Competition Tribunal Act

[Translation]

Mr. Gauthier: Mr. Speaker, we are now working under the new Standing Orders. I may recall that there are some questions on the Order Paper that require a reply within 45 days and other questions that do not. Upon checking today's Order Paper, I noticed there were some questions dated February 24, which means that 45 days have elapsed since these questions were put. I would therefore ask the Parliamentary Secretary if he intends to reply to these questions tomorrow. There are at least six, Mr. Speaker.

• (1110)

[English]

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Speaker, is the Hon. Member inquiring as to whether or not we will meet the timetable tomorrow? I think he will find that we are making every effort to meet the timetable, and tomorrow at this time I will probably be able to give the Hon. Member the news that we have.

Mr. Gauthier: Mr. Speaker, I do not think the point was well understood. Today is the forty-fifth day since at least five or six questions were put on the Order Paper. The new rules indicate that the Government must respond within those 45 days. Since the Parliamentary Secretary has not responded to them today, does he intend to do it tomorrow? We are going to be flexible.

Mr. Lewis: I am sorry, perhaps I did not understand the Hon. Member's presentation. I thought he said that tomorrow was the last day. If Hon. Members have requested replies—and the Hon. Member will know that we have replied to several petitions under the new rules—

Mr. Gauthier: I am talking about questions.

Mr. Lewis: —we will make every effort to reply to as many of them as possible. I will look into the matter and get back to the Hon. Member tomorrow $vis-\grave{a}-vis$ the petitions which have not been responded to.

Mr. Gauthier: Questions.

Mr. Lewis: Questions, I am sorry.

[Translation]

Mr. Speaker, I ask that the remaining questions be allowed to stand.

Mr. Speaker: Shall the remaining questions stand?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

[Fnolish]

Mr. Speaker: Shall the remaining questions be allowed to stand?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[English]

COMPETITION TRIBUNAL ACT

MEASURE TO ENACT

The House resumed from Wednesday, April 9, consideration of the motion of Mr. Côté (Langelier) that Bill C-91, an Act to establish the Competition Tribunal and to amend the Combines Investigation Act and the Bank Act and other Acts in consequence thereof, be read the second time and referred to a legislative committee.

Mr. Domm: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. At the conclusion of business yesterday and prior to the adjournment of the House, we endeavoured to determine whether we had reached the end of debate. At that time the Hon. Member for Thunder Bay—Nipigon—

Mr. Keeper: Thunder Bay-Atikokan.

Mr. Domm: Was it not the Hon. Member for Thunder Bay—Nipigon (Mr. Epp)?

Some Hon. Members: No.

Mr. Domm: All right, that is fine.

Mr. Speaker: At the time the Hon. Member for Thunder Bay—Atikokan (Mr. Angus) had the floor. He indicated that he wished to debate. He is not here to complete his speech, let us put it that way. Therefore, resuming debate with the Hon. Member for Kamloops-Shuswap (Mr. Riis).

Mr. Nelson A. Riis (Kamloops-Shuswap): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to have an opportunity to—

Mr. Ouellet: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I do not mean to interrupt the Hon. Member, but since the Parliamentary Secretary raised a point of order, I should like to raise another one. I should like to know if the Minister intends to be absent for the third day in a row while we are discussing his legislation in the House. I think it is very important legislation.

Mr. Speaker: I appreciate that the Hon. Member has a viewpoint, but I think he knows that it is not a point of order.

Mr. Ouellet: If it is not a point of order, it is a question of privilege.

Mr. Speaker: I think the Hon. Member has put his view on the record, but he has not raised a proper point of order, let me put it that way.

Mr. Riis: Mr. Speaker, it is a privilege to have an opportunity to say a few words on Bill C-91 today. To date the debate has been a very intelligent, which I believe reflects the seriousness of Members of Parliament in terms of what is now very clearly happening in the country, that is, the continuing move to more and more corporate concentration. I am