

and development work. Of course, such funds for that purpose are available in some degree today. He would extend the provisions of the Industrial Development Bank to establish industries in depressed areas, and inducements to develop in depressed areas could be by way of tax incentives, with government making capital available in a co-operative enterprise with industry—whatever that may mean.

The third point is that he would extend family allowances to certain classes of children from 16 to 21 years of age. The fourth point is the provision of medical services without charge to a substantial body of the population.

Honourable senators, I think the significant thing is that none of those points were touched upon by the Leader of the Opposition in this house, and I wonder whether my friends opposite are not somewhat disturbed by what they hear coming from the leader of their party in the other place.

I have in front of me a clipping from the *Toronto Daily Star* of Tuesday, October 9, and I shall just paraphrase an editorial on that page. It is entitled, "Where Will the Money Come From?" There can be no question that the program outlined would be extremely expensive. The cost of the Ontario hospital insurance scheme was estimated at \$200 million for the current year, including about \$120 million in taxes. A provincial medical plan would cost as much, and the whole bill could not be carried by the subscribers' premiums. Other projects—low-cost housing, free university tuition, assistance to farmers in raising their incomes, help to municipalities with their transit problems—would likewise cost the provincial treasury many millions of dollars. How would the money be raised? By increasing existing provincial taxes, by imposing new ones, by income from government-operated monopolies, or by some other method? The platform is completely silent on this question.

Hon. Mr. Croll: But he was not discussing the Liberals.

Hon. Mr. McCutcheon: No. I agree he was not discussing the Liberals, but he was discussing a platform like that of the Liberals in another place; and I suggest the comments that have been made on this platform—which was the platform of the N.D.P., as produced by the Ontario division at its convention last week, could be made about the platform that was enunciated by Mr. Pearson in another place a week ago.

Hon. Mr. Roebuck: Why not apply it to the Prime Minister's proposals as well?

Hon. Mr. McCutcheon: Well, I have not seen any of the Prime Minister's proposals that are going to involve the sums of money, from what source I know not, which are involved by some of the other proposals. In any event, being the Prime Minister he will have to put forward his proposals and the cost will then be assessed; whereas, the Leader of the Opposition is in the more fortunate position, as of course is the leader of the N.D.P., in that he can put forward the proposals but it remains for someone else to ask where will the money come from.

The Leader of the Government (Hon. Mr. Brooks) touched on another point yesterday. I do not want to traverse the same ground, but I think it is worth underlining. The Leader of the Opposition (Hon. Mr. Macdonald, Brantford), at the conclusion of his speech said:

To use the words of Sir John A. Macdonald, it is our duty to take a "sober second look" at all government legislation.

Then the leader quoted from a speech he made in 1957, and he concluded by making this, it seemed to me, very remarkable statement:

In this regard minority governments cast an added onus on the Senate, and we must remain more alert and conscious of our duties than of our prerogatives.

Now, if I can take anything from that statement, it means that because the Conservative party in the House of Commons has not a majority of members, any legislation that comes from that house to this chamber must be looked at more carefully than normally. The exact words were, "there is an added onus on the Senate because there is a minority government".

Honourable senators, there are countries where minority governments have been the rule rather than the exception. I trust that this situation will not arise in this country, but this is not the first time that we have had a minority government and it may well not be the last time. The point I want to make is that there is no such a thing as minority legislation. The legislation that comes to this chamber from the House of Commons will be passed by a majority of the persons voting on that legislation, and that legislation deserves no more or no less attention coming from the present Parliament than coming