

**Partisan Differences Between Election-Day Voting and Absentee Voting
in National Elections in Canada, 1993-2004**

Tony L. Hill

Department of Political Science
Massachusetts Institute of Technology
77 Massachusetts Ave. E53-470
Cambridge, Massachusetts 02139

Internet: tlh@mit.edu

*Presented at the annual meeting of the New England Political Science Association, April 29-30, 2005,
Portland, Me.*

Introduction

When the votes were counted in the 2004 Canadian general election, a remarkable thing was noted: In twelve ridings, the candidate who won the election had lost the election-day voting. This included five incumbents, among them two cabinet ministers. In the previous three general elections, this pattern had occurred only once in each election, and two of them were in ridings where the election was decided by less than 100 votes. Of the 2004 dozen, only one was in an election where the winner's margin was less than 100 votes, and in two cases, the margin was over 1000 votes. Moreover, there was a clear partisan pattern in these pivots. In 10 of the 12, Conservatives won seats they would have lost on the basis of the election-day voting alone: six to Liberals and four to New Democrats. The other two were in Quebec, where Liberal cabinet members won seats that would have gone to the Bloc Québécois on the basis of the election-day voting. These pivots would have made a phenomenal difference in the way the election turned out. As it was, the election produced a neat equation with the number of seats held by the Liberals and the New Democrats equaling the number of seats held by the Conservatives, the Bloc Québécois, and independent Chuck Cadman. Specifically, the 19 seats won by the New Democrats were not enough to give the party the balance of power; a government is defeated by a tie vote on a confidence motion. Thus, the Conservatives were emboldened by the scenario. Moreover, the 99 seats the Conservatives won represented a respectable enough increase over the 73 seats the party held at dissolution of the 37th Parliament¹ (66 Canadian Alliance at the 2000 election, plus 12 Progressive Conservatives at the 2000 election, plus two won in by-

¹ 66 Canadian Alliance MPs and 12 Progressive Conservatives were elected in 2000. The Canadian Alliance lost Joe Peschisolido, Inky Mark, and Jim Pankiw by defection. The Progressive Conservatives added Gary Schellenberger and Rex Barnes in by-elections and gained Inky Mark by defection. The combined Conservative Party gained John Bryden by defection. The combined party lost Scott Brison, Joe Clark, John Herron, André Bachand, Larry Spencer and Keith Martin by defection.

elections, plus 1 gained by defection, minus eight defects away from the Conservative Party) to ensure that there would be no immediate movement to oust Tory Leader Stephen Harper.

PARTY	2004 ELECTION FINAL	2004 ELECTION- DAY
LIBERAL	135	139
CONSERVATIVE	99	89
NEW DEMOCRATIC	19	23
BLOC QUÉBÉCOIS	54	56
OTHER	1	1

Had the election gone according to the election-day voting, the 38th Parliament would have been very different. Although the Liberals still would have had only a minority government, they would have been able to produce a functioning majority – a comfortable one – with a working alliance with the New Democrats. Moreover, the Tories winning only 89 seats would probably have produced a movement to oust Stephen Harper.

Thus, the pattern of election-day voting being moderated by non-election-day voting is important to an analysis of the 2004 election. Non-election-day voting has three separate components. The American term *absentee voting* is used here to comprehend all three. The largest and most important is **advance poll voting**.² This is early voting, where any qualified voter may appear at the designated polling place a week to 10 days before the election and vote. In the 2004 general election, 9.2 percent of voters cast their ballots this way. The others vote under **special voting rules**. There are two classes under special voting rules. The first class (SVR1) includes voters in the military, in prison, and outside Canada. The second class (SVR2) includes voters in Canada outside their home ridings and

² The term *advance poll voting* is preferred herein to *advance polling*, which conveys to many the idea of pre-election surveys conducted by the media and political parties.

those permanently unable to appear in person at the polls. Except for military, persons must pre-register in order to vote under special voting rules. In 2004, 0.3 percent voted under SVR1 and 1.5 percent under SVR2. These percentages have been fairly stable over the recent period. Advance poll voting, on the other hand, has increased greatly as a form of electoral participation in Canada lately. In 2004, the rate of advance poll voting was exactly double that of 1993. The rate has increased in every election since 1993, but Kay and Cattle speculate that the 2004 election coinciding with the end of the school year (a traditional vacation time) motivated some usual in-person voters to utilize advance poll voting. This is one potential reason why advance poll voting in 2004 was sharply higher than in 2000.

Beyond that Conservatives were winners in 10 of the 12 ridings that were pivoted, there was a clear pattern in favor of the Conservatives in aggregate in the absentee voting. Overall, the Conservatives ran 4.6 points better in absentee voting than in election-day voting. The NDP ran 2.5 points lower. For the Liberals, the national aggregate is almost a wash, with them running 0.1 points lower. However, any analysis needs to understand that Quebec is a different sphere from the rest of Canada in national elections, because the NDP is irrelevant and so were the Conservatives in 2004. Breaking the regions out separately, the Liberals were down 1.7 points in the rest of Canada and 4.3 points ahead in Quebec. This is a different picture from the overall difference of -0.1 points. The Bloc, conversely, polled 4.4 points worse in absentee voting than on election day. For the rest of Canada, the Tories polled 5.9 points better and the NDP 3.1 points worse in the absentee voting than on election day. This is a stark pattern of bias in favor of the Liberals in Quebec and the Conservatives in the rest of Canada and against the Bloc in Quebec and the NDP and the Liberals in the rest of Canada.

The rate of absentee voting in the 12 ridings in which absentee voting was pivotal was not different from the other ridings. The average rate of absentee voting in the 12 ridings was 10.8 percent, whereas for the other 296 ridings, the average was 10.9 percent.³

What, then, brought about this situation whereby absentee voting was pivotal in a dozen ridings and the effect was overwhelmingly in favor of the Conservatives, except in Quebec? Three theories come to mind. First, that a mobilization effect by parties and local riding campaigns is responsible. This theory holds that Conservatives do better in absentee voting than New Democrats because the party and candidates are doing a better job of getting people to vote absentee. This is a tempting explanation considering that even in some ridings which are unimportant to the Conservatives but are essential for the NDP to win (e.g., Halifax, Acadie-Bathurst, Windsor-Tecumseh, Burnaby-Douglas), the Conservatives maintained their pattern of being prodigious accumulators of absentee votes, while the NDP were underaccumulators of absentee votes.⁴ In fact, the Tories only ran better on election day than in absentee voting in 23 ridings, 13 of them in Quebec, and the NDP only ran better in absentee voting than on election day in 25 ridings, many of them where the party is utterly uncompetitive. The author has previously noted a tendency among NDP activists to lack a focus on the election and to spend valuable campaign time participating in other fora of social activism.⁵ A lack of mobilization of absentee voters by NDP campaigns would be concordant with this observation.

The second theory holds that demographic patterns drive absentee voting. It is well established that persons of higher socioeconomic status are more likely to vote absentee.

³ This analysis uses the average of ridings. The overall absentee voting rate of 11.0 percent was derived by a different method using the sum of votes.

⁴ This terminology is borrowed from patterns of wealth-building described by Thomas J. Stanley and William D. Danko in *The Millionaire Next Door: The Surprising Secrets of America's Wealthy*, Atlanta: Longstreet, 1996.

⁵ Hill, p. 11.

Senior citizens are more likely to vote absentee. There are other demographic patterns worthy of note that could influence a difference between absentee voting and election-day voting. The ridings in which Liberals did the highest degree better in absentee voting in 2004 than on election day are uniformly Francophone ridings, and not all of them are in Quebec. Despite their Quebec landslide in 2004, the Bloc only polled better in absentee voting than on election day in a dozen ridings.

A third theory is that there was a late shift in the 2004 campaign from the Conservatives to the other parties and therefore the absentee voting (especially the advance poll voting) was drawn at a time when the electorate was more generally in favor of the Conservatives than it was on election day.

In order to expound on these theories, the period of study was expanded back to the 1993 election. If either the mobilization or demographic theory is correct, there should be a consistent pattern of partisan differences between absentee voting and election-day voting throughout this period. For the most part, the sizeable advantage the Conservatives held in 2004 was not present in the other elections. However, there is a fairly clear pattern of Conservatives (construed as the Progressive Conservative Party before the 2004 election) doing better in absentee voting than on election day. Another consistent pattern is the Bloc Québécois underperforming in absentee voting. Thus, while the data do not support either of these hypotheses as the main reason for the pattern in 2004, they inform perhaps part of a long-term trend.

Kay and Cattle made a similar analysis looking at the differences between advance poll voting (disregarding SVR1 & SVR2) and total voting. Their hypothesis is that since advance poll voting takes place on certain days before the election, there should be correspondence between it and survey research conducted on those same days. They found

a very high consistency. However, it is not particularly surprising that a large number of ridings differ between absentee voting and the final election. This is because such a small share of the electorate votes absentee. Since large numbers are not at work, large differences between the 7-10 percent absentee voting (in this instance, the even smaller share of advance poll voting) and the 100 percent election data are not unusual. It is much more surprising that in 2004, there were pivotal differences between the 100 percent data and the 89 percent who vote on election day. So while the Kay and Cattle method helps illuminate the late shift in 2004, it does not help with the difference between the Liberals and the Bloc Québécois in both 1997 and 2000. In 1997, it is believed there was a late shift to the Bloc, and the 21 seat change from the Liberals to the Bloc between absentee voting and the total is consistent with such a late shift. However, there was no such shift believed to occur in 2000, when the Bloc performed poorly. Yet there were 20 seats that were going Liberal on the basis of the absentee voting that the Bloc won that year. So something is driving these almost identical changes other than a late shift. Moreover, there was also believed to be a shift from the Progressive Conservatives to the Bloc Québécois in 1997, but there is no evidence of that in these seat counts. Or perhaps that shift took place before the advance poll voting opened, in which case it would not be discovered under the method Kay and Cattle propose.

Furthermore, there are large numbers of seats turning out differently between parties all throughout this period that defy explanation by any single theory (e.g., Liberals losing two seats to NDP and NDP losing two seats to Liberals in the same election).

Since the 1993 election brought in a complete overhaul of the Canadian party system, it would be useful for this work to be extended back further, to the 1980s and perhaps earlier. Then we can say with greater confidence whether the pattern seen in the

2004 election was something new or something reminiscent of the old three-party system and expected to continue with the return of the old three-party system outside Quebec.

In the end, absentee voting holds a potential to offset late losses by parties and candidates. Parties and candidates have nothing to lose by urging their most loyal partisans to vote early. However, the ability of parties and candidates to mobilize the swing voters who decide elections is rather limited. Thus, if absentee voting is to truly emerge as a decisive factor in Canadian elections, some means of mobilizing key voters that doesn't require attachment to a party is important.

Bibliography

- Chief Electoral Officer of Canada. *Thirty-fifth General Election, 1993: Official Voting Results/Trente-cinquième Élection Générale, 1993: Résultats Officiels du Scrutin*. Ottawa: Elections Canada, 1993.
- Chief Electoral Officer of Canada. *Thirty-sixth General Election, 1997: Official Voting Results/Trente-sixième Élection Générale, 1997: Résultats Officiels du Scrutin*. Ottawa: Elections Canada, 1997. CD-ROM.
- Chief Electoral Officer of Canada. *Thirty-sixth General Election, 1997 & Thirty-seventh General Election, 2000: Official Voting Results/Trente-sixième Élection Générale, 1997 & Trente-Septième Élection Générale, 2000: Résultats Officiels du Scrutin*. Ottawa: Elections Canada, 2001. CD-ROM.
- Elections Canada. Results of the 38th General Election, 2004. Web site <http://elections.ca>.
- Hill, Tony L. *Canadian Politics, Riding by Riding: An In-Depth Analysis of Canada's 301 Federal Electoral Districts*. Minneapolis: Prospect Park Press, 2002.
- Kay, Barry J. and Chris Cattle. "Advance Polls as a Measure of the 'Late Switch' in the 2004 Canadian Federal Election." Paper presented at the national conference of the Midwest Political Science Association, April 7-10, 2005, Chicago.

**SEAT COUNTS BASED ON TOTAL VOTING, ELECTION DAY VOTING, AND NON-ELECTION-
DAY VOTING IN CANADIAN GENERAL ELECTIONS, 1993-2004**

	===== 1993 =====			===== 1997 =====		
	TOTAL	ED	NED	TOTAL	ED	NED
LIB	177	176	182	155	154	182
PC	2	2	8	20	20	20
NDP	9	9	11	21	21	21
REF	52	53	50	60	60	55
BQ	54	54	43	44	45	22
OTHER	1	1	1	1	1	1

Differences between NED & total:

Lib to BQ	8
Lib to Ref	3
Lib to NDP	1
PC to Lib	3
PC to BQ	3
NDP to Lib	2
NDP to Ref	2
Ref to NDP	1
Ref to Lib	2
SUM	25

Differences between NED & total:

Lib to PC	5
Lib to BQ	21
Lib to Ref	1
Lib to NDP	4
PC to Lib	3
PC to NDP	2
NDP to BQ	1
NDP to Lib	1
NDP to Ref	4
SUM	42

	===== 2000 =====			===== 2004 =====		
	TOTAL	ED	NED	TOTAL	ED	NED
LIB	172	172	189	135	139	117
PC/CONS	12	12	11	99	89	125
NDP	13	14	9	19	23	16
CA	66	65	73			
BQ	38	38	18	54	56	49
OTHER	0	0	1	1	1	1

Differences between NED & total:

Lib to PC	1
Lib to NDP	4
Lib to BQ	20
PC to Lib	1
NDP to Lib	2
CA to Lib	4
CA to PC	1
CA to NDP	2
Lib to Other	1
SUM	36

Differences between NED & total:

Lib to BQ	7
Lib to NDP	2
Lib to Cons	1
Cons to NDP	4
Cons to Lib	24
NDP to Lib	2
NDP to Cons	1
BQ to Lib	2
SUM	43

RIDINGS IN WHICH NON-ELECTION DAY VOTING WAS PIVOTAL, 1993-2004

YEAR RIDING	EDV WINNER	WINNER		ED	NED	TOTAL
1993 Edmonton Northwest, Alta.	Richard Kayler (Ref)	Anne McLellan (L)	McLellan	11797	802	12599
			Kayler	11813	774	12587
			McLellan	-16	28	12
1997 Saint-Lambert, Que.	Richard Bélisle (BQ)*	Yolande Thibeault (L)	Thibeault	17123	2313	19436
			Bélisle	17341	1117	18458
			Thibeault	-218	1196	978
2000 Saskatoon-Rosetown-Biggar, Sask.	Dennis Gruending (NDP)*	Carol Skelton (CA)	Skelton	10307	870	11177
			Gruending	10320	789	11109
			Skelton	-13	81	68
2004 Brome--Missisquoi, Que.	Christian Ouellet (BQ)	Denis Paradis (L)*	Paradis	15866	2743	18609
			Ouellet	15915	1622	17537
			Paradis	-49	1121	1072
2004 Jeanne-Le Ber, Que.	Thierry St-Cyr (BQ)	Liza Frulla (L)*	Frulla	16080	2686	18766
			St-Cyr	16450	2244	18694
			Frulla	-370	442	72
2004 Cambridge, Ont.	Janko Peric (L)	Gary Goodyear (C)	Goodyear	16752	2371	19123
			Peric	17284	1615	18899
			Goodyear	-532	756	224
2004 Newmarket-Aurora, Ont.	Martha Hall Findlay (L)	Belinda Stronach (C)	Stronach	18944	2874	21818
			Findlay	19131	1998	21129
			Stronach	-187	876	689
2004 Niagara West-Glanbrook, Ont.	Debbie Zimmerman (L)	Dean Allison (C)	Allison	18097	2777	20874
			Zimmerma	18224	1986	20210
			Allison	-127	791	664
2004 Oshawa, Ont.	Sid Ryan (NDP)	Colin Carrie (C)	Carrie	14016	1799	15815
			Ryan	14082	1270	15352
			Carrie	-66	529	463

RIDINGS IN WHICH NON-ELECTION DAY VOTING WAS PIVOTAL, 1993-2004

YEAR RIDING	EDV WINNER	WINNER		ED	NED	TOTAL
2004 Simcoe-Grey, Ont.	Paul Bonwick (L)*	Helena Guergis (C)	Guergis	18647	3849	22496
			Bonwick	19226	3170	22396
			Guergis	-579	679	100
2004 Kildonan-St. Paul, Man.	Terry Duguid (L)	Joy Smith (C)	Smith	11843	1739	13582
			Duguid	12303	1001	13304
			Smith	-460	738	278
2004 Regina-Lumsden-Lake Centre, Sask.	Gary Anderson (L)	Tom Lukiwski (C)	Lukiwski	9268	1021	10289
			Anderson	9470	697	10167
			Lukiwski	-202	324	122
2004 New Westminster-Coquitlam, B.C.	Steve McClurg (NDP)	Paul Forseth (C)*	Forseth	14270	1414	15684
			McClurg	14479	1091	15570
			Forseth	-209	323	114
2004 Southern Interior, B.C.	Alex Atamanenko (NDP)	Jim Gouk (C)*	Gouk	14693	2247	16940
			Atamanenko	14835	1425	16260
			Gouk	-142	822	680
2004 Vancouver Island North, B.C.	Catherine Bell (NDP)	John Duncan (C)*	Duncan	15900	2833	18733
			Bell	16456	1207	17663
			Duncan	-556	1626	1070

DIFFERENCES BETWEEN ELECTION-DAY VOTING AND NON-ELECTION DAY VOTING

	DIFF NED-ED =====						DIFF AP-ED =====						DIFF SVR1-ED =====					
1993	L	PC	NDP	REF	BQ	OTH	L	PC	NDP	REF	BQ	OTH	L	PC	NDP	REF	BQ	OTH
NF	-10.0%	9.7%	-0.5%	1.1%		-0.3%	-8.8%	8.8%	0.0%	0.3%		-0.4%	-16.0%	14.5%	-1.6%	3.0%		0.1%
PE	-4.0%	7.3%	-2.5%	0.0%		-0.8%	-1.0%	4.1%	-2.2%	-0.3%		-0.6%	-11.5%	12.7%	-3.1%	2.6%		-0.7%
NS	0.5%	6.8%	-1.9%	-4.2%		-1.3%	3.2%	4.6%	-1.4%	-4.9%		-1.5%	-13.7%	16.6%	-3.7%	0.6%		0.1%
NB	-1.1%	5.5%	-1.6%	-2.1%		-0.7%	1.1%	3.2%	-1.5%	-2.2%		-0.6%	-17.6%	16.3%	-2.3%	4.0%		-0.3%
QC	4.4%	7.6%	-0.2%		-11.3%	-0.4%	4.8%	6.7%	-0.3%		-10.8%	-0.5%	-6.4%	17.4%	0.4%		-12.7%	1.3%
ON	-1.5%	5.1%	-0.4%	-2.3%		-0.9%	-0.2%	3.7%	-0.5%	-2.2%		-0.8%	-15.9%	18.9%	-1.1%	-2.0%		0.1%
MB	-0.6%	4.0%	0.0%	-2.4%		-1.0%	0.5%	2.7%	0.6%	-2.7%		-1.1%	-12.3%	17.3%	-6.9%	2.8%		-0.9%
SK	-1.9%	4.6%	1.4%	-3.3%		-0.8%	-1.8%	3.2%	2.7%	-3.3%		-0.9%	-7.0%	18.8%	-10.1%	-2.5%		0.8%
AB	-1.4%	3.9%	-0.4%	-1.1%		-1.0%	-1.5%	2.5%	-0.6%	0.8%		-1.1%	-1.2%	17.9%	1.1%	-17.4%		-0.3%
BC	-3.7%	3.8%	-1.1%	2.4%		-1.4%	-2.6%	2.3%	-0.5%	2.2%		-1.4%	-9.2%	22.2%	-6.0%	-5.6%		-1.3%
YT	-3.6%	5.6%	-0.5%	-1.0%		-0.4%	-3.3%	4.5%	0.5%	-1.1%		-0.7%	3.5%	4.2%	-4.8%	-1.8%		-1.1%
NT	-6.7%	3.0%	-1.7%	4.1%		1.2%	-8.4%	1.0%	-0.4%	6.7%		1.0%	-8.2%	8.8%	-0.5%	1.1%		-1.2%
ALL	0.2%	5.8%	-0.2%	-0.3%	-4.7%	-0.8%	1.1%	4.3%	-0.2%	-0.5%	-3.9%	-0.8%	-8.9%	19.4%	-1.9%	-2.5%	-6.1%	0.1%
ROC	-1.8%	5.0%	-0.6%	-1.7%		-0.9%	-0.5%	3.4%	-0.4%	-1.5%		-1.0%	-10.6%	19.6%	-3.2%	-5.5%		-0.4%
1997	L	PC	NDP	REF	BQ	OTH	L	PC	NDP	REF	BQ	OTH	L	PC	NDP	REF	BQ	OTH
NF	7.5%	0.3%	-8.1%	0.5%		-0.2%	2.7%	3.6%	-5.6%	-0.5%		-0.2%	19.6%	-6.8%	-15.6%	3.2%		-0.4%
PE	3.2%	0.6%	-4.0%	0.2%		-0.1%	3.0%	0.9%	-3.7%	0.0%		-0.1%	5.9%	-2.1%	-6.9%	3.1%		0.0%
NS	4.4%	4.3%	-6.3%	-2.3%		-0.1%	2.3%	5.1%	-5.0%	-2.1%		-0.2%	16.3%	-0.6%	-17.2%	0.3%		1.1%
NB	5.5%	2.5%	-4.7%	-3.2%		-0.1%	4.5%	2.4%	-3.8%	-3.0%		-0.1%	13.1%	-1.5%	-11.2%	-0.9%		0.5%
QC	7.3%	-0.2%	-0.2%	-0.1%	-7.1%	0.2%	6.6%	0.0%	-0.3%	-0.1%	-6.5%	0.3%	1.1%	1.4%	0.9%	0.0%	-4.5%	1.1%
ON	-2.2%	4.6%	0.4%	-2.2%		-0.5%	-2.4%	4.6%	0.3%	-1.9%		-0.6%	1.1%	5.2%	-2.1%	-4.4%		0.2%
MB	1.8%	2.7%	-0.1%	-4.2%		-0.1%	1.2%	2.8%	0.0%	-3.5%		-0.4%	4.7%	4.3%	-4.7%	-5.7%		1.3%
SK	1.0%	1.0%	2.6%	-4.3%		-0.1%	0.3%	0.7%	2.3%	-3.1%		-0.2%	11.7%	5.4%	-1.9%	-16.0%		0.8%
AB	-0.4%	2.6%	0.7%	-2.5%		-0.3%	-1.1%	2.3%	0.4%	-1.2%		-0.4%	11.4%	6.2%	2.5%	-21.6%		1.4%
BC	-2.6%	1.8%	-0.4%	2.2%		-0.9%	-2.7%	1.5%	-0.4%	2.5%		-1.0%	4.8%	10.7%	-2.8%	-14.4%		1.7%
YT	-0.1%	0.9%	4.5%	-3.6%		-1.7%	-1.0%	0.1%	7.0%	-2.3%		-3.7%	5.8%	2.8%	-8.2%	-10.8%		10.3%
NT	19.3%	1.7%	-8.3%	-6.0%		-6.7%	-1.8%	7.2%	0.2%	0.8%		-6.4%	42.9%	-3.4%	-18.8%	-13.5%		-7.2%
NU	-6.7%	12.3%	-5.9%	0.3%		0.0%	-7.6%	12.5%	-4.4%	-0.5%		0.0%	-6.0%	19.3%	-12.4%	-1.0%		0.0%
ALL	1.4%	2.3%	-0.6%	-1.7%	-1.1%	-0.3%	0.9%	2.3%	-0.7%	-1.5%	-0.7%	-0.3%	5.3%	4.7%	-2.2%	-6.7%	-1.8%	0.7%
ROC	-1.1%	3.2%	-0.3%	-1.3%		-0.4%	-1.6%	3.1%	-0.3%	-0.7%		-0.5%	6.7%	6.0%	-3.6%	-9.7%		0.6%

DIFFERENCES BETWEEN ELECTION-DAY VOTING AND NON-ELECTION DAY VOTING

2000	DIFF NED-ED =====						DIFF AP-ED =====						DIFF SVR1-ED =====					
	L	PC	NDP	CA	BQ	OTH	L	PC	NDP	CA	BQ	OTH	L	PC	NDP	CA	BQ	OTH
NF	2.5%	-0.8%	-4.1%	1.8%		0.5%	-1.1%	3.3%	-2.3%	0.1%		0.0%	14.1%	-16.4%	-9.7%	14.4%		-2.5%
PE	4.5%	-3.8%	-1.5%	0.9%		-0.1%	4.9%	-3.7%	-1.3%	0.4%		-0.3%	2.3%	-15.4%	-5.5%	18.5%		0.1%
NS	2.1%	-1.8%	-0.9%	1.0%		-0.4%	1.1%	-1.3%	0.5%	0.3%		-0.5%	4.1%	-9.2%	-9.2%	13.9%		0.3%
NB	6.2%	-0.5%	-2.6%	-2.9%		-0.2%	5.5%	-0.3%	-2.3%	-2.7%		-0.2%	3.9%	-8.5%	-6.2%	10.7%		0.1%
QC	10.9%	-1.2%	-0.4%	-0.9%	-7.3%	-1.1%	9.5%	-1.0%	-0.4%	-0.8%	-6.1%	-1.1%	4.7%	0.3%	0.8%	6.8%	-13.5%	0.8%
ON	-0.5%	-1.7%	-1.1%	3.9%		-0.7%	-0.4%	-1.2%	-1.1%	3.5%		-0.8%	-2.9%	-3.9%	-0.7%	6.1%		1.4%
MB	1.6%	-3.3%	-0.5%	2.4%		-0.2%	1.0%	-3.1%	-0.6%	3.0%		-0.3%	5.8%	-4.3%	-5.5%	2.6%		1.4%
SK	0.5%	-0.4%	-0.9%	0.9%		-0.1%	-0.5%	-0.6%	-0.7%	2.0%		-0.2%	14.0%	1.0%	-10.0%	-6.3%		1.3%
AB	0.8%	-4.3%	-0.9%	4.7%		-0.4%	1.0%	-4.3%	-0.9%	4.7%		-0.4%	7.8%	-3.2%	0.8%	-6.0%		0.6%
BC	-0.5%	-1.9%	-1.6%	5.6%		-1.6%	-0.1%	-1.7%	-1.5%	5.2%		-1.8%	6.0%	-1.4%	-1.6%	-5.6%		2.6%
YT	-5.3%	-2.0%	4.3%	2.7%		0.3%	-2.5%	-2.2%	0.6%	3.6%		0.5%	-8.9%	2.6%	-0.4%	7.1%		-0.4%
NT	0.4%	-2.3%	-2.0%	4.0%		0.0%	-4.7%	-1.0%	0.3%	5.4%		0.0%	19.3%	-8.1%	-5.6%	-5.6%		0.0%
NU	-8.8%	9.3%	-0.1%	0.0%		-0.4%	-12.4%	8.9%	3.0%	0.0%		0.5%	9.7%	7.9%	-13.0%	0.0%		-4.5%
ALL	3.7%	-1.9%	-1.2%	1.7%	-1.4%	-0.8%	3.3%	-1.7%	-1.3%	1.7%	-1.1%	-0.9%	3.5%	-1.7%	-1.0%	3.3%	-5.1%	0.9%
ROC	0.7%	-1.9%	-1.3%	3.3%		-0.7%	0.7%	-1.8%	-1.4%	3.3%		-0.8%	3.5%	-2.8%	-2.1%	0.5%	0.0%	0.9%
2004	L	C	NDP		BQ	OTH	L	C	NDP		BQ	OTH	L	C	NDP		BQ	OTH
NF	-3.9%	7.1%	-3.6%			0.3%	-4.5%	6.5%	-2.4%			0.3%	-9.0%	18.9%	-11.0%			1.0%
PE	0.0%	4.6%	-3.5%			-1.1%	0.1%	4.8%	-3.4%			-1.5%	-13.6%	16.2%	-5.8%			3.3%
NS	0.9%	3.5%	-4.1%			-0.4%	1.1%	2.9%	-3.3%			-0.7%	-6.0%	16.6%	-14.7%			4.1%
NB	3.5%	3.7%	-6.3%			-0.9%	3.1%	3.9%	-6.0%			-0.9%	-7.7%	18.4%	-12.5%			1.8%
QC	4.3%	1.5%	-0.6%		-4.4%	-0.9%	4.0%	1.7%	-0.6%		-4.1%	-0.9%	-1.8%	15.1%	0.5%		-16.1%	2.4%
ON	-3.2%	7.6%	-3.2%			-1.2%	-3.2%	8.0%	-3.5%			-1.3%	-5.5%	8.1%	-4.1%			1.5%
MB	-0.4%	3.0%	-2.0%			-0.6%	-1.1%	4.3%	-2.3%			-0.9%	3.1%	-2.7%	-6.9%			6.5%
SK	-2.3%	2.4%	0.5%			-0.6%	-2.8%	3.5%	0.0%			-0.7%	7.4%	-9.3%	-1.1%			3.0%
AB	-0.8%	3.6%	-1.2%			-1.5%	-1.3%	4.5%	-1.6%			-1.6%	6.7%	-9.8%	0.6%			2.5%
BC	-3.0%	8.2%	-3.9%			-1.2%	-3.0%	8.3%	-3.8%			-1.5%	1.1%	2.3%	-6.9%			3.4%
YT	-1.3%	-1.0%	1.9%			0.4%	0.8%	-0.7%	-0.3%			0.2%	-15.3%	9.5%	-11.5%			17.3%
NT	-6.2%	6.7%	-2.6%			2.1%	-10.7%	9.2%	-1.1%			2.6%	12.7%	-4.7%	-8.6%			0.6%
NU	-0.4%	0.9%	1.3%			-1.8%	-2.5%	0.6%	1.9%			0.0%	12.2%	-4.9%	-12.3%			5.1%
ALL	-0.1%	4.6%	-2.5%		-0.9%	-1.1%	-0.2%	5.1%	-2.6%		-1.1%	-1.2%	-2.0%	7.6%	-3.8%		-4.0%	2.3%
ROC	-1.7%	5.9%	-3.1%			-1.1%	-1.6%	6.2%	-3.3%			-1.3%	-2.1%	5.1%	-5.3%			2.2%

DIFFERENCES BETWEEN ELECTION-DAY VOTING AND NON-ELECTION DAY VOTING

	DIFF SVR2-ED =====						== NED PARTICIPATION ==				NED%ED =====					
	L	PC	NDP	REF	BQ	OTH	AP%	SVR1%	SVR2%	NED%	L	PC	NDP	REF	BQ	OTH
1993																
NF	-5.5%	6.0%	-0.3%	0.4%		-0.6%	1.8%	1.0%	0.8%	3.6%	85.2%	137.0%	85.4%	206.0%		80.4%
PE	-7.3%	12.0%	-2.8%	-0.5%		-1.3%	3.9%	0.7%	2.0%	6.6%	93.4%	123.3%	53.1%	95.3%		53.4%
NS	1.5%	7.4%	-2.3%	-5.2%		-1.4%	4.5%	0.9%	1.3%	6.7%	101.0%	129.6%	72.9%	69.1%		71.8%
NB	-5.1%	12.4%	-2.0%	-4.1%		-1.1%	7.4%	0.6%	1.5%	9.6%	98.1%	120.0%	67.4%	75.8%		75.2%
QC	6.2%	9.0%	-0.3%		-14.1%	-0.8%	4.2%	0.3%	0.7%	5.3%	113.5%	157.8%	84.4%		77.3%	83.8%
ON	-2.9%	6.6%	0.4%	-2.9%		-1.2%	4.9%	0.3%	1.2%	6.4%	97.1%	129.2%	94.1%	88.7%		74.6%
MB	-1.1%	5.1%	-0.4%	-2.8%		-0.9%	4.0%	0.3%	1.0%	5.3%	98.8%	133.8%	100.1%	89.3%		75.4%
SK	-1.0%	5.9%	-0.7%	-3.3%		-0.9%	4.6%	0.3%	1.1%	6.1%	93.9%	141.7%	105.1%	88.1%		72.5%
AB	-1.2%	5.0%	-0.3%	-2.8%		-0.7%	4.2%	0.3%	1.3%	5.8%	94.5%	127.4%	89.1%	97.9%		75.6%
BC	-6.2%	4.7%	-1.9%	4.6%		-1.2%	5.0%	0.3%	1.5%	6.7%	87.0%	128.4%	93.1%	106.6%		79.6%
YT	-4.6%	6.6%	-1.1%	-0.9%		0.0%	4.3%	0.5%	4.7%	9.4%	84.8%	132.2%	98.7%	92.2%		84.7%
NT	-3.0%	3.2%	-4.4%	1.5%		2.8%	2.5%	0.8%	1.5%	4.8%	89.9%	118.8%	78.3%	149.6%		155.3%
ALL	-0.8%	7.2%	0.4%	1.5%	-7.4%	-0.9%	4.6%	0.4%	1.1%	6.1%	100.4%	136.8%	97.0%	98.5%	66.1%	79.0%
ROC	-3.8%	6.4%	-0.4%	-1.2%		-1.0%	4.7%	0.4%	1.3%	6.4%	96.0%	130.2%	93.5%	93.3%		76.6%
1997																
NF	10.1%	-2.5%	-8.3%	1.1%		-0.3%	2.1%	0.7%	0.7%	3.5%	120.0%	100.9%	63.5%	121.4%		72.4%
PE	3.0%	0.5%	-4.0%	0.3%		0.1%	5.2%	0.4%	1.3%	6.9%	107.2%	101.6%	74.1%	115.7%		78.6%
NS	9.1%	3.2%	-7.4%	-4.7%		-0.2%	5.3%	0.6%	1.0%	6.9%	115.8%	114.1%	79.4%	76.4%		87.7%
NB	9.7%	4.9%	-8.5%	-5.8%		-0.2%	6.8%	0.4%	1.0%	8.2%	116.9%	107.1%	74.9%	76.1%		88.1%
QC	15.3%	-2.3%	0.0%	-0.1%	-12.7%	-0.2%	6.0%	0.3%	0.8%	7.0%	120.3%	99.1%	89.1%	68.6%	81.6%	123.4%
ON	-1.8%	4.3%	1.8%	-3.9%		-0.3%	5.1%	0.2%	0.7%	6.0%	95.5%	124.6%	103.8%	88.4%		72.6%
MB	3.7%	1.9%	0.7%	-6.8%		0.5%	3.8%	0.3%	0.8%	4.9%	105.2%	115.5%	99.4%	82.5%		86.5%
SK	1.4%	1.2%	5.6%	-8.0%		-0.2%	4.9%	0.3%	0.7%	5.9%	103.9%	112.6%	108.3%	88.0%		77.5%
AB	0.5%	2.7%	1.7%	-4.6%		-0.2%	4.8%	0.3%	0.8%	5.9%	98.4%	117.9%	111.5%	95.4%		74.3%
BC	-4.1%	1.5%	-0.1%	3.8%		-1.2%	5.9%	0.2%	0.9%	7.1%	90.9%	129.7%	97.8%	105.1%		75.1%
YT	1.3%	3.0%	-0.4%	-5.8%		1.9%	6.3%	0.4%	2.2%	8.9%	99.4%	106.6%	115.8%	86.0%		83.1%
NT	4.7%	3.3%	-0.2%	-1.4%		-6.4%	3.9%	4.8%	2.1%	10.8%	148.8%	113.8%	58.8%	61.2%		46.0%
NU	0.2%	-9.2%	-2.6%	11.7%		0.0%	3.7%	1.1%	0.4%	5.1%	85.6%	152.2%	75.4%	105.0%		
ALL	3.4%	1.5%	0.6%	-1.5%	-3.7%	-0.3%	5.4%	0.3%	0.8%	6.4%	103.6%	112.4%	94.2%	91.2%	89.8%	84.6%
ROC	-1.2%	3.0%	0.7%	-2.3%	0.0%	-0.3%	5.1%	0.3%	0.8%	6.2%	97.1%	118.6%	97.9%	95.0%		76.9%

DIFFERENCES BETWEEN ELECTION-DAY VOTING AND NON-ELECTION DAY VOTING

2000	DIFF SVR2-ED =====						== NED PARTICIPATION ==				NED%ED =====					
	L	PC	NDP	CA	BQ	OTH	AP%	SVR1%	SVR2%	NED%	L	PC	NDP	CA	BQ	OTH
NF	4.8%	-2.1%	-5.3%	-0.5%		3.1%	2.7%	0.6%	1.2%	4.5%	105.6%	97.7%	69.1%	148.2%		115.1%
PE	3.9%	-1.8%	-1.2%	-1.0%		0.1%	6.2%	0.4%	2.4%	9.0%	109.6%	90.2%	83.9%	119.0%		73.3%
NS	5.8%	-1.0%	-3.1%	-1.2%		-0.5%	6.1%	0.6%	1.4%	8.0%	105.9%	93.8%	96.4%	110.2%		52.4%
NB	9.7%	0.3%	-3.0%	-6.8%		-0.2%	7.2%	0.3%	1.6%	9.2%	115.0%	98.3%	78.3%	81.8%		50.3%
QC	18.2%	-2.3%	-0.6%	-2.1%	-11.8%	-1.4%	6.3%	0.2%	1.4%	7.9%	125.2%	78.4%	76.3%	86.3%	82.0%	54.2%
ON	-0.5%	-3.8%	-0.9%	6.0%		-0.7%	6.2%	0.2%	1.1%	7.5%	99.1%	88.5%	87.3%	116.9%		67.2%
MB	3.0%	-3.7%	0.8%	0.4%		-0.4%	4.2%	0.3%	1.2%	5.7%	104.9%	77.7%	97.6%	108.0%		86.1%
SK	2.2%	0.4%	-0.1%	-2.3%		-0.1%	4.9%	0.2%	1.2%	6.4%	102.6%	92.1%	96.6%	101.9%		75.8%
AB	-1.3%	-4.3%	-0.8%	6.7%		-0.3%	5.4%	0.2%	1.1%	6.7%	103.9%	69.0%	84.4%	108.0%		70.9%
BC	-3.8%	-2.8%	-1.9%	9.7%		-1.2%	6.5%	0.2%	1.2%	7.9%	98.1%	74.7%	86.1%	111.5%		63.5%
YT	-9.2%	-1.9%	9.6%	1.3%		0.1%	6.2%	0.2%	4.4%	10.8%	83.8%	74.4%	113.6%	109.9%		191.9%
NT	3.3%	-2.9%	-4.5%	4.1%		0.0%	4.8%	0.7%	3.4%	8.9%	100.8%	77.3%	92.4%	123.1%		
NU	-3.4%	11.6%	-6.1%	0.0%		-2.1%	2.1%	0.2%	0.5%	2.9%	87.3%	217.7%	99.5%			90.2%
ALL	5.7%	-2.7%	-1.1%	1.2%	-2.2%	-0.8%	6.0%	0.2%	1.2%	7.5%	109.1%	84.8%	85.7%	106.6%	86.9%	63.9%
ROC	0.1%	-2.5%	-0.9%	3.8%		-0.6%	5.9%	0.3%	1.2%	7.4%	101.9%	86.9%	87.9%	110.1%		67.9%
2004	L	C	NDP		BQ	OTH	AP%	SVR1%	SVR2%	NED%	L	C	NDP		BQ	OTH
NF	0.8%	4.1%	-4.8%			-0.1%	5.8%	0.7%	1.5%	7.9%	92.0%	122.5%	80.0%			113.6%
PE	3.0%	0.6%	-3.6%			0.0%	8.9%	0.4%	1.6%	11.0%	100.0%	115.3%	72.8%			74.7%
NS	3.0%	1.6%	-4.1%			-0.5%	8.4%	0.6%	1.6%	10.6%	102.4%	112.7%	85.9%			90.4%
NB	8.6%	-0.6%	-6.3%			-1.7%	10.3%	0.4%	1.7%	12.4%	107.9%	112.1%	70.7%			75.4%
QC	7.0%	-1.2%	-0.4%		-4.0%	-1.4%	9.1%	0.3%	1.8%	11.2%	112.9%	118.0%	87.8%		91.1%	77.1%
ON	-2.9%	4.8%	-0.9%			-1.0%	10.2%	0.2%	1.3%	11.7%	92.9%	124.9%	82.4%			79.6%
MB	2.3%	-1.8%	0.2%			-0.6%	6.6%	0.3%	1.5%	8.4%	98.9%	107.7%	91.5%			86.1%
SK	-1.1%	-2.2%	3.5%			-0.3%	8.4%	0.3%	1.4%	10.1%	91.7%	105.7%	102.0%			92.5%
AB	0.5%	0.7%	0.4%			-1.7%	8.1%	0.3%	1.4%	9.8%	96.2%	105.8%	87.2%			78.4%
BC	-3.8%	8.4%	-4.0%			-0.6%	8.6%	0.2%	1.7%	10.5%	89.6%	123.1%	85.4%			85.7%
YT	-3.8%	-2.0%	6.0%			-0.3%	7.8%	0.3%	5.2%	13.2%	97.1%	95.4%	107.4%			105.3%
NT	-1.7%	4.5%	-4.2%			1.3%	6.6%	0.9%	2.7%	10.3%	84.6%	140.4%	93.4%			150.9%
NU	1.5%	5.6%	6.6%			-13.7%	7.5%	1.0%	1.7%	10.1%	99.2%	106.3%	108.5%			90.9%
ALL	0.6%	1.0%	-1.8%		1.4%	-1.1%	9.2%	0.3%	1.5%	11.0%	99.6%	115.9%	84.1%		93.1%	80.9%
ROC	-1.9%	4.0%	-1.2%			-0.9%	9.2%	0.3%	1.4%	10.9%	95.6%	116.3%	84.3%			81.9%

DIFFERENCES BETWEEN ELECTION-DAY VOTING AND NON-ELECTION DAY VOTING

1993	AP%ED=====						SVR1%ED=====						SVR2%ED=====					
	L	PC	NDP	REF	BQ	OTH	L	PC	NDP	REF	BQ	OTH	L	PC	NDP	REF	BQ	OTH
NF	87.0%	133.6%	98.6%	133.9%		76.0%	76.4%	155.1%	54.7%	399.1%		105.8%	91.8%	122.9%	92.4%	138.1%		59.6%
PE	98.3%	113.0%	57.9%	74.7%		67.1%	81.0%	140.1%	42.0%	354.8%		59.0%	87.9%	138.0%	47.2%	47.3%		24.3%
NS	106.2%	119.9%	79.8%	63.8%		66.5%	73.7%	172.3%	47.2%	104.4%		101.6%	102.8%	132.1%	67.3%	61.9%		68.7%
NB	102.0%	111.6%	70.2%	74.8%		77.0%	68.6%	159.6%	53.1%	145.7%		88.4%	90.9%	145.2%	59.3%	52.2%		61.1%
QC	114.6%	151.1%	82.7%		78.4%	82.4%	80.5%	232.3%	127.5%		74.6%	147.6%	119.0%	168.7%	78.0%		71.8%	68.1%
ON	99.7%	121.2%	91.7%	89.3%		75.4%	70.1%	209.4%	81.0%	90.3%		101.7%	94.5%	138.4%	107.1%	85.6%		64.0%
MB	101.0%	122.7%	103.8%	88.0%		74.4%	72.6%	247.9%	58.6%	112.5%		77.9%	97.6%	143.8%	97.7%	87.7%		78.9%
SK	94.4%	129.2%	110.2%	87.9%		69.2%	78.4%	270.3%	61.9%	90.8%		127.6%	96.8%	153.0%	97.4%	88.0%		68.7%
AB	94.1%	117.2%	85.1%	101.5%		71.8%	95.2%	224.4%	125.9%	66.7%		93.1%	95.4%	134.7%	92.2%	94.6%		83.5%
BC	90.9%	117.4%	96.7%	106.1%		78.8%	67.6%	267.7%	61.3%	84.4%		79.9%	78.0%	135.9%	87.5%	112.8%		82.1%
YT	86.2%	126.3%	101.3%	91.7%		70.8%	114.9%	124.1%	88.9%	86.5%		56.9%	80.4%	138.4%	97.4%	93.2%		100.4%
NT	87.3%	106.3%	95.2%	181.3%		147.6%	87.5%	154.4%	93.8%	113.5%		47.0%	95.4%	120.1%	42.8%	117.7%		225.5%
ALL	102.7%	127.8%	96.9%	97.1%	71.7%	77.8%	78.4%	223.9%	72.4%	86.4%	55.9%	102.0%	98.0%	145.9%	105.3%	107.9%	46.7%	76.4%
ROC	98.9%	120.7%	95.2%	94.1%		75.9%	76.2%	218.1%	64.7%	78.9%		91.1%	91.6%	138.4%	96.1%	95.2%		74.6%
1997	L	PC	NDP	REF	BQ	OTH	L	PC	NDP	REF	BQ	OTH	L	PC	NDP	REF	BQ	OTH
NF	107.2%	109.9%	74.8%	78.1%		80.4%	152.0%	81.6%	29.9%	228.9%		52.2%	126.7%	93.1%	62.5%	144.6%		68.3%
PE	106.8%	102.2%	75.8%	98.3%		61.0%	113.3%	94.6%	55.0%	307.9%		103.4%	106.8%	101.4%	74.0%	120.7%		141.9%
NS	108.0%	116.6%	83.9%	78.2%		74.2%	158.3%	98.0%	44.4%	103.5%		236.2%	132.5%	110.4%	76.1%	52.1%		73.6%
NB	113.7%	106.8%	79.8%	77.9%		86.6%	140.4%	95.6%	40.3%	93.4%		180.6%	129.9%	114.0%	54.6%	56.4%		61.1%
QC	118.3%	100.1%	85.5%	65.2%	83.1%	125.1%	103.0%	106.5%	144.4%	114.2%	88.3%	205.1%	142.2%	89.4%	99.2%	80.7%	67.0%	82.1%
ON	95.1%	124.7%	103.1%	90.0%		69.2%	102.2%	128.0%	80.3%	77.2%		112.0%	96.3%	123.1%	116.5%	79.6%		84.8%
MB	103.4%	115.8%	99.9%	85.2%		64.9%	113.7%	124.6%	79.8%	76.2%		222.7%	110.8%	110.8%	103.1%	71.6%		144.8%
SK	101.2%	109.0%	107.6%	91.3%		70.2%	147.5%	169.8%	93.8%	56.0%		223.7%	105.5%	116.0%	118.3%	77.8%		72.4%
AB	95.3%	116.4%	106.9%	97.8%		65.8%	147.3%	143.8%	144.6%	60.6%		217.2%	102.1%	118.8%	129.3%	91.6%		80.5%
BC	90.8%	125.4%	98.0%	105.8%		73.5%	116.6%	275.5%	84.7%	66.3%		146.2%	86.0%	124.5%	99.6%	108.8%		69.4%
YT	95.3%	100.5%	124.6%	90.9%		62.9%	126.5%	120.2%	71.4%	57.9%		202.5%	106.1%	121.4%	98.7%	77.2%		119.1%
NT	95.4%	157.7%	100.9%	105.4%		48.9%	208.4%	72.5%	6.9%	12.2%		42.5%	112.0%	126.3%	99.0%	90.7%		48.7%
NU	83.6%	153.1%	81.8%	91.7%			87.1%	182.3%	48.6%	83.8%			100.4%	60.8%	89.0%	288.2%		
ALL	102.4%	112.3%	93.4%	92.4%	93.6%	81.9%	113.7%	125.4%	79.8%	65.4%	83.7%	143.9%	108.7%	108.2%	105.4%	92.3%	65.7%	82.8%
ROC	96.0%	118.0%	98.0%	97.2%		73.2%	117.1%	134.8%	75.3%	63.9%		130.7%	97.0%	117.5%	105.0%	91.6%		82.7%

DIFFERENCES BETWEEN ELECTION-DAY VOTING AND NON-ELECTION DAY VOTING

2000	AP%ED=====					SVR1%ED=====					SVR2%ED=====							
	L	PC	NDP	CA	BQ	OTH	L	PC	NDP	CA	BQ	OTH	L	PC	NDP	CA	BQ	OTH
NF	97.6%	109.6%	82.6%	101.6%		101.2%	131.5%	52.5%	26.8%	483.4%		31.9%	110.6%	93.8%	60.3%	86.9%		185.8%
PE	110.4%	90.4%	86.0%	108.7%		51.5%	104.9%	60.3%	40.4%	476.2%		111.8%	108.3%	95.4%	86.6%	80.1%		122.5%
NS	103.0%	95.4%	101.9%	102.8%		46.3%	111.3%	68.6%	61.7%	246.6%		138.1%	116.0%	96.6%	87.0%	87.4%		44.4%
NB	113.4%	98.9%	80.5%	83.3%		47.2%	109.6%	72.1%	48.3%	166.8%		116.4%	123.5%	100.9%	74.8%	57.6%		49.6%
QC	121.9%	81.6%	76.6%	86.8%	84.9%	54.9%	110.8%	105.9%	145.2%	209.9%	66.7%	132.0%	142.1%	59.9%	65.7%	66.9%	70.8%	40.5%
ON	99.3%	91.8%	86.9%	115.0%		63.1%	94.4%	73.1%	91.2%	126.2%		162.1%	99.0%	73.6%	88.8%	125.6%		69.3%
MB	103.0%	79.0%	97.3%	109.8%		84.0%	117.8%	70.9%	73.7%	108.7%		178.1%	109.1%	74.6%	103.8%	101.4%		74.3%
SK	97.5%	87.0%	97.5%	104.2%		63.3%	167.9%	120.5%	61.8%	86.7%		324.3%	110.6%	107.4%	99.6%	95.2%		77.2%
AB	104.7%	68.8%	83.1%	108.0%		66.8%	137.1%	77.0%	114.5%	89.8%		145.8%	93.7%	68.7%	85.2%	111.5%		76.6%
BC	99.6%	76.7%	86.6%	110.6%		58.9%	121.7%	81.3%	86.2%	88.5%		158.3%	86.4%	62.6%	83.2%	119.8%		72.6%
YT	92.5%	71.7%	101.8%	113.0%		235.8%	73.0%	134.2%	98.6%	125.9%		0.0%	72.3%	75.3%	130.6%	104.7%		140.4%
NT	89.8%	89.9%	101.0%	131.1%			142.4%	20.9%	79.1%	67.5%			107.2%	71.7%	83.2%	123.7%		
NU	82.1%	212.7%	116.3%			110.3%	114.0%	199.0%	28.8%			0.0%	95.1%	245.9%	66.8%			53.8%
ALL	108.1%	86.2%	85.3%	106.7%	89.8%	61.0%	108.7%	86.6%	88.7%	113.1%	52.9%	137.8%	114.1%	77.9%	86.9%	104.6%	79.7%	63.6%
ROC	101.9%	88.0%	87.4%	110.1%		63.5%	108.8%	80.9%	81.0%	101.6%		140.1%	100.3%	83.2%	91.9%	111.9%		74.0%
2004	L	C	NDP		BQ	OTH	L	C	NDP		BQ	OTH	L	C	NDP		BQ	OTH
NF	90.8%	120.5%	86.7%			114.3%	81.4%	159.6%	38.0%			147.9%	101.7%	112.8%	73.1%			94.7%
PE	100.1%	116.0%	73.8%			65.6%	74.2%	153.5%	54.6%			173.6%	105.7%	102.1%	71.9%			100.2%
NS	102.7%	110.5%	88.6%			82.8%	84.8%	160.1%	49.2%			202.2%	107.6%	105.9%	85.7%			86.5%
NB	107.0%	112.6%	71.7%			76.1%	82.5%	160.2%	41.5%			147.8%	119.4%	98.2%	70.8%			54.0%
QC	111.9%	119.6%	86.6%		91.7%	77.1%	94.5%	275.1%	109.8%		67.4%	161.1%	121.0%	85.9%	90.8%		91.9%	64.6%
ON	92.9%	126.1%	81.0%			78.0%	87.8%	126.3%	77.8%			126.0%	93.5%	115.7%	95.0%			83.7%
MB	96.7%	111.0%	90.4%			78.7%	109.5%	93.0%	70.8%			251.7%	106.8%	95.3%	100.9%			85.3%
SK	89.8%	108.5%	100.1%			90.2%	127.0%	77.6%	95.4%			138.9%	96.1%	94.8%	115.1%			96.1%
AB	94.0%	107.4%	83.5%			77.0%	130.4%	84.0%	106.6%			135.4%	102.4%	101.2%	104.1%			76.0%
BC	89.7%	123.5%	85.7%			82.7%	103.9%	106.4%	74.6%			139.5%	86.8%	123.7%	85.2%			93.0%
YT	101.7%	96.8%	98.6%			102.9%	66.6%	145.3%	54.6%			325.1%	91.8%	90.6%	123.6%			96.6%
NT	73.3%	155.7%	97.2%			163.6%	131.6%	71.6%	78.1%			114.9%	95.9%	127.2%	89.4%			132.5%
NU	95.1%	104.2%	112.6%			100.1%	123.7%	65.9%	18.0%			126.3%	102.8%	139.3%	143.6%			29.1%
ALL	99.5%	117.6%	83.6%		90.9%	79.3%	94.5%	126.0%	75.9%		68.0%	140.0%	101.6%	103.4%	88.9%		110.9%	79.8%
ROC	95.8%	117.2%	83.2%			79.6%	94.6%	114.1%	73.4%			135.6%	94.9%	111.1%	93.8%			86.3%

Tony L. Hill
 MIT Dept. of Political Science tlh@mit.edu