

The Official Languages Act Systematically Violated: The Canada Post Corporation in Quebec

By William Johnson, President of Alliance Quebec

September 27, 1999

The Treasury Board has commissioned Denis Langlois to conduct an audit of the postal franchises in Quebec to ascertain their conformity with the Official Languages Act, particularly with respect to service in the minority official language, English.

We submit that an audit is urgently needed, but it should not start with the postal franchises. It should go back a step to audit the Canada Post Corporation's entire Quebec operation, especially in the officially designated bilingual regions that is, the Montreal area, parts of the Eastern Townships, of the Gaspé and of West Quebec.

In his Annual Report for 1998, the Commissioner of Official Languages has this observation: "Service to the public in both official languages was better at Canada Post's own counters than at postal franchises." (p. 49)

This is as true in Quebec as it is in other parts of the country. Service in English at postal franchises is haphazard, depending on the location (whether in a largely English-speaking area or elsewhere), and on the language competence or commitment to English of the proprietor of the franchise, and often, on the time of day.

For instance, I'm told that the postal franchise in the Pharmacie Jean Coutu, Place Portobello, in Brossard, there are shifts where none of the employees at the postal counter is bilingual; at other times, one can be served adequately in English. Meanwhile, at the Mano Dépanneur & Fume Plus, 6664 Cote St. Luc, Montreal, it is difficult to be served adequately in either English or French.

The fact is that the owners of most postal franchises pay their postal counter clerks small salaries, and hence the turnover of staff is frequent. To get fully bilingual employees to staff the counters is difficult, except in areas of heavy concentration of an English-speaking population. So, after the initial phase when the employees at a new postal franchise have been trained by competent Canada Post Corporation (CPC) staff, subsequent employees will frequently not be bilingual – unless CPC exercises vigilance to ensure that the postal franchises meet their obligations under their contract with CPC and under the Official Languages Act.

Now, the evidence is overwhelming that the Quebec operation of CPC is not committed to observing the spirit or the letter of the Official Languages Act. Even in the designated bilingual regions, such as Montreal, CPC gives uneven service to the public in English at its own postal counters, but in its internal operations it acts largely as a unilingual French enterprise, in violation of the Official Languages Act.

The Commissioner of Official Languages published in 1993 a booklet, *Official Languages: Basic Facts*, which lays out the rights of employees of the federal government and of federal agencies to work in their own language. This booklet was never circulated by CPC among its own Quebec employees, especially in the bilingual regions, with the result that the great majority of employees of CPC are totally unaware of their language rights.

"The Official Languages Act designates a number of regions in Canada where employees of federal departments, agencies and Crown corporations have the right to work in the official language of their choice and where these institutions have the obligation to ensure that their employees may exercise this right." (*Official Languages: Basic Facts*, p. 2)

Such bilingual areas include the National Capital Region, all of New Brunswick and parts of Northern and Eastern Ontario, as well as the areas of Quebec already mentioned. The booklet spells out the rights of employees and the obligations of the employer in these bilingual regions:

"In bilingual regions, what are the language of work obligations of federal institutions? To create a work environment where employees feel free to work in the official language of their choice, the following must be available in both languages:

Supervision of employees, as follows: employees occupying bilingual positions or positions requiring the use of either English or French are to receive instructions and performance appraisals in the language of their choice; employees occupying unilingual positions receive supervision in the language of the position;

Regularly and widely used work instruments produced by or on behalf of the institution (e.g., policy manuals, directives or circulars);

Regularly and widely used information technology systems, including software packages, acquired or produced by an institution as of 1991;

Personal and central services, regardless of the duties or language requirements of the employees position;

Staff or committee meetings within departments, agencies or Crown corporations or that involve more than one institution when employees of both language groups participate.

In addition, the senior or corporate management of an institution has, as a whole, the responsibility to function in both official languages (e.g., conducting meetings, accepting documents, hearing presentations).

The prescriptions of the Commissioner of Official Languages are more detailed instructions for carrying out Subsection 35(1)(a) of the Official Languages Act, which states:

"Every federal institution has the duty to ensure that

(a) within the National Capital Region and in any part or region of Canada, or in any place outside Canada, that is prescribed, work environments of the institution are conducive to the effective use of both official languages and accommodate the use of either official language by its officers and employees."

Anyone reading this law and these instructions, who is familiar with the operation of CPC in Quebec, must either laugh or cry. CPC observes none of them.

How does CPC subvert the Official Languages Act? In the first place, by designating almost all the positions, even in the bilingual regions, as "French essential," that is, requiring only French. If positions were designated as "bilingual," or "reversible," that is, requiring *either* English *or* French, then employees could choose the language of their supervision, and supervisors would have to be bilingual. Moreover, the employees could choose in what language they would receive written instructions and documents. They would have a right to meetings conducted in both languages.

Now, in the Greater Montreal region, there are more than 500,000 English speaking people – twice the number of francophones in all of New Brunswick, and greater than the number of francophones in the bilingual regions of Northern and Eastern Ontario. And yet, the vast majority of positions are designated French only, and almost none designated English only. The result is to deprive almost all non-francophones of the right to be supervised in English. The very intent of designating bilingual regions has been defeated as far as the employees are concerned.

One perverse result is that English-speaking potential employees are effectively excluded from CPC, unless they are fluent in French. We are presently trying to obtain the breakdown by mother tongue of CPC employees in Quebec, especially in the Montreal region. Informally, we are told that they are 98 per cent francophone.

Thus are English-speaking Quebecers deprived of their right to employment in this important federal agency, in violation of the Official Languages Act?

It is instructive to see the exclusionary system at work. On May 30, 1995, a driver for CPC in the Montreal region, Alan Greer, lodged a complaint about the language requirement for drivers. His complaint led to the Office of the Commissioner of Official Languages conducting an "Enhanced Investigation." In February, 1996 OCOL published its *Investigation Report Concerning the Identification of the Language Requirements for Canada Post Corporation Driver Positions in Montreal*.

The report noted that the complainant "states that Canada Post Corporation erred in requiring the knowledge and use of French only for all intra-city driver positions in Montreal." And the report found that Mr. Greer was correct in asserting that all postal drivers required only French: "During our interviews, we learned that all postal service driver positions in the metropolitan Montreal region – some 450 – are indeed identified as French essential."

As a result, none of these drivers – including Mr. Greer – had the rights outlined in the Official Languages Act to be supervised, instructed and documented in the official language of their choice. For them, to all intents and purposes, Montreal was not a designated bilingual region but unilingual French.

Why were these positions in a bilingual region designated as French only? Because that was the way things were done in Quebec, and because it was convenient, as the report pointed out.

"The managers with whom we met were unable to recall when all the driver positions were first identified as French essential. However, they stated that this was a well-established practice of long standing, that the identification was not reviewed at the time of each staffing action and that the existing identification was simply reconfirmed each time.

"Some managers added that this identification was justified since it was necessary to promote interaction among drivers by means of a single language of communication. Furthermore, in their view, it would be difficult to find the funds needed for possible language training for supervisors whose positions are now identified as French essential. These positions would no doubt be reidentified as bilingual if the drivers' positions were no longer French essential."

The report gave some comparisons with other bilingual regions which brought out how anomalous was the requirement of French only for 100 per cent of the drivers in the Montreal region. In the National Capital Region, according to the report, 95 per

cent of the driver positions were identified as *either* French *or* English required, thus giving the employees the right to work and be supervised in the language of their choice. In addition, 3 per cent of the positions required a knowledge of French only, and 2 per cent required a knowledge of English only.

So it was also in Moncton, New Brunswick. There, 93 per cent of the driver positions required knowledge of *either* English *or* French, giving the incumbents the choice of their language of work and supervision and meetings. The other 7 per cent required English only.

The report concluded, therefore, that "the French only requirement for these positions was not determined objectively, taking into account the duties performed."

"The Commissioner therefore recommends that Canada Post Corporation review, by March 31, 1996, the language requirements for postal service driver positions in the metropolitan Montreal region to ensure that they comply with the provisions of Section 91 of the Official Languages Act."

In a perhaps wistful final sentence, the report stated: "Canada Post Corporation has accepted our recommendation." In fact, in the following years, it was evident that CPC had accepted the recommendation only in small part, while continuing to violate the terms of the Official Languages Act.

In a letter to Mr. Greer dated Dec. 11, 1996, the investigator for OCOL who had done the report on the drivers' language requirement, Gerald Desmarais, reported on what progress had been achieved:

"After being informed that CPC had reidentified 90 of its 450 drivers' positions from French essential to either English or French essential, we met with Transportation Division management to verify if this was sufficient to meet the Commissioner's recommendations. We were told there was more to come and that the reidentification exercise will be completed in a few weeks."

The 90 positions supposedly reclassified meant that 1 in 5 positions now gave the choice of English or French to the employees. But, in fact, the positions reclassified were mostly part-time positions for people who worked three shifts one week, four the next, and always including a Saturday. They were undesirable positions for very junior drivers, with a high turnover. Mr. Greer, who had initiated the complaint, remained in the category of only French essential.

On May 7, 1997, Mr. Desmarais again wrote Mr. Greer, apparently with good news.

"We conducted a follow up to CPC's commitment to implement the recommendation and are pleased to inform you that as of June 1, 1997, all drivers' positions in the Montreal area will require the knowledge and use of either English or French. This major breakthrough was brought about by your personal involvement and we wish to congratulate you on this important accomplishment."

The congratulations proved to be premature. For instance, a competition for drivers' positions was posted this month, on Sept. 3, 1999. The first three positions posted, offering regular hours of work, required French only – even though two of them were located in Ville Saint-Laurent. What happened to the promise that, "as of June 1, 1997, all drivers' positions in the Montreal area will require the knowledge and use of either English or French"?

Canada Post is caught in a contradiction. It refuses to grant a recognition that most drivers deal with the public and must use both French and English in the Montreal area, for instance when they pick up priority post parcels or deliver parcels to the door and require a signature. Canada Post officials convinced the investigator for the Commissioner of Official Languages that the drivers required so little communication with the public in either English or French that they could not demand a bilingual status for their position, but only the designation of *either* French *or* English essential.

So Mr. Desmarais wrote in his report: "the results of our interviews with the managers, supervisors and drivers, as well as our review of the work descriptions, directives and forms, show that there is a virtual absence of service to the public by drivers, regardless of language. The drivers assigned to mail collection and the shuttle drivers have contact only with other employees of Canada Post and absolutely no contact with the public. As for the Priority Post drivers, they have simple and limited contact with the public, which consists mainly in obtaining a signature when picking up or delivering a package."

But, if this is so, then there is absolutely no justification for requiring "French essential" of any of these drivers who have so little linguistic contact with the public. They should have the choice of their language of work and of supervision, as is the intent of the Official Languages Act. That means that the supervisors should be bilingual to be able to supervise their employees in either French or English, according to the choice of the employee. It is the language choice of the employee rather than the convenience of the supervisor that should be decisive.

That is exactly what is not happening at Canada Post. The corporate culture is such that it is a settled, accepted fact that supervision takes place in French only, that communications at work between employees takes place in French only. This is the long-established tradition. Those who go against that tradition are considered as

"making waves." They are troublemakers. And most English-speaking employees – the few there are – are afraid to assert their rights under the Official Languages Act – if they even know they exist.

A vicious circle has become firmly established. There are very few English-speaking employees, because everything took place only in French. And almost everything takes place only in French because the only English-speaking employees working for Canada Post are those who speak French fluently, and they use French in their daily work. Those who insist on exerting their rights are punished, for example by having their tires deflated or the paint on their vehicle vandalized. (Both events have happened to Mr. Greer.) Another employee, when he speaks in English to a dispatcher by radio, has the experience of other drivers in their vans and trucks placing the microphone next to the receptor, causing a noisy feedback to drown him out. Another employee who complained had his own car towed from the Canada Post parking area, with damage resulting to the 4-wheel drive.

That any progress was made at all to recognize the language rights of the drivers was due to the courage and persistence of one driver (and union steward), Alan Greer. But what about the language rights of the letter carriers and the clerks who sort the mail? None of them has lodged a complaint about the language classification of their positions. Some are all too happy with the French only designation. Others, who are English-speaking, do not dare lodge a complaint, realizing that it would anger the supervisors, many of them French unilinguals, who would be forced to supervise those employees in English and to preside over meetings that were held in English as well as French.

So it is, again, that the Official Languages Act is fundamentally subverted in Montreal, which is the location of precisely the largest official language minority community in all of Canada.

Mr. Greer, over five years, has filed literally dozens of complaints with the office of the Commissioner of Official Languages, and his complaints were investigated and mostly found to be valid. But attacking violations of the Official Languages Act at CPC is rather like cutting off the head of the beast from Greek mythology: as soon as one is cut, another one grows.

Mr. Greer complained about unilingual French signs in Canada Post plants. His complaint was upheld. But there are still unilingual signs in the St. Laurent plant. And, when he complained about unilingual signs in the main plant on Ottawa Street, they were replaced by signs in which the English was half the size of the French – contrary to the equality of the two official languages proclaimed by the Official Languages Act.

He complained about unilingual French forms handed out to drivers. His complaint was upheld. Some bilingual forms were provided, but in many cases the information they contained was in French only.

In 1995, he complained of a training session related to work that was conducted only in French, and the documents distributed to the participants were in French only. The OCOL investigated, found that the complaint was valid, and reported that "the facilitator of the training session ...told the participants that documents were available in English but that he had left them in his car."

He complained about receiving correspondence from CPC in French only. Mr. Desmarais of the Commissioner's office investigated and reported back: "We have determined that your complaint was founded and that, consequently, there had been an infraction of the Official Languages Act. Recognizing this, CPC's authorities will ensure that, in Montreal, all correspondence will be in the employee's preferred official language."

Over and over, Mr. Greer pointed out violations of the Official Languages Act. Over and over, the OCOL found that there was, indeed, a violation of the law, and reported that CPC was resolved to mend its ways. But then the same problem, or another problem, arose again. CPC clearly found it easier to simply plead guilty, since there was no penalty attached, than actually to abide by the requirements of the Official Languages Act, which would have been more costly, more threatening and disturbing to its supervisors, and less efficient. Operating in one language, French, was much easier.

Mr. Greer complained of accident prevention reminders distributed in French only. He complained of a unilingual French job application form used by the Montreal Division of CPC. He complained of French unilingual form letters used for hiring, promoting and transferring employees. A letter from Mr. Desmarais assured him that, now, CPC had had the forms translated: "These form letters were only available in French before and the English versions had just been obtained through translation."

As always, OCOL reported that CPC would comply with the Official Languages Act in future. "We were glad to see that the situation had been resolved," Mr. Desmarais wrote. "However, one of your most recent complaints on a similar incident seemed to imply that these English versions were not being used at all times when corresponding with English-speaking employees."

Another complaint: "At a staff meeting held on May 30, CPC handed out a unilingual French card listing services and numbers."

Another complaint: "A customer satisfaction course is not available in English."

Another complaint: "The form available to the Montreal Division employees, in order to inform the Pay and Benefit Section of a change of address, is in French only."

Another complaint: "On July 16, 1996, at the Post Office in Cote St-Luc, in Montreal, a note coming from Industrial Relations Division on various topics such as dress code, itinerary choices, etc. was posted on the employees' notice board in French only."

Another complaint: "On July 16, 1996, at the Post Office in Cote St-Luc, in Montreal, a note coming from the Employees' Relations Officer, addressed to all directors and managers of the Montreal and Quebec divisions, was posted on the employees' notice-board in French only."

Another complaint: "As a result of our intervention following your having brought to our attention the distribution by management of a telephone card in French only, Regional Officials of Canada Post Corporation have advised all supervisory staff that, pursuant to the Official Languages Act, all written material intended for employees should be distributed simultaneously in French and English."

Another complaint: "Canada Post Corporation's authorities informed us that the unilingual French change of address form you were given came from an outstanding stock of obsolete forms."

Another complaint: "Canada Post Corporation's authorities recognized that these two unilingual French notes should not have been posted on the bulletin boards. CPC will in future ensure that all bilingual notes to be brought to the attention of all employees bear the notice "To Be Posted."

Another complaint: "The complaint dealt with a unilingual French form entitled *Port Du*. We determined that this complaint was founded and constituted an infraction of the Official Languages Act."

Another complaint: "You alleged that the drivers' supervisor in Cote St. Luc could not supervise her English-speaking employees in their preferred official language. We learned that indeed that position required the knowledge and use of both official languages but that the present incumbent enjoyed a legal exemption from meeting the language requirements since her previous position had been abolished and she was therefore on a priority list."

Another complaint: "I did not take the "Service Plus" course. It is not available in English... Also the supervisor and superintendent refuse to give me cards to provide to the customer..."

Another complaint: "Priority Post in Dorval distributed to employees of St. Laurent Mail Processing Plant a memorandum dated Oct. 15 1997 and some documents including one regarding an emergency measures plan, in French only."

Another complaint: "On Nov. 11, 1997, a form entitled "Sondage sur livraison" was distributed in French only to St. Laurent Mail Processing Plant employees who were at work that day. A few employees requested the English version of the form but were told that it was not available."

Another complaint: "Stop signs at different locations at the Mail Processing Plant St. Laurent building are in French only."

Another complaint: "Clerks write information in French only on bilingual Mail Transfer Bill forms." Despite the complaint, this is still the practice, in violation of the Official Languages Act. This morning, Sept. 27, 1999, the Mail Transfer Bill was still in unilingual French.

Another complaint: "Receiving clerks at the sorting plant request information from drivers in French."

Another complaint: "CPC's authorities have agreed to prepare a bilingual lexicon of terms used in filling out the Mail Transfer Bills." In fact, they still use unilingual French forms and have done nothing to correct the illegal practice, despite their promise to the Commissioner of Official Languages.

Another complaint: "CPC's authorities will be checking the software used to fill out the Control Delivery Forms to ensure it allows for the use of both official languages." In fact, despite the promise to OCOL, CPC authorities have not ensured the use of both official languages. This morning, Sept. 27, 1999, the Control Delivery Forms were in French only.

Another complaint: "... your communication of July 23, 1998, concerning a French-only billboard titled 'Mediapost' at the Cote St-Luc Post Office."

Another complaint: "...concerning a Canada Post Corporation questionnaire and its return envelope."

Another complaint: "The CPC's Human Resources Division issues competition posters completed in French only."

Another complaint: "There are nine unilingual French signs between post office boxes and the security wicket of Cote St. Luc postal station."

Another complaint: "...concerning the fact that the addresses of the postal outlets and days of the week are printed in French only on the bilingual Delivery Notices in the Montreal Region."

Another complaint: "...concerning unilingual French inscriptions on tags and credit cards and an answer in French to a grievance tabled in English."

Another complaint: CPC's authorities have undertaken to bilingualize the numerous unilingual signs at 1500 Ottawa Street."

Another complaint: Mr. Desmarais wrote on March 16, 1999: "CPC had the 555 McArthur emergency plans translated and distributed the English version to employees who had requested it."

Another complaint: Mr. Desmarais wrote on April 14, 1999: "CPC's authorities recently informed us that these competition posters will as of now be completed in both official languages. We have determined that there had been, in this case, an infraction of the Official Languages Act and that it has since been corrected."

Despite all the promises to amend, CPC posted a competition notice on Sept. 3, 1999. The heading and the date were in French only, contrary to the equality provisions of the Official Languages Act:

"Operations de Levee et Livraison

Mouvement de l'effectif

15 rue Ottawa, C.P. 18

Montreal, P.Q. H3c 1S0

Le 03 septembre 1999"

A notice posted on Sept. 1, 1999, gave the results of a competition for different drivers positions. The information was given in both French and English; but the letterhead was in French only, as was the date. The official whose name appeared at the bottom of the page gave her title in French only.

On August 26, 1999, Mr. Greer filed a new complaint with the OCOL, regarding a meeting he attended. At the very start of the meeting, he says, the top supervisor announced: "On fait ce rencontre en français." Here is what Mr. Greer alleges in his complaint:

"I was invited June 30, 1999, to a meeting with Mr. Guy Rochon, MSC, Mr. Jean-Pierre Desjardins, superintendent, West Depot, and Mr. Richard Boudreault, zone #3 manager. The meeting was conducted in French only, although I asked several questions in English. Mr. Desjardins, superintendent for 110 letter carriers, is unable to communicate in English. Mr. Boudreault zone manager understands, but refuses to communicate in English. I asked several questions in English, and was responded to in French only."

Mr. Desmarais, on behalf of the Commissioner of Official Languages, is now investigating the complaint and his investigation is not completed. But, in another case last year, driver Domenic Taddeo filed a complaint with OCOL because he was supervised in French only. Mr. Desmarais found his complaint justified.

"We could determine that there was, in this case, an infraction of the Official Languages Act and that the appointment of a bilingual supervisor will correct the situation." But the unilingual French supervisor was then transferred to the St-Laurent mail sorting plant, they're to supervise in French only clerks and mail handlers.

One might expect that the union serving these employees of CPC, the Canadian Union of Postal Workers, would protect the language rights of minority language employees. The contrary is the case. Mr. Greer, who is a dedicated union steward, reports that the union gives him no support when it comes to language matters and is, on the contrary, committed to restricting the use of English.

According to Mr. Greer, all union meetings are in French only, all correspondence is in French only. Bulletins posted are in French only, and the union's publication, *Lien Syndical*, which came out nine times last year, is in only French.

The national office of CUPW in Ottawa sends out material in both English and French. Material is often English on one side of a sheet, French on the other. But in Montreal, only the French side is usually photocopied and posted.

The office of the Commissioner of Official Languages has conducted innumerable investigations, and recognized innumerable violations of the Official Languages Act. But, despite promises readily made by Canada Post authorities to amend and to conform to the Official Languages Act, the promises are often broken, and the

fundamental situation of operating almost exclusively in French, in violation of the Official Languages Act, remains unchanged.

A fundamental problem, too is that the OCOL examines each case individually and formulates a judgment and possibly a recommendation in each case. The approach of the Commissioner of Official Languages is such as to miss the most important significance of these piecemeal violations: that they are part of a pattern, they are systemic, not isolated instances. They spring from a coherent set of attitudes, which is that Canada Post should operate in French in Quebec, that any concession to English is only to be made when forced, and made grudgingly, if at all, but without changing the fundamentals of the unilingual French language regime.

The Commissioner of Official Languages will never bring about compliance with the Official Languages Act by the present approach. The Commissioner responded to many dozens of complaints about violations of language rights when those complaints were made by Mr. Greer and a few others. But the Commissioner of Official Language's response to the proven systemic violations was limp, myopic, totally out of proportion to the immensity of the challenge.

The Commissioner's office must have known that the language rights of the letter carriers, mail handlers and the clerks were also being violated, just as were the drivers' language rights. That would be evident to anyone who asked for the language designations of the positions of letter carriers, mail handlers and clerks. And yet, the Commissioner did not investigate because no one complained. The Commissioner failed to fulfill the true obligation of his office, which is not merely to respond to complaints, but to ensure that the Official Languages Act is applied in all federal agencies. The Commissioner failed to have the Act applied in Canada Post's Quebec operations.

It is ironic that there are no complaints from the letter carriers and clerks precisely because the exclusion of English-speaking Quebecers has been so effective and the atmosphere of intimidation so thorough. And, because resistance has been put down and the violation of the Official Languages Act is so nearly total, the Commissioner does not investigate.

There has clearly also been a failure to carry out his duty on the part of the top executive of Canada Post, the Honourable Andre Ouellet. He was a member of Parliament when the Official Languages Act was adopted in 1969. He was at one time minister responsible for the Post Office. He, above all, must have been aware that, in Quebec, the Official Languages Act has been violated for many years. Yet he did not correct the continuing state of violation of the Act.

Mr. Ouellet must be called to account for his dereliction of duty. But the reform of Canada Post in Quebec cannot be left to Canada Post itself. The Corporation has now proven abundantly its bad faith and its unwillingness to apply the Official Languages Act to its Quebec operations.

That is why the federal government must appoint a commission of enquiry into the Quebec operations of Canada Post. The rule of law, the law of the Official Languages, cannot be brought about by internal reform. The resistance to the law is too entrenched, the culture of the violation of language rights is too pervasive.

Nor can reform be brought about by the many tiny pinpricks delivered by OCOL. The Commissioner, to judge by the record, is a paper tiger. Without the ability to punish, without the courage to expose the corruption at Canada Post according to its true dimensions, the Commissioner has little credibility left to undertake such a reform.

But the responsibility of the federal government is great. At stake is justice for many hundreds of thousands of non-French Quebecers who have been systematically robbed of their equality rights under the Official Languages Act and kept from jobs to which they had a right.

At stake, too, is the very credibility of the Official Languages Act. The Quebec operation of Canada Post gives credence to the supposition that the Official Languages Act is simply a measure to give advantages to those who are French-speaking, without any corresponding equity for those who are English-speaking. If the Official Languages Act fails spectacularly in Canada Post in Montreal, by what right can it succeed anywhere else?

An enquiry must reveal the linguistic composition of Canada post, especially in Montreal and the other designated bilingual regions. It must make public how many positions and what positions require French only, French and English, French or English, and English only. It must put forward credibly the justification for these language requirements.

And, above all, a commission of enquiry must propose a means to reform Canada Post so that it can respect once again the spirit and the letter of the Official Languages Act, which is based on respect for each of the two official languages, on an acceptance of equality between them, rather than the French supremacist mentality which seems to guide hiring practices and working conditions at Canada Post, as in the provincial government of Quebec.