

Tabling of Documents

She has disposed of the two agreements about which I asked, by tabling one and suggesting that the tabling of the second be postponed to a different occasion.

As a result of the tabling of the agreement I find that clause 3 states that the federal government will abandon the proposed loto game and, as was foreseen during the last provincial conference, a reasonable agreement will be reached, meaning in the future, between the provinces of Ontario and Quebec and the federal government regarding the disposal of assets for the loto game. There is now a third agreement. The minister indicated today in her reply that she had already told me on several occasions she did not think it appropriate to table that agreement at this time because negotiations were going on. That was in reference to the Loto-Canada and General Instruments agreement. This agreement deals with the method of dividing the assets or commodities purchased between the provinces of Ontario and Quebec and the federal government. That is definitely a third agreement which has not been mentioned heretofore in this House.

I did not know of that third agreement until this document was tabled, and I wanted to point out that there was an inconsistency in those replies. I am sure the minister did not do this intentionally, but perhaps on the spur of the moment she was confused. There are three agreements, and I thought I should bring that to the attention of the House at the first opportunity.

I am sure the minister will read this in *Hansard* and, in answer to a future question, or perhaps tomorrow after the question period, she will clarify the matter. I am interested in having that agreement between the provinces of Quebec and Ontario and the federal government, dealing with the proposed disposition of the assets which were the subject of the agreement between Loto-Canada and General Instruments, tabled as well. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[English]

URBAN AFFAIRS

TABLING OF DISCUSSION PAPER ON HOUSING POLICY

Mr. Walter Baker (Grenville-Carleton): Mr. Speaker, during the course of the question period, in fact in the lead question, the hon. member for Ottawa-Carleton (Mrs. Pigott) referred the Minister of State for Urban Affairs (Mr. Ouellet) to an agreement or a document, a copy of which I have in my hand, dated March 9, 1978, entitled "A Discussion Paper on the Implementation of Housing Policy to Achieve Federal Priorities for 1978-79". In fact the hon. member for Ottawa-Carleton quoted from that document in the course of her remarks.

During the interchange that took place in the House it was obvious that, for some reason or other, this reference agitated

[Mr. Dick.]

the government, and certainly over-agitated the minister. I really cannot understand why that should be so because this is a government document. In any event, during the agitation which occurred on the other side of the House, the minister and, indeed, his seatmate, the Minister of State for Federal-Provincial Relations (Mr. Lalonde) shouted, "Table it! Table it!" The hon. member for Ottawa-Carleton reminded them that, of course, it is the government's job to table documents.

If the government had intended to make a disclosure I am sure it would have tabled the document, but the minister is not here to do that. Since the tabling of the document in the House obviously has the approval of persons in such high position as both the Minister of State for Urban Affairs and the Minister of State for Federal-Provincial Relations, I wonder, sir, if I might obtain unanimous consent of the House to the tabling of that document as I have described it. In order that members may understand the document, it might be appropriate if I read from it.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member will realize the difficulty we are in now. In order for him to complete that line of thought to its ultimate conclusion, he might read the whole document, and thereby put on the record what he is endeavouring to have tabled. I think the hon. member has made the point that he is seeking unanimous consent for the tabling of the document. Quite frankly, I am glad he relieved me of the procedural difficulty of having to decide whether a private member can table a document, even if agreed to by a minister of the Crown, for in fact a decision in that regard would be in the negative. Nevertheless, the hon. member in attempting to table the document is seeking the consent of the House, and unanimous consent would be required if he were to table the document at the present time. Does the hon. member have the unanimous consent of the House for the tabling of this document at this time?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Speaker: Agreed and so ordered.

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): Mr. Speaker, I just wonder if it might be appended to *Hansard* rather than simply—

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): Mr. Speaker, since my friends have been so agreeable in respect of this matter, I wonder if this document, signed by the minister, which is fundamental to housing in Canada, could be appended to *Hansard*? I certainly think this would be an excellent idea.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I wonder if we could be absolutely clear in this regard. Procedurally the tabling of a document is quite different from having it printed in the records of the House. Was the hon. member originally seeking to have it printed in the records, or simply seeking to have it tabled?

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): Mr. Speaker, I thank the House for its generosity for agreeing, as I understand it, that