

Monday will be a holiday.

Tuesday and Wednesday of next week will be report stage on Bill C-43, the abortion bill, for which there is a House Order providing that we will have extended sittings on both days until 9 p.m. to give an opportunity for all members who desire to speak to speak, with votes on report stage on Wednesday at nine o'clock.

Thursday, we will continue with third reading of the abortion bill, again under the House Order on Bill C-43. The vote on that will be postponed until the following Tuesday.

I expect to call Friday of next week an allotted day. That will take care of next week.

**Mr. Gauthier:** Mr. Speaker, on a minor but nevertheless important detail, we have not, as of now, had all the amendments to Bill C-34. I do not think that either the government House leader or myself could make the undertaking that we would pass the bill at report stage and third reading tomorrow. I have not seen what the members of the House are going to bring in terms of amendments to the bill tomorrow. I think we should reserve on that one. If there are no unusual amendments, then I can give the undertaking.

• (1510)

**Mr. Andre:** I was not expecting a firm commitment in that regard, but I understood that there may be a minor typographical error. Where the word should have been "officers", it is "affairs". That is the extent of the amendment. Discussions will be undertaken among parties and, if no agreement is possible, so be it. Hopefully, an agreement will be possible.

**Mr. Gauthier:** Mr. Speaker, just to make sure that everybody understands, we have until six o'clock tonight to table amendments to that bill. I do not know if members have additional amendments. I just want to make sure that everybody's right to table amendments is protected and that members do not think that we are going to pass the bill come rain or high water.

**Mr. Andre:** Certainly, Mr. Speaker.

### *Speaker's Ruling*

#### PRIVILEGE

##### HOUSE OF COMMONS STATIONERY—SPEAKER'S RULING

**Mr. Speaker:** On Monday, April 23, 1990, the hon. member for Glengarry—Prescott—Russell rose on a question of privilege to draw our attention to a letter circulating in the United States which had been the subject of at least one news article in this country.

The letter in question was written by a former hon. member of this place and bore his signature. The text clearly indicates that the writer is no longer a member of Parliament. The opening sentence, directed to an American audience, reads:

I bid you greetings from Canada where, for eight years, I served that nation as a Member of Parliament until 1984.

This is followed by the declaration: "I chose to give up my seat in Parliament as a protest". Finally, the signature block refers to the writer as: "Member of Parliament (ret)".

[*Translation*]

Beyond noting those indications in the text that bear on the fact that the former hon. member was not misrepresenting his current status, I do not think the Chair should comment at all upon the content of the letter.

[*English*]

When the issue was first raised in the House, the Chair said: "The question is whether or not it is appropriate to send (the letter) out—under the guise of House of Commons stationery", and "The point I have to decide is whether whoever put this out has done something which breaches the privileges of the House".

The writer of the letter who is, as I have said, a former hon. member of this place, has, in a letter addressed to your Speaker, the House leader and several other hon. members, categorically denied sending this letter out on House of Commons stationery. This denial is supported by the statement of the president of the group which claims responsibility for the mailing at issue. According to that statement, the group took the writer's draft, which was on plain white paper, transferred it to a composite made up of two or three samples of parliamentary letterhead, and mailed it in a similar composite envelope.