

Compton—Stanstead, are entitled to associate with the member for Richelieu, as long as it is kept under wraps.

On this matter, I don't think you can afford to bury your head in the sand. The only thing I ask is that, during debate in this House and the broadcast of the proceedings, as well as in committees and every time my name is mentioned, I be referred to as the member for Mégantic—Compton—Stanstead or to the "Bloc Québécois", just as any other member affiliated with one group or another is referred to.

My request, Mr. Speaker, is supported by the most fundamental texts in our country, which are widely recognized in every nation of the world and by all governments and democratic assemblies.

**Hon. Jean Lapierre (Shefford):** I should like to comment on the same point of order, Mr. Speaker.

I think my colleague from Mégantic—Compton—Stanstead is quite right, for he speaks for us all. You may recall that all the members who had signed the memo I sent you on September 17 asked or officially advised you of their decision to sit under the banner of the "Bloc Québécois".

This note was signed by all my colleagues and expressed our common will to sit under that banner. That being so, be it in the various committees—indeed we will have to deal further with this because I imagine the Chief Government Whip will have something to say about it—if the various committees of the House are to be representative of the House it is obvious that we will have to find a solution concerning our participation in the various committees, given the number of us.

If the committees want to be true reflections of the composition of this House we will have to find a solution to that. I would ask you, and the Opposition Whip more particularly, to consider the matter.

Mr. Speaker, this involves not only television and the committees but also all the elements you mentioned with respect to the various proceedings of the House and the ministerial statements when we hope to be able to have the floor, whenever a decision has been made about that.

Since I am on this subject and knowing that your illustrious Board of Internal Economy had a meeting today, at least I imagine it did, I wonder if the House

might be advised as to whether your board has reached conclusions. This might be a good opportunity because all members of the House want to know to what extent a group which a member has joined freely must be recognized.

• (1650)

**Mr. Jim Hawkes (Calgary West):** Mr. Speaker, yesterday, in the Committee on the Review of the Parliament of Canada Act, we had practically the same discussion, not exactly the same but almost.

[*English*]

I think it is clear from our precedents in this Parliament, let alone previous Parliaments, that it is the right of members in terms of designation to remove the designation they had when they arrived in this place. If they ran under the Canada Elections Act under a particular party name and they choose no longer to be a part of that, then that is their choice. I discovered through conversations some months ago that no one else can take the designation away from them. That is a matter of individual choice and is well centred in our parliamentary democracy.

The issue the member is raising clearly today is whether or not he has the right to substitute for that designation a new designation of some kind. I am not sure; perhaps it would take a bit of table research to decide whether or not we really have any kind of clear precedents for the power to put a different set of words behind one's name in all of our publications including *Hansard*.

I do not know if anybody in this Chamber feels negative about the notion that the issue of labelling in our documents be referred to the Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections and that committee members, in their wisdom, hold whatever hearings they need and report back to the Chamber about that specific issue.

In the course of the argument some other issues were raised, for instance the issue of committee membership. The striking committee has not even met to consider the letter that is in our hands. On the issue related to the Board of Internal Economy, it has not met since that correspondence arrived. It would probably be premature to send any of the other matters to committee at this point.