

## ROYAL CANADIAN MINT

## LITERATURE—OMISSION OF PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND

**Mr. George Henderson (Egmont):** Mr. Speaker, last week I informed the House that the government video-tape which excluded Prince Edward Island from the world map and gave Newfoundland to the United States was inexcusable. My anger continues. The Royal Canadian Mint recently advertised the 1988 Calgary Olympic Winter Games coins. Subscribers were instructed to add appropriate amounts of provincial sales tax. The ad listed sales tax rates for only eight provinces. Prince Edward Island, Alberta, Yukon and the Northwest Territories were left out. I can understand omitting Alberta since it does not have sales tax; and perhaps our northern sisters share the same tax break. Where is P.E.I.? We have sales tax. Why are we not listed?

It is quite obvious that the Government really has wiped P.E.I. off the map. Not only do we see this in the ads, we see it in the Government's hopeless and inadequate policies and programs.

I stand in my place today to offer the Conservative Government a crash course in Atlantic geography. Interested Members may contact my office, room 423 in the Confederation Building, 996-4714.

\* \* \*

[Translation]

## THE ECONOMY

## REDUCTION IN INTEREST RATES—CONSEQUENCES

**Mr. Pierre H. Cadieux (Vaudreuil):** Mr. Speaker, this morning we heard that for the first time in more than 14 years, one of our major financial institutions is offering short-term mortgages at rates below 9 per cent. What a change from the exorbitant, 20-per-cent, plus rates that existed when the Liberals were in power!

In addition, Mr. Speaker, the Bank of Canada announced just a few minutes ago that the bank rate dropped by 0.25 points and is now at 8.72 per cent.

For the consumer who has to renew a five-year \$50,000 mortgage, the steady reduction in interest rates since we came to power has meant a monthly savings of nearly \$125. That is economic leadership, and we are going to continue in the same vein by creating more jobs, by attracting new businesses and by promoting economic growth in every sector and every region in Canada.

*Point of Order—Mr. Gray (Windsor West)*

[English]

## FORESTRY

## LUMBER EXPORTS TO JAPAN—AMENDMENT TO JAPANESE BUILDING CODE

**Mrs. Mary Collins (Capilano):** Mr. Speaker, one of the most important achievements of our Prime Minister's visit to Japan this week was the promotion of exports of Canadian forest products, particularly from British Columbia. For over a decade Canada has made representations to Japanese authorities and the Japanese construction industry to promote the acceptance of 2-by-4 timber frame housing construction in Japan.

Seizing the opportunity during his private meeting with Prime Minister Nakasone, our Prime Minister expressed a strong, personal interest in this issue. As a result Nakasone stated his intention to amend Japanese building codes in the near future to allow more timber frame housing in Japan. Such a change will be a significant boon to B.C.'s forest industry. It is one more example of how our Prime Minister's efforts are bringing real benefits to the economy of British Columbia.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

\* \* \*

## POINT OF ORDER

## RESPONSES TO QUESTIONS—MINISTERIAL RESPONSIBILITY—SPEAKER'S RULING

**Mr. Speaker:** Before going to Question Period I think I must rule now on the point of order raised by the Hon. Member for Windsor West (Mr. Gray). I am doing it now in order to make Question Period as long as possible. I listened very carefully to all the arguments which were made and I thank the Hon. Members who participated for the clarity and frankness with which they expressed their views.

I should say it this way. Questions to a Minister must involve ministerial responsibility in some way. It follows that questions which are purely personal ones on their face are out of order. Sometimes the borderline between what is ministerial and what is personal is not totally self-evident. Therefore, when I have heard what I believe to be borderline questions I have given the benefit of the doubt to members of the Opposition in order not to restrict unduly their right to ask questions. However, I must be fair to all Members. Therefore, I cannot allow questions which stray too far over the borderline. On review, the questions as they were put yesterday still seem to me to be not clearly expressive of the ministerial matters which they were attempting to raise. Therefore, I had to rule them out of order.

I will now deal with the second matter raised with regard to who may answer questions. Questions with regard to conflict