

Inquiries of the Ministry

will be made available to us when it is. The next test, of course, is some years off, but before we agree to make representations or decide what sort of representations to make we would want to study the data from the first test most carefully.

Hon. Robert L. Stanfield (Leader of the Opposition): A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Is it the position of the government of Canada, since Canada is associated with the United States in mutual defence in a way it is not associated with the U.S.S.R., that Canada is entitled to be consulted with regard to measures taken to defend the continent?

Mr. Sharp: Mr. Speaker, the Canadian government is consulted by the United States on many matters involved in the alliances of which we are a member. We are consulted very closely about the NATO alliance and also on matters affecting NORAD. The particular installations being made now in the United States are purely for defensive purposes, for the defence of the United States. They may help to defend us, too.

Mr. Harold E. Winch (Vancouver East): A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. In view of the minister's statement, should he not reconsider the necessity of expressing Canada's point of view on the installation of the ABMs? After all, these missiles are designed to shoot down enemy missiles over Canada and Canada will receive the fall-out.

Mr. Sharp: Mr. Speaker, I would rather have them shot down over our territory than have them land here.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Winch: They will be aimed at the United States and not at us.

Mr. Robert Simpson (Churchill): Mr. Speaker, may I direct a supplementary question to the Minister of National Defence. In view of reports to the effect that plans are under way to establish Canadian Armed Services units which will be stationed on several of our Arctic islands, is the minister in a position to enlighten the House or will he be making a statement on motions in the near future?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I doubt whether the hon. member's question is a supplementary. It may be a related question but the relation is a bit distant. Perhaps the hon. member might be given the opportunity in a moment to ask his question.

[Mr. Sharp.]

[Translation]

FINANCE

QUEBEC—REQUEST FOR REFUND OF
\$200 MILLION

Mr. Gilbert Rondeau (Shefford): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Prime Minister.

In the last few days, has he or has the Minister of Finance received a request from the Quebec government, specifically from the Quebec Premier or the Quebec Minister of Finance, for a meeting with the federal authorities this week in a new effort to obtain the \$200 million?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): No, Mr. Speaker. As far as I know, neither the Minister of Finance nor I have received any request from the Quebec Finance Minister. However, if such a request has come without our being aware of it or if it should come some day, we would, without doubt, gladly meet with the Quebec government representative to explain that this amount of \$200 million has been earmarked for a variety of purposes, and that Quebec's health insurance plan indicates that that province does not think its argument relating to health insurance is valid.

[English]

TAXATION

WHITE PAPER ON REFORM—CONFLICTING
ESTIMATES OF INCREASED REVENUES

Hon. George Hees (Prince Edward-Has-tings): Mr. Speaker, may I direct a question to the Minister of Finance. Why did the government refuse to make available to the government of Ontario as far back as December and as recently as February 2 the background and details in support of its estimate of the increased revenue which would result from the implementation of the white paper policies, and why did the minister's officials at the meeting of Friday last—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I hesitate to interrupt the hon. member, but perhaps he could rephrase the question because, as asked, it invites debate. Perhaps he might ask his question more directly.

Mr. Hees: Mr. Speaker, why has this information been refused and why did the minister's officials at the meeting of officials last Friday produce only part of the information that had been requested for the past two months?