

# **Un Québec Love: An Analysis of Québec's Voting Trends as Determined by the Social Characteristics of Montréal's Conscriptions**

**Daniel M. Chazin**

**December, 2007**

The social factors of conscriptions (electoral districts) in Québec can greatly influence the outcomes of general (provincial) elections. Using the census data from the last 10 years and the voting results from the last four elections I observe the social characteristics of the 28 conscriptions in Montréal and conclude specific voting trends. I find that English speakers (Anglophones) and other non-French language speakers (Allophones) tend to vote for the *Parti Libérale du Québec* (PLQ). French speakers tend to vote for the *Parti Québécois* (PQ) and the *Action Démocratique du Québec* (ADQ). I also find that this exists because Anglophones are the most socio-economically advantaged group in Québec, the Allophones have difficulty assimilating, and the Québécois are united under an informal connection to vote for a party that whose language-politics seeks to run a pro-Québécois social, cultural, and economic platform. These differences of opinion are set in a historical context of linguistic conflict.

*I would like to dedicate my thesis to the memory of my late uncle,  
Ray Seidelman*

## **TABLE OF CONTENTS**

Introduction	1-2
Literature Review	3-6
Methodology	7-9
Results	10-18
Conclusions	19-32
Acknowledgements	33
Bibliography	34-36
Appendix A : SPSS Charts and Data	37-45
Appendix B: Tables	46-54
Appendix C : A Brief Québec History	55-60
Appendix D : Glossary of Important Terms and Political Parties	61-62
Appendix E : How Québec Elections Work	63

## INTRODUCTION

This is a study of my heritage and culture as observed through the lens of political process. Through voting, the different groups of Québec differentiate themselves, choosing one of many sides in an on-going struggle for control of the province's economy and social reality. Even though the struggle dates far before what anyone today could have experienced first-hand, the current political parties and social movements represent the issues dating back to the origin of conflict.

Québec's historical timeline has been marked by colonization; first of the French over the native populations, then the British over the French in 1763. The British colonization of the inhabitants of "New France" set the path for the future province of Québec. From 1763 until 1977, with the passing of the Bill 101, the Québécois were a majority language group whose speakers almost always occupied a social position little better than a cheap labor source. They were barred from upward social mobility, access to capital, or valid political representation by the British government and the oversights of the Canadian Federal government. This sort of domination created bitterness that led to revolts, strikes, and eventually a provincial sovereignty movement afflicting Québec with polarizing language politics since the second half of the 20<sup>th</sup> century. In the past, the electoral struggle was between the political vehicles of French and English speakers; however the large influx of immigrants in the last 40 years has caused an increase in heterogeneity and the dynamics of voting to change. How exactly, is the subject of this study, in which I will analyze the voting trends of the province by looking at the 28 conscriptions in the city of Montréal.

My study asks: why do conscriptions vote the way they do in general elections? What are the characteristics of conscriptions that cause them to vote in that way? What defines those characteristics as indicators for voting for a particular political party? Voting patterns of the different groups of Québec are strongly related to a variety of social factors or characteristics of conscriptions. With those questions in mind, I have decided to concentrate on the following social characteristics:

- Language: number of single-answer mother tongue respondents [98.6% of 7,125,575]; the three languages were French [Québécois], English [Anglophone], and Other [Allophone];
- Immigration: the percentage of a conscription's population which was considered first or second generation of a family to have emigrated from abroad as of the 2001 census;
- Education: the percentage of a conscription's population to have attended to or continued to attend university;
- Median yearly income: the median yearly income of all the individuals aged 15 or older of a conscription's yearly income; and
- Employment: the percentage of the population in a conscription employed in the different sectors of the economy.

By looking at these social characteristics I will be able to extend theoretical framework to the data I have obtained, enabling me to reach conclusions and answer the questions that I have asked. With those answers I will not only support and contribute to the pre-existing studies about Québec voting trends, but add a new perspective to the pursuit of knowledge on the subject. I will now give a theoretical framework to support the approach for my study.

## LITERATURE REVIEW

Québec general elections are representative of an on-going disagreement between social groups in the province: the Québécois, Anglophone, and Allophone. The province's largest city, Montréal, is also the ethnic, urban, and metropolitan center. It represents the crossroads of linguistic conflict, but also the evolution the rest Québec will soon encounter. As the province continues to urbanize, the number of immigrants will increase, bringing diverse populations into cities where there currently exists very little. This will change the nature of the linguistic conflict in the province. In order to verify this with my data, I must first provide a theoretical framework to contextualize my future results and conclusions.

### **The Social Indicators**

Conscriptions are unique political entities and battlegrounds wherein voters have fought for their desired political representation. This representation however is arguably decided by the different social characteristics of the populations that inhabit them. There have been many studies (Cloutier 1991, Braconier and Cloutier 1995, Cloutier and Strutynski 1996, and Drouilly 1996) that helped point this study towards the most important social factors directly contributing to the outcomes of general elections in Québec. With the aid of *Statistique Canada* (STATCAN) and the *Directeur Général des Élections du Québec* (DGEQ) [see Appendix D], analysts such as Cloutier and Drouilly wrote about social characteristics of conscriptions in the annual publication of "L'Année Politique au Québec." These studies comparatively looked at election results from the last 30 years using the perspective of social characteristics of conscriptions to determine the importance of the linguistic vote. It is from these studies that the approach of this study is

based. At a glance, the multiple studies show that conscriptions that have voted for the PLQ tend to have higher percentages of Anglophones, Allophones, immigrants, university attendees, and median yearly incomes than conscriptions that tended to vote for the PQ and ADQ. This points to the importance of language in voting, and therefore deserves analysis to help bring conclusive evidence to the study.

### **Language, Common Sense, and New Social Movements Theory**

Historically, language has been a source of great social, economic, and political inequality in Québec. An individual's mother tongue and subsequent spoken language in adulthood tends to, but not exclusively, cause socialization that culturally differentiates populations. This differentiation causes discrepancies in potentiality for attaining capital (Bourdieu 1985). Anglophones, though the minority, historically have much better social standing, cultural dominance, and therefore access to economy than the Québécois or Allophones. Using the analysis of Bourdieu (1985), Anglophones have had much better social, cultural, and economic capital. That dominant position serves as motivation to maintain the occupation of a legitimized position of power within Québec society. This legitimacy was reinforced by generations of common-sense rationality (Haney López 2003) resulting in large-scale acceptance of social, cultural, and economic superiority of English speaking peoples. Consequently, the Québécois were long seen as a weak and un-intelligent cheap labor source to be institutionally repressed, causing deep frustration in many people:

Hubert Martel: We couldn't go into Eaton's [the major department store chain in Québec at the time] and speak French; even if the employees themselves spoke French. If we were there and tried to speak to the employees in French, we would be told to, 'Speak White!' and we would be refused service.

Thérèse Martel: To think we lived in our own country, where we were the majority and yet could not speak French if we wanted to get somewhere in life. [Group Interview: June, 2007]

In their legitimacy, Anglophones were able to place structural boundaries (Waters 1999) preventing large scale upward social mobility or access to capital for both Québécois and Allophones; with exception to the Québécois elite.<sup>1</sup> The elite were able to attain upward social mobility starting in the 1920s by gaining certain cultural capital such as being able to speak English then reproducing their capital each following generation. Speaking English allowed them to participate in the English-run economy much more than other Québécois.

### *Québécois Collective Action*

Out of the Quiet Revolution (*la Révolution Tranquille*) came a new generation of Québécois, motivated for action and mobilized under an anti-Anglophone banner: sovereignty. The sovereignty movement was rooted in the desire for Québécois to empower themselves in Québec society and the post-industrial economy of the 1960s. As a result of its nature, time, and context, it falls into the category with social and identity movements such as with the Gay Rights, Feminist, Civil Rights or what are known as New Social Movements (Buechler 1995 and 2000, Jurgen 1984 and 1987, Melucci 1989, and Inglehart 1990). They were united informally under collective action (voting), identity (Québécois empowerment), and the change of ideology, specifically common-sense rationality (Haney Lopez 2003) in their society using a cultural law schema for social change (Kostiner 2003). The majority of the Québécois sought a political party that would challenge the authority of the *Union Nationale* (UN) [see Appendix D] or the lack of social reform put forth by the PLQ. They found their voice in the PQ who successfully empowered them through legislation and political process.

---

<sup>1</sup> The elite were a small group of educated and wealthy Québécois living primarily in the western and certain central parts of Montréal such as Outremont.

## **Allo-Inherents, Assimilation Problems**

Assimilation for Allophones is a process of cultural assimilation by which immigrants are integrated into Québec society. Their assimilation is defined by the amount which they experience a “loss” or change of mannerisms, values, and language. The assumed changes of assimilation insinuate that immigrants eventually cease to be considered Allophone or immigrant, begin speaking either French or English in their homes, and socialize their subsequent generations to be either Québécois or Anglophone (Portes and Zhou 1993, Portes 1998, Rumbaut 1997, and Vetman 1979, 1986). This is commonly associated with straight-lined assimilation (Warner and Srole 1945). Difficulty in assimilating causes immigrants and Allophones to not be able to identify with Québécois language-politics. They subsequently feel rejected, furthering difficulties and voting against the French-speaking majority.

## **Wrap Up**

By analyzing social factors of conscriptions and discovering the trends which directly affect election results from the last four elections in 1994, 1998, 2003, and 2007, it may be possible to extrapolate what the future of Québec elections could be. The research not only reinforces but elaborates upon pre-existing studies’ analyses of various social factors, applying them to predict the outcome of an election. How this is true exactly, is what shall be discussed in the following sections.

## METHODOLOGY

What social factors help determine the outcomes of Québec's general elections from 1994-2007? Does Montréal's unique demographics reveal trends about those social factors? Can they be applied to the rest of Québec? These questions can be answered by doing a well-guided study of conscriptions in the province of Québec and the city of Montréal, Québec, Canada.

This is a study of Québec's voting trends as determined by the social characteristics of Montréal's 28 conscriptions. The purpose of this research is to aid future research to identify the factors which most influence voting trends in Québec's past 4 and potentially future general elections. The methodology of this study is based in:

- Online research of Montréal conscriptions through the Directeur Général des Elections du Québec (DGEQ), Statistique Canada (STATCAN), and the L'Année Politique au Québec;
- Online research of analysis of social surveys carried out by SOM, CROP, Léger Marketing, and CIRPE by reading the Montréal newspaper *La Presse* daily;
- Quantitative analysis of social factors with SPSS; and
- Interviewing small samples of Montréal's population.

### *Online Number Crunching*

The first online research portion of the study was done on the DGEQ, STATCAN, and L'Année Politique au Québec. The DGEQ and STATCAN websites have up-to-date socio-economic information about all of the 125 Québec conscriptions from the 1996 and 2001 censuses, results of federal and general elections, and results of referendums. I took this information and organized it for the 28 Montréal conscriptions to create comparisons by social factors that affect election outcomes: mother tongue, immigration, attendance of university, median yearly income, and employment. L'Année Politique au Québec is an

annual publication by Québec's political sociologists and intellectuals which analyzes social factors as they relate to the political trends emerging in the province.

#### *Online News and Opinion Analysis*

The second online research portion of the study was done through reading the Montréal newspaper *La Presse* daily. The paper publishes weekly surveys about voting, attitude, and opinion trends administered by think tanks such as Léger Marketing. The surveys update information about those trends in population samples of Montréal.

#### *Production of Graphs*

The third part of the internet research involved using the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS). After coding the emerging socio-economic patterns found in the quantitative data from the DGEQ, STATCAN, L'Année Politique au Québec, and *La Presse*, SPSS was used to produce cross-tabulations to support the arguments made by the results and conclusions of this research.

#### *Feeling it out with Pilot Test Interviews*

The last part of the research was done by qualitatively interviewing small samples of the population in Montréal. The interviews worked primarily as pilot tests to guide the direction of the rest of the research done in the study and thus will not be regularly used in the study. The interviews covered two small samples of Montréal's population. One location was chosen for a convenience sample: the Metro Station at Barry-UQAM in the heart of Montréal. The process consisted of introducing and identifying the research and its purpose then asking three open-ended, opinion-based questions about what issues are most important in provincial political discourse. About 1.5 hours were spent

interviewing, producing 12 respondents. The interviews were grouped together and analyzed. The results were used for support of the study's future research.

The second sample of Montréal population was another pilot test carried out in a snowball sample of my grandparents and their close friends to gauge if in their age, they had forgiven English speakers or if the wounds of the past persisted. The interviews produced 6 respondents each of whom were interviewed individually, but who all came together in a group one afternoon. I interviewed for four hours; then time was spent socializing about various Québec issues.

#### *Rules Adhered to*

The methods of this study adhered strictly to the bylaws and regulations of the American Sociological Association (ASA) Code of Ethics which ensures that no one, respondents or other persons, were damaged physically or mentally during the process of gathering research.

#### **Leading Into the Next Sections**

Through these processes, I am able to analyze results and make conclusions for my research goals.

## **RESULTS**

Taking a quick look at the data, Montréal's voting trends in the last four Québec general elections (1994, 1998, 2003, and 2007)<sup>2</sup> were responsive to the following social indicators:

- Mother Tongue;
- Immigration;
- Education;
- Median yearly income; and
- Employment.

Of the 28 conscriptions in Montréal, 7 voted for the PQ in every election from 1994-2007 whereas 18 of them followed the same trend for the PLQ. Only 3 conscriptions have had any variation in their voting results. These abnormalities exist because they teeter on the edge of the cut-off points for social indicators that tend to change voting outcomes. None of the conscriptions in Montréal have ever elected the ADQ to the National Assembly.

### **PQ Conscriptions**

There are 7 conscriptions which have voted for the PQ exclusively in each of the four elections from 1994-2007: Bourget, Gouin, Hochelage-Maisonneuve, Mercier, Pointe-aux-Trembles, Rosemont, and Sainte-Marie-Saint-Jacques. There has been one conscription that voted 3 of 4 times for the PQ and for the PLQ in 2003: Crémazie. Despite Crémazie's discontinuous voting pattern due to the results of the 2003 election, party loyalty for the PQ tends to be the majority in these conscriptions. The fact that they are almost exclusively voting for the PQ in all elections means that they exhibit particular similarities in their social characteristics. The strongest similarities which distinguish those conscriptions are that they almost always have a majority of their populations

---

<sup>2</sup> In this section, voting exclusively will refer to a conscription voting for a party in each of these four elections.

speaks French as a mother tongue, have fewer immigrants, fewer attendees of university, and lower median yearly incomes than those that vote for the PLQ.

### **PLQ Conscriptions**

There are 18 conscriptions which have voted exclusively for the PLQ in each of the four elections from 1994-2007: Acadie, Bourassa-Sauvé, D'Arcy-McGee, Jacques-Cartier, Jeanne-Mance-Viger, LaFontaine, Laurier-Dorion, Marguerite-Bourgeoys, Marquette, Mont-Royal, Nelligan, Notre-Dame-de-Grâce, Outremont, Robert-Baldwin, Saint-Henri-Sainte-Anne, Saint-Laurent, Viau, and Westmount-Saint-Louis. There are two conscriptions which did not: Anjou and Verdun. Anjou voted 3 of the 4 elections for the PLQ and for the PQ in 1994, and Verdun also voted 3 of the 4 elections for the PLQ and for the PQ in 1998. Despite Anjou and Verdun's discontinuous voting patterns due to the results of the 1994 and 1998 elections respectively, party loyalty for the PLQ tends to be the majority in these conscriptions. The fact that they are almost exclusively voting for the PLQ in all elections means that they exhibit particular similarities in their social characteristics. The strongest similarities which distinguish those conscriptions are that the majority of their populations almost always speak English or other non-French languages as a mother tongue. They also tend to have more immigrants, attendees of university, and higher median yearly incomes than those that voted for the PQ in Montréal.

### **Mother Tongue**

Mother tongue is a social indicator that refers to the languages that people are first taught to speak by parents or guardians. Language not only teaches communication, but a culture to which it is tied. The culture tied to that language tends to, but not exclusively,

cause differences in socialization from the others including a dominant culture for English, radicalized-sovereignist culture for French, or attempted assimilationist culture for foreign languages. These differences tend to affect election outcomes.

In Québec, as of 2001, conscriptions averaged 82% of their populations with French as their mother tongue (Québécois), 7.9% of their populations with English as their mother tongue (Anglophone), and 10.1% of their populations with another language as their mother tongue (Allophone). Québécois, Anglophone, and Allophone shall be the terms used to describe a conscription's majority mother tongue. The measurement for this social indicator is based on respondents giving a single-language response when asked about which language they learned from birth for the 2001 census. This was approximately 98.6% of the population, or 7,125,575 respondents (DGEQ 2001).

As for Montréal's voting trends, its Anglophone and Allophone conscriptions tended to vote exclusively for the PLQ. According to the cross-tabulation "Party Vote vs. Mother Tongue," [Appendix A, Figure 1] all 6 majority Anglophone<sup>3</sup> and all 5 majority Allophone<sup>4</sup> voted exclusively for the PLQ; comprising 55% of the PLQ's election per conscription in Montréal for the 2007 election. The Pearson chi-squared test yielded a p-value of .027 meaning that there is a 2.7% chance that the data was obtained by chance and thus is statistically significant.

Québécois conscriptions tended to vote for either the PQ or PLQ. As the data shows, of Montréal's 17 Québécois conscriptions, the 7 with more than 75% French speakers voted exclusively for the PQ and those 7 with less than 68% exclusively for the PLQ. The 3 with 68-75% French speakers tended to vote most elections for the PQ when

---

<sup>3</sup> Jacques-Cartier, Mont-Royal, D'Arcy-Mcgee, Notre-Dame-de-Grâce, Robert-Baldwin, and Westmount-Saint-Louis.

<sup>4</sup> Jeanne-Mance-Viger, Acadie, Laurier-Dorion, Viau, and Saint-Laurent.

the % was on the higher end. Crémazie, for example, with 75% of its population being Québécois, tended to favor the PQ. Those with lower percentages, such as Anjou and Verdun, who had 74.3% and 68.4% respectively, tended to favor the PLQ [Appendix B, Figures 13 and 14].

Yet, mother tongue is not the only social indicator that must be observed. Montréal's high number of immigrants and majority Allophone conscriptions greatly affect voting results because of difficulties of assimilation and rejection of Québécois language-politics experienced by a large majority of the group.

### **Immigration**

Immigration is a social indicator that refers to the percentage of the population in a conscription that is considered first or second generation immigrant. Immigrants tend to be Allophone, not identify with nationalist or pro-Québécois ideology, and vote almost always for the PLQ. Montréal has more immigrants total and per capita than any city in the province. Québec's provincial average (QPA) of immigrants per conscription was 9.9% whereas Montréal's city average (MCA) was 26.85%. PQ conscriptions averaged 15% of their populations being immigrant while PLQ conscriptions averaged 31.58%.

The data sets show [Appendix A, Chart 2, and Appendix B, Charts 15 and 16] 27 of the 28 conscriptions in Montréal were above the QPA for immigration. The only one below the QPA was the PQ enclave of Pointe-aux-Trembles, who had only 5.2% of its population considered to be immigrant. The data also shows that of those 27, 17 had two times the QPA or more, ranging from 19.8-49.7% immigrant. 16 of them voted for the PLQ in each election from 1994-2007, the last one, Crémazie, did not. Of the 10 that had less than two times but were above the QPA (a range of 9.9%-19.8%), 6 exclusively for

the PQ, and the others for the PLQ. The only exceptions are Anjou and Verdun. The cross-tabulation [Appendix A, Chart 2] yielded a Pearson chi-squared p-value of .003 which means that there is a .3% chance that the data obtained was by chance and that the data is statistically significant. Looking at the data sets, they show that conscriptions with percentages at or below 21% being immigrant tended to vote for the PQ (8 of 13, 61%) and those above 21% for the PLQ (15 of 15, 100%).

It is easy to see that the Allophone vote favors the PLQ. Immigrants, tending to be Allophone, have difficulty assimilating will likely not socialize their children to be Québécois and thus not identify with the political vehicles of a pro-Québécois agenda, such as the PQ or ADQ. The more immigrants a conscription has, the more likely it will be to vote for the center rightist PLQ because it is against sovereignty and language-based political reformation favoring the Québécois. The next social indicator to look at is the vote of the educated citizen to see if education changes the perspective of individuals to the point of affecting election results.

### **University Attendance**

University attendance is a social indicator that refers to the percentage the population in a conscription that attends or is attending university. Québec's provincial average (QPA) of university attendance per conscription was 20.3% whereas Montréal's was 30.28%. PQ conscriptions averaged 26.47% and PLQ conscriptions 31.7%. For the purposes of this analysis, those that have less than the QPA will be referred to as Category 1, those that have above, but less than two times the QPA are Category 2, and those that have two times the QPA or more are Category 3.

The data sets show [Appendix A, Chart 3, and B, Charts, 17 and 18] that 20 of the 28 Montréal conscriptions had percentages of their populations above the QPA attending or having attended university. 7 of them were Category 3, ranging from 42.43-63.2% of university attendees. 6 of them voted exclusively for the PLQ and the other for the PQ. 13 of those conscriptions were Category 2. 7 of them voted exclusively for the PLQ and 2 (Anjou and Verdun) exhibited their respective voting patterns, while 3 voted exclusively for the PQ. The thirteenth conscription in the category was Crémazie which exhibited its respective voting pattern. 8 of the 28 were Category 1. 3 voted exclusively for the PQ and the others voting the same way for the PLQ. The cross-tabulation's Pearson chi-squared test yielded a p-value of .482, meaning that there is a 48.2% chance that the data was obtained by chance and thus is not statistically significant, but there is an obvious observation that can be extrapolated from this information. Though on its own, university attendance is not a significant social characteristic for voting results in Montréal, adding other indicators such as mother tongue into the data yields a much different result.

Looking at the data [Appendix A, Chart 4], there are similarities and differences to prior data. Of course, all 8 PQ-voting conscriptions remain similarly grouped because they are all majority Québécois and without variation in mother tongue, no further statistics can be computed. The other 20 which voted for the PLQ are quite different. 6 of them were Anglophone conscriptions, of which 5 were Category 3 and 1 was Category 2.<sup>5</sup> 9 were majority Québécois, of which 1 was Category 3, 5 were Category 2,<sup>6</sup> and 3 were Category 1. The last 5 were Allophone, of which 3 were Category 2 and 2 were Category 1. The cross-tabulation's Pearson chi-squared test yielded a result of .003

---

<sup>5</sup> This was the conscription of Robert-Baldwin which had a total of 35.66%

<sup>6</sup> 2 of the 5 were Anjou and Verdun

meaning that there is a .3% chance that the data was obtained by chance, making it statistically significant. This data furthers the argument about language, the cultural privilege of the Anglophone, and how they and the Allophone tend to vote for the PLQ. Their stance is clearly against language-politics and the PQ. Conscriptions in which there are large populations speaking English as their mother tongue tend to have higher percentages of their populations attending or having attended university and they tend to vote for the PLQ in general elections. Still, there are other important social indicators that must be considered, such as wealth or more specifically Median Yearly Income.

### **Median Yearly Income**

Median Yearly Income (MYI) is a social indicator that refers to the median yearly income in Canadian dollars. This means that 50% of the population was making above and 50% below the amount in a conscription. In terms of this study of Montréal, MYI is instrumental in understanding a key fundamental truth about Québec; wealth is concentrated disproportionately in the hands of Anglophones. Québécois and Allophones tend to be left in the proverbial economic dust. As of 2001, Québec's median income for persons 15 years of age or more was \$27,125. For Montréal's PQ conscriptions the median income per person of 15 years of age or more was \$25,194 whereas for those that voted for the PLQ was \$29,664. Anglophone conscriptions averaged \$36,920, Québécois \$26,815, and Allophone \$23,290. A MYI above \$30,000 is a sign of considerable wealth in a conscription.

Looking at the data sets [Appendix A, Chart 5], of Montréal's 28 conscriptions, 14 had MYIs above the QPA. 12 voted exclusively for the PLQ and 2 for the PQ. 9 of the 14 had MYIs above the indicator of an economically advantaged conscription (\$30,000),

ranging from \$31,412-\$47,972. 8 of the 9 voted exclusively for the PLQ and the last was Verdun. All 6 of the majority Anglophone conscriptions were in this category, including the highest MYI.<sup>7</sup> None of them voted consistently for the PQ. Of the remaining 14, 6 voted for the PQ. 8 of them voted for the PLQ, 5 of which were the Allophone conscriptions, and the rest Québécois. The cross-tabulation's Pearson chi-squared test yielded a p-value of .025 meaning that there is a 2.5% chance that the data was obtained by chance and thus is statistically significant.

It is clear that Anglophone conscriptions have clear advantages of MYI over its Québécois and Allophone counterparts. All 6 had MYI above the wealth indicator, with only 3 for the Québécois, and 0 of the Allophone.<sup>8</sup> Finally, the social indicator of employment must be observed to consider voting trends.

## **Employment**

Employment is a social indicator that refers to the percentage of the population in a conscription that is employed in a particular job sector. Employment is important because certain jobs have prestige for individuals, aside from higher incomes and perhaps affects which political party will be voted for in general elections. The different sectors of employment are:

- Gestion (management and managers - GM);
- Affaires, finance, et administration (business, finance, and administration thereof - BFA);
- Sciences naturelles et appliquées et et professions apparentées (natural sciences, applications, and apprenticeships - SNAP);
- Secteur de la santé (sector of health - SDS);
- Sciences sociales, enseignement, administration publique et religion (social sciences, teaching, public administration, and religion - SSEAR);
- Arts, culture, sports, et loisirs (arts, cultural jobs, sports, and hobbies - ACSL);

---

<sup>7</sup> Westmount-Saint-Louis's MYI was \$47,972.

<sup>8</sup> All Allophone conscriptions were below the QPA.

- Ventes et services (sales and services - VS);
- Métiers, transport, et machinerie (transportation and transportation maintenance - MTM);
- Professions propres au secteur primaires (self employment agriculture, forestry, mining, fishing, and other primary production - PPSP); and
- Transformation, fabrication, et services publics (construction and public services - TFS).

Looking at the data sets [Appendix A, Charts 6-11, Appendix B, Charts 21-39], Montréal's 28 conscriptions are employed relatively similarly. What sector of the economy the majority of the conscription was employed in tended to have little to do with which political party would get elected in any of the elections from 1994-2007. The discrepancies of employment over averages in PLQ and PQ conscriptions were comparatively negligible. None of the cross-tabulation's Pearson chi-squared tests yielded p-values that indicated that any of the data was statistically significant including .184 for GM, 1.000 for BFA, .403 for SSEAR, .609 for ACSL, .318 for VS, .486 for MTM, and .903 for TFS. The discrepancies of employment over averages in PLQ and PQ conscriptions were comparatively negligible. None of the cross-tabulation's Pearson chi-squared tests yielded p-values that indicated that any of the data was statistically significant, thus, hypotheses are null and employment is not a statistically significant social factor in electoral results.

## CONCLUSIONS

This study was an analysis of the social characteristics in Montréal's 28 conscriptions and what effect they had on the outcomes of the last four general elections. Based on the theoretical framework and the results obtained from census research data from the DGEQ and STATCAN, along with the analysis done using the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS), the study leads me to support the following conclusions about voting trends Montréal conscriptions:

1. Given the historical context of French-English linguistic conflict in Québec, Anglophones still have the strongest social, cultural, and economic capital than any other language group resulting in their continued high social position. They seek to preserve this as indicated by their voting patterns in general elections;
2. In their own category, first or second generation immigrants and Allophones tend to not identify with the language politics of the Québécois culture and its political vehicle (PQ) because they have difficulty assimilating, thus they vote against it and for other parties such as the PLQ;
3. The Québécois, despite achieving political legitimacy and a mass collective action in their voting patterns, still lag behind the Anglophone socio-economically and will continue to do so unless the strategy of their political vehicles (PQ and ADQ) changes; and
4. The future of Québec will resemble what is currently happening in Montréal.

### **Anglophones in a Dominant Position**

Given the historical context of linguistic conflict and Anglophone economic dominance in Montréal, speaking English as a mother tongue is conclusively a social factor that increases peoples' potentiality for strong capital. Capital, as defined by Pierre Bourdieu (1985), quantifies the strength of social networks (social capital), assets (economic capital), and understanding or espousing cultural values, beliefs, nuances, mannerisms, or education (cultural capital). Cultural capital legitimizes people within the framework of a dominant culture. It enables them access to social networks that then open opportunities to higher paying employment or prestige positions. Access to capital

is limited and thus Anglophones have historically tried to emplace structural boundaries to prevent Québécois or Allophones from being able to strongly utilize it. Today, with such a long history of English being the dominant economic language, the cultural capital of the language preserves its position in Montréal. The electoral manifestation of this social reality is that Anglophones almost always vote exclusively for the PLQ in general elections.

### *Historical Context*

Anglophones have, since 1763,<sup>9</sup> been the strongest socio-linguistic group, dominating Québec's economy. Despite having always been a population minority, they controlled land, resources, and capital. This translated to both opaque and transparent political influence and social control. They were initially legitimized by the colonial British government who held command over the territory and repressed the Québécois. With that, Anglophones created colonial structures in Québec to maintain subordination and acceptance to their dominance. These structures were heavily operated by English-speaking elites, but created around the French culture.<sup>10</sup> In this environment only a very small group of Québécois were able to achieve upward social mobility with the majority having being unable participate in the Québec economy to the fullest.

Anglophones are still in a position of power. Despite their being a minority in sheer numbers of population (7.9%), they by no means have a weak status; their small numbers actually work to their advantage. Sharing an experience of being surrounded by

---

<sup>9</sup> 1763 was the year the Treaty of Paris was signed by Louis XIV wherein the British declared control over all of New France, in which all of the country's French speakers (who are the ancestors of the Québécois) lived. They were quickly put under British rule [Appendix C].

<sup>10</sup> Examples of this would be the Catholic Church or the French speaking but Anglophone controlled political parties, the PLQ or *Union Nationale*, both institutionally pushed for acceptance of English as an official language and that Anglophones were rightfully in control of Québec; the only difference was centrist neo-liberalism vs. rightist social conservatism respectively.

a Québécois majority causes them to vote together for the PLQ and against the PQ or ADQ. Conscriptions in which English is the primary mother tongue have the highest percentages of two major indicators of socio-economic advantage: university attendance and median yearly income.

### *Strongest Cultural Capital*

Continuing with analysis provided by capital, Jean-Luc Migué (1970) saw that a potential explanation for Anglophone domination of the economy was the social capital and the strength of English-speaking social networks. In Québec's economy, having historically been dominated by American and Anglo-Canadian firms, English speakers tend to benefit from the informal contacts derived from being able to speak the language of the economy. This cultural capital has enabled their social capital and chances at higher paying jobs or acceptance into important academic institutions; so much so that all 6 Anglophone conscriptions averaged 47% of their populations either attending or having attended university. That percentage is over 20% more of population per conscription than both the Québécois and Allophone conscriptions who averaged 26.33% and 23.58% respectively. In the same vein, the average median yearly income for Anglophone conscriptions was \$36,920, which is almost \$7,000 above the wealth indicator. It is over \$10,000 more per than in Québécois and Allophone conscriptions who averaged and \$26,815, and \$23,290 respectively.

### **Allophones, Assimilation Problems, and Voting**

Immigrants currently make up around 27% of Montréal's population, a percentage that is steadily climbing. Language-politics has largely left this group behind because of the pro-Québécois discourse of the PQ and potentially xenophobic ADQ.

Pauline Marois, the head of the PQ has taken a pro-assimilation stance for immigrants, favoring a more mythical straight-lined assimilation theory. This is a platform which Mario Dumont, the head of the ADQ since 1994, has taken a particularly negative stance. Dumont and the ADQ have gone so far as to suggest legislation on quotas on numbers allowed into the province. This is supposed to ensure successful integration and a benefit to Québec who necessitates the socio-economic support from immigration.

...The actual doorway of immigration was considerably increased a few years ago, and then we approved it, but we must be prudent. In life, we haven't only economic considerations. Up to this point we've avoided closed ghettos from society, and we must continue to stay away from that.  
– Mario Dumont (Beauchemin: August 15, 2007)

An increasing number of Québécois see immigrants as threats language politics and advancement for the French culture. In some extreme cases they are blamed for social problems in the province such as violent crimes and immigrant-native tensions. For example, around the time of the second referendum for Québec sovereignty there was a peak in extremism for many Québécois due to mistrust of the PLQ, the Meech Lake Accord, and the Referendum of 1992. Upon learning of the defeat of the referendum in 1995, Jacques Parizeau (the head of the PQ from 1991-1995) made the statement,

...we were defeated realistically by money and the Allophone ethnic vote. – Jacques Parizeau (Parizeau: October 30, 1995)

In this way, there is a tendency for the Allophone to feel rejected by pro-Québécois parties. That sense of rejection tends to push them to vote for the PLQ, a political party that supports no language politics agenda and a more open immigration policy, despite weak social programs.

All 5 majority Allophone conscriptions have voted exclusively for the PLQ in each of the last four elections with increasingly larger percentages as the number of immigrants increases. With the data sets as support, I can conclude that the more

immigrants a conscription has the more it will tend to almost always elect the PLQ. Also due to the rejection of language-politics, many Allophones have begun to favor assimilation into Anglophone culture, not only as a potential for stronger capital, but also as solidarity against the majority. Thus, conscriptions that are majority Allophone will almost never elect Québécois language-political parties such as the PQ or ADQ.

#### *Options of Assimilation for Allophones*

Discrepancies in social indicators such as median yearly income and university attendance are telling of Allophone conscriptions being the most socio-economically disadvantaged in Montréal. An explanation for this can be derived from the theoretical framework of assimilation options. Difficulty or lack of desire to assimilate into Québec society has a tendency to cause Allophones to feel left out.

#### *Straight-Lined Assimilation*

Assimilation and integration in Québec society are difficult for Allophone immigrants due to the history of linguistic conflict between Québécois and Anglophones. In choosing where to live in Montréal, immigrants are also making a choice to educate subsequent generations in French or English by the socializing elements of the population surrounding them. As the studies of theorists such as Veltman (1979) have stated, as time and generations pass, their assimilation is defined by the amount which they have the characteristic “loss” or change of mannerisms, values, or language similar. In this assumption, assimilation in the province presumes that immigrants eventually cease to be considered Allophone or immigrant, begin speaking either French or English in their homes and socializing their subsequent generations to be either Québécois or Anglophone, much akin to straight-lined assimilation.

Historically, straight-lined assimilation theory (Warner and Srole 1945) in the United States perpetuated the belief that immigrants seeking to adopt the outlooks and cultural beliefs of the native-born majority would, as a result, gain capital. This would be accompanied by incremental upward socio-economic mobility every following generation. Since the 1960s, this belief has continued to be a part of American political rhetoric, but a widely held myth. In Montréal, given the power position of Anglophones, the idea of assimilation into the native-born majority being beneficial has tended to be ignored because of the distinctly weaker position it has occupied.

#### *School and Cultural Capital in the Straight-Line Context*

Historically, the chances for upward social mobility were much greater if Allophones put their children in English-speaking public schools or lived in Anglophone conscriptions. Certain studies show that assimilation into Anglophone culture tends to be a more promising possibility for stronger capital and subsequent upward social mobility (Veltman 1986). This assumption is certainly supported by the data regarding university attendance and median yearly income obtained in this study. Recalling the analysis of Migué (1970) who predates Bourdieu's "Forms of Capital," (1985), the strength of the social networks (social capital) potentially derived from speaking English fluently in the work place has tended to be the most enticing cultural investment learned beginning in school. Being an integrative bi-lingual speaker towards the English language tends to greatly benefit immigrants because of its abilities to enable them to grasp more proficiently the informal fine points of the language to a set of values more like those of their majority Anglophone employers. This includes rejecting Québécois linguistic-political discourse and voting exclusively for the PLQ. Studies have shown that within

the Anglophone environment, Allophones not only learn the language but tend to maximize their understanding of that capital, allowing for a better chance at legitimizing themselves in its context and building the social networks necessary for opportunities for stronger economic capital such as jobs with higher salaries (Portes 1998).

### *Segmented Assimilation*

Unfortunately, the processes of assimilation do not have a uniform or mainstream path of integration, void of prejudices from Anglophones or Québécois groups. Immigrants may try to follow the straight-lined assimilation process, but many end up being as Portes and Zhou (1993) theorized, with two other options regarded as the keystones of segmented assimilation.

The first of the two options explains how in certain cases, rapid economic advancement (which could be associated commonly with living in Anglophone conscriptions) creates deliberate attempts to preserve the immigrant identity and community in a show of solidarity by developing an insular community. Unfortunately, Allophones tend to have desire assimilation rather than this option, so this has more validity in the United States than in Montréal.

The second segment option is when immigrants engage in downward social-mobility. Instead of successfully culturally assimilating while incrementally gaining capital each subsequent generation, some immigrants remain unable to learn either of the two main languages and the cultural values associated to them. As a result, they tend to become impoverished, are victimized by structural racism from the majority, and assimilate into an immigrant underclass. This produces the option of an insular immigrant community and oppositional culture (Ogbu 1974).

### *Lack of Capital*

Akin to the study done by Mary Waters (1999) on West Indian immigrants in the United States, the forces behind socio-economic powers both Anglophone and Québécois prevent immigrants in Montréal from being able to attain generational upward social mobility because they lack the capital necessary to rise above structural boundaries. The immigrant underclass, due to the rising concentration of immigrants in urban settings, has resulted in adversarial sub-culture in the second and third generations aimed against the mainstream Québécois culture. This is caused by the Québécois seeming to have largely shunned them. These generations have difficulties getting the cultural capital necessary to enable strong social capital which could result in increased economic capital. Instead, by participating in mainstream society, immigrants tend to hold occupations with little potential for upward socio-economic mobility.

The disillusionment associated with this type of dead-end employment runs the risk, conservative Québécois would argue, of turning immigrants to underground economic opportunities or crime. This “ghettoification” as it has been coined has become a constant for conservative political parties to scare the public and the National Assembly to favor anti-immigration legislation or quotas to lower the number of allowed immigrants into the province. Unfortunately for Québécois linguistic-political discourse, this sort of “cold-shouldering” of the Allophone population has pushed many immigrants to vote, if at all, against the xenophobic discourse of these political parties and favor the PLQ, which has a much more comprehensive and open immigration policy. The results of the last four elections would suggest that this sort of rejection of the French culture is glaringly true. It no doubt will cause Allophone-Québécois tensions. Coming from the

Québécois' historical context, it is easier to understand why they would be so forceful in their protection of the French language and culture.

### **The Contemporary Status of Voting for the Québécois**

The Quiet Revolution of the 1950s and 60s produced a newly educated and liberated consciousness of French-speakers in Québec. A large percentage of the Québécois were motivated for action and mobilized under an anti-Anglophone banner. Issues like sovereignty, separatism, and language-politics were in the forefront of a social movement for the advancement and preservation of the French language and culture in Québec. Using the analyses of Buechler (1995, 2000), Habermas (1984, 1987), Melucci (1989), and Inglehart (1990) this language-based sovereignty movement fits into New Social Movements. NSM identifies social and identity movements such as with the Gay Rights, Feminist, or Civil Rights movements, as groups committing a set of informally organized collective actions rather than physical fighting or a single protest group with bi-monthly group meetings and brainstorming.

The desire to be empowered was more a recognition of the times and the subconscious decision for change by a majority. In the case of the Québécois who drove for the success of the sovereignty movement in Montréal, collective action was voting. Through voting, they sought to empower their French identities and the attempt to change the common sense rationality (Haney Lopez 2003) which perpetuated the acceptance of English as the strongest language and culture in Québec. This would be achieved through the legitimacy of political parties and laws they would subsequently enact that would culturally shift the province (Kostiner 2003) away from the cultural consciousness of the group with the strongest capital, being Anglophones, in society.

By 1976, the majority of Québécois (74%) sought out a party that would challenge the authority of the UN or the lack of social reform put forth by the PLQ (Cloutier 1991). They found it in the PQ, who successfully empowered the Québécois through legislation and political process, this resulting in Montréal's conscriptions with more than 75% Québécois in their populations to vote exclusively for PQ; a trend that has almost always existed in Montréal (Drouilly 1996).

### *Legitimacy through Legislation*

The collective urgency of the Québécois was to obtain natural rights, freedoms, and sovereignty which were otherwise denied since the Treaty of Paris in 1763. This motivated many individuals to consider the sovereignty movement as positive and support separatism of Québec from Canada. Once the PQ was elected, they pushed first for *Charte de la langue française* (Charter of the French Language) also known as *Loi 101* (Bill 101). The French language and culture was then legitimized in law. Once that fight had been won, the collective sense of urgency began to subside and even dormant. When the PQ put forth the referendum for separatism in 1980, it failed miserably. Essentially, separatism had become a great risk that the majority of the Québécois and almost all of the non-Québécois did not feel the need to take:

In the past, because the situation was more serious, and there were rights which we thought belonged to us, which got refused, then it became more severe. People were more militant, more extreme because they wanted what the Anglophones would not give them. In fact, I was separatist until Lévesque was elected. Most people don't think much of it [separatism] today because we succeeded; with the Bill 101 and all that. We obtained what we wanted. The right to speak French, education, our health care system [in 1966], the right to be French without being persecuted. Because we got all of that, why should we fight to separate? – Paul-Émile Ronchon [Personal Interview: June, 2007]

Paul's words described an opinion shared by many Québécois. Though majority of the Québécois still favor the PQ, urgency remains only dormant, necessitating a threat to the French language or culture to radicalize. There have been instances since 1980,

such as with the Meech Lake Accord in 1987 or the failed the Referendum of 1992, where federalist Anglophones threatened the Québécois' language rights or beliefs in Québec as a socially distinct nation from the rest of Canada, causing a gust of wind to the sails of the sovereignty movement. Those gusts almost resulted in a successful separation referendum in 1995, but eventually subsided.

The ending reality is that like the Québec license plate says “*Je me souviens*,”<sup>11</sup> sovereignty it will lay low but never go away:

The sovereignty movement is too old and is too embedded in the consciousness of the Québécois do die out; it just still resonates somewhere within the core of the Québécois. – Yves Boisvert (Boisvert: 2007)

The continuation of the story is for us, the Québécois, sovereignty became the weapon of mass destruction. If Anglophone Canada is to ever do something really stupid to insult or agitate Québec and the Francophones, we have this sort of atomic bomb. We don't want to have to use it, but everyone else should be aware that if they do some really stupid actions, such as to question our identity, as Québécois in this federation, such as what happened with the Meech Lake Accord, when they decided to say that we weren't a distinct society, that we could use that. It may not be something that wins elections, but we can use it. – Michel C. Auger (Auger: August, 2007)

### *The Current Status of the Québécois*

The current position of the Québécois is a group of people still looking to better their status in Québec. Despite the 30 years since the Charter of the French Language legitimized their social movement and their continued existence as the majority in the province, they still do not hold the strongest socio-economic power positions. Concriptions in which the majority of the population is Québécois still lag behind their Anglophone counter parts in university attendance and median yearly income by discouraging numbers, which of course are worse in Allophones concriptions. It would be wrong as well to overlook the increased socio-economic and political participation that has been gained since the Bill 101. The interests of the Québécois are still very much

---

<sup>11</sup> *Je me souviens* literally means “I remember.” It is a reference to how the Québécois will remember the past of being dominated by Anglophones.

protected by law, but the problem is more that in this era, the Anglophones are not visibly exploiting them. The battle is not the same any more. As the analysis of Auger et al. (2007) stated, the poor Québécois are no longer fighting against the mean and rich Anglophones for basic rights. That battle is won. The Québécois are now, more than ever, enabled access to social, cultural, and economic capital, it's just that in the past, the province or nation was believed to belong to them, but now, the nature and composition has changed, evolved if you will. The more the Québécois resist the change and immigration, the more they will be left behind as Québec augments itself socially, politically, and economically, which could explain why the PQ and ADQ have lost the last two elections. Then again, the strength of the Québécois to engage in collective action is their power position, they are the majority, and where they are concentrated is where their capital is the strongest, they win elections, and socialize others into their language and culture.

### **What the Future Holds**

Québec's future is nothing beyond speculation, but trends do exist. As this study has reinforced, as conscriptions increase in wealth, education, and non-Québécois, there will be more voting for the PLQ or other future parties that reject language politics. Though the majority of Québec is still rural and highly Québécois, more immigrants are arriving in Québec every day. It is not unreasonable that one day more cities in Québec could resemble Montréal's ethnic, metropolitan composition. Some would consider this change a threat to the French language and culture, but cultures are always redefining themselves; they are never static and to try to prevent their evolution is foolish. This does not mean that the Québécois will fade away in a generation or two. The Québécois, the

sovereignty movement, and the political discourse of language politics are far from fading away.

### *The Future of Québec*

The future of Québec is therefore uncertain some ways and certain in others. It is certain in that social characteristics will continue to determine general elections in the province and uncertain because the extent to which Montréal or the entire province will evolve is impossible to anticipate. Political parties are changing, and if not, they will be forced to change or suffer a loss of context. For the PLQ, they will always have the support of the Anglophone and Allophone until a new party comes along. For the ADQ, the xenophobic, neo-liberal, conservative agenda will not capture all of Québec, but those concerned with issues of immigration and the French culture. Their rise in popularity was spurred from a transitional period for the PQ and a change in leadership. That will be short lived in urban areas, but stronger in rural areas of the province where the platform of the party conforms to the highly Québécois and economically struggling population looking to pin their blame on whatever they can. The PQ will see success and failure in the future. It can count on support from past successes and the “liberation” of French-speakers in the past, but they have been lacking context and will need to redefine themselves less as a separatist party against Anglophones, and more with another agenda. As Vincent Marissal, a columnist for *La Presse* in Montréal once said,

The sovereignists are going to have get with the times. The adversaries and enemies are no longer the same. We aren't really marred in this black and white dichotomy any more with the evil federalists from Ottawa who want to hurt the good sovereignists from Québec; the agents of change, progression, and who monopolize all the national symbols...The PQ candidates are hard to sell in the door to door. People would like to vote for them I'm sure, but the candidates lack a sort of strength which inspires.” – Vincent Marrisal (June, 2007)

Regardless of what happens, Québec's historical context has led its political discourse and voting trends to what they are today, and though the last 30 years are finally traceable, the future remains uncertain. I believe we are moving further and further away from separatism, but sovereignty will always be an issue to the Québécois, and if they can successfully integrate the influx of immigration into the French language and culture, then that will be reinforced as a powerful political tool, otherwise the Québécois and language politics will see their demise and Québec will become more like Anglophone Canada rather than resisting its federalist political discourse.

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

For their aid in the process of writing this work, I would like to acknowledge the following people or entities.

First and foremost, the province of Québec - my distant homeland - and all of its inhabitants. On a dit autrefois qu'un jour un l'aura notre pays, mais on l'a déjà, il est là, dans chacun de nous.

The professors and advisors who have gracefully guided me through my academic experience at Pitzer College. Thank you for providing the knowledge that has influenced who I am: Peter Nardi, Ami Mezahav, Phil Zuckerman, Rudi Volti, Ann Stromberg, Hung Thai, Tom Ilgen, Lako Tongun, Natalie Rachlin, Sidney Lemelle, David Amico, Ramaa Bhargava, Kerry Odell, Dan Calichman, Erich Steinman, Eric Grosfils, and Ahmal Thomas.

My friends, housemates, and classmates who have helped me through all of my experiences while at Pitzer College: Nate Adams and Kevin Garvey. Thanks for the good times, I hope they never end. I would also like to mention my gratitude to the years of support from all my friends around the world.

The Braineaters (men's) and Greenshirts (women's) ultimate Frisbee teams of the Claremont Colleges for giving me an outlet, but reminding me that I had to be serious about my life.

The following family members for their love and support: my father Walter, my mother Christiane, my sister Sara, my grand-parents (Thérèse, Hubert, Julian, and Millie).

The Wrights, the McLeans, and the Antoninis.

Mama Tony and Michael and Barbie and Steve Fujinaka for all the care during travels.

And last but not least, Admiral Ackbar, thanks for the warning.

Once again, this text is dedicated to the memory of my uncle Ray Seidelman.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Auger, Michel C., Boisvert, Yves, and Marissal, Vincent. 2007. "La souveraineté dormante 5 de 5" (Dormant Separatism Part 5 of 5). Montréal: Cyberpresse Video.
- Beauchemin, Malorie. 2007. "Dumont defend sa position sur l'immigration" (Dumont defends his position on Immigration). La Presse, Québec : Canada. Retrieved August 15, 2007.
- Boulet, Jac-André and Rowley, J.C.R. 1977. "Measurement of Discrimination in the Labour Market: A Comment (in Shorter Articles and Comments)" *The Canadian Journal of Economics / Revue canadienne d'Economie*, Vol. 10, No. 1: 149-154.
- Bourdieu, Pierre. 1985. "The Forms of Capital" *Handbook of Theory and Research for the Sociology of Education* ed. J.G. Richardson, 241-258. New York: Greenwood Press.
- Buechler, Steven M. 1995 "New Social Movement Theories." *The Sociological Quarterly* 36: 441-464. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing Ltd.
- Buechler, Steven M. 2000. *Social Movements in Advanced Capitalism: The Political and Cultural Construction of Activism*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Cloutier, Édouard. 1991. "L'opinion politique québécoise en 1990-1991" (Political Public Opinion of Québécois in 1990-1991) *L'année politique au Québec 1990-1991*. Les Presses de l'Université de Montréal : Montréal.  
<http://www.pum.umontreal.ca/apqc/>
- Cloutier, Édouard and Braconier, Anne-Marie. 1995. "L'opinion publique : Les hauts et les bas de l'option souverainiste" (Public Opinion : The Highs and Lows of the Sovereignist Option) *L'année politique au Québec 1994-1995*. Les Presses de l'Université de Montréal : Montréal. <http://www.pum.umontreal.ca/apq/>
- Cloutier, Édouard and Strutynski, Yann. 1996. "L'opinion politique québécoise" (Political Public Opinion of Québécois) *L'année politique au Québec 1995-1996*. Les Presses de l'Université de Montréal : Montréal.  
<http://www.pum.umontreal.ca/apqc/>
- Drouilly, Pierre. 1996. "Le référendum du 30 octobre 1995 : une analyse des résultats" (The Referendum of October 30th, 1995 : An Analysis of the Results) *L'année politique au Québec 1995-1996*. Les Presses de l'Université de Montréal : Montréal. <http://www.pum.umontreal.ca/apqc/>

- Directeur Général des Élections du Québec. 2001. *Dossier Socio-Économique des conscriptions*. Québec City : Québec.
- Habermas, Jurgen. 1987. *The Theory of Communicative Action: Lifeworld and System*, Volume 2, translated by Thomas McCarthy. Boston: Beacon Press.
- Habermas, Jurgen. 1984. *The Theory of Communicative Action: Reason and the Rationalization of Society*, Volume 1, translated by Thomas McCarthy. Boston: Beacon Press.
- Haney-López, Ian F. 2003. *Racism on Trial: The Chicano Fight for Justice*. Cambridge: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press. 2003
- Inglehart, Ronald. 1990. "Values, Ideology, and Cognitive Mobilization in New Social Movements." Pp. 43-66 in *Challenging the Political Order*, edited by Russell J. Dalton and Manfred Kuechler. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Kostiner, Idit. 2003. "Evaluating Legality: Towards a Cultural Approach to the Study of Law and Social Change" *Law & Society Review* 37: 323-368. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing Ltd.
- Melucci, Alberto. 1989. *Nomads of the Present : Social Movements and Individual Needs in Contemporary Society*, edited by John Keane and Paul Mier. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- Migué, Jean-Luc. 1970. "Le Nationalisme, l'unité nationale et la théorie économique de l'information (Nationalism, the Unité Nationale Party, and Economic Theory of the Information) *The Canadian Journal of Economics / Revue canadienne d'Economie* No. 3: 183-198.
- Ogbu, John U. 1974. *The Next Generation: An Ethnography of Education in an Urban Neighborhood*. New York: Academic Press.
- Parizeau, Jacques. 1995. *Concession Speech After the Failure of the Referendum of 1995: October 30, 1995*, retrieved August, 2007 from <http://www.vigile.net/spip.php?page=archives&u=http://archives.vigile.net/ds-souv/docs2/95-10-30-discours-parizeau.html>
- Portes, Alejandro and Zhou, Min. 1993. "The New Second Generation: Segmented Assimilation and Its Variants" *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 530: 74-96. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications
- Portes, Alejandro. 1998. "Social Capital: Its Origins and Applications in Modern Sociology" *Annual Review of Sociology* Vol. 24: 1-24.

Rumbaut, Ruben G. 1997. "Assimilation and Its Discontents: Between Rhetoric and Reality" *International Migration Review*, 31 No. 4: 923-960. Boston: Blackwell Publishing.

Veltman, Calvin. 1986. "Assessing the Effects of Quebec's Language Legislation" *Canadian Public Policy / Analyse de Politiques*, 12, No. 2: 314-319. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Veltman, Calvin J., Boulet, Jac-André, Castonguay, Charles. 1979. "The Economic Context of Bilingualism and Language Transfer in the Montreal Metropolitan Area (in Shorter Articles and Comments)" *The Canadian Journal of Economics / Revue canadienne d'Economique*, 12, No. 3: 468-479. Montréal: CIREQ.

Warner, W. Lloyd, Srole Leo. 1945. *The Social Systems of American Ethnic Groups*, New Haven, Yale University Press.

Waters, Mary. 1999. *Black Identities: West Indian Dreams and American Realities*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press.

## APPENDIX A

### 1. Mother Tongue vs. Party Vote in 2007

**PartyVote2007 \* Mother Tongue Crosstabulation**

			Mother Tongue			Total
			Québécois	Anglo-inhere	Allo-inhere	
PartyVote2007	PQ	Count	8	0	0	8
		% within PartyVote2007	100.0%	.0%	.0%	100.0%
		% within MaternalLanguage	47.1%	.0%	.0%	28.6%
PLQ		Count	9	6	5	20
		% within PartyVote2007	45.0%	30.0%	25.0%	100.0%
		% within MaternalLanguage	52.9%	100.0%	100.0%	71.4%
Total		Count	17	6	5	28
		% within PartyVote2007	60.7%	21.4%	17.9%	100.0%
		% within MaternalLanguage	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

### Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	7.247 <sup>a</sup>	2	.027
Likelihood Ratio	9.995	2	.007
Linear-by-Linear Association	5.858	1	.016
N of Valid Cases	28		

a. 5 cells (83.3%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 1.43.

## 2. Immigration vs. Party Vote in 2007

**PartyVote2007 \* Immigrantintensity Crosstabulation**

			Immigrantintensity			Total
			> 9.9	9.9 < > 19.8	19.8 <	
PartyVote2007	PQ	Count	1	6	1	8
		% within PartyVote2007	12.5%	75.0%	12.5%	100.0%
		% within Immigrantintensity	100.0%	60.0%	5.9%	28.6%
		% of Total	3.6%	21.4%	3.6%	28.6%
	PLQ	Count	0	4	16	20
		% within PartyVote2007	.0%	20.0%	80.0%	100.0%
		% within Immigrantintensity	.0%	40.0%	94.1%	71.4%
		% of Total	.0%	14.3%	57.1%	71.4%
Total		Count	1	10	17	28
		% within PartyVote2007	3.6%	35.7%	60.7%	100.0%
		% within Immigrantintensity	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
		% of Total	3.6%	35.7%	60.7%	100.0%

### Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	11.628 <sup>a</sup>	2	.003
Likelihood Ratio	12.436	2	.002
Linear-by-Linear Association	11.148	1	.001
N of Valid Cases	28		

a. 4 cells (66.7%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .29.

## 3. University Attendance vs. Party vote in 2007

**PartyVote2007 \* AboveUniverQPA Crosstabulation**

			AboveUniverQPA			Total
			Below QPA	QPA < > 40.6	40.6 and Above	
PartyVote2007	PQ	Count	3	4	1	8
		% within PartyVote2007	37.5%	50.0%	12.5%	100.0%
		% within AboveUniverQPA	37.5%	33.3%	12.5%	28.6%
	PLQ	Count	5	8	7	20
		% within PartyVote2007	25.0%	40.0%	35.0%	100.0%
		% within AboveUniverQPA	62.5%	66.7%	87.5%	71.4%
Total		Count	8	12	8	28
		% within PartyVote2007	28.6%	42.9%	28.6%	100.0%
		% within AboveUniverQPA	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

### Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	1.458 <sup>a</sup>	2	.482
Likelihood Ratio	1.613	2	.446
Linear-by-Linear Association	1.181	1	.277
N of Valid Cases	28		

a. 3 cells (50.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 2.29.

### 4. University Attendance vs. Mother Tongue vs. Political Party

Mothertongue \* AboveUniverQPA \* PartyVote2007 Crosstabulation

PartyVote2007				AboveUniverQPA			Total	
				Below QPA	QPA < > 40.6	40.6 and Above		
PQ	Mothers tongue	Québécois	Count	3	4	1	8	
			% within Mothers tongue	37.5%	50.0%	12.5%	100.0%	
			% within AboveUniverQPA	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	
			% of Total	37.5%	50.0%	12.5%	100.0%	
	Total	Count	3	4	1	8		
		% within Mothers tongue	37.5%	50.0%	12.5%	100.0%		
		% within AboveUniverQPA	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%		
		% of Total	37.5%	50.0%	12.5%	100.0%		
	PLQ	Mothers tongue	Québécois	Count	3	5	1	9
				% within Mothers tongue	33.3%	55.6%	11.1%	100.0%
% within AboveUniverQPA				60.0%	62.5%	14.3%	45.0%	
% of Total				15.0%	25.0%	5.0%	45.0%	
Anglo-inherent		Count	0	0	6	6		
		% within Mothers tongue	.0%	.0%	100.0%	100.0%		
		% within AboveUniverQPA	.0%	.0%	85.7%	30.0%		
		% of Total	.0%	.0%	30.0%	30.0%		
Allo-inherent		Count	2	3	0	5		
		% within Mothers tongue	40.0%	60.0%	.0%	100.0%		
		% within AboveUniverQPA	40.0%	37.5%	.0%	25.0%		
		% of Total	10.0%	15.0%	.0%	25.0%		
Total	Count	5	8	7	20			
	% within Mothers tongue	25.0%	40.0%	35.0%	100.0%			
	% within AboveUniverQPA	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%			
	% of Total	25.0%	40.0%	35.0%	100.0%			

### Chi-Square Tests

PartyVote2007		Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
PQ	Pearson Chi-Square	. <sup>a</sup>		
	N of Valid Cases	8		
PLQ	Pearson Chi-Square	16.105 <sup>b</sup>	4	.003
	Likelihood Ratio	19.627	4	.001
	Linear-by-Linear Association	.020	1	.889
	N of Valid Cases	20		

a. No statistics are computed because Mothertongue is a constant.

b. 9 cells (100.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 1.25.

### 5. Median Yearly Income vs. Party Vote

#### MaternalLanguage \* MYI2Times \* PartyVote2007 Crosstabulation

PartyVote2007				MYI2Times		Total	
				Below QPA	Above QPA < 2 Times		
PQ	MaternalLanguage	Francophone	Count	6	2	8	
			% within MaternalLanguage	75.0%	25.0%	100.0%	
			% within MYI2Times	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	
	Total			Count	6	2	8
				% within MaternalLanguage	75.0%	25.0%	100.0%
				% within MYI2Times	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
PLQ	MaternalLanguage	Francophone	Count	4	5	9	
			% within MaternalLanguage	44.4%	55.6%	100.0%	
			% within MYI2Times	50.0%	41.7%	45.0%	
		Anglophone	Count	0	6	6	
			% within MaternalLanguage	.0%	100.0%	100.0%	
			% within MYI2Times	.0%	50.0%	30.0%	
	Allophone	Count	4	1	5		
		% within MaternalLanguage	80.0%	20.0%	100.0%		
		% within MYI2Times	50.0%	8.3%	25.0%		
	Total			Count	8	12	20
				% within MaternalLanguage	40.0%	60.0%	100.0%
				% within MYI2Times	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

### Chi-Square Tests

PartyVote2007		Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
PQ	Pearson Chi-Square	. <sup>a</sup>		
	N of Valid Cases	8		
PLQ	Pearson Chi-Square	7.407 <sup>b</sup>	2	.025
	Likelihood Ratio	9.551	2	.008
	Linear-by-Linear Association	.768	1	.381
	N of Valid Cases	20		

a. No statistics are computed because MaternalLanguage is a constant.

b. 5 cells (83.3%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 2.00.

### 6. GM vs. Party Vote

#### PartyVote2007 \* Management Crosstabulation

			Management		Total
			Below QPA	Above QPA	
PartyVote2007	PQ	Count	5	3	8
		% within PartyVote2007	62.5%	37.5%	100.0%
		% within Management	41.7%	18.8%	28.6%
		% of Total	17.9%	10.7%	28.6%
	PLQ	Count	7	13	20
		% within PartyVote2007	35.0%	65.0%	100.0%
		% within Management	58.3%	81.3%	71.4%
		% of Total	25.0%	46.4%	71.4%
Total	Count	12	16	28	
	% within PartyVote2007	42.9%	57.1%	100.0%	
	% within Management	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	
	% of Total	42.9%	57.1%	100.0%	

### Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	1.765 <sup>b</sup>	1	.184		
Continuity Correction <sup>a</sup>	.820	1	.365		
Likelihood Ratio	1.760	1	.185		
Fisher's Exact Test				.231	.183
Linear-by-Linear Association	1.702	1	.192		
N of Valid Cases	28				

a. Computed only for a 2x2 table

b. 2 cells (50.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 3.43.

## 7. BFA vs. Party Vote

**PartyVote2007 \* Business Crosstabulation**

			Business		Total
			Below QPA	Above QPA	
PartyVote2007	PQ	Count	2	6	8
		% within PartyVote2007	25.0%	75.0%	100.0%
		% within Business	28.6%	28.6%	28.6%
		% of Total	7.1%	21.4%	28.6%
	PLQ	Count	5	15	20
		% within PartyVote2007	25.0%	75.0%	100.0%
		% within Business	71.4%	71.4%	71.4%
		% of Total	17.9%	53.6%	71.4%
	Total	Count	7	21	28
		% within PartyVote2007	25.0%	75.0%	100.0%
		% within Business	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
		% of Total	25.0%	75.0%	100.0%

**Chi-Square Tests**

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	.000 <sup>b</sup>	1	1.000		
Continuity Correction <sup>a</sup>	.000	1	1.000		
Likelihood Ratio	.000	1	1.000		
Fisher's Exact Test				1.000	.694
Linear-by-Linear Association	.000	1	1.000		
N of Valid Cases	28				

a. Computed only for a 2x2 table

b. 1 cells (25.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 2.00.

## 8. SSEAR vs. Party Vote

**PartyVote2007 \* SocialScience Crosstabulation**

			SocialScience		Total
			Below QPA	Above QPA	
PartyVote2007	PQ	Count	3	5	8
		% within PartyVote2007	37.5%	62.5%	100.0%
		% within SocialScience	21.4%	35.7%	28.6%
		% of Total	10.7%	17.9%	28.6%
	PLQ	Count	11	9	20
		% within PartyVote2007	55.0%	45.0%	100.0%
		% within SocialScience	78.6%	64.3%	71.4%
		% of Total	39.3%	32.1%	71.4%
	Total	Count	14	14	28
		% within PartyVote2007	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%
		% within SocialScience	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
		% of Total	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%

**Chi-Square Tests**

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	.700 <sup>b</sup>	1	.403		
Continuity Correction <sup>a</sup>	.175	1	.676		
Likelihood Ratio	.706	1	.401		
Fisher's Exact Test				.678	.339
Linear-by-Linear Association	.675	1	.411		
N of Valid Cases	28				

a. Computed only for a 2x2 table

b. 2 cells (50.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 4.00.

**9. ACSL vs. Party Vote**

**PartyVote2007 \* ALS Crosstabulation**

			ALS		Total
			Below QPA	Above QPA	
PartyVote2007	PQ	Count	2	6	8
		% within PartyVote2007	25.0%	75.0%	100.0%
		% within ALS	22.2%	31.6%	28.6%
		% of Total	7.1%	21.4%	28.6%
	PLQ	Count	7	13	20
		% within PartyVote2007	35.0%	65.0%	100.0%
		% within ALS	77.8%	68.4%	71.4%
		% of Total	25.0%	46.4%	71.4%
Total		Count	9	19	28
		% within PartyVote2007	32.1%	67.9%	100.0%
		% within ALS	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
		% of Total	32.1%	67.9%	100.0%

**Chi-Square Tests**

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	.262 <sup>b</sup>	1	.609		
Continuity Correction <sup>a</sup>	.004	1	.949		
Likelihood Ratio	.270	1	.604		
Fisher's Exact Test				1.000	.484
Linear-by-Linear Association	.253	1	.615		
N of Valid Cases	28				

a. Computed only for a 2x2 table

b. 1 cells (25.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 2.57.

## 10. VS vs. Party Vote

**PartyVote2007 \* Sales Crosstabulation**

			Sales		Total
			Below QPA	Above QPA	
PartyVote2007	PQ	Count	4	4	8
		% within PartyVote2007	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%
		% within Sales	22.2%	40.0%	28.6%
		% of Total	14.3%	14.3%	28.6%
	PLQ	Count	14	6	20
		% within PartyVote2007	70.0%	30.0%	100.0%
		% within Sales	77.8%	60.0%	71.4%
Total	Count	18	10	28	
	% within PartyVote2007	64.3%	35.7%	100.0%	
	% within Sales	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	
	% of Total	64.3%	35.7%	100.0%	

### Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	.996 <sup>b</sup>	1	.318		
Continuity Correction <sup>a</sup>	.315	1	.575		
Likelihood Ratio	.973	1	.324		
Fisher's Exact Test				.400	.284
Linear-by-Linear Association	.960	1	.327		
N of Valid Cases	28				

a. Computed only for a 2x2 table

b. 1 cells (25.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .86.

## 11. MTM vs. Party Vote

**PartyVote2007 \* Transportation Crosstabulation**

			Transportation		Total
			Below QPA	Above QPA	
PartyVote2007	PQ	Count	7	1	8
		% within PartyVote2007	87.5%	12.5%	100.0%
		% within Transportation	26.9%	50.0%	28.6%
		% of Total	25.0%	3.6%	28.6%
	PLQ	Count	19	1	20
		% within PartyVote2007	95.0%	5.0%	100.0%
		% within Transportation	73.1%	50.0%	71.4%
Total	Count	26	2	28	
	% within PartyVote2007	92.9%	7.1%	100.0%	
	% within Transportation	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	
	% of Total	92.9%	7.1%	100.0%	

**Chi-Square Tests**

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	.485 <sup>b</sup>	1	.486		
Continuity Correction <sup>a</sup>	.000	1	1.000		
Likelihood Ratio	.441	1	.507		
Fisher's Exact Test				.497	.497
Linear-by-Linear Association	.467	1	.494		
N of Valid Cases	28				

a. Computed only for a 2x2 table

b. 2 cells (50.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .57.

**12. TFS vs. Party Vote**

**PartyVote2007 \* Infrastructure Crosstabulation**

			Infrastructure		Total
			Below QPA	Above QPA	
PartyVote2007	PQ	Count	5	3	8
		% within PartyVote2007	62.5%	37.5%	100.0%
		% within Infrastructure	29.4%	27.3%	28.6%
		% of Total	17.9%	10.7%	28.6%
	PLQ	Count	12	8	20
		% within PartyVote2007	60.0%	40.0%	100.0%
		% within Infrastructure	70.6%	72.7%	71.4%
		% of Total	42.9%	28.6%	71.4%
Total		Count	17	11	28
		% within PartyVote2007	60.7%	39.3%	100.0%
		% within Infrastructure	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
		% of Total	60.7%	39.3%	100.0%

**Chi-Square Tests**

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	.015 <sup>b</sup>	1	.903		
Continuity Correction <sup>a</sup>	.000	1	1.000		
Likelihood Ratio	.015	1	.902		
Fisher's Exact Test				1.000	.624
Linear-by-Linear Association	.014	1	.904		
N of Valid Cases	28				

a. Computed only for a 2x2 table

b. 2 cells (50.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 3.14.

## APPENDIX B

13.

Québécois PQ Concriptions	% of Québécois
Pointe-Aux-Trembles	93.3
Hochelaga-Maisonneuve	86.5
Bourget	86
Mercier	78.9
Gouin	78.6
Rosemont	77.9
Sainte-Marie-Saint-Jacques	75.5
Crémazie	75

14.

Québécois PLQ Concriptions	% of Québécois
Anjou	74.3
Verdun	68.4
Saint-Henri-Sainte-Anne	64.3
Bourassa-Sauvé	63.6
Marquette	57.7
Outremont	52.9
La Fontaine	49.1
Marguerite-Bourgeoys	44.5
Nelligan	42.5

15.

PLQ Concriptions	% of Immigrants
L'Acadie	45.50
D'Arcy McGee	43.30
Jacques-Cartier	19.80
Jeanne-Mance-Viger	38.50
Marguerite-Bourgeoys	25.30
Mont-Royal	49.70
Notre Dame de Grâce	31.30
Outremont	33.80
Robert-Baldwin	33.90
Westmount-Saint Louis	35.30
Anjou	19.10
Bourassa-Sauvé	27.40
La Fontaine	29.30
Laurier-Dorion	41
Marquette	15.50
Nelligan	22.10
Saint-Henri-Sainte-Anne	18.80
Saint-Laurent	45.90
Verdun	14.40
Viau	41.70

**16.**

PQ Concriptions	% of Immigrants
Bourget	10.60
Crémazie	21
Gouin	17.50
Hochelaga-Maisonneuve	11.80
Pointe-Aux-Trembles	5.20
Rosemont	18
Mercier	17.20
Sainte-Marie-Saint-Jacques	19

**17.**

University PLQ Concriptions	% of conscription
Westmount-Saint Louis	63.20
Outremont	58.83
Notre Dame de Grâce	50.34
Jacques-Cartier	46.29
Mont-Royal	44.46
D'Arcy McGee	42.43
Robert-Baldwin	35.66
Nelligan	34.11
Saint-Laurent	33.08
L'Acadie	31.06
Verdun	28.55
Anjou	23.50
Laurier-Dorion	23.30
Marquette	22.45
Saint-Henri-Sainte-Anne	22.31
Marguerite-Bourgeoys	18.47
Jeanne-Mance-Viger	17.24
La Fontaine	14
Viau	13.20
Bourassa-Sauvé	11.43

**18.**

University PQ Concriptions	% of conscription
Mercier	45.12
Sainte-Marie-Saint-Jacques	39.48
Crémazie	30
Gouin	28.42
Rosemont	25.30
Hochelaga-Maisonneuve	17.80
Bourget	15.53
Pointe-Aux-Trembles	12.33

19.

PLQ Concriptions	MYI in Canadian Dollars
Westmount-Saint Louis	47,972
Jacques-Cartier	43,066
Nelligan	36,507
Outremont	36,186
D'Arcy McGee	34,522
Notre Dame de Grâce	33,030
Verdun	31,675
Robert-Baldwin	31,521
Mont-Royal	31,412
Anjou	28,476
Saint-Laurent	28,144
Marquette	27,936
L'Acadie	25,841
Marguerite-Bourgeoys	25,564
La Fontaine	25,535
Jeanne-Mance-Viger	24,106
Saint-Henri-Sainte-Anne	23,275
Bourassa-Sauvé	20,156
Laurier-Dorion	19,568
Viau	18,792

20.

PQ Concriptions	MYI in Canadian Dollars
Mercier	27,782
Crémazie	27,600
Sainte-Marie-Saint-Jacques	26,997
Pointe-Aux-Trembles	26,773
Rosemont	25,764
Bourget	24,453
Gouin	22,421
Hochelaga-Maisonneuve	19,765

21.

PLQ Concriptions	% Employed in GM
Jacques-Cartier	20.50%
Westmount-Saint Louis	18.20%
Nelligan	17.80%
Robert-Baldwin	16.10%
D'Arcy McGee	15.50%
Notre Dame de Grâce	14.50%
Saint-Laurent	13.20%
L'Acadie	13.10%
Outremont	12.60%
Mont-Royal	11.50%
Verdun	11.30%
Marquette	10.20%
Jeanne-Mance-Viger	10.10%
La Fontaine	8.90%
Marguerite-Bourgeoys	8.60%
Saint-Henri-Sainte-Anne	8.60%

	Anjou	8.40%
	Bourassa-Sauvé	6.20%
	Laurier-Dorion	6.10%
	Viau	4.80%
<b>22.</b>		
	PQ Concriptions	% Employed in GM
	Sainte-Marie-Saint-Jacques	11.30%
	Crémazie	9.60%
	Mercier	9.60%
	Bourget	7.70%
	Rosemont	7.70%
	Gouin	7.50%
	Pointe-Aux-Trembles	7%
	Hochelaga-Maisonneuve	5.20%
<b>23.</b>		
	PLQ Concriptions	% Employed in BFA
	Marguerite-Bourgeoys	26.60%
	Anjou	24.90%
	Jeanne-Mance-Viger	23.80%
	La Fontaine	22.90%
	Marquette	22.80%
	Verdun	22.70%
	Nelligan	22.20%
	Saint-Henri-Sainte-Anne	21.50%
	Jacques-Cartier	21.30%
	Robert-Baldwin	21.10%
	Saint-Laurent	20.70%
	D'Arcy McGee	20%
	L'Acadie	19.90%
	Bourassa-Sauvé	19.30%
	Westmount-Saint Louis	18.90%
	Viau	17.30%
	Notre Dame de Grâce	18.20%
	Outremont	17.10%
	Laurier-Dorion	16.70%
	Mont-Royal	16.60%
<b>24.</b>		
	PQ Concriptions	% Employed in BFA
	Bourget	23.70%
	Crémazie	22.20%
	Pointe-Aux-Trembles	21.50%
	Rosemont	21.30%
	Hochelaga-Maisonneuve	20.10%
	Gouin	19.10%
	Sainte-Marie-Saint-Jacques	17.80%
	Mercier	16.80%
<b>25.</b>		
	PLQ Concriptions	% Employed in SNAP
	Westmount-Saint Louis	11.10%
	Nelligan	10.50%
	Outremont	10.40%
	Saint-Laurent	10.20%
	Jacques-Cartier	10%
	Notre Dame de Grâce	9.90%

Robert-Baldwin	9.50%
Mont-Royal	9.40%
L'Acadie	9.10%
Anjou	7.90%
Marquette	7.90%
Saint-Henri-Sainte-Anne	7.70%
D'Arcy McGee	7.50%
Verdun	7.50%
Laurier-Dorion	6.70%
Marguerite-Bourgeoys	6.60%
Jeanne-Mance-Viger	6.20%
La Fontaine	5.80%
Viau	4.80%
Bourassa-Sauvé	3.60%

26.

PQ Concriptions	% Employed in SNAP
Mercier	9.40%
Crémazie	8.90%
Sainte-Marie-Saint-Jacques	8.60%
Gouin	8.10%
Rosemont	8%
Hochelaga-Maisonneuve	6.30%
Bourget	6.20%
Pointe-Aux-Trembles	5.50%

27.

PLQ Concriptions	% Employed in SDS
D'Arcy McGee	7.60%
Outremont	7.30%
Mont-Royal	7.20%
Anjou	6.80%
Verdun	6.20%
Notre Dame de Grâce	6.10%
Marguerite-Bourgeoys	6%
Jacques-Cartier	5.80%
Robert-Baldwin	5.80%
Westmount-Saint Louis	5.70%
Bourassa-Sauvé	5.50%
Marquette	5.40%
L'Acadie	5.30%
Saint-Laurent	5.30%
La Fontaine	5.10%
Viau	5.10%
Nelligan	4.80%
Jeanne-Mance-Viger	4.50%
Saint-Henri-Sainte-Anne	4.40%
Laurier-Dorion	4.30%

**28.**

PQ Concriptions	% Employed in SDS
Crémazie	7.40%
Rosemont	6.80%
Bourget	6.20%
Pointe-Aux-Trembles	5.80%
Hochelaga-Maisonneuve	4.80%
Mercier	4.50%
Sainte-Marie-Saint-Jacques	4.50%
Gouin	4.10%

**29.**

PLQ Concriptions	% Employed in SNAP
Outremont	17.90%
Westmount-Saint Louis	16%
Notre Dame de Grâce	14.50%
D'Arcy McGee	11.80%
Jacques-Cartier	10.30%
Mont-Royal	10.20%
Laurier-Dorion	9.10%
Verdun	8.60%
L'Acadie	8.30%
Anjou	8.20%
Robert-Baldwin	7.50%
Saint-Laurent	7.50%
Nelligan	6.90%
Saint-Henri-Sainte-Anne	6.60%
Marquette	6.10%
La Fontaine	5.70%
Marguerite-Bourgeoys	5.60%
Bourassa-Sauvé	5.40%
Jeanne-Mance-Viger	5.40%
Viau	5.10%

**30.**

PQ Concriptions	% Employed in SNAP
Mercier	15.10%
Gouin	11.60%
Sainte-Marie-Saint-Jacques	11.40%
Crémazie	11.20%
Rosemont	10.70%
Hochelaga-Maisonneuve	7.90%
Bourget	6.60%
Pointe-Aux-Trembles	5.60%

**31.**

PLQ Concriptions	% Employed in ACSL
Outremont	11.00%
Westmount-Saint Louis	8.70%
Notre Dame de Grâce	8.50%
Laurier-Dorion	6.10%
Saint-Henri-Sainte-Anne	5.60%
D'Arcy McGee	4.70%
Verdun	4.50%
Jacques-Cartier	4.40%
Anjou	3.40%
L'Acadie	3.40%

Mont-Royal	3.20%
Viau	3.20%
Robert-Baldwin	3.10%
Saint-Laurent	3.00%
Marquette	2.90%
Nelligan	2.60%
Bourassa-Sauvé	2.30%
Marguerite-Bourgeoys	2.10%
Jeanne-Mance-Viger	2%
La Fontaine	1.80%

32.

PQ Conscriptions	% Employed in ACSL
Mercier	16.90%
Sainte-Marie-Saint-Jacques	13.50%
Gouin	9.40%
Hochelaga-Maisonneuve	6.50%
Rosemont	5%
Crémazie	4.70%
Bourget	2.60%
Pointe-Aux-Trembles	2.40%

33.

PLQ Conscriptions	% Employed in VS
Saint-Henri-Sainte-Anne	26.30%
Viau	26.10%
Bourassa-Sauvé	25%
Laurier-Dorion	24.30%
Marquette	24%
Marguerite-Bourgeoys	23.60%
Jeanne-Mance-Viger	22.80%
Anjou	22.70%
Verdun	22.70%
Robert-Baldwin	22.40%
Mont-Royal	22.30%
D'Arcy-McGee	22.20%
La Fontaine	22.10%
Nelligan	21.70%
L'Acadie	21.60%
Saint-Laurent	21.10%
Notre Dame de Grâce	19.60%
Jacques-Cartier	19%
Westmount-Saint Louis	17.50%
Outremont	16.10%

34.

PQ Concriptions	% Employed in VS
Hochelaga-Maisonneuve	27.20%
Bourget	24.40%
Sainte-Marie-Saint-Jacques	24%
Pointe-Aux-Trembles	23.90%
Rosemont	22.40%
Gouin	22.30%
Crémazie	19.90%
Mercier	18.20%

35.

PLQ Concriptions	% Employed in MTM
Bourassa-Sauvé	15.40%
La Fontaine	14.10%
Jeanne-Mance-Viger	12.80%
Viau	12.80%
Marquette	12.70%
Marguerite-Bourgeoys	12.30%
Saint-Henri-Sainte-Anne	11.50%
Anjou	11%
Verdun	10.10%
Laurier-Dorion	9.60%
L'Acadie	9.10%
Nelligan	8.20%
Robert-Baldwin	8.10%
Saint-Laurent	7.70%
Mont-Royal	5.90%
Notre Dame de Grâce	5.40%
Jacques-Cartier	5.20%
D'Arcy McGee	4.70%
Outremont	3.60%
Westmount-Saint Louis	2%

36.

PQ Concriptions	% Employed in MTM
Pointe-Aux-Trembles	18.40%
Bourget	14.30%
Hochelaga-Maisonneuve	12.70%
Rosemont	10.30%
Gouin	8.80%
Crémazie	8.70%
Mercier	5%
Sainte-Marie-Saint-Jacques	4.90%

37.

PQ Concriptions	% Employed in PPSP
Gouin	0.50%
Hochelaga-Maisonneuve	0.50%
Crémazie	0.40%
Rosemont	0.40%
Bourget	0.30%
Pointe-Aux-Trembles	0.30%
Mercier	0.30%
Sainte-Marie-Saint-Jacques	0.20%

38.

PLQ Concriptions	% Employed in TFS
Viau	20.60%
Laurier-Dorion	17.10%
Bourassa-Sauvé	16.60%
La Fontaine	13.60%
Mont-Royal	13.10%
Jeanne-Mance-Viger	11.40%
Saint-Laurent	10.50%
L'Acadie	10.10%
Marguerite-Bourgeoys	7.90%
Marquette	7.70%
Saint-Henri-Sainte-Anne	7.40%
Anjou	6.60%
Robert-Baldwin	6.20%
Verdun	6%
D'Arcy McGee	4.80%
Nelligan	4.80%
Outremont	3.90%
Notre Dame de Grâce	3.40%
Jacques-Cartier	2.70%
Westmount-Saint Louis	1.40%

39.

PQ Concriptions	% Employed in TFS
Pointe-Aux-Trembles	9.70%
Hochelaga-Maisonneuve	9%
Gouin	8.70%
Bourget	8%
Crémazie	7.70%
Rosemont	7.50%
Mercier	3.90%
Sainte-Marie-Saint-Jacques	3.80%

## APPENDIX C

Québec's early history and foundation rests in the North American standard of conquest of native peoples and the subsequent declaration of seized lands in the name of a European power or monarchy, which in this case is France and foundation of what was then known as 'New France.' Here are events which occurred from the beginning of New France until 1995.

### **Discovery, Settlement, and Loss of New France (1534-1763)**

1534:

1. Frenchman Jacques Cartier from St. Malo, who while trying to find a western route to Asia lands in the Gulf of the St. Lawrence.
2. He explores areas of modern-day Newfoundland, small islands such as Iles-des-oiseaux, the Gaspé Peninsula, and meets native peoples such as the Mi'kmaq and Iroquois.
  - a. In the process of the journey, Cartier plants a cross in the bay of Gaspé declaring the land in the name of Francis I, the king of France.

1535:

1. Cartier reaches Stadacona (modern day Québec City).
2. Cartier takes a small boat and crew and sails down the St. Lawrence, landing in the much larger Iroquois center of Hochelaga (modern day Montréal).

1541:

1. Cartier returns to find riches and minerals.
2. The Iroquois are concerned and turn hostile on the Frenchmen
  - a. Cartier goes downriver from Stadacona and builds a settlement, mining crystal quartz and iron pyrites while achieving some type of successful agri-pastoralism.

1542:

1. Cartier and his men, hurting from scurvy and conflicts with the natives abandoned the settlement of Charlesbourg-Royal.

1608:

1. Samuel de Champlain penetrates the St. Lawrence River and establishes the settlement of Québec City to create a stronghold for the French Colonial Empire establishing an economic enterprise with fur trading outposts for exchange with native peoples.
  - a. Ultimately, the fur outpost serves as a base to forge military alliances with the Huron and Algonquin nations appealing to them mainly with metal weapons in exchange for furs.
  - b. Missionaries and traders begin to explore the interior and established trading posts along the St. Lawrence tributaries even as far west as the great lakes.

1627:

1. To ensure French rule, King Louis XIII of France enacts the seigneurial system, forbidding non-Catholics from settling in New France.
2. Catholic missionaries were encouraged to settle missions and convert the Huron and Algonquin to Catholicism.
  - a. In the process trading posts and new towns such as Trois-Rivières and Montréal are settled.

1663:

1. King Louis XIV declares New France a province of the French Empire to be run by the Sovereign Council of New France.

a. The Sovereign Council of New France was a political body made up by Louis XIV including nine different positions consisting of:

- A governor: The direct representative of Louis, and diplomatic leader of New France.
- An intendant: responsible for all economic affairs, trade, and seigneurialism.
- A bishop: Responsible for controlling religious affairs, education, hospitals, and Christianization of natives.
- A Militia Captain: Responsible for reporting about how inhabitants were faring and their concerns.
- Councilors: Five people responsible serving as a court of appeal and governing body. By 1703, the number of councilors was raised to twelve.

b. This body stands until the fall of New France on April 28, 1760 at the battle of Saint-Foy.

2. The population increases to tens of thousands, but separated from France, settlements of New France are left vulnerable to attack from adjacent economically and militaristically more powerful British Colonies.

1753:

1. Forts are built had been built in the Ohio territory belonging to the British.

a. British Governors give orders for the French to clear the land, but the French refuse and the altercation became increasingly serious.

1754:

1. British forces, lead by George Washington, besieged the French at Fort Duquesne (modern day Pittsburgh) to enforce their control on the Ohio River valley.

1756-1763:

1. The Seven Years War or French and Indian War begins between the British and the French both allied with certain groups of native peoples such as the Huron and Algonquin.

a. The fighting lasts seven years in the areas around Nova Scotia, New England, and New France.

b. 50,000 standing British forces and militiamen allied with the Iroquois nation (who had long-standing resentment toward the French) handily defeats approximately 3,900 standing French forces, 7,900 New France militiamen, and 2,200 fighters of the native populations in a series of battles which ended for the most part by 1760 when the French surrendered Montréal and essentially all of New France.

1763:

1. The British, clearly the victors, with the aid of the Spanish and Portuguese create the Treaty of Paris; officially ending the war.

a. The result of the Treaty of Paris was that the French ceded all claims to their lands east of the Mississippi river and New France, abandoning 60,000 or so Francophone 'habitants' of New France.

b. New France is renamed the British Province of Québec.

### **The British "Occupation" (1763-1867):**

The Province of Québec under British rule was initially a difficult period. The first decade of British control was marked by repression of Catholicism and French culture in an attempt to assimilate the Québécois into British customs and religions. Lands were owned in a paternal seigneurial land tenure system which gave rise to a few

prominent land owners and an impoverished majority. The British feared the Québécois siding with rebels in the thirteen colonies as the conflict of the American Revolutionary War intensified and thus platform of assimilation abandoned in order to gain the favor of the Québécois.

1774:

1. British Parliament passes the Québec Act, allowing for the recognition of French law, the Catholic religion, and the French language for all inhabitants of the Province.

1791:

1. British Parliament passes the Constitutional Act of 1791 which states that:

- Québec is divided into two separate provinces: Upper Canada (modern day Ontario) and Lower Canada (modern day Québec);
- Each province elects a Legislative Assembly with the aid of an executive and legislative council chosen by a British governor general, representing British rule in the colony.
- Upper Canada is run by a lieutenant governor named by the governor general while Lower Canada is run by a direct representative of the governor general.
- The governor general is the speaker of the Legislative Assembly, sets dates and locations of elections, and has the power to approve or reject laws.
- The Church of England and the Church of Scotland are awarded lands in each of the two provinces.

2. The Anglophone British parliamentary control leaves the Québécois lacking power and voice in the legislative assembly.

1834:

1. The Parti Patriote (Patriot Party), led by Louis-Joseph Papineau, wins a majority in the provincial election and sends the 92 Resolutions to the monarchy claiming their loss of faith in the British system and demanding provincial autonomy.

1837:

1. Lord Gosford, an envoyé of Britain to tries to appease the Patriotes and reconcile the assembly.

2. The Patriotes arm themselves and turn violent, attacking British troops in what becomes the Rebellion of 1837.

- a. A few victories are won by the Patriotes but the British forces quickly dispatch the rebellion sending most into exile.

1840:

1. At the suggestion of British functionary, Lord Durham, the two provinces are unified into the Province of Canada through the Act of Union.

- a. There are about 500,000 Anglophones and 600,000 Québécois in the Province of Canada at this time. Now, since the Québécois had the majority in the Legislative Assembly, an equal amount of Anglophones are added to create balance.
- c. Anglophones gradually take the name “Canadians” and Québécois the name “French Canadians.”

1867:

1. The British pass the British North America Act which creates the country of Canada (made of Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, and the Province of Canada).

2. Canada is given autonomy over its own affairs but is externally controlled by Britain.

3. East Canada becomes the Province of Québec and West Canada, the Province of Ontario.

**Conservative Catholic Rule and “The Great Darkness” (1867-1959):**

1868:

1. Prime Minister Pierre-Joseph-Olivier Chauveau of the Parti Conservateur (Conservative Party) creates the first public school system.
  - a. The Clergy of the Catholic church is quick to denounce free and religiously neutral education because they believed it would create more rebellions.
  - b. The Clergy, backed by the elites and Anglophones living in the Québec are in a clear position of power.

1905:

1. Lomer Gouin enacts modest economic reforms to encourage nationalist economic expansion.

1910:

1. The first nationalist and French Canadian interest newspaper “Le Devoir,” is founded by Louis-Joseph Papineau’s grandson, Henri Bourassa.

1911:

1. Armand Lavergne is elected to public office in Québec and succeeds in passing a law which pushes for public rights to the French language and culture.
  - a. The law pushes heavily for bi-lingual rights in public services.
  - b. Before this law, services like communication or transportation did not recognize the French language, to the disgust of the Québécois; the clear majority of the province.

1917:

1. Henri Bourassa uses Le Devoir to fight against the British Conscription of 1917, where Canadians were forced to participate in World War I.

1931:

1. Under the statute of Westminster, Canada is granted full autonomy under the formation of the British Commonwealth.

1936:

1. Ultra conservative and anti-nationalist party l’Union Nationale (National Unity) takes control of the province in the year’s elections.

1936-1939 and 1944-1959 (The Great Darkness):

2. The head of UN, Maurice Duplessis, maintained power and ran a platform intensely conservative in nature under the guise of nationalism. This time is later known to the population as “La Grande Noirceur” or The Great Darkness:
  - a. Québec’s growth and development is subsequently retarded by direct collaboration between the government and the Catholic church; Catholicism was the religion of the clear majority of citizens.
    - 1a. The Catholic church used its influence to convince the Québécois of the necessity of preserving the conservative government and Duplessis; encouraging the support of the English language, Anglophone businesses, and Anglophone economic domination.
  - b. Duplessis prevents unionization and social reform through violence, using police to quell demonstrations across the province.

- c. Québec and the Québécois end up lagging behind all other Canadian provinces in educational, social, and economic conditions.

### **La Révolution Tranquille, the Sovereignty Question, and Referendums (1960-1995):**

1960:

1. The Liberal Party is elected to power under Prime Minister Jean Lesage under which Québec enters an era of rapid modernization through many social and economic reforms known as “La Revolution Tranquille,” due to so much change occur without violence.
2. Systems of public education and health care are guaranteed to all citizens.

1962:

1. Energy production through hydro-electric dams are nationalized into a company: Hydro-Québec whereas they had previously been controlled by an elite group of Anglophones.

1963-1971:

1. An extremist terrorist group the Front de Libération du Québec (FLQ) begins an eight-year clandestine movement of violence due to the feeling that even though change was coming, the change was not coming quickly enough, and Anglophones still held what believed was an excess of power.
  - a. At the time, for example, only 1 of every 28 businesses in Québec were Québécois-owned.
  - b. The French language was still not recognized. For example in Eaton’s, the major department store chain in Canada, if you spoke French, you would be refused service, prompting Pierre Vallières, an intellectual writer and leader of an FLQ cell to write a book which exclaimed that the Québécois were, “les nègres blanc d’Amérique,” or “the white niggers of America.”
2. The FLQ committed attacks primarily in Montréal, attempting to destroy institutions controlled by Anglophones, and accidentally killing a handful of innocent civilians.
3. The FLQ succeeded in kidnapping a diplomat (James Cross) and a minister of the Québec government (Pierre Laporte) who was assassinated, prompting the Prime Minister Robert Bourassa to instate martial law. The cells were subsequently broken up.
  - a. Though majority of the population was not in favor of the FLQ’s actions, the sentiment that things had to change and sovereignty being necessary for Québécois self-determination was strong at this time.

1967:

1. French General Charles de Gaulle visits Montréal and rallies a cry for Québec independence with the famous phrase, “Vive le Québec Libre,” or “Hooray for a free Québec.” Much to the shock of Anglophones.
  - a. The symbolic act by de Gaulle was a recognition of Québécois that they were distinct linguistically and sociologically from the rest of Canada. This realization became a symbol for the movement of sovereignty and French Canadian separatism.

1968:

1. The long standing leftist and sovereignist party *le Parti Québécois* (PQ) is formed, directed by René Lévesque.

1976:

1. The PQ is elected in the majority for the first time. Lévesque, with a platform of Québécois interests become Prime Minister.

1977:

1. The law 101 is enacted. French becomes Québec's official language; including for various social institutions such as public school and the workplace.

1980:

1. Lévesque and the Association of Sovereignty puts forth a referendum for Québec separation from the rest of Canada including political and economic sovereignty; it did not pass with only 40 percent of the population in favor.

1982:

1. Liberal Party of Québec and Prime Minister Pierre Elliott Trudeau refuse to ratify the Canadian constitution.

1985-1994:

1. The Liberal Party of Québec holds power and tries to enact pan-Canadian referendums, but each gets rejected in 1987, 1990, and 1992 under the opinion of the population that Québec does not have enough autonomy.

2. The *Action Démocratique du Québec* (ADQ) is formed by Mario Dumont in 1994.

1995:

1. The PQ proposes a new referendum for separatism. It fails to pass 50.6 percent being against and 49.4 percent for it.

## APPENDIX D

### **Glossary**

A **Québécois** is a person whose mother tongue is French, is socialized in the French culture, and who identifies as a native person from Québec.

An **Anglophone** is a person whose mother tongue is English, is socialized in the English culture, and who identifies as a native person from Québec.

An **Allophone** is a person whose mother tongue is a language other than French or English, who is socialized in a foreign culture, and who identifies as a person from another country.

The **Bill 101** was passed in 1977. It gave the right of anyone in Québec to have government branches, employees associations, enterprises, and corporations running their businesses in Québec to communicate in French. It gave the right to speak French in deliberative assembly, the right of workers to work and do tasks in French, the right of consumers to do business and be served in French, the right of those in public school to be taught in French, and empowered the French language by naming it the official language of the province. The law also considered the rights of Anglophones and Allophones in court, giving them the right to have their children be taught in whichever of the two languages (English or French) they preferred.

The **Parti Québécois (PQ)** is a left-wing sovereignist or separatist party in the Canadian province of Québec. The party's foundation was in 1968 under the leadership of René Lévesque; their followers are called *péquistes*. The PQ is concerned primarily with a strong social program of health, education, and regional development, the preservation and bolstering of the French language and Québécois culture in Québec, separation of Québec from Canada, and although it has no formal association with any unions it works heavily in favor of labors and labor unions. It was first elected as a majority in the *Assemblée Nationale du Québec* (National Assembly of Québec) in 1976 and was the first Canadian party to recognize the self-determination of the Québécois (or French-Canadians). Until the 2007 election and the rise of the right-wing French nationalist party Action Démocratique du Québec (ADQ), the PQ was the primary party for the majority of Francophones in Québec.

The **Parti Libéral du Québec (PLQ)** is a right-centrist-federalist political party in the Canadian province of Québec. The party's foundation was in 1867 under unison of the Parti Canadien (Patriot Party in English) who helped support the Lower Canada Rebellion in 1837, and the Parti Rouge who tried to fight for responsible government and the power of the Roman Catholic Church in Lower Canada. Their followers are called *libéraux*. The PLQ is concerned primarily with maintaining Québec federalism and their membership in the Canadian confederation, free enterprise, decentralization, and social liberalism. The PLQ has won the last 2 general elections (2003 and 2007) in Québec and

has been generally considered to be the party which is most favorable to the majority of the population in Québec; especially Anglophones and Allophones.

The **Action Démocratique du Québec (ADQ)** is a populist-right-conservative-nationalist political party in the Canadian province of Québec. The party was founded in 1994 by Mario Dumont; their followers are called *adéquistes*. The ADQ is concerned primarily with a platform of populism, neo-liberalism, and moderate Québec nationalism. The ADQ thus heavily proposes scaling back Quebec's civil service, putting welfare recipients back to work and reducing government spending by one per cent, lifting freezes on college tuition and abolishing school boards, implementing an election reform in which the prime minister would be elected by popular vote, resulting in a presidential government along side the National Assembly of Québec, encouraging a private health care system, "reasonable accommodation" granted to immigrants, preventing cultural communities from interfering with what they believe are a number of mainstream values of the Québec society, erasing mandatory dues and membership for unions and subcontracting duties currently handled by full-time employees, drafting a new Constitution declaring the existence of the Autonomous State of Québec which would have the power to grant Citizenship, and extensively restructuring the Quebec tax system, and lowering taxes overall. The ADQ began as a fringe party in 1994 winning only 1 seat and very few in the subsequent elections. In 2007, the party gained resonance with rural, Francophone, and conservative areas of Québec, becoming the official opposition party to the PLQ, winning 41 seats in the election.

The **Union Nationale (UN)** is a now defunct political party that ran a pro-Anglophone and highly conservative agenda in Québec for the better part of the first half of the 20<sup>th</sup> century. The party was founded in 1935 by Maurice Duplessis. It was a party that favored an anti-civil rights, pro-clergy, pro-Anglophone, anti-union platform. Though it is famous for gripping the province in *la grande noirceur* (the Great Darkness) during the 1940s and 1950s, it suffered a rapid decline in the 1970s and ceased to exist giving way to other conservative parties.

The **MCA** is the Montréal City Average or the average of Montréal's 28 conscriptions of particular social factors.

The **QPA** is the Québec Provincial Average or the average of Québec's 125 conscriptions for percentages or total numbers of particular social factors.

The **DGEQ** (Dirécteur Générale des Élections du Québec) is a database with information and results from all referendums and elections, both federal and general, in each of Québec's 125 conscriptions.

**STATCAN** (Statistique Canada) is a database with socio-economic information for Québec and compiles the census.

## APPENDIX E

### **National Assembly and General Elections**

Québec's government is run by a unicameral legislative body (one legislative parliamentary chamber) called L'Assemblée Nationale du Québec (National Assembly of Québec). The National Assembly of Québec operates with a system of general elections which are held every five years or less. In these general elections, any registered Canadian citizen who has lived over six months in Québec may vote. The vote works in a system where electoral *conscriptions* (electoral districts or ridings in English) are drawn and encompass specific areas. Within those conscriptions (there are 125 in total), voters vote for candidates representing different parties (there were 9 parties on the ballots in the 2007 election) to take a seat as a Member of the National Assembly. The three strongest parties in Québec are the Parti Libéral du Québec (PLQ), Parti Québécois (PQ), and the Action Démocratique du Québec (ADQ). The candidate that wins the popular vote in a conscription wins the seat and joins his party as a representative of whichever he or she won. The party that wins the largest number of seats is considered the majority leader and is generally asked to choose a *Premier Ministre* (premier or Prime Minister in English). The minority parties get to choose the Leader of the Opposition. In this system, a series of debates over policy occurs.