Routine Proceedings

The other question the hon. member raised was initiatives by banks. I mentioned the Bank of Montreal and its prime-plus card. It used the floating cap when I was told it could not be done. It said it would charge prime plus 5 per cent. That was one year ago and I applauded that initiative. I said to the Bank of Montreal that this was a good move.

Lo and behold, the other banks have not followed. The Bank of Nova Scotia came out late last year with its special credit card at 10.5 per cent. I applauded it for the action it took in setting the card rate at 10.5 per cent. Do not get too anxious. That does not mean that we can go over to Scotiabank or the Bank of Montreal and say we have this amount owing to CIBC Visa of \$4,000 and ask whether they can lend us \$4,000 and then we will get their card. It does not work that way.

Mr. Barrett: No?

Mr. Rodriguez: No sir. It does not work that way.

Mr. Barrett: Why not?

Mr. Rodriguez: It is because they want to sign up new business. They are not going to give people money to pay off and finance that CIBC card at 10.5 per cent.

This is the situation. It was unfortunate that the committee did not stick by its 1989 recommendations of a floating cap. I was most disappointed to see my Liberal colleague falling in with the Tories on the committee. It was the same member on the committee who in 1989 supported the floating cap. In 1992 he had a change of heart. What had changed? Nothing had changed.

Credit card interest rates were still high and the Bank of Canada rate was down. It seemed to me that one had to ask why there was a change of heart.

Hon. Doug Lewis (Solicitor General of Canada): Madam Speaker, my hon. friend is a well-known friend and supporter of Ms. Shelley Martel, the NDP cabinet minister who took a lie detector test to prove conclusively that she was telling the truth when she said she lied.

It has often been rumoured that he was the person behind that strategy. There has even been a rumour that he leaked it to the media.

• (1040)

I wonder if my hon. friend has discussed this very serious matter with Ms. Martel in the many strategy sessions they hold in their weekly and almost daily meetings while he is in the riding. It is very well known that they are very close and that they share strategies. I just wondered if he has discussed this with her.

An hon. member: Order, Madam Speaker. This is completely out of order.

Mr. Rodriguez: Madam Speaker, I fail to see the relevance of the minister's question to the issue of what is being done to consumers on credit card interest rates. The issue we are dealing with is the rates that banks and other financial institutions charge on their credit cards.

This has nothing to do with conflicts of interest by Sinclair Stevens or other Tories of the past.

An hon. member: Or convictions for theft or corruption.

Mr. Rodriguez: They have nothing to do with convictions for theft by Tory members—

An hon. member: Or patronage.

Madam Deputy Speaker: I think comments on both sides are out of order and certainly not relevant.

Mr. Rodriguez: On a point of order, Madam Speaker. You sat there quietly while he raised a question that had absolutely no relevance.

Madam Deputy Speaker: My comment was that comments on both sides did not belong in this place and I could not see the relevance of the comments from the minister. After I saw that the hon, member had answered and was continuing with comments that were not particularly relevant I thought it was a bit early today to get out of the normal line of discussion in this House.

Mr. Charles A. Langlois (Parliamentary Secretary to Leader of the Government in the House of Commons and to Minister of National Defence): Madam Speaker—

Mr. Rodriguez: Madam Speaker, I am rising on a question of privilege because there were implications in the minister's remarks and I believe they must be withdrawn. I believe they impugn my reputation by innuendo and that is not becoming of a member in this House.