# Separation in Theory and Practice: Process and Purpose, and Limits

JACK JEDWAB

**Jack Jedwab** is President and CEO of the Association for Canadian Studies and the Metropolis Institute. He holds a Ph.D. in Canadian History from Concordia University. Prior to 1998, he served as executive director of the Quebec branch of the Canadian Jewish Congress. He is an author and contributor to academic publications, government reports and newspapers across the country in the fields of immigration, multiculturalism, diversity, human rights and official languages. Following three decades of wide-ranging research on public opinion and demographics, he is regularly consulted by media and government bodies alike for his expertise and insights on issues of import in the public sphere. He has taught and lectured at McGill University, the Université du Québec à Montréal and Concordia University, offering courses ranging from public policy to the history of immigration and minority groups, to sports in Canada.

## Introduction: What Quebecers Want—and What Separation Means

This essay draws on recent survey findings examining how Quebecers and other Canadians understand both the process and the purpose of Quebec separation. Taken together, these findings reveal a fundamental tension: while sovereignty retains appeal to Quebecers when it comes to the protection of language and identity—there is limited confidence in its practical benefits and considerable uncertainty about how it would unfold. This tension is not new. It has shaped the sovereignty debate for decades. What is different today is the extent to which it is reflected in public opinion. The contemporary debate is no longer simply about whether Quebec should become independent, but about how such independence would occur and who would ultimately benefit from it. To understand the current state of sovereignty, it is necessary to begin not with its motivations, but with method.

Sovereignty is often presented politically as an option or decision that simply requires the endorsement of a simple majority of Quebecers in a referendum. In the aftermath of such a result, the details that culminate in the accession to nationhood are often assumed to fall into place. However, since the 1995 referendum and the introduction of the Clarity Act, there has been increasing attention to the process required to reach that point and what it implies for the entity from which Quebecers would seek to separate—that is, the rest of Canada.

Across Canada, there is broad recognition that any move toward independence would require a clear question, a decisive level of support, and a period of negotiation involving multiple actors. These expectations reflect the legacy of the Supreme Court's Secession Reference and the subsequent Clarity Act, which established that a referendum result would not automatically produce independence but would instead trigger negotiations under constitutional constraints.

However, this legal and political framework has never been fully accepted within Quebec's sovereigntist movement. While Quebec's Bill 99 affirms the Quebec people's right to self-determination, its constitutional interpretation has remained contested. In litigation surrounding the law, Quebec's attorney argued before the courts that the form of self-determination contemplated could be understood as internal—that is, exercised within the Canadian constitutional framework. The Quebec Court of Appeal, for

its part, indicated that any attempt to use Bill 99 as the basis for a unilateral secession could be found unconstitutional. Yet politically, sovereigntist actors have often presented the law more expansively, portraying it as affirming Quebec's ability to determine its future free from external constraints. This has produced an enduring ambiguity between the legal interpretation advanced before the courts and the political interpretation presented to the public.

This divergence produces two competing conceptions of the process: a federal view, in which separation is conditional, negotiated, and constrained; and a sovereigntist view, in which a democratic mandate compels Canada to negotiate terms of partnership.

The latter has been consistently articulated in political discourse. In 1995, Lucien Bouchard argued that a Yes vote would lead not to rupture, but to a negotiated partnership with Canada. That argument persists today, with contemporary leaders such as Paul St-Pierre Plamondon continuing to frame independence as a reconfiguration rather than a break, while questioning the legitimacy of the federal framework governing the process.

Underlying this position is a strategic assumption: that Canada would have little practical choice but to negotiate a cooperative arrangement with Quebec. Yet this assumption is not widely shared. Public opinion surveys conducted by Leger for the Association for Canadian Studies suggest that Canadians do not see separation as a process that Quebec can define unilaterally. Instead, they expect a structured and collective negotiation in which the terms are far from predetermined.

What emerges, then, is a profound ambiguity. The rules of the process are partially understood, but their application remains uncertain. There is no shared expectation about timelines, outcomes, or even the basic parameters of negotiation.

## Why Separation? Identity as the Core Rationale

If the process appears complex and uncertain, the motivations for pursuing it are comparatively narrow.

The strongest and most consistent rationale for sovereignty lies in the domain of language and identity. Independence is widely associated with the idea that it would strengthen the position of French in Quebec. For many francophones, sovereignty is understood as a means of ensuring the long-term vitality of a linguistic community situated within a broader North American context.

Beyond this, however, the case for sovereignty weakens considerably.

There is limited belief that independence would produce clear economic advantages. Most Quebecers do not expect that sovereignty would make them more prosperous. Nor is there strong confidence that Quebec would gain greater influence on the international stage.

This creates an imbalance in case for sovereignty where it is driven by identity, but its adeherents often urge that it considered on its economic outcomes or what it would imply for global influence. While the symbolic and/or emotional appeal of independence remains significant, it is tempered by doubts about its material consequences. As the **Table 1** reveals, a majority of Quebecers do not believe that Quebec would be better off as an independent country (57%), only somewhat more persons elsewhere in Canada think Quebec would be better off on its own (66%).

*Table 1*

| Quebecers would be better off as an independent country and not part of Canada | Canada | Quebec | Rest of Canada |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Yes** | 16% | 27% | 13% |
| **No** | 64% | 57% | 66% |
| **I don't know / I prefer not to answer** | 19% | 16% | 20% |

*Table 2*

| | English-speaking Quebecers will be better off in an independent Quebec than as part of Canada | | Members of ethnic minorities would be better off in an independent Quebec than as part of Canada | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Quebec** | **French** | **English** | **French** | **English** |
| **Yes** | 15% | 12% | 18% | 4% |
| **No** | 55% | 78% | 49% | 80% |
| **I don't know / I prefer not to answer** | 30% | 10% | 33% | 16% |
| **Total** | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% |

## For Whom? Unequal Expectations and the Question of Inclusion

If the motivations for sovereignty are uneven, perceptions of those that would benefit from it most are even more revealing.

A central claim of contemporary sovereigntist discourse is that independence is civic and inclusive, rather than ethnonational. This framing has been particularly important in the aftermath of the 1995 referendum, when Jacques Parizeau's attribution of defeat to "money and the ethnic vote" generated widespread backlash and forced a rearticulation of the movement's principles.

Since then, some sovereignists have insisted that it's the ethnic minority voters that challenge the civic and inclusive vision underlying the independence option. Yet Quebecers' public perceptions do not fully align with this framing.

Recent survey findings reveal that a majority of Quebecers do not believe that independence would benefit English-speaking Quebecers or members of ethnic minorities. Only small minorities see clear advantages for these groups in a sovereign Quebec. As observed below relatively few francophone or anglophone Quebecers believe that English-speaking Quebecers will be better off in an independent Quebec than as part of Canada. And the same is true with respect to whether members of ethnic minorities would be better off in an independent Quebec than as part of Canada. Less than one in five Quebec francophpones agree they'll be better off and less than one in twenty anglophones do.

This is neither implied nor intended to suggest that sovereignty as an exclusionary project. It does suggest, however, that many Quebecers perceive its benefits as unevenly distributed, with clearly the most tangible gains associated with the francophone majority.

This perception helps explain the continued sensitivity around the ethnonational question. To acknowledge that sovereignty is primarily understood as benefiting one group over others risks undermining its civic framing. To deny that's the case risks disconnecting political discourse from public perception.

## The Canadian Perspective: Constraint Without Enthusiasm

As noted, neither Quebecers nor other Canadians believe that the country would be better off without Quebec. Outside Quebec, attitudes toward separation reflect a combination of reluctance and constraint. At the same time, there is limited willingness to facilitate separation on flexible or undefined terms. Canadians tend to emphasize rules, procedures, and collective decision-making. This reinforces the idea that independence would not be a bilateral negotiation, but a multilateral and constitutionally grounded process.

It also highlights a key divergence between Quebec and the rest of Canada. Assumptions about citizenship, economic arrangements, and institutional continuity are not shared. What may appear plausible within Quebec is not necessarily accepted elsewhere.

What is often left implicit in these assumptions is the nature of the counterpart or partner with which Quebec would negotiate. Sovereigntist discourse frequently invokes the idea of a partnership with the "rest of Canada," as though that entity was politically unified, stable, and capable of acting as a single negotiating partner. Yet this is far from certain.

The prospect of Quebec's departure could itself trigger or intensify regional instability elsewhere in the country, including the amplification of secessionist sentiment in provinces such as Alberta. In such a scenario, Quebec would not necessarily be negotiating with a coherent national counterpart, but potentially with multiple actors representing diverging regional interests and emerging political formations. The "nation-to-nation" framework that has long underpinned the imagined aftermath of independence may therefore rest on a simplifying assumption that does not reflect the complexity of what could follow a referendum result.

## Parallel Pressures: Alberta and the Changing Landscape of Separation

The debate over Quebec sovereignty no longer unfolds in isolation. Recent findings from the May 2025 Leger survey suggest that concerns about national unity are increasingly shaped by developments beyond Quebec, most notably the perceived rise of Alberta separatism.

A majority of Canadians (52%) believe that the threat of Alberta separation should be taken very seriously, compared to 42% who say the same about Quebec separation. This represents a notable shift in the geography of concern within the federation. While Quebec has historically been viewed as the central locus of secessionist pressure, many Canadians now see Alberta as posing a more immediate or pressing challenge. And, as revealed in **Table 3** Albertans are considerably more likely to believe the threat of separation is far more serious in their province than it is from Quebec.

At the same time, these views are not uniformly shared. Quebecers are slightly less likely to regard Alberta's separatist potential as more serious than their own province's, underscoring the persistence of regional asymmetries in how unity is understood.

Perceptions of legitimacy further reinforce these patterns. Slightly more Canadians believe that Albertans have legitimate reasons to contemplate separation (35%) than say the same of Quebecers (33%). This does not signal a rejection of Quebec's claims, but it does suggest that grievances rooted in economic and political dissatisfaction—particularly in Western Canada—resonate broadly across the country.

*Table 3*

| Should be taken very seriously… | Canada | Quebec | Alberta |
|---|---|---|---|
| The threat of Alberta Separation | 52% | 46% | 63% |
| The threat of Quebec Separation | 42% | 47% | 31% |

The emergence of Alberta as a focal point of concern complicates the traditional framing of Canadian unity. Quebec sovereignty has long been treated as a distinct case, grounded in language, culture, and history. The rise of Western alienation introduces a different logic—one rooted less in identity than in perceptions of economic imbalance and political marginalization.

For the broader Canadian public, however, the coexistence of these pressures appears to reinforce a preference for constraint. Faced with the possibility of multiple regions expressing dissatisfaction, Canadians are more likely to emphasize rules, clarity, and collective decision-making in any process of separation. The expectation that secession would involve structured negotiation rather than unilateral action is strengthened, not weakened, by the presence of multiple potential claimants.

In this context, Quebec sovereignty is reframed. It is no longer viewed solely as a unique constitutional question, but as part of a wider pattern of regional discontent. This does not erase its distinctiveness, but it situates it within a more complex and uncertain national landscape—one in which questions of belonging, legitimacy, and the durability of the federation are being raised in several regions at once.

## Conclusion: Bridging Process and Purpose

The contemporary sovereignty debate is defined by a growing disconnect between process and purpose. On the one hand, there is an emerging recognition that separation would be complex, negotiated, and uncertain. It is not widely seen as a straightforward or unilateral act.

On the other hand, the rationale for pursuing such a demanding process remains comparatively narrow. The strongest argument for sovereignty lies in the protection of language and identity. Yet this objective does not translate into widespread confidence about economic performance, international influence or social harmony.

This is the central contradiction: a difficult and uncertain process paired with a limited and unevenly shared sense of purpose.

Compounding this is the absence of consensus on who would benefit from independence. While sovereignty is framed as inclusive, it is often perceived as primarily advancing the interests of the francophone majority. This perception complicates its ability to attract broad-based support.

The emergence of Alberta as a parallel source of separatist pressure further underscores the fragility of national cohesion. Rather than a single, historically rooted challenge, Canada now faces a more diffuse set of regional tensions that differ in origin but converge in their implications for unity.

Finally, the divergence between Quebec and the rest of Canada in their understanding of separation suggests that even the starting assumptions of a future referendum would not be aligned.

Rather than pointing toward any clearly defined outcome, we are staring into something closer to a vast unknown—a kind of political black hole or bottomless pit where the contours of a potential break-up are impossible to map. ‘Clarity’ remains persistently elusive: it is not at all evident what such a rupture would look like in practice, nor where it would lead, given the many fault lines that run beneath the surface. These fractures, along with the numerous practical and political hurdles they imply, are largely sidestepped in public discussion, leaving us without even a shared language to describe the consequences of what is being contemplated.

## References


Association for Canadian Studies, Quebec Separation: Why, What For and For Whom? (Leger survey, December 2025).

Association for Canadian Studies, Canadian Views on the Process of Separation (Leger survey, May 2025).

Reference re Secession of Quebec, [1998] 2 S.C.R. 217; Clarity Act, S.C. 2000, c. 26.

National Assembly of Quebec, An Act respecting the exercise of the fundamental rights and prerogatives of the Québec people and the Québec State (Bill 99), 2000.

Lucien Bouchard, speeches during the 1995 Quebec referendum campaign emphasizing economic and political partnership with Canada.

Public statements by Parti Québécois leader Paul St-Pierre Plamondon (2024–2025) rejecting the applicability of the Clarity Act and framing independence as negotiated partnership.

Association for Canadian Studies, Quebec Separation: Why, What For and For Whom? (Leger survey, December 2025).

Jacques Parizeau, remarks following the 1995 referendum result.

See, for example, Gérard Bouchard, Interculturalism: A View from Quebec (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2015)