

Privilege

to the principles of the party, as I understand them, that I prefer to have complete freedom to express my views in the debate without embarrassment to my colleagues.

At the earliest convenient opportunity I will meet with the members of the executive of the Progressive Conservative party of Winnipeg South Centre and in consultation with them take whatever action is considered appropriate.

I shall continue to maintain a friendly and sympathetic interest in the Conservative party, in the hope that at some time in the future it will once again command my steadfast and unwavering support.

I rest my case with a man of the stature of Gordon Churchill who wanted to be an independent Conservative for a fundamental break with the party and was so recognized.

I can go through some 90—some names where again they were not open to challenge. That shows what state Parliament has got to when an individual member with a lot of consideration and a difficult decision makes a public declaration and lo and behold, out of the cobwebs of procedure we get someone standing and saying: "You cannot do that."

Mr. Speaker, I ran and I will be running again, whenever Elections Canada says. Right now, in this House of Commons, I want to clear up my status for the record so that the elementary political eunuch in terms of appellation can be clarified and to do what is the fact of life, that is, to be known in the records officially as an independent Conservative.

Mr. Jim Hawkes (Calgary West): Mr. Speaker, I am not sure if we are in a debate, on a point of order, or a question of privilege. Certainly it was at some length.

I have no quarrel with my colleague across the way in terms of his willingness and ability to call himself whatever he wants to and to indicate what in his own mind is any political affiliation.

What we are dealing with is my intervention of some couple of weeks ago when I rose in terms of our printed record, *Hansard*, which is a publication that governs what we do in committees.

At the back of every Wednesday's *Hansard* is a section that carries the names of members, the constituency they represent, and their political affiliation. To this point in the life of this Parliament and preceding Parliaments, and I suggest going back to the adoption of the current election law in Canada which flows from the Constitu-

tion of Canada, we have designated people in this part of our written record according to the political affiliation under which they ran during an election and therefore were elected to represent the New Democratic Party or the Progressive Conservative Party. In one case in our current records, it is the Reform Party or the Liberal Party of Canada. That is the affiliation.

People have been expelled from caucus without being required to change that affiliation because their voters voted for them as an individual in a constituency with a political affiliation. What we have allowed members to do is to withdraw that affiliation. If they were no longer happy with what they were elected to do, which is to affiliate with other members with a similar label, we have allowed them to withdraw and to put the word "Independent" in our written record. The truth is they no longer affiliate with any political group.

The member opposite raises another situation where an hon. member moves from one political group to another recognized political party. Yes, there have been cases of people moving from the Progressive Conservative Party to the Liberal Party or to the New Democratic Party. In fact, we had one member in the last Parliament who I think visited every party. He was elected as a Progressive Conservative and sat with each of the other parties, and ended up finally sitting as an Independent.

If you were to accept the arguments by my hon. friend across the way, then you would have the absurdity, Mr. Speaker, and the potential in theory of 295 separate political affiliations the blue party, the pink party, the yellow party, the green party, the up party, the down party, the inside out party, et cetera.

What this is intended to be is a serious historical record that can be consulted and will help scholars and others in the future to determine the political dynamics of the place at a given point in time. If you allow people to designate their own political affiliation after they have been through an electoral process, would we have accepted, for instance, the hon. member's request, having run as a Progressive Conservative, having sought the concurrence of his voters, and having been elected that way, to emerge on the opening day of this Parliament and to stand up in his place and say: "I want to be recorded in the back of this book as a communist"? Would we have accepted that the designation of political