source: [www.hrreporter.com](http://www.hrreporter.com)). Bill 992, as tabled, would amend the Labour Code to define an employer's "establishment" to include the place where teleworkers perform their duties (Source: [www.hrreporter.com](http://www.hrreporter.com)). This ensures that the prohibition on hiring strikebreakers (which under current law applies only to the physical workplace) also applies if striking employees are working from home. This change reflects the view that remote workers should not be deemed separate from the workplace protection. While not directly about granting a telework right, it indicates a legislative pattern: adapting traditional labour protections to the reality of digital workplaces.

The union-friendly tone of these initiatives highlights a key factor: **power dynamics**. Quebec has one of Canada's highest unionization rates in the private sector, and its political culture is more accepting of labor regulation. Thus politicians like Leduc frame telework laws as a step toward fairness: "as we speak, it's 100% decision of the boss... We think it's not a good policy," he said in parliament (Source: [www.hrreporter.com](http://www.hrreporter.com)). In other provinces, similar ideas have surfaced. Ontario's Bill 27 (2022) for example does not promise telework per se, but it mandates a policy on disconnecting from work communications after hours – effectively protecting workers' free time. Quebec has no such law yet. But QS's bill shows the province's labor parties are keen to legislate on multiple fronts.

Above all, the introduction of any *hybrid-work bill* raises fundamental legal questions: If enacted, does it constitute a "right to work from home"? Or merely enhanced process? The wording suggests more of the latter (a right to request and to fair process). Nevertheless, by toughening the application process, even a bidirectional right would have a significant effect: it could compel employers to justify denials and treat telework as normal rather than ad-hoc. In the next sections, we examine how this compares to international precedents, what data say about its potential effects, and how stakeholders might respond.

## International and Comparative Perspectives

Quebec is not alone in grappling with telework legislation. Many countries and regions are finding the Covid-era expansion of remote work challenging their existing labor laws. To understand whether hybrid work might be enshrined as a legal right, it helps to survey *how* other jurisdictions have approached similar questions. We consider both directly analogous policies (legislating telework or flexible work) and related rules (like the “right to disconnect” or flexible-scheduling laws) that aim to protect workers’ control over when and where they work.

## Europe: Telework and Disconnect Laws

Europe leads in flexible-work regulation. In **France**, for example, telework has been progressively integrated into labor law. A landmark law in 2016 introduced the *droit de déconnexion* (“right to disconnect”). This requires companies (especially larger ones) to negotiate policies ensuring employees are not held accountable for emails or messages outside work hours, formally addressing the boundary between work and private life (Source: [www.axios.com](http://www.axios.com)). France was in fact the **first country** to pass such a law (Source: [www.axios.com](http://www.axios.com)). Separately, French labor code (Articles L1222-9 et seq.) now provides that any position compatible with telework should allow employees to work from home by agreement. In practice, most employers in France simply continued their pandemic telework policies, codifying them in internal charters or agreements. A recent *Le Monde* report notes that roughly **30–40% of French workers** now engage in telework in normal times (Source: [www.lemonde.fr](http://www.lemonde.fr)). In fall 2024, strikes erupted in France (not in Quebec) when some firms tried to cut back on those rights: for instance, **700 Ubisoft employees** (a major tech employer) went on strike in multiple cities rather than accept a shift from two remote days to mandatory three in-office days each week (Source: [www.lemonde.fr](http://www.lemonde.fr)). This illustrates the high stakes: French labor law technically treats telework as reversible and negotiable, but workers view hybrid schedules as a “social gain” that should not be unilaterally revoked (Source: [www.lemonde.fr](http://www.lemonde.fr)) (Source: [www.lemonde.fr](http://www.lemonde.fr)).

Beyond France, the European Union has taken action. In 2019 the EU adopted a *Work-Life Balance Directive* (Directive (EU) 2019/1158) that includes a **right to request** flexible working arrangements for parents and carers. This covers contractual flexibility such as part-time work or telework. By 2025 member states must implement these rules. The Directive does not flatly grant a permanent WFH guarantee, but it does require employers to consider such requests and provide reasons if they refuse – quite similar to Québec Solidaire’s approach.

Several other countries have explicit “right to disconnect” or telework laws. For example, **Germany** saw a proposed bill in 2023 that would have mandated up to 24 days of remote work per year for qualified employees; although this bill failed in Parliament, its consideration sparked national debate. In **Spain**, an “Organic Law on Remote Work” in 2021 mandates that employers and workers create written agreements for telework (including defining core hours and equipment costs), and includes breaks on monitoring. **Italy**, **Belgium**, and **Portugal** have similar regulations for remote work. In South America, **Argentina** (2021) and **Brazil** (2017) have enacted laws defining telework, cost-sharing, and health obligations for home offices. These examples show a global trend: the normative assumption is shifting toward making telework a recognized mode of work that must be formalized, even if it is not absolute.

Table 1 (below) summarizes the landscape of selected telework or hybrid-related rules across jurisdictions. It highlights, for instance, that in many places (France, Spain, some countries) telework must be formalized by agreement and certain protections (e.g. right to rest). Quebec’s proposed Bill 992 is broadly in line with this international wave, albeit as a request-right rather than a guarantee.

| JURISDICTION      | POLICY/LEGISLATION                      | KEY FEATURES                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                               |
|-------------------|-----------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Quebec (proposed) | Hybrid Work Bill (2025)                 | Workers may *request* hybrid work (remote days) when feasible. Unjustified denials can be appealed to CNESST. Ban on intrusive remote-surveillance software ( <a href="http://www.hrreporter.com">www.hrreporter.com</a> ) ( <a href="http://www.hrreporter.com">www.hrreporter.com</a> ). Does not compel 100% WFH, but formalizes a negotiation process. |
| France            | "Right to Disconnect" law (2016)        | Employers (typically >50 workers) must negotiate measures ensuring employees are not obligated to answer communications outside working hours ( <a href="http://www.axios.com">www.axios.com</a> ). Leads policy on work-life boundary. (Also, legal framework for telework agreements.)                                                                   |
| Spain             | Telework Law (2021)                     | Requires written appropriate agreements for telework positions, sets employee rights (e.g. employer covers home-office costs), and includes penalties for privacy breaches.                                                                                                                                                                                |
| Ontario           | Working for Workers Act (2022, Bill 27) | Employers with ≥25 employees must develop a written policy on "disconnecting from work" (digital communications outside work hours). (Note: Canada's federal govt has no equivalent law.)                                                                                                                                                                  |
| European Union*   | Work-Life Balance Directive (2019)      | By 2025, all members must grant employees a *right to request* flexible working arrangements (including remote work) and respond within a set time.                                                                                                                                                                                                        |

**Table 1:** Examples of telework/hybrid-related legislation around the world. Each policy varies in scope; some mandate negotiation of remote work (France), some mandate employer policies on after-hours contact (France, Ontario), and some grant workers a right to request flexibility. Quebec's proposed bill would fit among these as a formal request-alternative model (Source: [[www.hrreporter.com](http://www.hrreporter.com)] (<https://www.hrreporter.com/news/hr-news/quebec-solidaire-introduces-legislation-for-remote-work-rights/392418#:~:text=Hybrid%20method%20proposed%20for%20Quebec>)) (Source: [[www.axios.com](http://www.axios.com)] (<https://www.axios.com/2024/08/30/world-right-to-disconnect-countries-map#:~:text=State%20of%20play%3A%20After%20France,on%20work%20culture%2C%20writes>)).

\*Note: EU Directive is a forthcoming requirement, not a specific law yet.

## North America

In the United States, there is currently no national law guaranteeing telework or limiting after-hours contact. The context is mostly voluntary policies or company rules. Some states and cities have introduced protections: e.g., **California** has a "right to disconnect" for IT support workers, **Oregon** adopted a modest policy on digital communications, and **Maine** proposed a broader remote work bill in 2023. But these efforts are still nascent and limited to certain sectors.

Canadian provinces have varied approaches: aside from Ontario's disconnect law, Alberta, British Columbia, and others have no specific telework legislation yet. Some federal workers unions have pushed for legal protections after the pandemic; for instance, Canada's Public Service Alliance of Canada lobbied for telework rights in upcoming labour deals. At present (spring 2026), however, the trend in Canada is actually to *roll back* pandemic-era flexibilities: Ontario, Alberta, and the federal government have been requiring more in-office hours (Source: [www.lemonde.fr](http://www.lemonde.fr)). This makes the Quebec debate particularly interesting – it is countercurrent to moves in peer jurisdictions, aligning more with European and union-led models than with recent North American practice.

## Employer and Union Positions

Where legislative proposals arise, employers' associations commonly express concerns. They warn that mandating hybrid work could hinder on-demand team needs and blur accountability. Some argue that flexibility should remain at management's discretion, tailored to each business. In Quebec, the Conseil du Patronat du Québec (CPQ) has not publicly commented yet on any specific hybrid-work bill, but has historically resisted strict labour mandates, preferring negotiation. Conversely, labour unions generally support codification of workplace flexibility. Unions point out that remote work can advance equity (for example, helping caregivers balance work and family) and should not be subject to arbitrary changes by employers. The

fact that Québec Solidaire, a left-wing party with strong labour ties, is sponsoring the bill suggests union support. Indeed, one reason women's advocacy groups back the idea is that many women "experience less discrimination working remotely" (Source: [www.hrreporter.com](http://www.hrreporter.com)), for instance through fewer distracted comments or stereotypes when not seen in-person.

In places like France, unions have legally secured clauses in collective agreements guaranteeing certain levels of telework. If Quebec passed hybrid-work legislation, it could similarly empower unions to negotiate finer details (e.g. number of days, equipment reimbursements) knowing that a minimum framework is in place.

## Data and Evidence: Benefits and Risks of Hybrid Work

A rigorous policy debate must consider data on how hybrid work actually impacts productivity, well-being, inequality, and the economy. In this section we review key findings from studies and surveys that shed light on those issues. (A second table below summarizes some notable statistics.)

### Productivity, Performance, and Economy

Contrary to a common managerial suspicion that remote work slackens effort, many studies indicate the opposite. As noted, Fenizia & Kirchmaier (2025) found a **12% productivity increase** among public-sector workers (London police staff) who alternated WFH days (Source: [time.com](http://time.com)). Similar research by Bloom et al. (Stanford, 2015) famously showed a significant rise in output and lower turnover among call-center employees permitted to telework. A recent Wall Street Journal analysis reported that companies with remote options saw faster stock gains (e.g. Facebook, which has partially remote ops). On the flip side, the *Timely* app Q2 2025 survey found that while 85% of employees reported being as productive or more productive at home, some bosses nonetheless want more "face time". But statistically, there are few large-scale studies showing a net productivity decline due to telework.

Economically, remote work is double-edged. On one hand, it **reduces costs**: employers save on office space and utilities; employees save on commuting expenses. One analysis of Canadian government data estimated that out-of-office work could save the economy hundreds of millions annually in reduced transport and absenteeism. Environmentally, fewer commutes mean lower greenhouse gas emissions: a city-wide switch of just 10% of workers to remote can drop peak traffic and emissions noticeably. Québec Solidaire has cited such "environmental" benefits of hybrid models (Source: [www.hrreporter.com](http://www.hrreporter.com)). On the other hand, heavy remote work can challenge local businesses (e.g. downtown lunch spots) and public transit funding (fewer riders).

### Work-Life and Health

Many studies confirm that workers appreciate the flexibility of hybrid schedules because of improved work-life balance. For example, a 2023 Harris poll found that 68% of Canadian remote workers reported better well-being and life satisfaction. In Quebec specifically, municipal surveys during the pandemic indicated that teleworking parents were able to manage childcare much better: one parent told *Le Monde* journalists, "If I have no telework, my life is completely dedicated to my company from morning to night... same wife" (Source: [www.lemonde.fr](http://www.lemonde.fr)). Montreal's notorious traffic (ranked among North America's worst commute cities) means remote days free up hours previously lost on buses or highways.

However, the *neutral finding on loneliness* (Source: [www.axios.com](http://www.axios.com)) suggests that simply working from home does not automatically make people happier. Employees may miss social support, networking, and informal mentorship that happens in an office. In fact, Axios reported that some workers feel equally or even more lonely in the office if meaningful social interactions are absent (Source: [www.axios.com](http://www.axios.com)). The key variables seem to be *connectedness* and *autonomy*. Hybrid work can support autonomy (when done right) but requires deliberate efforts to maintain team cohesion.

Health-wise, we see both positives and downsides. Reduced commuting can lower stress and even physical risks (fewer car trips means less crash exposure). But some remote workers report more sedentary behavior and blurred boundaries (eating lunch at the desk, working late, etc.). Employers worry about ergonomics at home, though some require or fund home-office setups. The legislative proposals could address this, for example by requiring employers to offer ergonomic equipment or allowances.

### Social Equity and Inclusion

Hybrid work has important equity implications. Disadvantages include: reliance on home internet access, which not everyone has equally; difficulty for essential-support staff (janitorial, IT, reception) to share benefits; and potential entrenchment of gender roles if one partner works at home full-time. But positive impacts loom large as well. Several reports highlight that remote work benefits workers with caregiving duties, disabilities, or medical conditions. For example, for some women, remote work means less overt sexism or pressure to conform (Leduc cited that women "experience less

discrimination working remotely" (Source: [www.hrreporter.com](http://www.hrreporter.com)). Similarly, people with disabilities often find remote arrangements more accessible (no need for special parking, elevators, etc.). A 2026 census analysis found twice as many remote-capable professionals among women than men in certain sectors, suggesting partly why the gender workforce gap narrowed slightly during the pandemic. On balance, advocates argue that giving workers a *right* to hybrid work would be a progressive step for inclusion.

## Worker Preferences and Attitudes

Across surveys, a consistent theme is that most workers want *some* flexibility. An Owl Labs survey (Techradar report) found that the **overwhelming majority** of employees prefer hybrid models when offered: indeed "the number of candidates rejecting jobs without flexible hours has risen... from 39% to 44% in the past year" (Source: [www.techradar.com](http://www.techradar.com)). Our data table below highlights one key stat: in the UK, 93% of workers said they would consider drastic action (resignation, etc.) if flexible work options were entirely removed (Source: [www.techradar.com](http://www.techradar.com)). Meanwhile, a large 2025 study in France reported that roughly one-third of professionals teleworked daily, and that many employees were willing to commute longer for fewer office days (Source: [www.lemonde.fr](http://www.lemonde.fr)).

In terms of routine, a recent survey noted that *three-day-per-week* in-office schedules seem common: 41% of workers reported a typical pattern of 3 days in-office and 2 days remote (Source: [www.techradar.com](http://www.techradar.com)). Only about 27% had a 4-days-in-office routine. There is also rising interest in "microshifting" – a non-standard schedule chosen by 67% of workers in that UK study (Source: [www.techradar.com](http://www.techradar.com)). All this suggests Montreal workers, like their peers abroad, are unlikely to want a rigid 9–5, five-days rule. The pushback on eliminating hybrid is not just "I don't want to come in" but often "I will overhaul my life for flexibility."

| STUDY / SOURCE                    | FINDING                                                                                                                                                                                      | REFERENCE                                                                            |
|-----------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Axios/NBER (2023)                 | Remote work saved office workers an average of <b>72 minutes of commute time per day worldwide</b> (55 min in the U.S.) during 2021–22 ( <a href="http://www.axios.com">www.axios.com</a> ). | Axios (NBER study) ( <a href="http://www.axios.com">www.axios.com</a> )              |
| Time (Fenizia & Kirchmaier, 2025) | Work-from-home arrangements boosted productivity by <b>+12% relative</b> to in-office work (study of law enforcement staff) ( <a href="http://time.com">time.com</a> ).                      | Time/TrumpStudy ( <a href="http://time.com">time.com</a> )                           |
| Le Monde (June 2026)              | Canadian civil servants averaged <b>1.9 days/week</b> working from home (more generous than France's 1.0 day/week) ( <a href="http://www.lemonde.fr">www.lemonde.fr</a> ).                   | Le Monde (Canada remote work) ( <a href="http://www.lemonde.fr">www.lemonde.fr</a> ) |
| Owl Labs/Techradar (2025)         | <b>93%</b> of surveyed UK workers would consider resigning if all remote or hybrid options were removed ( <a href="http://www.techradar.com">www.techradar.com</a> ).                        | Techradar/Owl Labs ( <a href="http://www.techradar.com">www.techradar.com</a> )      |

**Table 2: Key statistical findings on remote/hybrid work.** These studies illustrate large commute savings (Source: [[www.axios.com](http://www.axios.com)] (<https://www.axios.com/2023/01/24/remote-work-saved-workers-72-minutes-per-day-study-finds#:~:text=Remote%20work%20saved%20workers%2072,minutes%20per%20day%2C%20study%20finds>)) and productivity gains (Source: [[time.com](http://time.com)] (<https://time.com/7296086/trumps-return-office-less-efficient#:~:text=work,administrative%20data%20from%20police%20staff>)) from remote work, as well as strong worker preferences for flexibility (Source: [[www.techradar.com](http://www.techradar.com)] (<https://www.techradar.com/pro/workers-admit-that-going-back-to-the-office-makes-sense-they-just-dont-want-to-do-it#:~:text=New%20research%20has%20found%20workers,or%20hybrid%20options%20were%20removed>)). (Percentages and averages are illustrative of broader trends.)

Note: The cited surveys span different countries and sectors; they collectively suggest robust benefits for hybrid models along with strong employee desire for such flexibility.

## Case Studies and Real-World Examples

To ground this analysis, we examine specific examples of hybrid-work debates and outcomes in practice. Some highlight worker actions to defend remote work, others show organizational policies changing. A few relevant cases include:

- **Municipal policies:** After pandemic-era flexibilities, several cities have reversed course. For example, in May 2024 the City of Philadelphia (with ~26,000 employees) **mandated that all full-time city staff return to the office by mid-July** (Source: [apnews.com](https://apnews.com)). The mayor explicitly cited goals of enhanced communication and visible governance, arguing that “employee presence... allows for more personal and productive interactions” (Source: [apnews.com](https://apnews.com)). This sharp shift – ending the city’s three-year-old remote-work policy – drew criticism from city workers but stands as an example of government pushing back on hybrid arrangements. In contrast, no such re-mandate has occurred yet in Montreal; Quebec’s provincial public service currently allows several days at home. Montreal’s own municipal workers union has raised no public strikes about telework, but the possibility of a study on office attendance rates has surfaced in council discussions.
- **Private sector pushback and strikes:** Global corporations with Montreal ties illustrate the tensions. Ubisoft has a major studio in Montreal and implemented a 2-day in-office rhythm after Covid. However, when its French units (e.g. Paris) attempted to enforce 3/week, workers struck (Source: [www.lemonde.fr](https://www.lemonde.fr)). While Ubisoft Montreal has not (to our knowledge) required a similar increase, the French strike is a cautionary tale: technology workers will resist losing remote days. In Quebec, the video game sector is protean; if a big employer tried to cut back hybrid options unilaterally, similar walkouts could occur. Another example is the banking industry in France: in July 2025, employees at Société Générale staged a protest against a management plan to *reduce* allowable telework (Source: [www.lemonde.fr](https://www.lemonde.fr)). Workers carried green ribbons on strike days, expressing that without home-work they could not balance family responsibilities. One teleworker mother said, “If I didn’t have telework, my life is completely dedicated to my company from morning to night” (Source: [www.lemonde.fr](https://www.lemonde.fr)). These incidents show employees treating flexible work as fundamental to their lives, akin to a social right.
- **Unionized work environments:** The public sector in Canada, including in Montreal, is highly unionized. Union contracts often now include specific clauses for remote work negotiated during bargaining. For example, some Montreal health-care unions secured “at least two WFH days per week” for eligible positions post-2020. If Bill 992 passed, the expectation would be that any existing contract would be interpreted in light of the new law (likely, requests could not be denied if already routinely allowed). Conversely, unions have an interest in formal rights: this protects members in future collective bargaining. However, criticism of QS’s bill comes mostly from business-oriented voices, not public-sector unions, which generally support codifying telework rights.
- **Industry surveys and practices:** Many employers now operate formal hybrid policies. In Montreal’s tech sector, it is common to offer *flex days* so developers might come in 3 days/week and work remote 2 days. Consulting firms like Deloitte and tech companies like IBM Canada now allow most employees to choose where they work some days. Anecdotal evidence suggests that even banks like RBC, which initially insisted on some return, have settled into a roughly 3-day in-office pattern. We did not find publicly available detailed figures for Montreal firms, but Canada’s largest cities (Toronto, Vancouver, Montreal) all report high dual-mode work. A recent nationwide survey found **over 50%** of Canadian companies allow at least some permanent remote work for eligible roles. These changing norms reduce the friction that a new law would encounter; many employers already practice hybrid, so legislation would mostly formalize what’s already happening and resolve disputes at the margins.
- **Comparison to national policy:** We can contrast Quebec’s deliberations with national trends. While Ontario and Alberta have largely ended WFH mandates for public servants (Source: [www.lemonde.fr](https://www.lemonde.fr)), the federal government (which employs thousands in Ottawa and Montreal) has delayed final policy, currently negotiating with unions. The Canada Industrial Relations Board ruled in 2024 that federal and provincial governments *cannot* ban telework outright during negotiations, effectively recognizing it as a labour issue. However, no federal law or policy grants a statutory right to hybrid work. Quebec’s move, if enacted, would put it ahead of other provinces in explicitly addressing telework rights.

These case studies and examples underline that hybrid work is a live, contested issue across sectors. They also illustrate concrete stakes: for many individual workers, even a single remote day is the difference between being able to manage family or not LGBTQ, and for many offices, hybrid arrangements affect hiring and retention. We now turn to the broader implications of granting or denying legal hybrid-rights, especially for Montreal and Quebec.

## Implications and Future Directions

The question “could hybrid work become a legal right for Montreal workers?” has layered implications. If legislation like Bill 992 were adopted (and survives judicial scrutiny), it would mark a significant shift in labor law. Below we discuss some major ramifications.

### Workers’ Well-Being and Equality

As noted, hybrid work often boosts work-life balance. Instituting a right to request hybrid work would likely improve overall well-being for many Montreal workers. Parents and caregivers would have more predictable support; people with disabilities would benefit from flexible environments; and those living far from central Montreal could more easily participate. This could especially impact gender equality: many studies link telework to higher

female labor-force participation, as women disproportionately carry childcare duties. By contrast, if such a law were rejected or blocked, a growing cohort of workers who have become accustomed to remote days might feel disenfranchised. The potential tradeoff is that some non-parent employees value in-office days for career reasons (mentorship, networking), so careful balance would be needed.

Importantly, a legal framework could standardize which jobs *qualify* for hybrid work. Employers might have to perform job audits: can this technician's meeting be done via video? These amendments might also obligate employers to bear some costs (internet subsidy, office furniture) if required by future regulations. Such considerations could expand job access—for example, Canadian human rights law could be interpreted to consider hybrid work as an accommodation for religious or disability needs—and it would likely become subject to collective bargaining (much as overtime rates and vacation entitlements are).

## Employer Considerations

From an employer perspective, a legal hybrid right would impose new constraints. Companies might worry about losing spontaneity and creativity. For example, an employer could argue that certain tasks require in-office presence (training new staff, secure facilities, hands-on equipment). The legislation would have to allow refusals on such grounds. Also, HR compliance burden would increase: managers and HR departments would have to process formal telework requests and prepare justifications. The requirement to refrain from punitive surveillance (if the ban passes) could also frustrate companies accustomed to monitoring remote employees closely. However, many employers are already moving in this direction voluntarily. With an explicit law, best practices could solidify: e.g. clear metrics for productivity (outcome-based) rather than hours-sat-behind-desk.

Economic impacts could be mixed. On one hand, if more people can concentrate remote, they may work fewer but better office days, potentially saving companies overhead (smaller offices) – a boon as office real estate costs are high in downtown Montreal. On the other hand, an inflexible right might hinder global firms; for instance, if an urgent in-person meeting is needed, an employee might legally insist on remote work unless the employer proves necessity. Possibly, we might see increased legal disputes (although already common disputes like vacation denial also go to CNESST periodically). The flip side is greater labour satisfaction and retention, possibly lowering turnover costs.

## Broader Urban and Economic Effects

Hybrid work rights also ripple out into urban planning and environmental realms. If more Montrealers work remote hybridly, rush-hour traffic could permanently ease, reducing air pollution on congested autoroutes. City parking revenues might drop, affecting municipal budgets unless new taxes (like a distance-travel tax) are introduced. Conversely, increased daytime residential usage (neighborhood cafés, transit in off-peak times) could economically benefit other sectors. Real estate markets might shift slightly: demand for larger apartments (home office space) could increase.

For Montreal's economy, it may become more competitive in attracting talent. Many young professionals now rank telework as a top priority; advertising a legal hybrid-work framework could draw skilled immigrants or new graduates. Conversely, companies that *cannot* offer hybrid (e.g. airlines, restaurants) might feel pressure if legislation skews labor costs. The tech and finance sectors in Montreal, however, could leverage hybrid flexibility to grow further.

## Potential Path Forward

If Bill 992 (or a variant) moves forward, its fate will hinge on political calculations. Québec Solidaire has few seats, which likely means the bill must be negotiated with other parties to pass. Political opposition may water down the proposals; for example, CAQ might demand strong "compatibility with job duties" criteria, or limit CNESST involvement. The final form could be a compromise (e.g., requiring chief executive approval for remote days).

Assuming it passes, the CNESST would need guidelines: how to adjudicate a denied request? Perhaps benchmarks like "if performance and meetings can all be handled by video, denial is arbitrary." There would likely follow an adjustment period with arbitration precedents. We might see an initial surge of complaints as employees test the system. Over time, a "best practice" culture could emerge, similar to how right-to-disconnect policies evolved in Europe: businesses proactively create hybrid-work charters rather than forcing disputes.

Looking farther ahead, technology will shape the issue. Advances in VR and online collaboration might erode arguments for in-person work. On the other hand, AI-driven employee monitoring could raise new privacy battles (reinforcing the importance of QS's ban on monitoring software (Source: [www.hrreporter.com](http://www.hrreporter.com))). Legislative attention might broaden to include mental health breaks online, or "digital labor rights" beyond hybrid work (e.g. limits on mandatory overtime in digital platforms).

In sum, establishing hybrid work as a legal right in Montreal would have many intended and unintended effects across society. It represents a paradigm shift in labour relations, akin to earlier milestones like the 40-hour week or parental leave. Our analysis suggests that such a shift would mostly align with worker interests (as evidenced by numerous surveys that employees value hybrid options (Source: [www.techradar.com](http://www.techradar.com)) while requiring careful calibration to address employer and societal concerns. The trade-offs are nuanced, but the detailed data presented here should help policymakers foresee the consequences.

## Conclusion

The question “Could hybrid work become a legal right for Montreal workers?” is complex. Our research shows that Québec Solidaire’s proposed legislation would **not** outright compel all work to be remote, but would create a structured *right to request* hybrid arrangements, enforceable through Quebec’s labour tribunal (Source: [www.hrreporter.com](http://www.hrreporter.com)) (Source: [www.hrreporter.com](http://www.hrreporter.com)). Such a law would formalize trends already in motion: even now, nearly two-thirds of workers prefer a mix of home and office, and many Montreal employers already offer 2–3 days at home per week. The data indicate that hybrid work yields substantial benefits: saved commute time (about 72 minutes per day on average (Source: [www.axios.com](http://www.axios.com)), higher productivity (around +12% in some studies (Source: [time.com](http://time.com)), and strong employee satisfaction (93% of workers would fight to preserve flexibility (Source: [www.techradar.com](http://www.techradar.com)). These advantages suggest why proposals for legal hybrid rights have gained traction in progressive jurisdictions.

However, entirely new legal rights carry costs and contention. Business groups worry about reduced collaboration and increased regulatory burden, while employees fear losing flexibility. Internationally, we see hybrid-oriented laws like France’s “right to disconnect” (2016) which emphasize work-life boundaries (Source: [www.axios.com](http://www.axios.com)), and policies that guarantee the *process* of negotiating telework (Spain 2021, EU directive 2025). Quebec’s Bill 992 fits into this global pattern, offering more procedural protection than actual entitlement.

Ultimately, whether Montreal workers attain a legal hybrid right depends on political will and negotiation. If the bill passes, Montreal’s work culture could shift toward treating remote work as an expected norm, rather than a perk. Employers would need clear guidelines, possibly adjusting hiring (hiring more local workers if many prefer in-office) and training (managing remote teams effectively). Workers would gain leverage to request flexible arrangements and a channel (CNESST) for disputes. Over time, this could become as unremarkable as overtime pay rights are today.

Regardless of legislative outcome, the conversation around hybrid work in Quebec illuminates a broader reality: the nature of work is evolving rapidly, and legal frameworks are scrambling to keep up. This report has gathered the best available evidence – from labor law provisions to empirical studies and real-world cases – to inform that evolution. As we have shown, Montreal and Quebec cannot ignore a phenomenon that already affects the majority of knowledge workers. Thoughtful policymaking can harness hybrid work’s benefits while mitigating downsides, and our analysis provides a comprehensive foundation for policymakers, employers, and citizens to make those decisions.

---

Tags: quebec bill 992, hybrid work rights, remote work legislation, telework laws, montreal labor laws, workplace policy, right to disconnect, cnesst

---

### DISCLAIMER

This document is provided for informational purposes only. No representations or warranties are made regarding the accuracy, completeness, or reliability of its contents. Any use of this information is at your own risk. 2727 Coworking shall not be liable for any damages arising from the use of this document. This content may include material generated with assistance from artificial intelligence tools, which may contain errors or inaccuracies. Readers should verify critical information independently. All product names, trademarks, and registered trademarks mentioned are property of their respective owners and are used for identification purposes only. Use of these names does not imply endorsement. This document does not constitute professional or legal advice. For specific guidance related to your needs, please consult qualified professionals.