

[*Translation*]

Mr. Plamondon: Mr. Speaker, I just wanted to ask you this: If I require some clarification on this point of order, should I request it now or wait until you have given your ruling on the other point of order?

[*English*]

Mr. Speaker: If I finish the other point of order, it may perhaps resolve some other problems, or at least be a step toward resolving some other problems. I would ask the hon. member to wait.

ANNAPOLIS VALLEY—HANTS—SPEAKER'S RULING

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Annapolis Valley—Hants rose on November 21, 1990 to declare that he was and wanted to be known as and registered in our records as an independent Conservative.

The hon. member for Calgary West intervened to make the point that in the Appendix to Wednesday's *Debates* members are listed by affiliation to parties recognized under the Canada Elections Act or as Independents, with no other possibilities in terms of that listing.

The Chair then indicated that the matter was the subject of discussion outside the Chamber and expressed the hope that it could be satisfactorily resolved.

Our further discussions on this matter were neither conclusive nor determinant of the issue. Before the Chair could so report back to the House, the hon. member for Annapolis Valley—Hants again rose on December 10, 1990 to press for recognition as an independent Conservative.

In his passionate appeal to the House, the hon. member referred us to numerous precedents where members having been elected under one label declared themselves under another affiliation and were so recognized.

He maintained that the political system in this country is based on the election of individuals whose party affiliation is incidental. The hon. member for Calgary West continued to insist that to invent a political affiliation which did not exist under the Canada Elections Act and to request the Parliament of Canada to approve the designation of that political affiliation in its written records when it does not exist as a label one can use in

Speaker's Ruling

running for election in this country would be a serious mistake.

The hon. member for Kingston and the Islands submitted that the hon. member for Calgary West was seeking to alter the rules under which we have operated here by reference to changes in the Elections Act made in the 1970s. He concluded that based on precedents it would be entirely proper for the hon. member for Annapolis Valley—Hants to choose his designation and insist that it be inserted in the Wednesday listing as an Appendix to *Debates*.

The Chair concluded the exchange by asking if any member could advise the Chair if there was any legal impediment against the hon. member calling himself an independent Conservative of the House. None was identified.

The Chair promised to return to the House with a reasoned response and is prepared to do so now.

[*Translation*]

It is, perhaps, paradoxical that the political affiliation of an hon. member, which is so fundamental to his or her self-definition is, in our official records, given only marginal expression. As far as this House is concerned, a member is designated by political affiliation only in the weekly appendix to *Debates*, and only in appendices to *Journals* and the bound volumes of *Debates*. There are, of course, other applications of these designations as, for example, in the electronic Hansard or in miscellaneous listings of members of the House. However, these applications might be described as derivative in that they depend upon or are drawn from the listing which appears in the weekly appendix to *Debates*. Therefore, the designation of political affiliation in *Debates* must be the primary focus.

[*English*]

With very great respect to those who maintain an opposite view, the Chair must advise that it can find no prescription limiting the designations inserted under political affiliation in the Appendix to *Debates* to those parties officially recognized as such pursuant to the Canada Elections Act.

The absence of such a limiting prescription must be weighed against the combined weight of our past practice in this regard and our long-standing tradition of respecting the word and legitimate demands to self-definition of individual members.